The first meeting for the spring semester 2002 was called to order at 10:10 a.m. on Wednesday, January 9, 2002 in AMU Ballroom A 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. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by welcoming Ms. Stephanie Russell, Executive Director of University Mission and Identity, to the Committee. Dr. Robert Deahl then volunteered to lead an opening prayer invoking insight and a clarity of vision as the Committee entered a New Year. He also sought continued cooperation for our students and a renewed commitment to completing the work of curricular reform.

I. Minutes. The Committee addressed the unapproved minutes of December 14, 2001. Members noted a number of amendments as follows: (1) a typographical error in the first paragraph on page 3, by which “comments” would be substituted for “commends;” (2) page 2, first full paragraph, Fr. Rossi substituted “they are in some way educational of certain principles and should be incorporated by the academic community” for “they are educational to community;” and (3) page 3, Part III B, Fr. Rossi substituted, “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 in a particular discipline” for the sentence beginning with the same introduction. Finally, at the top of page 4, Dr. Courtright offered that Physics 008 should be designated exclusively as having been deferred. There being no further additions or corrections to the minutes, Dr. Ken Ksobiech moved their approval, as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Robert Deahl and passed unanimously.

II. Chair’s Report. As contemplated by the agenda, Dr. Snow announced that the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) would convene independently from 9:00 to 10:00 a.m., after which it would be joined by members of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee (CCAC) from 10:00 to 11:00 a.m. Turning to the first item of business, she inquired whether the Committee wished to publish its minutes of November 30 without redaction of the particularized discussion of core course submissions. The Committee decided by consensus to publish the minutes as written since they listed no names of individual course instructors and demonstrated the level of discourse devoted to core course submissions. Dr. Snow next reported that Drs. Ksobiech, Heinrich and she would be joined by Professor Wiseman that afternoon to meet with principals from the Biomedical Engineering Department in order to discuss issues surrounding integration of the core curriculum with the curriculum in Biomedical Engineering. She also reported that she would begin drafting the CCRC final report. That report would be available to the Committee for initial review on Thursday, January 17. She proposed that the report would feature an introduction focused on the student-centered core, a description of the core curricular process (including an overview of its history), the role of faculty focus groups, descriptions of the responsibilities of the CCRC and the CCAC, integrative considerations, and a concluding section that articulates recommendations and budgetary considerations. She contemplated that the report would be submitted to the Committee for final vote on January 30 and noted that the report was now scheduled for informational presentation to the Academic Senate at its regular meeting on February 18. The Academic Senate was scheduled to vote on the final report at its March 18 meeting.

Professor Wiseman expressed her concern that the final report include a series of recommendations that perpetuate faculty governance of the process, including perhaps a Director of Core Curriculum. In that regard, Dr. Snow confided that she had met with Fr. Wild who confirmed his dedication to core curricular reform; in his specific words, “sabotage will not be tolerated.” Dr. Courtright added that the recommendations might also address jurisdictional issues, such as the status of the CCRC as a standing committee of the University or the Academic Senate. Dr. Naylor noted that whatever its
ultimate status, that status should be reflected in the By-laws of the University; continuation of the CCRC should not be dependent upon the discretion of the new Provost or the President. Fr. Rossi then voiced a parallel concern with regard to the status of the CCAC. Dr. Deahl recalled for the Committee that preliminary discussions about the Institute for Teaching and Learning had considered that venue an appropriate site for the work of the CCRC and the CCAC. He added that conversations with the new Provost should include this topic. Dr. Malin suggested that these and other recommendations should be placed on the agenda for further consideration by the Committee. She also led the Committee in thanking Professor Wiseman for her leadership efforts with core curricular reform. Fr. Rossi closed the discussion by asking whether it might be possible for representatives of the CCRC to meet with provost candidates as part of their respective campus visits. Professor Wiseman offered that she had already volunteered to meet with the provost candidates in an effort to smooth the transition in Academic Affairs. She indicated that she would invite members of the CCRC to join in those meetings. Dr. Quade then recommended that a packet of core materials be sent to each provost candidate in advance of his or her campus visit. Dr. Heinrich added that at least one question regarding the core would be included even in the early screening process. Fr. Rossi offered that including this information would signal the importance of core curricular reform efforts. Ms. Russell agreed to communicate the need for this thematic approach to the members of the Provost Search Committee.

Concluding her Chair’s Report, Dr. Snow reminded the subcommittee chairs to complete their analysis of pending course proposals from the last call for core courses. These submissions would be considered at the January 17 meeting. She reported that the CCRC had now qualified fifty-one courses for the core of common studies and complimented the members on their collective efforts.

III. September 28, 2001 Core Curriculum Conference: Preliminary Discussion of Focus Group Reports. Dr. Snow announced that a packet of focus group materials had been distributed to each member of the CCRC and the CCAC by campus mail in preparation for the ensuing discussion. She then distributed an additional report from Dr. Stephanie Quade (a copy of same is attached to the original of these minutes). By way of introducing the discussion, Dr. Shelly Malin reported that she had reviewed the core conference evaluations and observed that most of the ratings and comments ranged from “very good” to “excellent.” Some evaluators wrote “nice job” and a few were critical of program aspects, but substantive comments were minimal. Dr. Linda Laatsch continued that many of the comments apparently related to integrative issues regarding Engineering and the core curriculum. She inquired whether that concern applied to all Engineering programs or particularly to the program in Biomedical Engineering. Dr. Heinrich responded that the 36-hour common core would be “a bit painful” for all programs in Engineering but that the number of credits affected Biomedical Engineering most particularly. He offered that they were experiencing difficulties accommodating a core of even thirty-six credits. He explained that the Biomedical Engineering program is broader than other Engineering programs, in part because Biomedical Engineering must satisfy the curricular needs of pre-med students in addition to students with engineering aspirations.

Dr. Courtright then asked whether the students’ ability to finish their education in four years was also a consideration. Dr. Heinrich concurred and added that biomedical engineering students might not have sufficient flexibility to obtain a minor. Thus, faculty were concerned that the new core would offer greater breadth at the expense of intensive study in a given area. Dr. Heinrich added, however, that despite these concerns, there existed no outright resistance to the core. Dr. Ksobiech commented that these concerns were exacerbated by fears that some colleges could lose their teaching assistants. Although not openly discussed, faculty know there will be consequences to implementing a common core. Professor Wiseman responded that faculty must be mindful of the added value of a Marquette degree; the core of common studies captured the school’s Jesuit identity and preserved other aspects of Jesuit pedagogy. Presumably, that is why students attended Marquette rather than its public counterparts. She also emphasized that the Deans had begun communicating with each other about the need to cooperatively devise interdisciplinary core courses that would accommodate programmatic needs in Engineering and elsewhere.

Fr. Rossi commented that the “focus groups” constituted at the core conference represented an imperfect way to “take the temperature of the faculty.” However, he suggested that it might be worthwhile
to systematically examine and classify their various concerns by theme in order to bring them into focus. He also inquired how many of the fifty-one qualified courses were new courses, suggesting that it might be appropriate to examine the way we have done things in the past. Dr. Snow responded that Fr. Rossi’s diagnosis was correct, but emphasized that the CCRC was now at a pivotal point in the process; it had moved to a transformative phase. She suggested it was critical to involve the Deans in discussions about what their students need and to involve Department chairs with crafting new courses. She offered that the CCRC might encourage that by framing recommendations for process and budget in its final report. Dr. Courtright commented that, in his various meetings with Dr. Buckholdt, Dr. Buckholdt confirmed his decision to commit $50,000 to this effort but that the effort might require multiples of that amount. He inquired whether Fr. Wild was prepared to commit such University resources. Dr. Eckman countered that the Manresa grant already included monies for course development. Though insufficient, those monies could provide for some initiatives.

Dr. Machan observed that the core process thus far had approached course qualification issues on a case-by-case basis. At some point, a transformative effort would require consideration of the larger budget and staffing issues. He echoed Professor Wiseman’s assessment that one of the more positive developments surrounding the revised core was the involvement of the various Deans. He stressed as well the need to “hire a spider” who could hold together the disparate elements of core, staffing, scheduling, and programming, since decisions in any one of these areas necessitate affected the others and, to date, a course-by-course approach had not accorded the necessary attention to these issues. Dr. Pustejovsky offered that the first phase of core development was critical, i.e., faculty must gain control of the curriculum. He emphasized that the CCRC was presently involved in that phase. Faculty governed the core curriculum now where it had not before. Consequently, it was still appropriate to explore the parameters of this process. He also noted that where 30-40% of the undergraduate teaching faculty had been involved in the process through the early focus-group stage, many more faculty had been involved now in the form of core submissions. Dr. Quade added that it was necessary to strategize the continued evolution of core curricular reform to reduce anxiety over the changes in Academic Affairs. Dr. Deahl cautioned, however, that there was not enough conversation at the Deans Council meetings about the needs of the various colleges; the Deans were still unclear about how the work of core curricular reform impacts the work of the colleges. He offered that someone should speak to the Deans before Dr. Snow’s presentation to the Academic Senate. This was especially important as the University moved to responsibility-based budgeting.
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At 10:00 a.m., members of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee (CCAC) joined the meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC). Members Present: Dr. Virginia Chappell, Dr. Joe Collins, Dr. Robert Deahl, Mr. Daniel Gemoll, Dr. Stephen Heinrich (CCRC liaison), Dr. Robert Masson, Ms. Julie O’Keeffe, Dr. James Rice, Dr. Susan Schneider, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Joan Whipp and Professor Christine Wiseman. Members Excused: Dr. James Holstein, Dr. John Jones, Dr. Susan Lamon, Dr. Mark McCarthy, Professor Linda Milson and Dr. Barry Velleman.

Professor Wiseman provided opening remarks. She indicated that the combined meeting was designed to gather all perspectives surrounding the Core Curriculum Conference and to deliberate the role of the Assessment Committee in core curricular reform. Dr. Malin continued, reporting that the CCRC had received twenty-eight evaluative responses from attendees. On a five-point scale, the mean scores were four in every aspect evaluated. She suggested that those scores were quite good since faculty were known to be a tough audience. She emphasized that the score for overall effectiveness of the reflective method was also a four, suggesting that the conference had met its goals. Each presentation was then evaluated individually. In that regard, the principal speaker, Dr. Virginia Anderson, received the widest range of comments as might be expected. Finally, Dr. Malin noted the overall dearth of written comments from the group.
Fr. Rossi commented that, given the process engaged thus far, the reports from the various conference focus groups were the only concrete indicia of our effectiveness in talking with faculty and "taking their temperature." He suggested it might be important to work through the comments thematically. He also noted that a number of themes appeared to emerge. These included financing for the core of common studies, the educational vision that informs the core, and the kinds of opportunities presented by the core. In retrospect, it might have been better to assign a thematic analysis to all members before coming together as a combined group.

Professor Wiseman then suggested that the CCRC and the CCAC collectively address short-term issues that would predominate over the work of both committees during the spring semester 2002. Dr. Snow remarked that assessment presented an immediate need. She indicated that the course templates required assessment plans but not many departments had acted on that initiative. Dr. Masson countered that, from the outset, the CCRC had a clear and practical orientation. However, the mission of the CCAC in core assessment was not so clear. He inquired about how others viewed the role of the CCAC. Ms. O'Keefe responded that the Departments would require regular consultation to implement effective assessment strategies, but it was not clear that the CCAC could presently act in that role. Dr. Whipp responded that the CCAC was under the impression that it should review all core proposals and play a role in evaluating the accompanying assessment plans. She indicated that there were people with extensive experience on the CCAC and elsewhere who could offer concrete suggestions in the short-term and identify which Departments have the greatest needs. She also advised that there was tremendous variation across Departments and that some Departments might have no assessment expertise. Dr. Malin added that, for purposes of assessment, it would be important to gather data about the students’ ability to meet the learning objectives. The CCAC might ask some faculty to undertake testing in order to gather that data for the NCA accreditation visit.

Mr. Gemoll advised that at some point there must be an aggregation of data but there are different ways to do that. He suggested that there were three overriding principles that should be disseminated to all units: (1) there must be learning objectives; (2) the learning objectives must be measurable, and (3) the learning objectives must be measured. Concretizing these principles for all units would help. Dr. Schneider then inquired whether a course could be "unqualified" if it was qualified initially. The consensus was that a course could be "unqualified" if it did not meet expectations with regard to the learning objectives in the knowledge area. Assessment and feedback would provide that information. Dr. Schneider then suggested that once qualified, a course should be placed upon a regular cycle of review. She added that it was not necessary to mandate a specific method for assessment but that each course proponent needed to provide an assessment plan.

Dr. Deahl then summarized the work of the CCAC thus far. He noted that the CCAC began its efforts by learning about assessment from its members who held that expertise and by calling in other experts within the field. Furthermore, the duties of the CCAC were not conveyed as a clear set of tasks. He was convinced, however, that a central systematic process of assessment would need to emerge. He also reported that Dr. David Buckholdt had asked each Dean to submit a report on assessment in the majors for purposes of the University Self-Study. That data should provide evidence about how the majors are assessed. From that data, the CCAC might be able to formulate and describe a clear process for University assessment in the core.

Dr. Masson added that the CCAC is not a representative body, having been constituted on the basis of expertise. He therefore inquired how best to include all Departments in the assessment process since all disciplines are different and all Departments have a different culture. Dr. Maranto reported that, for the most part, the template responses to an assessment plan consist of "exams and papers." Syllabi do not often articulate the specific learning objectives of a course or of the relevant knowledge area. However, faculty who are teaching core courses must understand the reality of assessment; they must identify learning objectives for the students and communicate those learning objectives to the students. In that regard, it is apparent that faculty will require some assistance. Dr. Masson responded that several faculty on the CCAC had developed a methodology for assessing their courses in a given knowledge area and posted their assessment plans on the Academic Affairs web page. However, no general guidelines had...
emerged. Dr. Whipp suggested that it was possible for the CCAC to devise a generic template for each of the knowledge areas, adhering to the three principles suggested by Mr. Gemoll. She added that the CCAC should also identify what counts for measurement. Dr. Malin responded that the CCAC appears to be providing some models for how assessment is accomplished. Faculty should be informed that having a course qualified for inclusion in the core carries some benefits as well in the sense that they can expect some help with their assessment plans. However, this benefit to the faculty would entail a financial commitment from the University.

Dr. Chappell then inquired which came first: the assessment plan or qualification as a core course. Dr. Snow responded that although the course qualification template called for identification of an assessment plan, the CCRC was allowing proponents of core courses fairly wide latitude when reporting a plan. When core courses were qualified, however, the CCRC provided feedback to proponents and their Department chairs indicating that some evidence of a learning objective-specific plan would need to be developed. Dr. Maranto offered that the CCRC had qualified nearly half of the courses proposed for inclusion in the core with the understanding that assessment plans would need to be developed. Dr. Snow added that feedback was provided also to Department chairs, who co-signed the course proposals. They were informed of the need to insure viable assessment plans for courses submitted by their Departments. In view of that, what role could the CCAC be expected to play? Dr. Masson responded that it would be helpful to have assessment guidelines. He also suggested that the CCAC should arrive at a general assessment plan or broader program for assessment across the core. Fr. Rossi concurred, noting that the CCRC process with assessment had been course-focused. At some point it would be necessary to ask the larger question: are there ways of assessing the core as a whole?

Ms. O’Keeffe noted that if the CCAC were to provide such guidance, who would be coaching the Departments? She indicated that web pages cannot provide coaching; someone would need to work with faculty within the various Departments. Furthermore, although each Department might have a process, someone would need to provide coherency between the Departments. Dr. Laatsch concurred. She added that if faculty were not successful in achieving their goals, they would need to be coached about ways to improve.

Dr. Wierzbicki then suggested another agenda item for the CCAC: to educate faculty about assessment and “sell” them on the need for assessment. He suggested that there was still some resistance to assessment in many areas. Dr. Snow added that faculty want their courses qualified for the core. However, she feared that faculty would make no further efforts regarding assessment once their courses were qualified. Thus, she offered that it would be important for the CCAC to contact each Department chair who had proposed a qualified course and inquire what assessment plans are in place in order to discover whether the Departments or Department chairs required additional assistance. Dr. Pustejovsky then added that he had some materials useful to assessment in the majors and would share those with Dr. Snow and Professor Wiseman. Dr. Collins echoed the need for a long-term assessment plan. He also indicated that such a plan should provide for integrative assessment. That would require the CCAC to conclude its paragraph identifying “the Marquette graduate.” The “Marquette graduate” description should be communicated to faculty in each Department who must be convinced of its “living” value.

Dr. Heinrich suggested the need for an additional letter from Dr. Snow as chair of the CCRC, reminding the Department chairs that each qualified course requires an assessment plan by September 1, 2002. He added that the letter might indicate that assessment help is available, but he also suggested that faculty can arrive at an assessment plan if they are simply provided with Mr. Gemoll’s basic guidelines. Dr. Snow suggested that there might be a need to call a meeting of Department chairs for this purpose. Dr. Heinrich continued that any assessment plan should be submitted by each Department chair to the CCAC as well as the CCRC. He also concurred with Dr. Schneider that qualified courses should be placed on a three-year or five-year cycle, at the end of which each Department would provide a short (half page) assessment summary identifying problems and strengths of the course. That summary should be submitted to the CCAC which then issues a collective status report.

Ms. O’Keeffe offered that, beyond the CCAC, the University would need someone to lead this assessment effort, whose job description would include University assessment. That person could also lead
a dialogue among the various departments. She cautioned, however, that this recommendation should be made to the University by the CCRC or some person with political clout. It might be included as a recommendation within the CCRC final report.

Professor Wiseman closed the meeting by thanking the collective membership of the CCRC and the CCAC for their efforts. She indicated that the process of core reform would survive because it was in their capable hands and she hoped the University would one day recognize the enormity of their commitment.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Chair
Core Curriculum Assessment Committee
The January 17 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 7:10 a.m. in Straz Hall 488 by Dr. Nancy Snow. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Tim Machan and Dr. Phillip Naylor.

Dr. Snow opened the meeting by seeking volunteers to offer an opening reflection. Ms. Stephanie Russell agreed to do so, giving thanks for the fullness of the day and seeking wisdom and perspective for all who served the larger needs of the University, such as those present in core curricular reform.

I. Minutes. Professor Wiseman indicated that the unapproved minutes for the meeting on January 9, 2002, were not yet available. They would be available with the unapproved minutes of this meeting for the CCRC meeting on January 30.

II. Chair’s Report. Dr. Snow reported that she had arranged visits with both Dr. David Buckholdt and Dr. Jerry Viscione to ensure a hierarchy of support for the continuing work of core curricular reform, whatever changes ensued in the Office of Academic Affairs. She noted that both were unanimous in their support and praise for the work of the Committee. In particular, Dr. Viscione had asked her to convey his compliments to Committee members for their work.

Secondly, she reported that she had contacted Dr. Michael McKinney, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, to suggest that members of the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) participate in interviews with Provost candidates. She explained that the continued success of core reform would require the candidates’ understanding of the process and surrounding issues. In response, Dr. McKinney suggested he would attempt to have each candidate meet with a subset of the CCRC. Dr. Snow indicated as well that she wished to distribute a comprehensive packet of core materials to each Provost candidate. Finally, she would devise a list of candidates and distribute same to members of the Committee so that they might participate in the interviews as time permitted.

III. Agenda Item: Subcommittee Recommendations on Pending Core Course Proposals. At the invitation of Dr. Snow, the Committee turned its attention to discussions regarding pending course submissions. Addressed by the respective groups, these courses consisted of the following.

A. GROUP I: Dr. Cheryl Maranto issued the report for the subcommittee on Diverse Cultures and Literature/Performing Arts. She offered the following recommendations on behalf of the subcommittee:

- **GERM 148:** German Literature in Translation (Literature/Performing Arts): ***Qualify***
- **SPAN 125:** Golden Age Drama and Poetry (Literature/Performing Arts): ***Qualify***
- **SPAN 126:** 19th & 20th Century Peninsular Drama (Literature/Performing Arts): ***Remand; course objectives were not documented with sufficient evidence; supporting examples were too conclusory in that they did not describe how the particular objective was met, which is the purpose of providing examples***
- **SPAN 193:** Spanish American Literature I (Literature/Performing Arts): ***Qualify***
- **SPAN 194:** 20th Century Latin Am Lit (Literature/Performing Arts): ***Remand; the subcommittee questioned whether this was properly a core course, noting that by the time a student takes the course indicated, the student will have fulfilled the three-credit knowledge area requirement for the Core. Thus, it might not be appropriate to submit this course for the Core.***
- **LATIN 055:** ***Qualify with Restrictions; syllabus does not articulate learning objectives and instructor should be so advised***
FR 119: French 19th Century and Colonial Representations (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
FR 116: 16th Century Literature (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
HIST 071: Latin America (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 173: Carribean (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 174: History of Mexico (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 185: Modern Japan (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 184: Modern China (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 082: Survey of East Asian Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand; with each of these submissions the subcommittee noted that the templates provided no evidence that the course addressed the prescribed learning objectives in a systemic fashion that was also conceptually organized
HIST 120: African American History (Diverse Cultures): Qualify; the subcommittee noted that this course distinguished history as a humanistic approach to diverse cultures rather than a discursive approach

Dr. Snow remarked that if certain deficiencies such as those noted above were repeated with each template, she would write an explanatory letter to the sponsoring Department. She then inquired about recommendations for SPAN 100 and SPAN 102. The subcommittee noted that each of those submissions was still pending since the subcommittee had neglected to address them in the course of its other business.

Dr. Wierzbicki then inquired whether it was appropriate for the CCRC to reject a core submission because the particular course at issue required other core courses as a pre-requisite. This situation might present itself particularly with upper division courses. Fr. Rossi observed that situations might exist where students have fulfilled certain pre-requisites, making them eligible to take the particular course, but the credits are not reflected on their transcripts (e.g., transfer students). He inquired which set of circumstances ought to frame the CCRC policy response. He also indicated that the CCRC should investigate the waiver issue more directly before Framing any such policy. In that regard, Dr. Malin responded that the individual colleges should exercise jurisdiction over pre-requisites. Dr. Laatsch agreed, noting that the CCRC should simply approve courses whose templates are sufficient without regard to the question of pre-requisites at this juncture. With respect to the Diverse Cultures submissions, Dr. Maranto clarified that none of the submissions noted above responded in any way to the objectives as framed or contemplated by the knowledge area, with the exception of HIST 120 (African American History). She noted that while there was no doubt that the courses raised issues of diversity, there was no evidence that the courses addressed the prescribed learning objectives for the knowledge area in a systemic fashion that was also conceptually organized. She remarked that the template information appeared to be reproduced verbatim for some of the course submissions, to the point where some templates actually mentioned a country different from that defined by the course title.

B. GROUP II: Dr. Ken Ksobiech reported that the subcommittee on Mathematical Reasoning and Rhetoric had received no further information regarding PSYCH 060, which had been remanded to the proponent and Department for clarification. Thus, no further recommendation would issue regarding that course.

C. GROUP III: Reporting for the subcommittee addressing Individual and Social Behavior and Histories of Cultures and Societies, Dr. Mike Wierzbicki indicated that HIST 083 was likewise still pending for approval since the further information requested by the subcommittee had not yet been received. He added as well that the subcommittee had met to address ROTC templates for AFAS 131, AFAS 132 and NASC 022, but those templates were still circulating among members of the subcommittee. With regard to MILI 146, no template had yet been submitted. When asked by Dr. Snow for his preliminary observations, Dr. Wierzbicki noted that the templates failed to address a number of the learning objectives from the respective knowledge areas. His sense was that the military topics were very narrow in range. Moreover, when addressed, the specific learning objectives were not clearly demonstrated by the examples cited. However, Dr. Wierzbicki cautioned that his observations were preliminary; the situation might be resolved after further communication. Professor Wiseman questioned whether these issues were capable of resolution, given the fact that the military prescribed a finite curriculum. Dr. Wierzbicki
responded that the narrowness of the topics was troublesome but that the subcommittee might be willing to allow for flexibility. He cited as more troubling the fact that the ROTC course templates do not identify prevailing educational theories so that their relationship to the respective knowledge areas might be more clearly identified. Dr. Snow responded that she would report these general concerns to the various ROTC curriculum coordinators so that missing information could be supplied.

Fr. Rossi then asked whether there was flexibility within the ROTC package to do what the core curriculum expects them to do, i.e., meet the goals of the core curriculum. Dr. Malin added that she could imagine a leadership course that was broad enough to cover learning objectives within some knowledge areas, noting that her experience with ROTC students was that they were very well prepared. She expressed some concern that the prevailing templates might be deficient. Furthermore, based on her experience in the College of Nursing, she noted that Nursing has done considerable negotiating around their summer experiences in order to meet prescribed goals; she was not convinced that the same could not be done within the parameters of the ROTC programs. She added that a number of Jesuit institutions carry ROTC programs. With some investigation of these other situations, the CCRC might be able to fashion a more creative approach than simply excusing ROTC students from the core requirements. Dr. Wierzbicki added that the subcommittee was working to draft an appropriate response to this situation, noting its sensitivity. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that it might be appropriate as well to request help from national ROTC educators since they prescribe the curriculum. Dr. Maranto added that there might be some analogy between the ROTC courses and various history courses. She suggested that the substance may be there but the conceptual information is missing. In particular, the ROTC templates need to identify where the various learning objectives are situated.

D. GROUP IV: Reporting on behalf of Human Nature and Ethics; Science and Nature and Theology, Dr. Shelly Malin indicated that the subcommittee had met on January 9 with regard to three pending submissions. These were as follows:

- PHYSICS 007 (Science and Nature): Qualify, but note the need for additional information about a learning-objective specific assessment plan
- PHYSICS 008 (Science and Nature): Defer
- PHYSICS 009 (Science and Nature): Defer

Dr. Malin explained that Physics 008 and 009 were being deferred in order to afford the opportunity for a meeting with the Department. The templates were deficient in citing examples that reflected how the students would meet the learning objectives rather than examples citing what the instructors would teach. She noted that the syllabi were also deficient. Although the courses were important science offerings for non-science majors, and therefore necessary to the core, the evidence was deficient at present. Dr. Malin indicated that she was presently gathering e-mail feedback and would join with an additional member of the subcommittee to meet with the Department chair.

There being no further discussion on course submissions, Fr. Rossi moved to accept the subcommittee recommendations. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky. Dr. Snow indicated that the CCRC would vote January 30 on this motion in accord with its two-meeting rule.

IV. Literature/Performing Arts Designation. Dr. Snow referred Committee members to three memos concerning this subject that were distributed in advance of the meeting. The first was a memo dated January 15, 2002 from Ms. Phylis Ravel, Artistic Director, Department of Performing Arts; the second was a memo from Committee member Dr. Tim Machan, dated January 16, 2002 (copy of the Focus Group report from AESTHETIC, SEMIOTIC AND SYMBOLIC was attached), and the third was a memo from Committee member Dr. Ken Ksobiech, dated January 17, 2002. (Copies of these memos are attached to the original of these minutes). Dr. Snow distributed additional copies to those members who had not received them initially and directed the Committee members to review the contents of each. Each memo discussed issues surrounding the conjunction of Literature/Performing Arts and/or Foreign Languages/Diversity. After examining the memos, Dr. Snow asked the CCRC members how they wished to proceed.
Fr. Rossi responded that there existed three disciplines/areas which, at one level, would be appropriate to include as part of the core. These included Logic, Performing Arts and Foreign Languages. However, he suggested that additional action by the CCRC was circumscribed because the CCRC had determined a finite number of hours for the core of common studies in a compartmentalized fashion without asking certain overriding questions. He suggested that the CCRC had placed itself in a box by the decision to adopt a finite number of credits; if the Committee were going to consider these excluded areas, it would need to go back and revisit the numbers as decided.

Dr. Malin disagreed; she considered that the CCRC had made a decision, in terms of an overview, that the core of common studies was *not* compartmentalized. Dr. Eckman wondered whether Performing Arts could fit within any of the existing knowledge areas, noting that the Foreign Languages Department is qualifying a number of courses within the Literature or Diversity learning objectives. Dr. Malin responded that there might exist a difference regarding Performing Arts since that Department may believe that all students should be required to take courses within this subject area as part of the common core.

Dr. Ksobiech then offered that when the CCRC enacted a common core of thirty-six credits, its members understood that the relevant knowledge area was designated, “Literature/Performing Arts.” He suggested that the designation was clearly contemplated by the CCRC and consistently referred to within the CCRC Minutes. He then recapitulated the substance of his January 17 memo, noting that the motion to approve the credit allocation in the core, which passed by a 12 to 3 vote, required all undergraduates to complete three hours of study in the knowledge designated, “Literature/Performing Arts.” He added that the members of the CCRC were aware that the focus group charged to develop learning objectives was originally designated, “Aesthetic, Semiotic and Symbolic,” and that they had decided to rename the knowledge area, creating separate but related sets of learning objectives for Literature and Performing Arts. Nevertheless, the proposal articulated at the April 21 meeting, moved for adoption on May 17, and subsequently adopted on May 25, clearly required three hours in “Literature/Performing Arts.” Dr. Ksobiech continued that the three credits prescribed for this knowledge area would not prohibit individual colleges from determining how that requirement was met, citing to his experience in the College of Communication. The faculty there had tentatively determined that students should complete nine (9) hours in the Literature/Performing Arts knowledge area allocated as follows: six (6) in Literature and (3) in Performing Arts. The faculty of another college might decide a similar or different allocation. However, Dr. Ksobiech argued that the CCRC was clear in its decision: every undergraduate from Marquette University must complete three credits of “Literature/Performing Arts.”

The CCRC members then asked the Reporter to examine the detailed minutes of April 21, May 17, and May 25. Professor Wiseman read aloud from each of those minutes, verifying that the knowledge area had been written on the blackboard as described by Dr. Ksobiech, transcribed into the minutes exactly as written on the board, and voted on as transcribed. Dr. Laatsch confirmed that the Core Curriculum Steering Committee had examined core curricula at other institutions, at which point the topic of Fine Arts surfaced. She recalled that most universities did not have a separate Fine Arts designation within the core, which is why the Steering Committee arrived at the designation, “Aesthetic, Semiotic and Symbolic.” Dr. Ksobiech confirmed her recollection, agreeing that the knowledge area ultimately was re-packaged with a new title and separate learning objectives by the focus group. He reiterated, however, that the CCRC minutes were clear about the nature of the vote. Dr. Snow then inquired about how the issue should be determined. She noted that Ms. Ravel had sought an opportunity to be heard and observed that Dr. Tim Machan was not present either. Other members noted, however, that the matter appeared to be settled as indicated by Dr. Ksobiech. The Committee thereafter agreed by consensus that there was no further issue for deliberation; the core of common studies was a “zero-sum game” whose credits were allocated as indicated by the motion. Dr. Snow summarized the Committee’s determination, and its members agreed with her summary: there is one knowledge area designated, “Literature/Performing Arts,” with two sets of learning objectives – one set in Literature and another in Performing Arts. Courses that satisfy *either* set can be approved for the core of common studies.

With respect to the knowledge area designated, “Foreign Languages/Diverse Cultures,” the Committee determined that the dual reference was a mistake. Its members noted that there had always been only one set of learning objectives – those for Diverse Cultures. Historically, there had been no
attempt to include the study of foreign languages *per se*. Thus, henceforth, the knowledge area would be designated exclusively as “Diverse Cultures.”

V. Draft of Final Report. Dr. Nancy Snow announced that she and Professor Wiseman had worked to produce a draft of the CCRC Final Report for consideration by the Committee. After a cursory review, members noted several issues, some of which were substantive and some of which were scrivener errors. For example, the Draft Report should now reflect the knowledge area as “Literature/Performing Arts” within its text; the emphasis on a tiered approach to the core of common studies was consistent with the determination made initially by the Steering Committee; specific budget recommendations should be included; the date of the final focus group reports should read September 22, 2000. Several members suggested as well that the draft report should include page and line numbers so that it might be subject to piecemeal review. Additional recommendations could reference page numbers and lines of text and could be submitted to Dr. Snow by e-mail. Dr. Snow suggested that the Committee would revisit discussion of the Final Draft as an agenda item at its January 30 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman  
Reporter  
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Core Curriculum Review Committee
Approved Minutes
January 30, 2002

The January 30 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU 227. Members Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, 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. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Tim Machan and Ms. Stephanie Russell. Guest: Ms. Natalie Gross.

After order was called, Professor Christine Wiseman introduced Ms. Natalie Gross to the members. Ms. Gross is a graduate student in Educational Policy and Leadership Studies in the School of Education who is interning in the Office of Academic Affairs. Professor Wiseman indicated that she would join the CCRC when convenient and assist with the minutes for CCRC meetings. Dr. Snow then called upon Fr. Phil Rossi who opened the meeting with a quotation from Wisdom. He asked God’s spirit of wisdom to be with the Committee members today and throughout their entire lives.

I. Minutes. Dr. Snow indicated that the Committee would consider two sets of minutes for approval: the first from January 9 and the second from January 17, 2002. Turning to the January 9 minutes, Dr. Stephen Heinrich sought addition of the words “36-hour” to modify “common core” in the first paragraph under Part III. He also asked that the last clause of the paragraph’s final sentence be replaced with the words, “in part because Biomedical Engineering must satisfy the curricular needs of pre-med students in addition to students with engineering aspirations.” He asked as well that the membership list for the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee on page 3 reflect his CCRC liaison status. In addition to these, Dr. Machan sent e-mail instructions in lieu of his presence at the meeting, asking that the fourth sentence in the second full paragraph on page 3 be amended to read: “He stressed as well the need to ‘hire a spider’ who could hold together the disparate elements of core, staffing, scheduling and programming, since decisions in any one of these areas necessarily affected the others and, to date, a course-by-course approach had not accorded the necessary attention to these issues.” Finally, Dr. Linda Laatsch noted a typographical error on page 5, substituting the word “educate” for “education.” There being no further additions or corrections to the minutes of January 9, Dr. John Pustejovsky moved their approval as revised. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ellen Eckman and passed unanimously.

With regard to the January 17 minutes, members noted that the Reporter had inadvertently repeated the same discussion of the December 14 minutes in the minutes of January 17. In point of fact, no minutes were discussed at the January 17 meeting since the January 9 minutes were not yet available. Professor Wiseman indicated that she would amend the January 17 minutes to reflect that fact. Fr. Rossi then asked to delete the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 4 and add the following: “He suggested that the CCRC had placed itself in a box by its decision to adopt a finite number of credits; if the Committee were going to consider these excluded areas, it would need to go back and revisit the numbers as decided.” Finally, Dr. Laatsch noted that the word, “semiotic” had been misspelled in two places on page 4. There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Robert Deahl moved to approve the January 17 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. John Pustejovsky and approved unanimously.

II. Agenda Items. (A) Provost Candidate Interviews. Dr. Snow announced the addition of one important matter to the agenda, which she would address. She reported that she had received an e-mail message from Dean Michael McKinney, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, asking her to name eight or ten members from the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee who would come together to meet with each Provost candidate for forty-five to fifty minutes. Dr. Snow indicated that she was unaware the Assessment Committee would be included within that group; she would have preferred a discrete meeting at which members of the CCRC could attend on a first-come, first-served basis, without prior designation. Responding to a timing question, Dr. James Courtright indicated that the Provost interviews would be scheduled during the weeks of February 18 and February 25. Dr. Malin added that it might be important to have a small group of the same people present for each candidate interview to ensure consistency. Dr. Wierzbicki noted that since the CCRC was being invited to
 send representatives to visit all candidates, the CCRC should opt for consistency. Fr. Rossi and others concurred. Dr. Malin added that such consistency would strengthen any recommendation emanating from the CCRC. Dr. Laatsch offered that it would also be helpful for the CCRC to design a group of five or six questions that might be put to each candidate so that all would address the same questions. Responding to concerns that the Provost candidates might wish to reconfigure or revise the core to their own specifications, Dr. Deahl commented that the issue of methodology had been discussed at great length among the Deans. They were agreed about the need to be realistic with the candidates but to be as positive as possible. Dr. Deahl noted that since the CCRC carried a mandate from Fr. Wild, any Provost candidate who sought to re-invent the core would likely have a problem with the President as well. Dr. Snow then offered that she had met with Fr. Wild on another matter the afternoon of Monday, January 28. At that time, he reiterated his support for the core reform occurring on campus and suggested that he might include a message of support in his Pere Marquette remarks.

Since the CCRC had achieved consensus on the need to put the same five or six questions to each candidate, Dr. Snow also suggested a format for meeting with each candidate. Under her arrangement, the CCRC Executive Committee would invite three members of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee to join them for each candidate’s interview. Professor Wiseman would discuss this with members of the Assessment Committee at their February 13 meeting. The remaining four members of the interview team would come from the larger CCRC membership. Dr. Snow suggested that it would be important to extend the opportunity to other members of the CCRC, who could be present for at least some of the dialogue. Dean McKinney had indicated that recommendations from each member of the interviewing team would be sought, but that a summary recommendation from the entire CCRC would also be appropriate. Dr. Snow reminded CCRC members to e-mail her with a list of possible or actual questions. Dr. Heinrich added that since the core was not the only important issue in the selection of a new Provost, CCRC members should attend the general candidate forums as well.

(B) Pending Motion on Core Course Submissions. Reverting to the minutes of January 17, Dr. Snow recounted that a seconded motion was pending with regard to each of the following recommendations, in accord with the two-meeting rule:

GROUP I:

GERM 148: German Literature in Translation (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
SPAN 125: Golden Age Drama and Poetry (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
SPAN 126: 19th & 20th Century Peninsular Drama (Literature/Performing Arts): Remand
SPAN 193: Spanish American Literature I (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
SPAN 194: 20th Century Latin Am Lit (Literature/Performing Arts): Remand
LATIN 055: Qualify with Restrictions; syllabus does not articulate learning objectives and instructor should be so advised
FR 119: French 19th Century and Colonial Representations (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
FR 116: 16th Century Literature (Literature/Performing Arts): Qualify
HIST 071: Latin America (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 173: Caribbean (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 174: History of Mexico (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 185: Modern Japan (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 184: Modern China (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 082: Survey of East Asian Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
HIST 120: African American History (Diverse Cultures): Qualify, noting that this course distinguished history as a humanistic approach to diverse cultures rather than a discursive approach

GROUP IV:

PHYSICS 007 (Science and Nature): Qualify
There being no further discussion on the motion, Dr. Snow called the question. All members voted in favor, including Dr. Ken Ksobiech who voted by proxy. There were no members opposed and none abstained.

(C) Additional Course Proposals. Dr. Snow inquired whether Group I had addressed the pending submissions for SPAN 100 and SPAN 102. Reporting for the subcommittee, Professor Wiseman noted that the subcommittee had met and deliberated on Monday, January 29, and offered the following:

SPAN 100: Spanish Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
SPAN 102: Spanish-American Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand

With regard to both submissions, Professor Wiseman reported that the template responses were conclusory; they did not explain or document how the particular course fulfilled the specific learning objectives of the knowledge area. She observed that a proponent must provide specific examples, drawn from the course, that illustrate how the particular learning objective is addressed. Furthermore, the entire syllabus must be in English; a listing of specific topics and assignments in the language spoken by the reviewers helps to document coverage as it relates to learning objectives. The template responses at issue often related very superficially to the actual questions. For example, when responding to “Use discipline specific concepts to explain how values, beliefs, norms . . . are shaped by . . . historical, religious, economic . . . or social context,” a response that “[s]tudents use a variety of terms to analyze the historical bases of the cultures in question” (SPAN 100) does not fully address the question. Professor Wiseman noted that the instructors clearly possessed a wealth of knowledge pertaining to Spanish and Spanish/American civilization and could speak with authority on key experiences. However, neither the syllabi nor the templates approached the tasks at an analytical level that matched the questions on the template. To fulfill the objectives of the knowledge area, courses should provide more than knowledge of one or more cultures. Through their study, students must identify social and psychological processes (e.g., prejudice, stereotyping) which are human universals and operate in all cultures. She cited the template for SPAN 103 as an excellent example; the subcommittee would direct the proponents to that template as well.

With respect to Group II, Dr. Snow inquired whether additional supportive evidentiary materials had been received for PSYCH 060. Dr. Wierzbicki indicated that the Department was still awaiting further direction from the subcommittee, which had not yet particularized the deficiencies. Likewise, with respect to Group III, the subcommittee had received no further materials regarding HIST 083. Dr. Wierzbicki reported, however, that the subcommittee had addressed the templates submitted for AFAS 131 and 132, NASC 022, and MISC 146. Their recommendations were as follows:

AFAS 131: Air Force Leadership Studies I (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
AFAS 132: Air Force Leadership Studies II (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
NASC 022: Sea Power and Maritime Affairs (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Remand
MISC 146: Military Law, Professionalism and Ethics (Individual and Social Behavior): Defer

With respect to AFAS 131 and 132, Dr. Wierzbicki noted two concerns. First, the range of concepts covered was rather limited such that neither course might be sufficiently broad to constitute a core course. Secondly, the templates did not provide specific examples of theories, research methodologies, quantitative methods or alternative interpretations of phenomena addressed in the course. With respect to NASC 022, the subcommittee viewed that course as a limited offering in naval history rather than a course which provides interpretive breadth and depth complemented by a variety of distinct methodologies. Dr. Wierzbicki noted that the History Department had been contacted about developing a course that could fulfill NROTC needs as well as those of the core. That discussion has yet to occur. Finally, no syllabus accompanied the template for MISC 146. Thus, there was insufficient information upon which to make a decision regarding the qualification of that course.

Following the subcommittee report, Dr. Snow inquired whether any of these courses could be revised so as to meet core requirements. Dr. Naylor responded that there appeared to be no option unless these courses were conjoined with a Western Civilization or American History approach. Both he and Dr.
Lance Grahn, Chair of the History Department, would discuss this matter further and meet with ROTC curriculum coordinators to explore these issues. Dr. Wierzbicki also observed that there was no indication that the military science courses were being presented as social science with attendant theories and methodology. He explained that since the subcommittee had insufficient knowledge about the predominant theories, it was still possible that some of the courses might qualify.

In response to a question by other CCRC members, Dr. Snow recounted that a March 1 deadline existed for resubmission of remanded courses. Under the circumstances, it was appropriate that the CCRC act on these courses as soon as possible. She then questioned Group IV about its progress on Physics 008 and Physics 009. Dr. Malin responded that the subcommittee had been unable to meet with the Physics Department chair amid the press of other business.

There being no further discussion on pending submissions, Dr. Ellen Eckman moved the recommendation of Groups I and III as follows:

SPAN 100: Spanish Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
SPAN 102: Spanish-American Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
AFAS 131: Air Force Leadership Studies I (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
AFAS 132: Air Force Leadership Studies II (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
NASC 022: Sea Power and Maritime Affairs (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Remand

The motion was seconded by Dr. Robert Deahl. Dr. Snow indicated that the CCRC would vote on these submissions either on February 14 or earlier, if an additional meeting were to be scheduled. Dr. Snow announced that she favored an additional meeting in early February to approve the CCRC Final Report, which now existed in draft form. She also asked Group III to approve the release of information regarding the military science courses to the ROTC curriculum coordinators. Dr. Wierzbicki provided that authorization to Dr. Snow.

(D) Biomedical Engineering. Dr. Snow reported that the CCRC Executive Committee, accompanied by Professor Wiseman, had met with principals in the Department of Biomedical Engineering on January 9, 2002 regarding core curricular requirements. These included: Dr. Lars Olson, Dr. Jack Winters (Chair) and Ms. Brigid Lagerman (Asst. Chair). Dr. Snow indicated that the Biomedical Engineering Department is struggling to incorporate the new core curricular requirements into their undergraduate curricula and had asked for assistance from the CCRC Executive Committee. The discussion between the Executive Committee and the BIEN representatives led to the following potential options to alleviate the BIEN difficulties: (1) two “double dips” in the core; (2) 15 credit-hour semesters become 18 credit-hour semesters, plus one “double dip” in the core; (3) create a different credit hour requirement in one of the knowledge areas; (4) create an elective out of a required course in the BIEN curriculum; (5) build a rhetoric option into an engineering course; (6) build an individual and social behavior option into an engineering course; and (7) combine two courses to equal three credits in one knowledge area. The Executive Committee and Professor Wiseman indicated that these options would be further discussed with the entire CCRC. Biomedical Engineering then reported back to Dr. Snow that they were exploring options (5), (6) and (7). They were also encouraged by options (1) and (3). Option (4) was dismissed as unpopular.

Dr. Snow suggested that the “double dips” constituted the only real policy issue the CCRC was required to consider. If one course were to satisfy the learning objectives in two knowledge areas, the learning objectives in each knowledge area would need to be met. Fr. Rossi added that the course would need to be qualified in both knowledge areas as well. CCRC members thereafter engaged a discussion of the merits of this proposal. Dr. Snow identified, for example, that some History courses might be qualified in both Past Cultures and Societies and in Diverse Cultures. Likewise, some Foreign Language courses might be qualified in both Literature/Performing Arts and Diverse Cultures.

Dr. Heinrich countered that three issues existed for the CCRC: “double dipping;” changing the size of the core (reducing it), and combining two courses to provide three credits in a given knowledge area. Dr. Deahl added that the issue of using a single course to meet learning objectives in more than one
knowledge area would prove to be a significant issue over time. Dr. Snow indicated that nothing in the CCRC literature prevented “double dipping.” Professor Wiseman cautioned, however, that since the CCRC faced the issue only in theory, the CCRC at best could decide whether it would or would not accept that option. She suggested that the CCRC was not situated to decide any other parameters since no actual case was pending before it. Fr. Rossi added that the CCRC needed to address how transfer options and credit-hour requirements would fit into the larger picture. He emphasized that the CCRC had not spent time discussing the integration of learning objectives among all the knowledge areas. Dr. Snow responded that, to some extent, the CCRC had anticipated that issue because it had interjected a question into the template requiring proponents to assess the impact of a given course on other knowledge areas.

Dr. Deahl then cautioned that the word “double dipping” should be eliminated since it cheapens the concept. Instead, he suggested use of the term, “dual application.” Dr. Heinrich responded that he did not favor dual application since that concept would lead to a non-uniform core size (e.g., 36 credits for some, 33 credits for others). He opined that the common core should be the same size for all students. Dr. Heinrich therefore viewed the dual application option as inferior to (a) an across-the-board reduction in core size (to 33 credits), and (b) permitting a combination of courses to satisfy the credit requirement in a given knowledge area, e.g., 1.5 credits from one course and 1.5 credits from another. Dr. Pustejovsky added that he could not support the idea of splitting a knowledge area over two or three courses; to do so would corrode the intentionality of the core and constitute an administrative nightmare. Fr. Rossi again noted that the CCRC had failed to holistically address the relationship among the knowledge areas before making any such determination. Dr. Malin agreed, suggesting that Fr. Rossi’s refrain indicated that the CCRC had not fully addressed this issue. Therefore, she proposed the formation of another subcommittee to undertake that holistic examination in order to inform the thinking of the CCRC and to assess the core as a whole. Dr. Pustejovsky countered that the Preamble Subcommittee was already engaged in those discussions. Thus, he offered that the Preamble Subcommittee should expand its efforts to include that analysis. He expected that the subcommittee would prepare its submission shortly. Dr. Quade noted that the discussion itself proved that the CCRC could engage this analysis. She also observed that some parallels already exist within the Grad School for some of the strategic options suggested to BIEN. At that point, Dr. Snow postponed any further discussion in view of the need to address the draft of the CCRC Final Report.

(E) Draft of Final Report. Dr. Snow indicated that she had attempted to incorporate all of the changes submitted by various members of the CCRC. In her estimation, several issues would require resolution before completing the final report. These included: (1) adoption of a tired approach to the core of common studies; (2) transfer students; (3) the question of AP or transfer credits and (4) the list of recommendations. Dr. Snow had incorporated all of the suggested recommendations with the idea that these could be winnowed at a later time. She was resolved to include whatever the CCRC would need to accomplish its objectives and let the administration decide which of the recommendations were not feasible. She had also asked Dr. David Buckholdt about the availability of monies from the Quality Enhancement Fund but had received no response as yet. She asked the CCRC for a motion to approve the final report with appropriate edits so that it could be subject to vote at the next regular meeting or at a special meeting if one was called. She reiterated that she had sketched the CCRC agenda to Fr. Wild and told him she would send it on to the administration for final approval after a vote by the Academic Senate. Dr. James Courtright then moved that the CCRC accept the Final Report as suitably amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Robert Deahl.

In its ensuing discussions, some members noted that the College of Engineering might raise several concerns about the core at the Academic Senate meeting on February 18. These concerns would likely include the BIEN issues. Dr. Snow suggested that the final report required an “escape clause” permitting the CCRC to handle such issues as they arise from time to time. She also considered it important to reconstitute the CCRC as a standing committee of the University/Academic Senate. Fr. Rossi then inquired whether it was appropriate to invite feedback on the draft of the final report before it was presented to the Academic Senate. He was concerned that the CCRC had not fully explored the “temperature of the faculty” on the core of common studies. Professor Wiseman countered that, under the terms of the Implementation Plan by which the process originated, only a report that identified the core of common studies was subject to feedback. Furthermore, that report had already been posted on the web and
submitted to the Deans Council and all of the Deans’ advisory councils. She added that the final report under discussion was the CCRC’s report; it was not subject to feedback from other constituencies and was subject to no other approval after it was considered by the Academic Senate and forwarded to the central administration. She also stressed that it was important to include a recommendation within the final report indicating that “the CCRC retains continuing jurisdiction over all matters concerning the core of common studies, including the power to amend the core with due notice to all constituents.” Dr. Snow added that she desired the appointment of a Director of Core Curriculum with dedicated administrative assistance. The Director might also assume overriding responsibility for assessing the core of common studies.

Dr. Laatsch then asked what was intended by the words, “sequenced in a three-tiered fashion.” She offered that the curricula in Health Sciences could never accommodate a core that would permit no student to take courses in Human Nature and Ethics or Theology until much later in their studies. Fr. Rossi suggested that the phraseology could be changed but that the language should remain fairly restrictive since faculty in the Theology Department remained convinced that students in their first semester, first year, had not yet developed appropriate analytic and interpretive skills to take THEO 001. Professor Wiseman noted that the tiered approach was intended to counter any claim that the core of common studies had adopted a “cafeteria style” approach to student learning. Thus, the concept of a “tiered” approach had been articulated by the Steering Committee and by several of the focus groups. To meet Dr. Laatsch’s concern, she suggested insertion of the words, “insofar as possible,” in lines 35-36 of the draft report. Dr. Courtright recommended adding the phrase, “Recognizing the conceptual structure of the core” at the beginning of that same paragraph. Thus, the opening sentence on page 2, line 35 of the draft would read: “Recognizing the conceptual structure of the core, the Committee further recommends that, insofar as possible, instruction in the knowledge areas be sequenced in a three-tiered fashion as follows . . .” Fr. Rossi also suggested that the subtitle for Part C 2 be renamed, “Programmatic Issues,” rather than “Integration of the Core . . .”

(F) Assessment Letter. As a final matter, Dr. Snow asked the CCRC to offer comments on Dr. Heinrich’s proposed assessment letter, which would be sent to the chairs of each Department that had sponsored a core course submission but had yet to submit a learning-objective-specific assessment plan. Professor Wiseman offered that the matter should be considered by the Assessment Committee before any letter issued. She had arranged two imminent meetings for the Assessment Committee: February 13 and February 22. She would place the letter on the agenda at the first meeting and asked Dr. Heinrich to forward a copy to her by electronic mail so that she could forward it to each member of the Assessment Committee.

Since time had expired, Dr. Snow asked the remaining members to consult their calendars for an additional meeting next week. She asked that the Committee meet on Wednesday, February 6 from 10:30 until 11:30 a.m. She would follow with details by e-mail to each member. The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The February 6, 2002 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 10:30 a.m. by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU 252. 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. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. Members Excused: Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Michele Malin, and Ms. Stephanie Russell. Guest: Ms. Natalie Gross.

After order was called, Dr. John Pustejovsky offered the opening reflection.

I. Minutes. As a first order of business, Dr. Nancy Snow asked for additions or corrections to the minutes of January 30, 2002, which had been earlier distributed by e-mail. Fr. Phil Rossi asked that the final paragraph of Section II E, page 6 of the minutes, be amended to read as follows: “Fr. Rossi suggested that the phraseology could be changed but that the language should remain fairly restrictive since faculty in the Theology Department remained convinced that students in their first semester, first year, had not yet developed appropriate analytic and interpretive skills to take THEO 001.” Dr. Stephen Heinrich then suggested four amendments to the minutes. He asked that the opening paragraph of Section II D on page 4 be amended to read: “The discussion between the Executive Committee and the BIEN representatives led to the following potential options to alleviate the BIEN difficulties . . .” He then asked that the parenthetical comment in the final paragraph on page 4, attributable to him, be stricken from the minutes. He also asked that the first full paragraph on page 5 of the minutes be amended to read as follows: “Dr. Heinrich responded . . . since that concept would lead to a non-uniform core size (e.g., 36 credits for some, 33 credits for others). He opined that the common core should be the same size for all students. Dr. Heinrich therefore viewed the dual application option as inferior to (a) an across-the-board reduction in core size (to 33 credits), and (b) permitting . . .” Finally, he asked that the first paragraph of Section II F regarding the “Assessment Letter” be amended to add, “but had yet to submit a learning-objective-specific assessment plan,” to the conclusion of the paragraph’s opening sentence.

There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Linda Laatsch moved to approve the January 30 minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. James Courtright and passed unanimously.

II. Agenda Items.

(A) Vote on Pending Course Submissions. Reverting to the minutes of January 30, 2002, Dr. Snow recounted that a seconded motion was pending with regard to each of the following subcommittee recommendations, in accord with the two-meeting rule:

SPAN 100: Spanish Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
SPAN 102: Spanish-American Civilization (Diverse Cultures): Remand
AFAS 131: Air Force Leadership Studies I (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
AFAS 132: Air Force Leadership Studies II (Individual and Social Behavior): Remand
NASC 022: Sea Power and Maritime Affairs (Histories of Cultures and Societies): Remand

Dr. Snow observed that further discussion regarding MISC 146 was suspended since the course submission had been withdrawn by the ROTC unit. There being no further discussion regarding any of the other courses noted above, Dr. Snow called the question. All Committee members present voted in favor of the motion to approve the subcommittee recommendations, remanding all course submissions. There were no votes opposed and no abstentions. Dr. Snow announced that two proxy votes from Drs. Shelly Malin and Robert Deahl would be cast in favor of the motion as well.

(B) Draft of Final Report. Professor Wiseman announced that she had received the amended draft report from Dr. Snow. She then edited the report for greater clarity and reorganized the final
recommendations, consistent with the language suggested by the members during the January 30 CCRC meeting. She also reported that she and the Executive Committee had met with Dr. Buckholdt on Tuesday, February 5, 2002, regarding the protocol for interdisciplinary course proposals. (Minutes of that meeting would issue before the next regular CCRC meeting). In view of that meeting and CCRC needs to remain informed of resource issues, Professor Wiseman proposed an additional recommendation for inclusion in the final report as Recommendation (11): “To insure the integrity of the core development process, the Director of Core Curriculum must be included in any discussions between the Provost and the various Deans regarding the development of new or interdisciplinary core courses.” Committee members agreed with the substance of the recommendation, but Dr. Naylor suggested that it would be more appropriate for the Committee to issue only ten recommendations. Thus, he suggested preserving the recommendation for inclusion within existing Recommendation (4).

In keeping with his motion of January 30 that the CCRC accept the Final Report as suitably amended (which motion had been seconded by Dr. Deahl), Dr. James Courtright expressed the view that Dr. Snow or Professor Wiseman should be accorded authorization to effect whatever editorial changes were necessary to issue a coherent report. That view was adopted by consensus vote of the Committee.

In the ensuing discussions, Fr. Phil Rossi expressed his desire that the actual twelve to three vote approving the format for the core should be reflected in the body of the Final Report on page 9. [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, lines 224-225]. His suggestion was accepted by consensus. He also inquired about the statement on page 14 suggesting that “the Core Curriculum Review Committee has sought extramural funding to stimulate core curricular development.” Dr. Snow responded that she had investigated extramural funding in the form of NEH Humanities focus grants with the Office of Development. The Committee determined that Professor Wiseman should revise the language accordingly to reflect Dr. Snow’s activity [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 15, lines 385-386].

Committee members next pursued the language in the second full paragraph on page 7 of the report, indicating that certain parts of the University Core of Common studies were “fixed” and “stable.” Members suggested other alternatives, such as “is presently another fixed part” or “emerged as a present determination.” However, Fr. Rossi observed that he was less concerned with identifying these determinations as “fixed” or “stable” than he was with the idea that there had been any intentional decision at all by the Committee on these issues. He reiterated that the Committee had not discussed coherence among the knowledge areas or any different way of arranging course structures within the core. He was concerned that the paragraph, as stated, conveyed a consensus decision by the Committee after weighing other alternatives, when in fact there had been no discussion of alternative formats for core courses. In particular, Fr. Rossi observed that the language indicated a deliberative process by the Committee which resulted in consideration of only three-credit core courses.

Dr. Wierzbicki agreed, indicating he did not know what was meant by the terms, “fixed” or “stable.” He could identify the determination as “important” in the sense that the Committee made a present determination to adopt a certain format for core courses, but he could not accept any decision beyond that. The Committee then acted by consensus, instructing Professor Wiseman to rewrite the paragraph in such a way that confirmed the idea of knowledge areas and finite credit-hours by which these knowledge areas would be implemented in the core, but indicated no deliberative process with respect to other issues. Committee members agreed that the third sentence of that paragraph should be amended to read: “The courses that satisfy the learning objectives in the knowledge areas comprise an evolving part of the Core of Common Studies and are evaluated and approved on an ongoing basis.” [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 7, lines 166-172]. Professor Wiseman also noted that given its significance to Fr. Wild and the Board of Trustees, a sentence should be added to that same paragraph suggesting that each individual school or college within the University was expected to build upon the University Core of Common Studies when implementing its own core [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 7, lines 172-174].

Moving on to other issues, Fr. Rossi noted that language regarding the importance of “capstone seminars and service learning” was included on page 3, lines 71-72, but was never repeated elsewhere in the recommendations. He offered that this recommendation should be recaptured in Recommendation 5 at
the conclusion of the report [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 18, lines 448-449]. He also cautioned that “assessment of the core as a whole” was an important concept that had not yet been discussed by the Committee. He reiterated that although he favored a tiered structure, the Committee had not yet discussed the rationale for a tiered structure or the complementarity of the knowledge areas. He suggested the need to spend considerably more time addressing these issues.

Professor Wiseman noted that she was also sympathetic to these concerns. However, she also noted the serious time constraints within which the CCRC was expected to function; those constraints had been established by members of the administration and the Board of Trustees. Dr. Maranto agreed that integration of the knowledge areas across disciplines was an integral issue to the new Marquette core. She therefore echoed the need for a strong concluding statement suggesting that the core “was an unfinished piece of business,” including the need to integrate core experiences. She echoed Professor Wiseman’s observation, noting that “the reality is that the CCRC has had only a finite number of hours within which to consider these issues.” Dr. Eckman suggested that the concluding paragraph should not only highlight time constraints but articulate the issues left for resolution. Dr. Courtright concurred, noting that there was nothing in the final report suggesting that courses, once qualified, could be removed for failure to meet the learning objectives. He suggested that there might be the need for a more specific statement to that effect [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 11, lines 268-271]. He also noted that there might be other reasons a core course could be withdrawn by the Committee beyond assessment of the learning objectives. These reasons might denote a failure to comport with the Marquette mission. Dr. Quade then concurred that this “unfinished business” should be reflected in the Conclusion to the report. [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, pages 19-20]. She also recommended an “Executive Summary” which might reflect the tension between this unfinished business and the time constraints that have circumscribed the work of the Committee. Dr. Nancy Snow agreed that she would revise the “Conclusion” to reflect CCRC concerns and that she would draft an Executive Summary for the report.

Turning to a reconsideration of Recommendation 4, Dr. Wierzbicki offered that the respective duties of the Director of Core should be prioritized and bulleted for greater clarity [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, pages 16-17]. Fr. Rossi also suggested that Recommendation 8 should include a specific directive to gather instructors in each of the knowledge areas so that they might conduct discussions among themselves. He therefore suggested addition of the words, “These should include regular meetings (e.g., conferences, workshops, etc.) of instructors in each of the knowledge areas.” [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 18, lines 460-462]. In view of these discussions, Dr. Quade questioned whether “Final Report” was the appropriate title for this document. Professor Wiseman responded that the Committee might just term it the “Report of the Core Curriculum Review Committee.” The Committee agreed by consensus to accept that designation.

Dr. Cheryl Maranto then questioned whether the Committee agreed with Dr. Courtright’s observation that approval of core courses might be rescinded for failure to comport with the Marquette mission or for some other reason, as yet undetermined. She commented that relevance to mission was already covered by questions in the template. Furthermore, if core courses at some point failed to meet student learning objectives within the respective knowledge area, the assessment process would disclose that. Assessment was designed to be more than a mechanistic approach to covering the learning objectives. She was also concerned about the perception that core course qualification could be rescinded for other reasons not yet defined or specified. Dr. Courtright responded that he simply wanted the report to note that, once qualified, a course was not approved in perpetuity.

Dr. Courtright also questioned the specifics of Recommendation No. 1 at page 15, requiring that future Committee members be elected by a majority vote of the sitting Committee. Professor Wiseman responded that if the representative unit suggested more than one candidate, or more than one unit could sponsor a representative, e.g., Cultural Diversity, a choice would have to be made as between the candidates. Dr. Courtright accepted her explanation and later offered the following: “In the case of multiple nominations for a designated position on the CCRC, new Committee members should be elected by a majority vote of the sitting Committee” [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 16, lines 410-412]. Fr. Rossi then added that Recommendation 10 should be amended to further delineate the purpose of assessment monies and to request a parallel figure for the development of cross-disciplinary initiatives for
the core, suggesting that both funds should be administered by the Core Director. [Reporter’s Note: See Tracked Report, page 19, lines 469-471].

Dr. Snow then initiated a discussion of the CCRC approval process for the report and the time within which to realistically obtain such approval from the Committee. Committee members agreed that they wished to see another draft of the report before voting. Since the next meeting was scheduled for February 14, with consideration by the Academic Senate to follow on February 18, they agreed that the February 14 date would be too late. Professor Wiseman then suggested that she could amend the draft to incorporate the revisions suggested by these minutes before the end of the day on Friday, February 8. She suggested as well that Dr. Snow could send the report by e-mail and that all members could register their vote by e-mail response. Their votes should issue no later than Monday or Tuesday, February 11 or 12. That would allow sufficient time to forward the report to the Academic Senate.

Committee members also agreed that they would vote “up or down” on the report, without qualification, since reservations about language would be too difficult to track. Professor Wiseman noted that any failure to respond by individual Committee members could be recorded as an abstention. Committee members agreed with her suggestions and also advised that Professor Wiseman should use her computer tracking device to note the revisions so that Committee members could distinguish them more easily. Once the report was approved, Dr. Snow would reproduce the report for the Academic Senate and have it posted on the Academic Affairs web page. Dr. Courtright volunteered that he would also post it on his web site if the Committee wished him to do so.

Dr. Snow adjourned the meeting at 11:30 a.m. since time had expired. [Reporter’s Note: Committee members have since forwarded suggestions for additional revisions, e.g., substituting words and removing the opening sentence on page 3, lines 53-55. Those have been incorporated to the extent possible].

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Reporter
Core Curriculum Review Committee
The March 6, 2002 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 10:05 by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU 227. **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, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. **Members Excused:** Dr. Michelle Malin, Ms. Stephanie Russell, and Prof. Christine Wiseman.

After order was called, the opening prayer was led by Dr. Heinrich who asked for blessings on our continued efforts and the whole university community.

I. **Minutes.** Dr. Laatsch moved to approve the minutes from the February 6th meeting, which was seconded by Dr. Eckman and approved unanimously.

II. **Agenda Items.**

- **Chair's Report.**
  - Update on meeting with the Board of Trustees. Dr. Snow reported that the Board members stated they were pleased with progress on the Core, and that everything appears to look good from their perspective.
  - Minutes from the Executive Committee’s meeting with Dr. David Buckholdt were distributed. Dr. Machan expressed concern that the English Department is not accurately represented. No personnel from English were contacted. Dr. Machan pointed out several errors in the document, specifically regarding the English 001 and 002 courses. Dr. Machan indicated that the English department has offered to hire “discipline-specific” teaching assistants, as the department believes that English needs to be integrated into the rest of the University to help students’ writing improve. Dr. Snow suggested writing an addendum to Executive Committee minutes. Dr. Machan wanted to be sure that this will be sent to Dr. Buckholdt as well to clarify inaccuracies or misrepresentations of the English Department. Dr. Snow will try to prepare a summary; Dr. Machan wants to approve the amendment before it is distributed. Dr. Heinrich clarified “resource limitations”—based on conversation with Kris Ratcliffe of the English Department. He intended “Limitations” to refer to technology, such as not all being able to have programs such as Power Point for presentation. Dr. Laatsch asked for clarification—does English mean separate sections of English 1 and 2 per college? Dr. Machan said the logistics of separate sections undermines commonality of common core and is hard to coordinate: There would be one course for students and it will involve multiple forms of rhetoric. Dr. Maranto asked to please be sure that communication goes to Deans, and assistant/associate Deans. Fr. Rossi said that the need to raise the consciousness and educate faculty is evident from this discussion. Students can develop skills for “presentation” in particular academic disciplines, which allows us to help make certain connections. We have the chance to have a collegial discussion about how to incorporate these assignments in disciplines. Dr. Machan said that English 001 and 002 focus on academic and workplace literacy, respectively. It is also important to emphasize the place of rhetoric beyond the first year of individual disciplines. Departments can be challenged to incorporate writing at a higher level. The English department has technical writing expertise. Dr. Courtright asked what is the status of the executive committee minutes? Dr. Snow clarified: the minutes are merely a reflection of the discussion.
  - **Change of next meeting:** Move meeting scheduled during spring break one week to March 21st—Thursday, 7 to 9 pm.
  - Dr. Heinrich gave the provost search committee update: recommendations will be provided to Fr. Wild. Dr. Heinrich will summarize CCRC committee member feedback. Dr. Courtright asked whether any of the candidates offered positive suggestions for core review processes.
Discussion followed about some of the comments, suggestions made by specific candidates. Dr. Deahl indicated that each of the candidates brought up the core in Dean’s interviews.

III. Academic Senate meeting report

Comments on minutes: Dr. Deahl indicated the spirit of his comments regarding the CCRC report were more in the spirit of “there’s no such thing as a perfect document,” not a question of no one being entitled to a perfect document. (Recorders note: there was general agreement that people were also not entitled to perfect minutes, either.) Fr. Rossi said that his doubts were “more than lingering.” He continued that faculty conversations need to be ongoing, whole faculty need to be invested/engaged. Dr. Maranto said that it is hard to ensure that the whole faculty is engaged—buy-in is strong now and can get stronger but will never be a full 100%. Fr. Rossi said there must be structures provided for ongoing dialog and debate--sustaining reflective discourse about our academic culture must be an intentional process. He further indicated that we must invest in structure, incentives to give people time to engage in dialogue to inform their work and the whole university and that there must be a challenge from below and above to encourage this dialogue, not a “hands off” approach once core is established. Dr. Laatsch said we can start now and gave the example of a full conference. Fr. Rossi said perhaps we could have two conferences and articulated that attendance should “count in some way” if we are working to create a culture of dialogue. Dr. Pustejovsky said we talk about reflection on experience across the campus: we need to do this about the core and suggested an afternoon of reflection. Dr. Deahl seconded Dr. Pustejovsky’s idea about reflection. Further, referring to Fr. Rossi’s comments, he stated that he believes we are committed to dialog; he thinks people at academic senate heard this and are committed to it as well. Dr. Heinrich cautioned “Do not confuse activity with accomplishment:” workshops are not enough—how we allocate financial resources will be part of how this is lived out. Dr. Snow said this all seems to be pointing to need for core director. Dr. Pustejovsky asked about activity versus accomplishment and indicated that the issue comes down to how we tell the story, reminding the members that ownership of the core by a lay faculty is a new story on the campus.

Dr. Courtright asked whether this was a modifiable core. What if academic senate wants to modify it? Dr. Maranto said it is not the academic senate’s purview. Dr. Courtright asked what if any group wants to revise? Dr. Maranto responded that the committee will be ongoing, recommendations come to the committee.

Dr. Snow moved to discussion of the academic senate meeting. There was discussion at the senate regarding the relationship of the core and the President’s office. Is the core committee advisory to the President? Discussion ensued and it was concluded that as in all matters, final authority is vested with the president of the university. Another point raised at the senate meeting dealt with the provision in the report regarding the use of assessment results to “withdraw a course,” revise learning objective as needed. Dr. Pustejovsky said that in the Core Curriculum Steering Committee courses were always envisioned as approved with “term limits." Fr. Rossi asked whether we can add this temporal nature of course approval to recommendation number three, which relates to the approval, and the withdrawal of approval for courses. Dr. Snow asked about periodic review of core courses. Dr. Ksobiech said that perhaps we should articulate “periodic review” of courses. Dr. Courtright said that in the February 6th minutes, we implied that assessment alone would be only reason the CCRC would remove a course from the core. Dr. Maranto agreed. Dr. Quade said that any other reason (resources, change in faculty) would be departmental/college decisions, not CCRC decisions. Dr. Maranto made a statement about course approval being withdrawn by college/department because of changes in course, faculty and so on. Dr. Pustejovsky said that as courses change now, the college office signs off: in the future, when it’s a core course, there will need to be some loop to include CCR process. Dr. Snow said we should amend language under recommendation three, in order to leave ourselves open as process evolves.
In terms of replacement of CCR committee members, it was suggested at the academic senate that the process reflect the Committee on Faculty nominating convention, in order to ensure that make membership was “more "democratic.” Dr. Snow asked if this convention was used how we would ensure expertise in knowledge areas? Do people submit biographies? Dr. Pustejovsky replied that using COF nominating convention may not yield most appropriate faculty representatives. Dr. Machan said that there were some departments that have standing Seats, that the expertise and willingness of committee members is the key and that the ballot method may not necessarily be appropriate to the needs of this work. Fr. Rossi said that some departments do have particular representatives and further asked how specific we can be in terms of surfacing candidates at particular levels of expertise. In the future, units may need to cooperate in terms of putting forward representatives. He cautioned that we are writing “election law” and therefore we need to respect the structures of individual departments without tying the hands of departments, representatives, and so on. Dr. Quade asked what the documents delineated about at large representatives. Dr. Machan referred to the history of the committee membership, and indicated that currently, there is a large number of voting members and noted that as committees expand, processes can become unwieldy. He further added that Diverse Cultures is the only knowledge area without a specific department. Dr. Maranto said that we need to write a clear process for naming committee representatives. Dr. Pustejovsky said that appointing or electing is not the issue. Persons will approach current members to learn the ropes—what is the character, ethos of the committee? Are people representing departments? Whose interests?

Dr. Machan articulated that the rationale behind the 15 positions was equal representation from the departments and areas represented in the Core. He indicated that the particular areas should have their choice of representatives, and that the COF nominating convention was not the best way to ensure this. Dr. Snow asked whether we should indicate that particular areas should come to consensus and there was general discussion, reiterating that some are knowledge area representatives, and some are department representatives. Dr. Snow said that perhaps we could rotate representation among departments with courses in the core. Fr. Rossi asked who makes the final appointment to the committee and suggested that some common guidelines should be suggested for units. Dr. Snow said that possibly we could have a two stage procedure: the committee puts forth a call for representatives in a particular area and the committee elects from nominees. Dr. Machan said that everyone on the committee now is term-limited and mentioned a concern that there would be no history of the whole committee turned over at the same time. Dr. Snow said that we can consider staggering—will need to make some 2 year or 4 year terms if possible in this first iteration. It was suggested that incentives be offered for membership, continuing membership: scotch seemed to have some committee support as an incentive. Dr. Wierzbicki said that we should not be responsible for electing new members. Elections/selections should be done within the department or unit. Dr. Snow said that we want to preserve the representative nature of the committee. Dr. Ksobiech said that membership must be codified. Dr. Wierzbicki said that each unit can devise its own procedures, as it does for chair nominations/elections. Fr. Rossi asked what would happen if there were multiple nominations for particular positions and indicated that the units should only send one name to committee.

Dr. Eckman said we need to develop bylaws for CCRC. Dr Machan said that the structure of the committee already has been approved. Dr. Eckman referred to the specifics of the elections. After much discussion, the following wording was agreed to:

At the expiration of the member’s three year term, it shall be the responsibility of the department(s)/college (as designated in II, C 1) to find a suitable replacement. In the event that a member cannot complete his/her term (e.g. sabbatical, medical leave, retirement), the unit shall identify a replacement to complete the term

Dr. Snow moved to feedback on assessment letter. Some chairs have commented to her, asking “what more do we need to do” after approval. Fr. Rossi said that the approach most
likely to get cooperation should stress the committee’s willingness to help departments with their assessment plans. Do we have a protocol for assessing assessment plans? Dr. Snow said that perhaps we should soften the language in letter as currently written. There are models on the web, and the guidelines are delineated on the web. We need to help departments access and utilize these resources. Dr. Buckholdt has agreed to bring in an assessment consultant to assist departments in this process and perform an assessment audit, Dr. Tim Riordan from Alverno College. Dr. Pustejovsky said that we cannot have departments reasonably be expected to comply with the assessment plan deadline by June 1st. He added that we need to consider “term limits” for courses that we will “certify” for additional time if an assessment plan is approved. Dr. Deahl said that there is no deadline in the letter. A report of state of core curriculum assessment should be made public to inform the community what progress has been made and plan towards the future. He also suggested that we not “certify” courses for specific times, but phase them in. Dr. Maranto agreed with Dr. Deahl. She said we shouldn’t use specific deadlines for approval without assessment plans and agreed that June 1st is too soon of a deadline—but don’t move on course without assessment plans. Dr. Machan said that there is a lot of responsibility for assessment plans falling to chairs or key point persons—the assessment plan needs a deadline and direction, just not “June 1.” Dr. Heinrich said that the assessment plan approval will be loose in the beginning as we don’t have precedents. Dr. Snow said that this is why assessment audit will be helpful—help communicate that it has to be done and determine the state of current events. Dr. Laatsch said to consider this letter at the next meeting. Dr. Maranto said that September 1 as a deadline is achievable if resources are provided. Dr. Snow said the issue will come up at the next meeting on March 21st.

Dr. Snow adjourned the meeting at 12:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie L. Quade
The meeting was called to order by Dr. Nancy Snow, Chair of the CCRC at 7:10 p.m. **Members present:** Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Michelle Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Phil Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, and Dr. Michael Wierzbicki. **Members excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Phil Naylor, Dr. Stephanie Quade, and Professor Christine Wiseman.

Dr. Snow led the opening prayer, asking that we see diversity as a blessing, not a curse.

I. **Minutes.** Several requested changes were made to the minutes of the March 6 meeting. Dr. Heinrich noted that the comment attributed to him in the paragraph on the Minutes of the Executive Committee should read “resource limitations” (not research limitations). Several sentences later in that paragraph should read “Dr. Maranto asked to please be sure that communication goes to Deans, and Assistant/Associate Deans” (instead of Deans, not assistant Deans). Dr. Machan requested that the technical writing person hired by the English Department, who is mentioned later in that same paragraph not be named, so her name was stricken and the sentence should read “The English Department does have technical writing expertise.”

In part III of the minutes, on the Academic Senate meeting report, the word “acting” should be changed to “activity” in the following sentences: “Do not confuse activity with accomplishment”. And “Dr. Pustejovsky asked about activity versus accomplishment . . .”

The third paragraph in part III, Dr. Pustejovsky pointed out that the sentence referencing his comment regarding “term limits” of core courses should read “Dr. Pustejovsky said that the Core Steering Committee envisioned that courses were always approved with ‘term limits’”. In the fifth paragraph of that section, Father Rossi noted the following correction. “Fr. Rossi asked who makes the final appointment to the committee and suggested that some common guidelines should be suggested to units.” In the next paragraph, Dr. Machan suggested that the sentence “Dr. Machan said we should amend the report” be stricken.

Dr. Pustejovsky moved to accept the minutes as amended. Dr. Courtright seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

II. **Chair’s Report.** Dr. Snow reported that the Academic Senate voted to approve the Core Curriculum Review Committee Report and recommendations by a vote of 21 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions. She
thanked all committee members who attended the meeting and lent their support during the discussion. Dr. Snow will contact all units to ensure that they know they must develop assessment plans for courses that have been approved for the core. She has asked Dr. Buckholdt about bringing in an assessment consultant to help units with this task, and he has agreed to do so. Donna Engelmann from Alverno is one such expert. While we do not want to use the Alverno model of assessment, Dr. Engelmann has consulted widely on assessment issues, and has knowledge of various models. There is also a graduate student in the School of Education with assessment expertise. We may also call on him for consulting assistance. Dr. Snow has also met with the Dean’s Advisory Council of the College of Arts and Sciences and informed them of the assessment requirements for core courses, and the assistance that will be provided by one or more consultants.

III. Agenda Items.
Dr. Rossi again suggested the need for the CCRC to spend time discussing what we have accomplished so far, and to reflect upon it. He noted that there is a real need to step away from what we’ve been involved in and to ask what it is adding up to, perhaps with the assistance of a facilitator. He expressed concern about how much of our work has gone on without direct faculty contact, and about the lack of credibility that our work might have with some faculty, as a result. A lengthy and wide-ranging discussion followed on this subject.

Dr. Pustejovsky noted that first the Steering Committee and now the CCRC have worked for their entire existence on tasks tied to deadlines. But the work we are doing is also tied to our aspirations for the future of the university. We need to take a moral inventory on this work. Dr. Laatsch offered that the Steering Committee had a retreat that was very helpful in their work—that it gave time to think in broader terms. It was held in January 1999 in Arrupe House. The group worked all morning, and lunch was brought in. It was very productive. She was therefore supportive of doing something similar now. Dr. Malin noted that when you try to make a big change with a lot of people involved, it necessarily happens incrementally. If people come to the retreat with a written reflection of what we want the Marquette graduate to be, that might be helpful. Work on the core necessarily entails breaking it into parts (i.e., courses), but one wonders whether it will fit when we put it back together.

Dr. Wierzbicki noted that some CCRC members might not want to continue on the committee. If anyone is stepping down and others are coming on, it might be better to do this as part of a transition process. Some individuals may be tiring. Dr. Pustejovsky noted that perhaps that is why we should do it now. Developing a truly new and integrated core depends on the development of trust. We need to figure out what it is that we’re putting our trust in; we need a process for working together. Dr. Wierzbicki noted that there are people
across campus who do not buy into the core, as was evidenced at Monday’s Academic Senate meeting. If the CCRC merely meets by itself, it won’t address that problem. Dr. Laatsch opined that we do need to deal with the issue of lack of buy-in by some faculty, but that we should meet by ourselves first. We need to articulate where we are and what our mission is. Dr. Courtright noted that he has heard complaints about the core, but they are non-specific. He raised the concern that, with all the work we have done on the core with qualifying courses, we have done relatively little to address the issue of advanced standing students, and how we will handle core requirements for them. If we’re setting up more than a list of courses, we need some sort of capstone course, or some other way to ensure that we qualitatively address our goal.

Dr. Eckman referred to Dr. Pustejovsky’s idea of a meeting for reflection with some scotch. We may need two events: one to reflect and think about where we go next (an end of the year relaxing, reflective gathering), and a retreat at the beginning of next year to get new people up to speed and to talk about bigger issues. Dr. Rossi suggested that at such a second meeting, we could invite the new provost, and end with a reception. This would allow us to convey critical information to an incoming provost, but also enable him to pick up on the dynamic of this endeavor. It would be a non-task-oriented opportunity for conversation. This could also be useful for the new Core Director. It would also be useful for the committee to reflect on the ideal qualities in a Core Director—organizational/administrative skills, etc. The success of the core as a coherent educational piece is contingent on a director with vision, enthusiasm, and credibility with all faculty. There is still a deep problem of faculty not buying in to the new core.

Dr. Pustejovsky noted that in one core course submission, it was clear that the faculty member did not know how to talk about outcomes, but clearly knew how to deliver a great course. We need to stop and figure out what we’ve learned in this process. Dr. Courtright pointed out that about 25% of the undergraduate experience will be in the core. We have not really discussed how this will flow into the major. If the core is successful, it will enable faculty to do things in upper level major courses that they couldn’t do before. A Core Director or Provost could help faculty realize that this is a unique experience for students, and to convey our vision regarding the curriculum. Dr. Snow reiterated that the core must reside in the faculty. She liked the idea of a meeting for reflection, and asked Ms. Russell if she would be willing to facilitate one. Ms. Russell agreed. Dr. Courtright noted that at some point it would be good to have committee replacements in on the discussion.

Dr. Maranto shared the concern regarding the level of misunderstanding and mistrust of the core, and the need to address that issue. Dr. Malin noted that mistrust and unease is a part of change. It doesn’t mean that the core won’t work, but it would be useful to talk about it at a retreat. Dr. Eckman suggested
that Ms. Russell could help us understand the change process. Ms. Russell suggested that, in our scotch session, we should remember the process that we went through, and remember that others have not been privy to that process. Then in the fall, we can structure our efforts around the themes that emerge from that discussion.

Dr. Heinrich noted that the College of Engineering’s concerns with the core are legitimate. Even though there were only two “no” votes in the Senate, we do need to continue to address these concerns. Dr. Courtright recalled that in one of Father Wild’s speeches, he noted their need for a broad, ethical sense. Engineering students will get something special here because of the core. Dr. Heinrich pointed out that ethics (both theoretical and professional) is currently part of the engineering core and integrated into the majors.

There was a general consensus that we should schedule a special meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee to relax, as well as to reflect on our accomplishments and our future challenges. We will try to find a date near the end of spring semester for this purpose.

IV. Proposed Assessment Letter. Dr. Snow queried the committee whether we should send the letter on assessment requirements for core courses that Dr. Heinrich drafted and distributed. Dr. Rossi posed the question: How do you get people institutionally on board regarding assessment? How can assessment plans be presented to departments as a way to improve teaching? The letter must say “We know you’re likely to need resources to do assessment. The committee’s task is to facilitate your doing this. We will work together to bring this about.” This approach is more likely to succeed with departments that are reluctant to get on board, and to produce more effective assessment plans. There will need to be a checklist and/or a template for developing and approving assessment plans. Dr. Snow noted that the Assessment Committee is working on guidelines for assessment plan approval, and that task will hopefully be completed by the end of the academic year. How it is presented will be important.

Dr. Pustejovsky noted that Donna Engelmann, who has a Ph.D. from Marquette and is on the Alverno faculty, has gone all over the country providing consulting on assessment. On these trips, she always faces the “motivation question.” We should bring faculty whose courses have been approved to meet with Dr. Engelmann.

Dr. Machan noted that in our earlier discussions of the letter, we already talked about taking off the June 1 deadline. The deadline should probably be October or November. Dr. Snow noted that perhaps a letter is not the way to accomplish our goal. She has been in contact with chairs and deans on this issue. Arranging for faculty to meet with Diane would be useful. Different faculty and units are in very different situations with respect to assessment.
Dr. Wierzbicki suggested that we remind chairs that they need an assessment plan by the Bulletin publication date. Dr. Snow noted that ideally every core course should have an assessment plan in place in fall ’03 when the core officially starts.

Dr. Byleen asked if it is ok to ask for resources as part of an assessment plan. Dr. Snow responded that money is available this year for a consultant, but it is not clear how much will be available next year. The CCRC should make a push for money to help departments with assessment. Dr. Courtright suggested that there is a sense that we have momentum behind us, so we should push for money now, and not wait for a new provost to arrive. We should ask for a realistic sum now. Dr. Malin noted that her own experience with assessment (which they had to do for Nursing College accreditation) suggests that it is useful to provide faculty with money to help them design courses so that assessment data are gathered as part of the course design (e.g., via assignments and feedback from patients during their practicum). It is extremely important to figure out the best ways to do the measurement. That is an unknown right now. Perhaps there should also be broad assessment done on all students, and that might entail significant cost. Dr. Snow noted that the Assessment Committee has three assessment models so far. More work needs to be done.

Dr. Rossi observed that if the letter does not go out, there needs to be a general communication with departments providing a roadmap on where assessment is going, and to update them on assessment initiatives. What people will be available to help? What dates or events are coming up in the fall that they should be aware of? Dr. Snow asked whether this communication should come from Dr. Buckholdt. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that it should come from the CCRC. Dr. Snow tried to summarize the discussion by suggesting that we not send out the letter as drafted, but get assessment resources lined up and get faculty engaged in this work. There was general consensus to follow that approach.

Dr. Heinrich then asked what happens if a course (department) never puts an assessment plan in place? Without sending the letter that puts them on notice of this requirement, what would we do were this to occur? Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that we should then send a “sunset” letter informing the department that if an assessment plan is not in place within one year, it will no longer be an approved course for the core. Dr. Rossi suggested writing and disseminating an “update report” that would inform departments that at some point in Fall semester (October or November), a letter will issue from the CCRC with a deadline by which assessment plans must be in place.

Dr. Byleen suggested the need to invite submission of assessment plans from departments. Dr. Rossi added that this would be especially true once we have a checklist developed. Dr. Wierzbicki suggested that departments or
departmental representatives need to meet with the assessment consultant. It is the department that needs to develop assessment plans.

V. Discussion then turned to issues surrounding the difficulty that the College of Engineering, especially the biomedical engineering department, is having finding the credits to meet the requirements of the core as approved.

Dr. Jack Winters, Chair of the Biomedical Engineering Department, has suggested that representation on the CCRC be based on student population, instead of the departments that are offering the core courses. Dr. Pustejovsky opined that this recommendation is based on the false assumption that the CCRC is representative of students. However, it is faculty who teach the courses who are to be represented. The suggestion was made to table Dr. Winters’ suggestion. Dr. Snow reported that Dr. Winters asked to come and talk to the CCRC. Dr. Heinrich then noted that, in good faith, the biomedical engineering department has determined that it cannot cut more technical courses, but they also fear they will lose competitiveness if they add 6 more credits to the degree, which is currently at 133. They would love a 33 credit core. This would be possible if the option of “double-dipping” was allowed in which one course could simultaneously satisfy two different knowledge areas.

Dr. Malin suggested that numbers 5 and 6 of the “Policy options for BIEN discussion” (Build a rhetoric option into an engineering course, or build an individual and social behavior option into an engineering course) were intriguing. This would help to foster more interdisciplinary courses. However, she wondered how long it would take to develop such interdisciplinary courses. Dr. Snow noted that Dr. Lance Grahn, Chair of the History Department, is working to develop courses in history that can satisfy the core plus ROTC requirements. Perhaps the English Department could be asked to develop an English course with the BIEN department. Dr. Malin suggested that this initiative is sufficiently important that we could go to Academic Affairs with a message that we really need funds to develop these courses, and this has to be done before the core starts.

Dr. Rossi then asked why the core is what has to give? Are there not creative ways that BIEN faculty can combine their technical requirements in a different configuration? Dr. Heinrich noted that if we allow one course to “double-dip”, that would take care of 3 of the credits at issue. Then they would still have to figure out how to “find” the other 3 credits on the technical side. The department insists that they have looked at other possibilities, and simply can’t do it. The department and major cater to many different audiences (e.g., pre-med, . . .), and this is part of the difficulty. Dr. Wierzbicki asked whether one possibility would be to have multiple tracks for different audiences, so that all students do not have to take all of the technical courses that, for example, only pre-med students really need. Dr. Heinrich said that might work. Dr. Wierzbicki also suggested that engineering needs to tell other
Dr. Heinrich noted that currently there are only 24 credits of non-technical courses in their program, which is why they need to “find” an additional 6 hours to meet the 30 credits of the proposed core beyond the math/science requirements. Dr. Machan observed that if a student needs a specialized engineering course, he didn’t see how it could also satisfy a core course requirement. Dr. Eckman noted that education students have a lot of credit requirements in education, that often require them to take additional credits. Few education student graduate in 4 years, in part because they need two majors. But they will be stronger teachers for doing this.

Dr. Malin suggested that it might be possible to do multidisciplinary courses, but that it is hard to envision how to do it. Dr. Eckman wondered if perhaps there are technical courses that, if you really look at them, might be amenable to an interdisciplinary approach.

Dr. Courtright asked what knowledge areas would be added with the additional 6 credits. Currently the engineering core consists of a total of 9 credits in philosophy and theology (so they need another 3 there), 9 credits are in social sciences and humanities, 6 in English, and 2 in public speaking. Dr. Malin observed that Nursing has to find 6 credits as well. Currently nursing students have one free elective. With the new core, they will not have any electives. Dr. Machan asked if there is any potential for one course to meet two knowledge area requirements. Dr. Heinrich asked about double-dipping, e.g., can one course satisfy both diverse cultures and history of cultures and societies? Are people open to allowing one core course to satisfy two core requirements? Dr. Laatsch opined that if a course satisfies both knowledge areas, how could we not allow all students to double-dip? However, would there be enough slots for engineers if such a course were open to all students? Dr. Pustejovsky noted that Arts and Sciences has a course that they reserve the first 20 seats for their own students, and suggested that such an approach might be used. A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of developing an engineering course that would satisfy the ethics requirement. The consensus seemed to emerge that it would be easier to design a course to satisfy two different requirements within the core. Mr. Lowrey raised the concern that adding credit hours might impair Marquette’s competitiveness with state schools like Madison.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl Maranto
I. Minutes. Dr. Snow sought additions or corrections to the minutes of March 21, 2002. Ms. Stephanie Russell noted that she was marked both as present and excused at the same time. Dr. Stephanie Quade offered that she, in fact, had been absent from the meeting and asked the reporter to note that change. Turning to page 2 of the Chair’s Report, Dr. John Pustejovsky then asked that the phrase, “of assessment” be added to the statement, “While we do not want to use the Alverno model. . . .” He also noted that the 14th sentence in the last paragraph on page 7 should read, “Dr. Pustejovsky noted that there are courses where they reserve the first 20 seats for their own students. . . .” In that same paragraph, Dr. Linda Laatsch noted a typographical error in the 12th sentence, suggesting that the sentence should read: “. . . how could we not allow all students to double-dip?”

Dr. Stephen Heinrich also suggested a number of amendments to the minutes, noting that he would forward a copy of his revisions to the reporter. He sought the correct spelling of his first name on page 1. In Part III on page 4, he asked that the following sentence be added to the first full paragraph on the page: “Dr. Heinrich pointed out that ethics (both theoretical and professional) is currently part of the engineering core and integrated into the majors.” On page 6, Dr. Heinrich asked that the second full paragraph of Part V be amended in lines 9-11 as follows: “. . . the biomedical engineering department has determined that it cannot cut more technical courses, but they also fear that they will lose competitiveness if they add 6 more credits to the degree, which is currently at 133.” On that same page, he asked that the Committee eliminate the sentence, “There are 103 hours of technical courses in the BIEN curriculum,” since it was inaccurate and not part of his statement. Finally, on the last page of the minutes, he asked that the phrase, “to meet the 30 credits of the proposed core beyond the math/science requirements” be added to conclude the first full sentence on the page; that the words “public speaking” be added to conclude the second sentence in the final paragraph on the page, and that the word “itself” be eliminated from the second last sentence on the page.

Dr. James Courtright then expressed concern about his recollection regarding Fr. Wild’s statement that engineering requires “a broad, ethical sense,” noting that he would not object to removal of the sentence. However, after confirming the substance of his recollection, the Committee determined that the statement should remain, as enhanced by the addition of Dr. Heinrich’s statement regarding the role of ethics in the current engineering core. There being no other additions or corrections, Dr. Robert Deahl moved to approve the minutes amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Linda Laatsch and approved unanimously. In response to a question from Dr. Machan, Professor Wiseman observed that any corrections to the prior minutes were memorialized in the minutes of the meeting at which those prior minutes were approved; the practice of the Committee had been consistent in that regard.

II. Chair’s Report. Dr. Nancy Snow distributed an addendum to the Executive Committee minutes of February 5, 2002, authored by Dr. Tim Machan. Dr. Machan explained that the Executive Committee minutes reflected a discussion that attributes certain sentiments and positions to the English Department that do not accurately reflect the thinking of the Department regarding ENGL 001/002. Professor Wiseman noted that since the Executive Committee minutes reflected only the existence of a
meeting which occasioned no independent action by the Core Curriculum Review Committee as a whole, Dr. Machan’s statement should likewise be included within the Committee’s formal record. Committee members therefore agreed by consensus to incorporate Dr. Machan’s addendum in the full record of Committee minutes following inclusion of the Executive Committee minutes of February 5.

Dr. Snow also reported that she had received an electronic message that morning from Dr. Susan Mountin reminding the Committee that a CCRC representative was still needed for the Manresa Project. In particular, Dr. Mountin sought participation and advice regarding an hour-long workshop on core course development now scheduled for May 21. Dr. Snow suggested that whoever assumed this responsibility would work with course development as a whole and core course development in particular. Ms Russell added that a number of dollars within the grant were set aside for core course development. She also noted that it was important for a representative from the CCRC to join these Manresa deliberations as soon as possible. Dr. Shelly Malin then offered that she would be interested in assisting with the workshop although she might not be able to join the Manresa group for the larger purposes suggested. Ms. Russell assured the Committee that such an arrangement would be possible.

III. Agenda Items.

A. Public Access to Templates and Evaluation Tools. At the request of Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Nancy Snow addressed the issue of public access to templates and evaluation tools regarding core course submissions. Mr. Lowrey had requested access to this documentation in order to assess and plan information literacy. Professor Wiseman initiated the discussion by noting that there were certain risks attached to keeping these documents private, especially since disclosure of some templates had been encouraged for illustrative and instructional purposes. In particular, she observed that this Committee functioned as a representative University body, not as a private “licensing” agency. She noted that the Committee might restrict public inspection to: (1) templates or evaluation tools for courses that had been approved and (2) members of the immediate University community.

Fr. Rossi countered that it might be important to include all prior template drafts regarding approved courses in order to provide a historical perspective or context. Dr. Maranto concurred that it might be useful as well as informative for faculty and others to see multiple versions or revised drafts in order to assess the difference between prior unsuccessful submissions and those submissions that were ultimately approved. Professor Wiseman noted that, whatever its approach to this issue, it would be important for the Committee to adopt a policy that could be clearly communicated. Dr. Maranto then cautioned that the Committee would need to exercise care in treating all drafts as public documents since the proponents of the various courses might have held a different understanding about public access when the documents were initially submitted. In view of this caution, Dr. Naylor offered that it might be appropriate to limit public access to the final version; he noted that such a policy would offer the clearest directive. Dr. Laatsch then inquired whether assessment plans would be attached to the templates when publicly disclosed. Professor Wiseman added that assessment plans should be included since the templates already sought that information. Dr. Courtright then observed that it might be useful to at least publish a list of all courses that had been submitted to the Committee, whether approved or not. Such a list could prove instructive to faculty or departments that were considering additional course submissions.

Returning to whether public disclosure should encompass all drafts, Fr. Rossi offered that the Committee had embarked upon an educative process with regard to future submissions. He noted that core courses, once submitted, were not exclusively the work of individual faculty. Instead, they arrived with the endorsement of the Department after collegial consultation among its various members. He suggested that this endorsement process was also something of a public act, noting that if the Committee disclosed prior drafts, it did so because it understood these documents to be part of a transaction among the faculty member, the Department and the University.

Dr. Pustejovsky countered that some faculty might not be pleased to have all drafts made public. He favored archiving only those documents that were approved by the Committee. He noted that since the Committee already archived its minutes, there would be a permanent record of all course submissions for faculty or other members of the University who chose to investigate the issue. Dr. Deahl then noted that
the Committee could approve different levels of access to such documentation. Furthermore, he agreed that the Committee should publish a list of all course submissions, whether approved or not, noting that the process might prove helpful for oversight by the future Director of Core Curriculum, who could then direct relevant inquiries to the Department or to specific faculty members who proposed various iterations of an approved template. Dr. Naylor cautioned, however, that many courses had been proposed – some by only one person within a Department who hoped to teach a given course. Dr. Naylor indicated that the situation could hold repercussions for untenured faculty members. Thus, it was better to keep the situation as simple as possible. Dr. Maranto agreed with these sentiments, noting that the minutes were available on the web, from which a de facto list of courses could be obtained. Dr. Wierzbicki also noted that those minutes had been redacted to remove harsh criticisms and dispel any embarrassment; thus, they provided a good source of information on all course submissions. Responding to a particular question, Dr. Snow remarked that the Committee currently archived everything. She recommended, however, that the Committee make public only documents relating to courses that had been approved in order to protect any unsuccessful proponents from embarrassment. The Committee thereafter agreed that the approved templates, together with accompanying submissions and the corresponding evaluation tools, are public documents and may be accessed by anyone within the University, upon request. No list will be published containing all the courses submitted to the Committee for approval. Dr. Machan noted that it was important to limit access to persons within the University since faculty might otherwise consider syllabi and related materials their own intellectual property. Dr. Wierzbicki emphasized the importance of making evaluation tools public as well. There being no further discussion, Dr. Cheryl Maranto moved to approve the Committee’s determination as noted in bold. The motion was seconded by Fr. Rossi. The Committee elected to refer Dr. Courtright’s concern about maintaining duplicate templates in the event of destruction to Academic Affairs.

B. Subcommittee Recommendations on Course Submissions. (1) Turning to the course submissions remaining from the March 1 submission date, Dr. Snow first sought the recommendations of the subcommittee on Diverse Cultures and Literature/Performing Arts. Speaking for the subcommittee, Dr. Cheryl Maranto explained that the subcommittee had addressed ten of its 21 submissions. It would address the remaining submissions later that afternoon. Dr. Maranto entered the following recommendations on behalf of the subcommittee:

Diverse Cultures:

EDUC 008 (Intro to Schooling in a Diverse Society): Qualify
ENGL 147 (Postcolonial Literature): Qualify
ENGL 177 (Studies in Multicultural Literature): Qualify
FREN 130 (French Canadian Culture through Literature): Remand
HIST 168 (Russian Revolution and the Soviet Union): Remand
MANA 155 (Diversity in Organizations): Qualify
PHTH 512 (Culture and Disability): Remand
SOCI 163 (Race and Ethnic Relations): Qualify

Literature/Performing Arts:

THAR 050 (Theatre Appreciation): Qualify
SPAN 055 (Spanish Literature I): no action pending receipt of a more detailed syllabus

Dr. Maranto noted that those submissions in the Diverse Cultures area for which remand was recommended either failed to demonstrate how the course objectives related to the learning objectives within the knowledge area or failed to demonstrate a larger context for race and ethnicity beyond age and disability or the historical. With regard to PHTH 512 in particular, the template demonstrated no attempt even to address stereotyping for age and disability. The subcommittee was confident that these were wonderful courses; however, the templates would need to be revised to reflect a broader scope.
Speak for the subcommittee on Histories of Cultures and Societies and Individual and Social Behavior, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki noted that the subcommittee had ten course submissions to address. The recommendations of that subcommittee with respect to all ten were as follows:

**Histories of Cultures and Societies:**

HIST 083 (Survey of East Asian Civilization): *Qualify*
ITAL 101 (Italian Contribution to Western Civilization): *Remand*

**Individual and Social Behavior:**

CRLS 167 (Women, Crime and Criminal Justice): *No Recommendation*
ECON 020 (Introduction to Economics): *Qualify*
PSYC 078 (Introduction to Lifespan Developmental Psychology): *Qualify*
PSYC 132 (Theories of Personality): *Qualify*
SOCI 001 (Principles of Sociology): *Qualify*
SOCI 021 (Sociology of Family): *Qualify*
SOWJ 080 (Introduction to Social Welfare and Justice): *Remand*
MISC 136 (Military Leadership and Ethics): *Defer*

In general, Dr. Wierzbicki thought these templates much improved over the first set of submissions. In particular, HIST 083 was a second submission for which the revised template provided enhanced detail. Likewise, PSYC 078 was much improved. Because PSYC 078 had originally been developed in response to a request from the College of Nursing, it might be helpful to Nursing students if PSYC 078 was included in the core. Dr. Wierzbicki also surmised that PSYC 132 might be an important course within the college core. He noted as well that SOCI 001 and 021 were very well prepared. With respect to SOWJ 080, Dr. Wierzbicki noted that the proponent appeared simply not to understand the procedure, substituting his or her own learning objectives for learning objectives specified for the knowledge area. A minor clarification would resolve that issue before re-submission.

With respect to CRLS 167, Dr. Wierzbicki commented that the subcommittee was not decided about its recommendation since it was not clear whether a course dealing with women and women’s issues would be sufficiently broad to qualify under the learning objectives. Thus, Dr. Wierzbicki asked that the status of CRLS 167 be placed on the agenda for the next CCRC meeting on April 18 for discussion by the full Committee. Finally, with regard to MISC 136, Dr. Wierzbicki reported that the subcommittee did not think that the course sufficiently addressed the theories, methodologies, and quantitative methods required of a course in the Individual and Social Behavior knowledge area. Dr. Linda Laatsch also noted that it was not clear, as between MISC 136 and MISC 138, which topics were addressed by which course since there was no discussion of the role of co-requisites. However, rather than reject the submission, the subcommittee wished to encourage the Department of Psychology to meet with the ROTC program in the same fashion that the History Department has meet with ROTC, in order to see whether an acceptable course could be developed or team taught. Dr. Wierzbicki agreed to communicate that recommendation to the Chair of the Psychology Department.

The Committee noted, with respect to ITAL 101, that the subcommittee had originally recommended that the course NOT be approved, rather than suggesting that the submission be remanded. When questioned, Dr. Wierzbicki responded that the subcommittee was concerned that the course might not be appropriate for inclusion within the core. However, Dr. Maranto suggested that any determination should still involve “remand” rather than “not approve,” since the latter category had not been fully investigated by the Committee. Dr. Snow agreed that the Committee should still use “remand.” However, she would communicate that the Committee would not recommend re-submission of the course unless the course was re-conceived so that it was broad enough to meet the learning objectives. In other words, “resubmission would be contingent upon meeting the learning objectives in the knowledge area.” Dr. Snow also agreed to place CRLS 167 on the agenda for April 18.
With respect to core course submissions in the Rhetoric and Mathematical Reasoning knowledge areas, Dr. Ken Ksobiech reported the subcommittee’s recommendations as follows:

**Mathematical Reasoning:**

- **MATH 060 (Modern Elementary Statistics):** Qualify
- **MATH 073 (Calculus for Biological Sciences):** Qualify
- **MATH 081 (Calculus 2):** Qualify
- **PRST 020 (Foundations of Applied Mathematics):** Remand
- **PRST 060 (Research and Statistical Methods):** Remand
- **SOCI 060 (Social Statistics):** Qualify

Dr. Ksobiech emphasized that in both MATH 060 and SOCI 060, prior weaknesses had been addressed and remedied. On the other hand, MATH 073 and MATH 081 could use work regarding their syllabi, but the weaknesses there did not warrant remand. However, the subcommittee found that PRST 020 and PRST 060 did require additional work since each course enumerated its own learning objectives rather than the learning objectives in the Mathematical Reasoning knowledge area. Dr. Robert Deahl offered that he would speak with faculty in the College of Professional Studies about these templates and direct them to speak with Dr. Karl Byleen. There were no additional course submissions in the Rhetoric area.

Following these discussions, Dr. Linda Laatsch moved to approve each of the subcommittee recommendations. The motion was seconded by Dr. Robert Deahl. A vote on the motion will occur at the April 18 meeting in accord with the two-meeting rule. Dr. Nancy Snow noted that the subcommittee on Human Nature and Ethics/Theology had been unable to meet.

**C. BIEN Options.** Dr. Nancy Snow distributed additional copies of a memo from Dr. Douglas Green and Dr. Stephen Heinrich responding to her from the College of Engineering regarding the Marquette Core of Common Studies. The memo was dated March 27, 2002 and had been distributed in advance of the meeting. (A copy of same is attached to the original of these minutes). Dr. Snow then invited discussion of the concerns raised in the engineering memo. Dr. Karl Byleen noted from the Engineering Bulletin that two electives could be selected by students from a long list of courses. In that regard, PSYC 114 is listed as an elective, which might be qualified as a core course in Individual & Social Behavior. He also suggested that if another course in Bioethics were qualified, BIEN students might meet core requirements with a total of 133 hours. Dr. Heinrich noted, however, that many students did not choose PSYC 114 as their elective. He also noted that Biomedical ethics was not currently on the list of electives and would have to be submitted. However, if engineering students chose these two courses as electives in order to fulfill their core requirements, they would eliminate options for taking other electives. Dr. Byleen pointed out that, nevertheless, by choosing this option, BIEN students could fulfill their core course requirements in 133 credit hours. Dr. Stephanie Quade also observed that many BIEN students enrolled with advanced placement credits such that they required fewer than 133 credits to graduate. Dr. Heinrich responded by noting that the BIEN electives are not truly electives for the pre-med students in BIEN; they use these six credits to take extra science courses required by medical schools.

Considerable discussion ensued about the viability of this option as compared to “double dipping” or simply adding electives and arriving at a larger number of credit hours for graduation. These discussions included the option of a separate track for pre-med BIEN students who might take longer to graduate. Other Committee members emphasized that their pre-med students routinely required longer than four years to graduate. Dr. Heinrich objected that such an option would eliminate any competitive advantage to Marquette engineering students.

Fr. Phil Rossi then suggested another approach, noting that Marquette’s broad-based liberal arts core should be viewed positively and marketed as such to incoming students. He suggested that the Committee should investigate whether the core could be viewed differently than numbers of three-credit courses. This might require a different conceptual view of the core to accommodate core and engineering requirements. Dr. Heinrich agreed that the Committee needed to see the core as a positive development rather than looking for ways to hide the core among other requirements. Dr. Wierzbicki added that students
attended Marquette for reasons beyond the excellence of technical or professional education. In fact, there was a “value-added” component to the Marquette education, and that is why students attended. He noted that a coherent core of common studies would make it easier to identify and sell that “value added.” Dr. Robert Deahl noted that conversations about marketing were also appropriate within the CCRC; to that end it might be a good idea to track enrollment trends in some of these areas in order to ascertain whether the size of the core had a market effect, either positive or negative. Dr. Malin added that it would be appropriate to address more of these topics and expressed her gratitude to Dr. Heinrich for continuing to explore these issues in a constructive fashion. In closing the discussion, Dr. Heinrich noted that BIEN continued to hold an interest in double dipping and required some closure on this issue. Thus, he would likely make a motion at the April 18 meeting with regard to a double dipping option.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman  
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Chair, Core Curriculum Assessment Committee
The April 18 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was convened by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU Room 252 at 7:05 p.m. **Members Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki, and Professor Christine Wiseman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl and Dr. Tim Machan.

Ms. Stephanie Russell offered the opening prayer, expressing gratitude for the days that brought the Committee together, enhanced by God’s law and the Committee’s common purpose. She also asked for guidance and wisdom, praying for the students who will benefit from the core and especially for the young faculty at Marquette University.

**I. Minutes.** Dr. Snow next sought additions or corrections to the minutes of April 3, 2002. Dr. Karl Byleen asked that the fifth sentence in Part C on page 5 be stricken, by which he confirmed that the Engineering college was discussing a total of 133 credit hours for graduation. The next sentence would simply read, “Dr. Karl Byleen noted from the Engineering Bulletin that two electives could be selected by students from a long list of courses.” At the top of that same page, Dr. Ken Ksobiech asked that the words “in statistics” be stricken from the third sentence of the opening paragraph. Returning to the paragraph beginning with Part C, Dr. Stephen Heinrich asked that the first sentence of the paragraph be redrafted to read as follows: “Dr. Nancy Snow distributed additional copies of a memo from Dr. Douglas Green and Dr. Stephen Heinrich to her, responding to her from the College of Engineering regarding the Marquette Core of Common Studies.” He also asked that the following sentence be inserted at the conclusion of the paragraph: “Dr. Heinrich responded by noting that the BIEN electives are not truly electives for the pre-med students in BIEN; they use these six credits to take extra science courses required by medical schools.” Finally, he noted that the last sentence in that paragraph should read, “Dr. Heinrich objected.” Dr. Michael Wierzbicki then asked that the third sentence in the first full paragraph on page 4 be modified as follows: “Likewise, PSYC 078 was much improved. Because PSYC 078 had originally been developed in response to a request from the College of Nursing, it might be helpful to Nursing students if PSYC 078 was included in the core.” There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Linda Laatsch moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion was seconded by Dr. Phillip Naylor and passed unanimously.

**II. Chair’s Report.** (1) Dinner with Fr. Wild. Dr. Nancy Snow reported that the dinner with Fr. Wild to celebrate the Committee’s efforts toward core curricular reform would be held on May 7, 2002 in the fifth floor of AMU at 5:30 p.m. She repeated that all members of the CCRC were invited to attend.

(2) CCRC Retreat. Fr. Phil Rossi, Dr. John Pustejovsky and Ms Stephanie Russell had met to discuss recommendations for a CCRC retreat. Following their discussions, they had arrived at two topics: (a) an “unpacking” of the Core Committee’s experience thus far as it has involved construction of the core and the team efforts to work together, and (b) a discussion of future questions, including the relationship of the CCRC to the Provost Office. The discussion of future questions might require an additional session. Ms. Russell noted that Committee members had been very generous about meeting for long hours after the work day. Thus, she suggested it might be wise for the Committee to meet on a Friday evening and then continue working the next morning. Arrangements could be made for the members to stay over night for the occasion. She counseled that the CCRC should decide how it wished to approach these sessions before setting any dates. She then asked for input from Committee members.

Fr. Rossi echoed the need for extended discussion among the Committee members with respect to dynamics and overriding principles. He cautioned that to date the Committee had been very “task oriented.” Dr. Shelly Malin and Dr. Cheryl Maranto approved the idea as well but suggested that finding common weekend times in the schedules of so many busy people might be difficult. Fr. Rossi responded that it would be important for Committee members to make the time so that the Committee could approach
these issues creatively. Dr. Pustejovsky agreed, noting that Committee members owed it to each other to commit this additional effort since their combined activity would effectively shape the future of the University. Ms. Russell then offered that the two sessions could be staged separately rather than as a weekend event. She also offered to investigate retreat sites before the next meeting. Considerable discussion ensued among the members during which each member voiced strong support for the retreat idea, although the members were divided about whether the sessions should occupy one single day or extend into two. Ms. Russell agreed to survey the members about their wishes by asking each to identify a preference.

(3) Meeting on ROTC Issues. Dr. Snow reported that she and Professor Wiseman had met with Dr. Lance Grahn, Chair of the History Department, regarding the design of core courses that might accommodate ROTC curricular issues. Dr. Grahn would be working with the military science chairs over the summer to investigate several options. It appeared that the Navy curriculum would have the greatest difficulty with a thirty-six hour University core. However, plans were underway to work with Navy in developing a History course that broadens Naval History so as to cover the learning outcomes now outlined for HIST 006. Another, more radical idea, would seek to address the learning objectives in a core knowledge area by linking several military science or other courses in a planned fashion. This option would involve a unified plan based on coherent principles, which might be possible since the ROTC curriculum holds very little flexibility. Most students take their course work in lock-step fashion.

(4) Assessment Issues. Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. David Buckholdt and Professor Christine Wiseman had met with Dr. Donna Engelmann to discuss working assessment sessions for departments that will offer courses in the Marquette core of common studies. Such sessions are tentatively scheduled for May 16, 17 and 18 and will run during the afternoons for a period of three hours each. Dr. Engelmann’s fee was $1000 per day. It was expected that three representatives from each particular academic unit would be invited to attend and that a letter of invitation would jointly issue from Dr. Buckholdt and Dr. Michael McKinney. Dr. Heinrich offered that each department across the University should be invited to attend without restriction to those departments offering courses in the core. He reasoned that the core is open to the entire University; thus, the invitation should extend to the entire University as well. [Reporter’s Note: A copy of the workshop invitation is attached to the original of these minutes]. Dr. Snow explained that the idea was to educate a “missionary” group of people who could work through an assessment plan and then communicate the process to others. Dr. Pustejovsky offered that the Department of Foreign Languages was also planning a three-day assessment workshop to cover issues particular to that department. Dr. Courtright observed that the School of Education might have experts and inquired whether they would join Dr. Engelmann. Dr. Snow acknowledged that possibility and asked Dr. Ellen Eckman to supply the names of graduate students or faculty who would have such expertise.

Dr. Ken Ksobiech then inquired whether money had been committed for assessment and other core curricular needs. Professor Wiseman responded that the commitment of any such monies had been postponed until the appointment of a new provost. Dr. Courtright interjected, however, that if the central administration and Fr. Wild seriously supported these efforts, they should be financed. Dr. Wierzbicki added that if money was an issue the CCRC could use Dr. Engelmann initially and then use Marquette faculty and graduate students as in-house consultants, compensated with a course overload. In closing, Professor Wiseman noted that St. Louis University had just been re-accredited. In the announcement reporting its success, however, St. Louis had mentioned the need for further work on the core curriculum and assessment of learning objectives.

III. Agenda Items.

A. Public Access to Templates and Evaluation Tools. Dr. Snow next turned to the motion regarding public access to core course templates. As set forth in the April 3 minutes, that motion states as follows: “that the approved templates, together with accompanying submissions and the corresponding evaluation tools, are public documents and may be accessed by anyone within the University, upon request. No list will be published containing all the courses submitted to the Committee for approval.” She asked for any further discussion on the motion, noting that all of the evaluation tools that have been archived thus far bear the names of the evaluators. She indicated that if
such identification was a problem, the individual names could be masked. Dr. Wierzbicki responded that the members of each subcommittee were listed on the minutes as a matter of public record. Others noted that the evaluations had been signed by the individual who prepared the analysis and presented it to the relevant subcommittee. Many assumed that those signatures would be public. Dr. Heinrich was concerned lest there be the appearance of a conflict of interest in some instances. Professor Wiseman suggested that Dr. Snow might append the language, “for Subcommittee I, II, III or IV” after each signature. Dr. Laatsch offered that the Committee might simply append the final Committee vote since each of these courses had been finally analyzed by the full CCRC. Members therefore discussed what notation should be added to the evaluation tools already archived. However, Dr. Wierzbicki reasoned that the matter was a non-issue. Since access would be allowed only for those courses which had been approved, the identity of the evaluator would make no difference. Other members agreed. Dr. Snow therefore called for a vote on the motion. The Committee registered a unanimous vote in favor of the motion. There were no abstentions.

B. Subcommittee Recommendations on Course Submissions. Turning to the course recommendations made by the various subcommittees as noted in the April 3 minutes, Dr. Snow observed that a seconded motion was pending to accept the following recommendations:

Diverse Cultures:

EDUC 008 (Introduction to Schooling in a Diverse Society): Qualify
ENGL 147 (Postcolonial Literature): Qualify
ENGL 177 (Studies in Multicultural Literature): Qualify
FREN 130 (French Canadian Culture through Literature): Remand
HIST 168 (Russian Revolution and the Soviet Union): Remand
MANA 155 (Diversity in Organizations): Qualify
PHTH 512 (Culture and Disability): Remand
SOCI 163 (Race and Ethnic Relations): Qualify

Literature/Performing Arts:

THAR 050 (Theatre Appreciation): Qualify
SPAN 055 (Spanish Literature I): No action pending receipt of a more detailed syllabus

Histories of Cultures and Societies:

HIST 083 (Survey of East Asian Civilization): Qualify
ITAL 101 (Italian Contribution to Western Civilization): Remand

Individual and Social Behavior:

ECON 020 (Introduction to Economics): Qualify
PSYC 078 (Introduction to Lifespan Developmental Psychology): Qualify
PSYC 132 (Theories of Personality): Qualify
SOCI 001 (Principles of Sociology): Qualify
SOCI 021 (Sociology of Family): Qualify
SOWJ 080 (Introduction to Social Welfare and Justice): Remand
MISC 136 (Military Leadership and Ethics): Defer

Mathematical Reasoning:

MATH 060 (Modern Elementary Statistics): Qualify
MATH 073 (Calculus for Biological Sciences): Qualify
MATH 081 (Calculus 2): Qualify
PRST 020 (Foundations of Applied Mathematics): Remand
PRST 060 (Research and Statistical Methods): Remand
SOCI 060 (Social Statistics): Qualify
Dr. Pustejovsky noted that there would be no change in the motion resulting from a reconsideration of SPAN 055; the subcommittee would continue to defer consideration on that course. Likewise, there was no recommendation on CRLS 167 (Women, Crime and Criminal Justice) pending a discussion of that course by the entire Committee. Since there was no time to entertain such discussion at this meeting, CRLS would be placed on the agenda for the May 1 meeting. There being no further discussion, Dr. Snow called for a vote on the motion to accept the foregoing recommendations. The motion passed unanimously; there were no abstentions.

C. Additional Subcommittee Recommendations from Groups I and IV.

(1) Group IV. Speaking on behalf of Subcommittee Group IV, Dr. Shelly Malin offered the following recommendations:

Theology:

THEO 100 (Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament Overview): Remand
THEO 102 (Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament – Selected Books): Remand
THEO 109 (Good and Evil, Past and Present): No Recommendation
THEO 116 (Christian Theology in Cultural Contexts): Approve

With respect to THEO 100, Dr. Malin observed that the course addressed only three of the eight learning objectives, leaving five without comment. Furthermore, rhetorical questions were used to respond to the questions on the template such that the template provided insufficient information about how the learning objectives were met. Similarly, with respect to THEO 102, a significant number of learning objectives were not addressed and there was insufficient explanation with regard to those objectives that were addressed. Dr. Snow responded that remanding these courses would be appropriate since these deficiencies appeared to be easily curable. With respect to THEO 109, the subcommittee confided that there had been no time to fully consider the proposal.

Human Nature and Ethics:

MISC 136 (Military Leadership and Ethics): Not Approve.

Dr. Malin reported that MISC 136 focuses on specific practical needs of the students in terms of their preparation for military leadership. While this is quite appropriate for a course, it utilizes a pedagogy that does not provide much opportunity for treating the main concepts from the broader theoretical, historical and cultural perspectives envisioned by the learning objectives in the knowledge area. Dr. Malin recommended that if the proponent intended to re-submit the course, the proponent should focus either on the human nature or the ethics components of the learning objectives. By focusing on both, neither had been accomplished.

Science and Nature:

CHEM 001 (General Chemistry 001): Approve
CHEM 002 (General Chemistry 002): Approve
BISC 001 (Current Topics in Science and Health): Defer
BISC 015 (Principles of Human Anatomy and Physiology): Approve
BIO 001 (General Biology 001): Approve
BIO 002 (General Biology 002): Approve
PHYS 003 (General Physics with Introductory Calculus 1): Remand
PHYS 004 (General Physics with Calculus 2): Remand
PHYS 009 (Earth and Environmental Physics): Approve
ARSC 010 (Major Concepts in Modern Science 1): Approve
ARSC 011 (Major Concepts in Modern Science 2): Approve
PRST 018 (Aspects of Modern Science): Approve

With respect to BISC 001, Dr. Malin noted that the vote was split, with three subcommittee members voting to approve and two voting to remand. There had been considerable effort to frame the course objectives to satisfy the learning objectives in the knowledge area, but some subcommittee members thought it too ambitious to cover this array of topics as planned. Concern was also expressed that there would be several faculty involved in teaching the course. A suggestion was made that courses should not be considered for inclusion in the core until they had been taught at least once. Dr. Laatsch responded that one of the goals contemplated by the core was to encourage faculty to develop and submit interdisciplinary courses. If these endeavors are to succeed, it should be recognized that several faculty may be involved in teaching such courses. Asking faculty to teach the courses before they are submitted for core approval may be counterproductive to this effort. It might also be difficult to attract students to new interdisciplinary courses unless they have been recognized for inclusion in the core. After checking the minutes as far back as February 28, 2001, Professor Wiseman confirmed that new courses could be submitted to the CCRC for approval if they had been approved by the Department, regardless of whether they had been taught. In view of Committee reservations, however, it was determined to defer consideration of this course in order to secure additional information. Finally, with regard to PHYS 003 and 004, Dr. Malin reported that neither template described how students would achieve the relevant learning objectives. The subcommittee recommended that the proponents for each course use previous submissions from their own department (PHYS 001 and 002) as a guide for these submissions.

(2) Group I. Dr. Cheryl Maranto presented the deliberations and recommendations of Subcommittee Group I in the following knowledge areas:

Diverse Cultures:

SOCI 165 (Social Inequality): Approve
SOCI 166 (Race and Family): Approve
ORLE 135 (Culturally Diverse Organization): Approve
HIST 162 (History of France since 1815): Remand
PHAS 417 (Ethics and Diversity in Health Care): Remand
EDUC 048 (Inquiry into Contemporary Educational Issues): Approve, pending receipt of a revised template

Literature and Performing Arts:

MUSI 051 (Music Appreciation): Approve
MUSI 152 (History of Musical Theatre in America): Approve
SPAN 175 (Golden Age Prose): Approve
SPAN 192 (18th and 19th Century Spanish Literature): Approve
JAPA 148 (Japanese Literature in English Translation): Approve

With respect to HIST 162, Dr. Maranto noted that the syllabus did not articulate any learning objectives that were related to Diverse Cultures. In its survey of three French novels, there was no discussion of how race or ethnicity discussions would occur since no conceptual framework had been laid. Likewise, with PHAS 417, there were no examples provided as to how the learning objectives would be met. Consequently, there was no indication as to how much of the course was related to diversity. With respect to EDUC 048, Dr. Ellen Eckman remarked that Dr. Joan Whipp had not yet had time to clarify the subcommittee’s concerns, but it was expected that she would do so by the following Monday. The members suggested that if the clarification was provided, the course submission would be approved. If not, the course would be withdrawn before any vote.

Having concluded the foregoing discussions, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki moved that the subcommittee recommendations be approved. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ken Ksobiech. The motion will be subject to vote at the May 1 meeting.
D. BIEN Options. Continuing the prior CCRC discussions about BIEN options, Dr. Nancy Snow distributed a memo from Dr. Stephen Heinrich summarizing the comparable Engineering requirements at other Jesuit institutions (a copy of same is attached to the original of these Minutes). She also reported that the College of Engineering has now submitted a tentative college core and that there existed no real enthusiasm for the creation of a subcommittee to further consider these integration issues. She also noted that Dr. Buckholdt has distributed a memo to each college asking the colleges to report their various cores by June 15.

Turning to the Engineering summary, Dr. Heinrich emphasized that the Engineering requirements at Marquette would be consistent with Detroit and Santa Clara, but pointed out that neither of those has a Department of Biomedical Engineering. Furthermore, although St. Louis has such a department, it is newly created. He reiterated that the BIEN Department at Marquette would like a double-dipping (dual application) option. Dr. John Pustejovsky then indicated that, for purposes of discussion, he would sponsor a recommendation to allow Engineering the equivalent of six core credits to be earned by double dipping, as long as such an option did not include Philosophy or Theology. Dr. Heinrich responded that the option to double dip should extend to the entire University rather than the Engineering College exclusively. He added, however, that each college should be able to eliminate that option within its discretion. Dr. Heinrich then noted that the Committee should consider the following issues independently: (1) would it allow an option for double dipping, and (2) for how many credits or courses would this be possible. Dr. Byleen responded that he wished to know how many students would be affected by this option and Dr. Courtright inquired whether other universities permitted double dipping. Dr. Heinrich responded that Santa Clara appeared to allow that option for three credits. Dr. Courtright then noted that the Engineering curriculum at Marquette appeared to require more technical credits that did programs at other institutions.

Fr. Rossi then wondered what the core would look like for Engineering students. Would there be an array of courses that would qualify for the core in two knowledge areas? He noted that if such an option were viable, a number of departments at Marquette would need to offer courses that fulfill more than one knowledge area. Dr. Heinrich responded that BIEN would need to work together with the remaining colleges to make such an option viable. He also doubted that everyone would opt for double dipping since it might be difficult to administer. Dr. Quade confirmed, however, that a number of Marquette students double dip in their majors across the colleges. Thus, students from a number of colleges could be expected to benefit. Mr. Lowrey added that if the learning objectives were met, it should make no difference whether the objectives were met in one course or two, since students would experience the same benefit. Dr. Heinrich also noted that such an option might benefit faculty who would be encouraged to think creatively about interdisciplinary courses. Dr. Maranto reminded the Committee, however, that it had not yet approved a single course in two different knowledge areas, though that was possible in courses such as the Psychology of Prejudices. Dr. Wierzbicki remarked that many students have double major limits; thus, the option should be available to everyone, though the Committee might set upper limits on the number of credits for which the option was available. Finally, Dr. Naylor noted that this option might also help transfer students. Though he did not favor the idea of double dipping (dual application), it appeared that some exceptions would have to be made. Professor Wiseman responded that the Committee should consider the importance of Human Nature and Ethics and Theology with regard to the core and perhaps limit the dual application doctrine with respect to those knowledge areas. Following these discussions, Committee members proposed the following motions for vote at the May 1 meeting:

1. That a dual application policy be adopted as part of the Core of Common Studies by which a core course may simultaneously fulfill two knowledge areas requirements if that course has been submitted to and approved by the CCRC in each of the two knowledge areas (motion made by Dr. Heinrich and seconded by Dr. Pustejovsky);

2. That the dual application policy be restricted in application to knowledge areas other than Human Nature and Ethics and Theology (motion made by Dr. Pustejovsky and seconded by Dr. Wierzbicki);

3. That the dual application policy be made applicable to no more than six of the thirty-six core credits (motion made by Dr. Heinrich and seconded by Fr. Rossi);
(4) That the colleges are authorized to adopt a more restrictive dual application policy or do away with such a policy within their discretion (motion made by Dr. Heinrich and seconded by Dr. Pustejovsky).

Discussion followed about the need for an additional motion limiting the dual application policy to no more than three of the thirty-six core credits. Consultations with Parliamentarian Dr. Ken Ksobiech convinced the group that, if necessary, Motion (3) could be amended to three credits in compliance with the two-meeting rule if Committee members determined to do so at the May 1 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine M. Wiseman
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Reporter, Core Curriculum Review Committee
The May 1, 2002 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was called to order at 10:06 a.m. by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU 227. 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 Mallin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki and Prof. Christine Wiseman. Members Excused: Rev. Philip Rossi and Ms. Stephanie Russell.

After order was called, the opening prayer was led by Dr. Deahl who acknowledged the busyness of the end of the year, asking for continued guidance on good decision-making for members of the committee and Marquette students.

I. Minutes. The minutes from the April 18, 2002 meeting were not available and were tabled until available.

II. Agenda Items

Chair’s Report.
Dr. Nancy Snow brought up the idea of scheduling an additional meeting because many issues are still pending, reflected on the end of this meeting’s agenda. She pointed out that it might be a good idea to try to resolve these issues before the beginning of next year. It was agreed to schedule the meeting and see who would be able to attend.

Retreat. The topic of an overnight retreat for the committee members was discussed again with a possible date in June 2002: this issue was not resolved. Dr. Snow will bring it up for further discussion.

Assessment sessions update. Thirty-three faculty members have signed up to date. Several departments have not responded. Please alert chairs or other department members that it is expected that Arts and Sciences departments with courses in the core will send people to the sessions.

Preamble subcommittee. Ms. Stephanie Russell has been asked to chair this subcommittee as Dr. Pustejovsky leaves the CCRC.

Representative for Manresa Curriculum Review Committee (MCRC). Dr. Ksobiech is on the Manresa Advisory Committee. We will need to look for another member to be on the Review Committee. Dr. Courtright was asked if he would volunteer and he agreed to be the representative to the MCRC. The committee thanked him for his willingness to serve in this role.

Course submissions.
The course submissions presented at the previous meeting were considered. Clarifications and updates were made by subcommittee representatives regarding the following courses:

Dr. Maranto indicated that in terms of EDUC 048, the revised template was turned in April 30, 2002. The subcommittee was unable to review it before the meeting. Recommendation: defer until next meeting.

Dr. Malin reported that in terms of THEO 109, the current template and syllabus preclude the ability to make a decision at this time. Recommendation: remand (with one abstention).
In terms of BISC 001, Dr. Malin indicated that the subcommittee agreed that there was not enough information for a decision. (It was noted that this could be a good core course, but more information is needed.) Recommendation: remand (vote 5-0).

Dr. Snow asked that the recommendations for course approvals be changed to reflect these comments and the called for a vote on the motions regarding the course recommendations. The motions unanimously passed:

**Group I:**

**Diverse Cultures**

- SOCI 165 Social Inequality: approve
- SOCI 166 Race and Family: approve
- ORLE 135 The Culturally Diverse Organization: approve
- HIST 162 History of France Since 1815: remand
- PHAS 417 Ethics and Diversity in Health Care: remand
- EDUC 048 Inquiry into Contemporary Educational Issues: defer

**Literature and Performing Arts**

- MUSI 051 Music Appreciation: approve
- MUSI 152 History of the Musical Theatre in America: approve
- SPAN 175 Golden Age Prose: approve
- SPAN 192 18th and 19th Century Spanish Literature: approve

**Group IV:**

**Theology**

- THEO 100 Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament Overview: remand
- THEO 109 Good and Evil, Past and Present: remand
- THEO 116 Christian Theology in Cultural Contexts: approve

**Human Nature and Ethics**

- MILITARY SCIENCE 136 Military Leadership and Ethics: Not approve

**Science and Nature**

- CHEM 001 General Chemistry 001: approve
- CHEM 002 General Chemistry 002: approve
- BISC 001 Current Topics in Science and Health: remand
- BISC 015 Principles of Human Anatomy and Physiology: approve
- BIO 001 General Biology 001: approve
- BIO 002 General Biology 002: approve
- PHYS 003 General Physics with Introductory Calculus 1: remand
- PHYS 004 General Physics with Calculus 2: remand
- PHYS 009 Earth and Environmental Physics: approve
- ARSC 010 Major Concepts in Modern Science 1: approve
- ARSC 011 Major Concepts in Modern Science 2: approve
- PRST 018 Aspects of Modern Science: approve
Pending motions.

(1) Motion that a dual application policy be adopted as part of the Core of Common Studies by which a core course may simultaneously fulfill two knowledge area requirements if that course has been submitted to and approved by the CCRC in each of the two knowledge areas;

(2) Motion that the dual application policy be restricted in application to knowledge areas other than Human Nature and Ethics and Theology;

(3) Motion that the dual application policy be made applicable to no more than six of the thirty-six core credits;

(4) Motion that colleges are authorized to adopt a more restrictive dual application policy or do away with such a policy within their discretion.

There was some discussion regarding re-ordering the motions prior to discussion on the individual motions. It was decided to keep them in their original order.

Discussion on Motion 1.

Dr. Maranto stated the importance of moving forward and was in favor of approving the motions. Dr. Byleen was concerned that one three-credit course could achieve two sets of learning objectives considering the examples set by students in his classes. He stated that he is trying to keep open mind, but questions the feasibility and raised the issue of assessment. In his view, we are trying to make a general policy for ten percent of the population: can we accommodate those students without this change? There may be unanticipated consequences—certain courses may become very popular creating a “power core.” He continued that the first motion would create a 30-credit core for some students and suggested it would be acceptable for Engineering to say they cannot handle more than 30 credits. He wondered whether we should we have considered a 2-credit course instead.

Dr. Machan agreed with some of Dr. Byleen’s points, indicating he feels that it may be pedagogically challenging to handle two learning objectives in one course. Courses that will dually apply may become magnets for enrollment. He views this plan as an exception and to that end feels it should not be made a policy. Dr. Eckman stated that philosophically, Motion 1 doesn’t talk about numbers. Dr. Laatsch agreed that there may be problems from Health Sciences’ perspective and that some mechanism should be investigated to help students in “high credit” majors. Motion 4 provides the individual colleges with the option not to allow dual application. Dr. Courtright commented on the idea of a 2-credit option—that to achieve the learning objectives students may have to work just as hard as in a 3-credit course. Dr. Machan stated that putting the emphasis on the colleges to opt out seems to work against a common university core. Dr. Deahl stated that there is a common core of learning outcomes: regardless of credit differences, there is a common core of outcomes, if a course dually applies.

Dr. Wierzbicki stated that the common core is based on learning objectives, not courses. He shares the concern that it may be difficult for a course to dually apply, but feels that it is not impossible. He added that abuses that have been raised may not be a problem if the committee does its work. Dr. Deahl stated that we sometimes operate based on worst-case scenarios, but the reality of academia is such that colleges for the most part will have a 36-credit core. A controlled form of dual applications seems like it might encourage interdisciplinary course development. Dr. Maranto agreed that we have a number of “failsafes” in place that will limit the number of dual application courses. We need to be prudent and watch registration numbers over time. We need to have faith in our own processes and believe that the courses will meet the learning objectives that they document. There are limits within the system to stop some of the “flocking to courses” that were brought up. She asked if we are sincere about an outcomes-based approach. Dr. Heinrich observed that dual application might encourage the introduction of interdisciplinary courses. Dual applications may increase the relevance and applicability of individual courses. The core has the potential to add value to the student’s education. It is pragmatic but may lead
to integration and greater satisfaction among certain facets of the community. Because of the number of knowledge areas and particular emphases, there are structures that dictate a 36-credit hour core. We must have faith in the review and assessment processes that some of the concerns raised will be addressed. Dr. Naylor stated that dual application may be helpful to transfer students. Dr. Snow received an email from Dr. Ksobiech raising concerns regarding the viability of courses to satisfy two learning objectives. Dr. Pustejovsky stated that when this process first started we wanted to raise the level of academic review in many arenas within the colleges. Mechanisms such as templates for core courses have done this. He wondered if we need to have a “body” with respect to each of the knowledge areas, such as a subcommittee from the CCRC to help refine the learning objectives and development of courses?

Dr. Wierzbicki stated that the learning objectives came from Task Forces comprised of faculty with knowledge area expertise. As the process has continued, the subcommittees have refined some of the learning objectives. Dr. Snow stated that we should consider these issues separately at a later time. Dr. Wiseman suggested that the retreat might be a good time for this discussion. Dr. Heinrich agreed with Dr. Naylor regarding transfer students and also said that dual application would be helpful for ROTC students. Dr. Deahl felt that students in the College of Professional Studies would be looking for ways to bring in other credits. Dr. Ksobiech stated that the College of Communication would not be interested. Dr. Eckman felt that some students in the School of Education might be interested. Dr. Maranto said that the College of Business wouldn’t need it. Dr. Machan stated that he felt dual application meant we would be moving from seven separate college cores to four or so. Dr. Malin reiterated that we had approved a learning objective-based core.

Dr. Ksobiech offered two pragmatic objections to the dual application motions: 1) We do not want to communicate to the individual colleges that they can solve their “core problems” with dual applications when we have yet to receive submissions for courses that would dually apply. 2) Double sets of learning objectives may encourage application for core approval of courses that are not ready and the committee will be pressured to approve them to help the colleges. Dr. Eckman stated that there are courses that are in the wings that do not seem like a stretch in terms of meeting two sets of learning objectives. If departments knew that dual applications would be approved, courses may be submitted in more than one knowledge area. Dr. Maranto agreed and indicated that courses are not being dually submitted because no policy exists to approve them. This approach provides us the opportunity to integrate knowledge areas. She indicated that she would not feel compelled to approve a course that does not meet a majority of learning objectives just to have a course that dually applied. Dr. Malin stated that she would feel stronger if there was certain to be funding for core course development. She continued that we should foster dialogue about which areas can best complement one another. Prof. Wiseman stated she would be meeting with the new provost to communicate that the money that has been committed to the core should absolutely be dedicated to the core.

Dr. Snow called for a vote on Motion 1. The motion passed 10-4-1: 10 votes in favor, 4 votes opposed and 1(unwittingly misinformed) abstention.

**Discussions on Motion 2.**

Dr. Pustejovsky called the question on Motion 2. Dr. Wiseman reported on meeting with the Board of Trustees, on May 1, 2002. She indicated that the Deans have been asked to provide rationale for college cores and that concerns are being raised regarding reduction in requirements in certain areas (especially Philosophy and Theology). Dr. Deahl stated that the foregoing issue has been raised at length in the Dean’s Council. In addition, he observed that pedagogically it is possible for Philosophy/Theology courses to dually apply. Dr. Heinrich questioned why we need to limit Philosophy and Theology. He wondered if we are “taking away” from Philosophy or Theology if we allow a course to dually apply. Dr. Machan articulated the concern that a separate department would submit a course to apply in Philosophy or Theology and continued that from his review of Jesuit documents, it is clear that Philosophy and Theology are at the center of our education. He also mentioned that these areas are the least addressed at the high school level, so students entering college are not well-grounded in these disciplines. Dr. Heinrich stated that another hallmark of Jesuit education is practicality—not ivory tower education, and
integrated, relevant courses are appropriate to our education. Dr. Eckman wondered if, for example, Philosophy develops a course for other areas it would be acceptable. Dr. Wiseman noted the distinction between interdisciplinary and inter-knowledge areas. She also indicated that the committee can always rescind the policy if it is not meeting the committee or the University’s needs. Dr. Pustejovsky stated that History and Philosophy of Crime and Punishment is limited in terms of how students can count the credits. He argued that we should not allow dual application in Philosophy and Theology, as we need trained Philosophy, Theology instructors.

Dr. Laatsch asked if we are saying a course must carry a Philosophy or Theology acronym or if we are concerned with the learning objectives? Dr. Snow responded that we are looking at learning objectives, not acronyms. Dr. Ksobiech indicated that Theology/Philosophy should be excluded from dual application. Dr. Wiseman added that we are defining the colleges’ rights to reduce in certain areas. While there may not be courses that would be affected by this motion, we are signaling that these areas are sacrosanct. Dr. Pustejovsky stated that the first motion merely anticipated eventual submission of courses for dual application. Motion 2 is simply a prudent limit on policy.

Dr. Snow called for a vote on Motion 2. The motion passed 8 – 0 – 7: 8 votes in favor, 0 votes opposed, 7 abstentions including 1 misinformed.

Discussion on Motion 3.

Dr. Snow called the question on Motion 3. Dr. Eckman moved to amend Motion 3 to change “6 credits” to “no more than 3 credits”. Dr. Maranto seconded the motion. Discussion was called for on the amendment. Dr. Byleen stated that he had remaining reservations regarding the dual application policy and argued that if a student can achieve multiple sets of learning objectives, why would we want to limit access. Prof. Wiseman stated there seems to be some inherent limitations. We need to be aware of signals we are sending regarding learning objectives and the attainment of credits. Dr. Snow stated that we are always balancing a robust core with flexibility for students who have particular needs. However, she stated that we do not want to compromise too much in certain areas. Dr. Heinrich said that so few students will take advantage of 3 credits let alone 6 credits. However, he added, ROTC may require 6 credits. Prof. Wiseman wondered that if we limit to 3, would it appear that we were dealing primarily with Biomedical engineering, while 6 credits would allow us to address a broader host of problems. Dr. Heinrich indicated that he was not thinking solely of BIEN and agreed that 6 credits would not tie our hands in the future. Dr. Ksobiech said it is not necessarily our committee’s job to “give” so everyone can fit: other areas need to come to the table.

Dr. Heinrich stated that a 6-credit limit doesn’t simplify problems for BIEN or anyone else—courses still need to be designed, and the work still has to be done. Dr. Machan commented that there are nine knowledge areas—if Philosophy and Theology are exempt—it is only possible for dual application in seven areas and that may be challenging to administer: it may be unclear for which course the student is dually-applying. Dr. Pustejovsky said that precedent for dual application and how it counts is already History and Philosophy of Crime and Punishment.

Dr. Malin called for the vote to amend Motion 3. The motion passed, 10-2-3: 10 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed, 3 abstentions, 1 unwitting.

Dr. Ksobiech called the question on the amended Motion 3. The motion passed, 10-2-3: 10 votes in favor, 2 votes opposed, 3 abstentions.

Discussion on Motion 4.

Dr. Ksobiech called for a vote on Motion 4. Dr. Eckman stated that the colleges already have the ability to limit, set and change their own cores and to do so without touching the university core. Dr. Ksobiech said that he didn’t think that was the purpose of this motion. He thinks the motion is intended to let colleges opt out. Dr. Eckman stated that the colleges don’t need this motion. Dr. Maranto noted that adding another course to the college core is not the same as allowing dual application and indicated that
the motion does not do violence to anything we’ve approved: the issue is not course creation, it is about students enrolled in the colleges. Dr. Courtright stated that any college can do anything with its own core as long as it includes the common core. Dr. Snow asked if the colleges have jurisdiction over dual applications in common core and indicated that this motion does not deal with the college cores. Dr. Pustejovsky stated that every student enrolled in a college is bound by the rules of the college. Further, he added that colleges can specify restrictions for students and majors as applicable.

Dr. Heinrich moved to withdraw the original motion.

Dr. Snow told the committee that there would have be an additional meeting to deal with the other agenda items not attended to today.

The next meeting was set for Friday, May 17th at 9:00 a.m. Location TBA

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie L. Quade
Dr. Nancy Snow, Chair of the CCRC, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.  
**Members present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Steven Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Timothy Machan, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Phillip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Wierzbicki, Prof. Christine Wiseman.  
**Members excused:** Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Phil Naylor.

Ms. Stephanie Russell offered the opening prayer. Dr. Snow then reported on the recent assessment workshops given by Dr. Donna Engelmann of Alverno. She reported that 45 faculty signed up for the workshops, representing all departments with courses qualified for the core with the exception of Biology, Chemistry and Math. Dr. Scott Reid will spearhead the assessment effort for the Chemistry Department, and will work with Dr. Snow. Dr. Karl Byleen will spearhead assessment for the Department of Math, Statistics and Computer Science. Dr. Snow has not yet heard from the Department of Biology concerning their assessment efforts. Dr. Snow then distributed a memo that she received from the Department of Political Science that contains a series of questions regarding assessment. Dr. Engelmann was given a copy of the memo, and she addressed some of the erroneous assumptions contained therein. Unfortunately, no one from the Department of Political Science was present at the workshop when the memo was addressed.

**Remarks by Provost Madeline Wake**

Dr. Madeline Wake was invited to speak to the CCRC to provide her perspective on the committee’s work and on the role of the core curriculum revision for the university. She began by expressing her total support for the work of the CCRC, and stated that the new core curriculum will be implemented in Fall ’03. She observed that the university has come a long way in this effort, and expressed her opinion that the Committee has done incredible work. She was a member of the core curriculum committee in 1990-91, and has been a proponent of revising the core for years. She is in a professional discipline, nursing, where the humanities and science meet. She endorsed the notion that our new core is not a set of required courses, but rather a curriculum designed to produce certain outcomes. Assessment is not an addition to the core, but essential to it. Therefore, “double-dipping” is not a bad thing. The core should not be measured in “seat time,” but rather in outcomes. She expressed her belief that all of higher education is moving in this direction.

With respect to the notion of appointing a Director of Core, she asked the Executive Committee of the CCRC a series of questions on this issue, and their responses are in the executive committee minutes. Dr. Wake then invited questions and input from members of the CCRC.

Dr. Courtright asked whether it would be possible to generate new courses and lines for the core (i.e., whether additional funds will be available from the Provost’s
office), given the rumors of severe budget constraints. Dr. Wake replied that there is no
direct tie between interdisciplinary work and new lines, although it does involve
resourcing. Marquette is fiscally constrained. However, she is personally committed to
interdisciplinary work. A Responsibility Centered Management environment can lead to
a perspective that revolves around turf—i.e., grab as many students as you can get.
However, that approach is very unproductive for a university. We are one organization.
One challenge she faces as Provost is to find ways to ensure that people who work
together are not disadvantaged. But to do that, she has to resource them. There is a need
to develop systems of rewarding all those who work toward the university mission.

Fr. Rossi suggested that the term “core” may not be an appropriate term. It is a
framework of inquiry that allows students to come out with a set of intellectual habits and
skills. They need to be able to take what’s old and present and deal with what’s new and
future. Dr. Wake responded that Fr. Rossi was right on in saying that we have to measure,
not individual courses, but the whole. The university has not attended t the core as a
whole and how the pieces fit together. This will be one of the major tasks of the Core
Director. There is a need to reflect on the overall outcome. The Director needs resources
and opportunity for faculty to come together to talk about the Preamble. Fr. Rossi
expressed the fear that at best we will end up with a marginal improvement, because we
haven’t affected the fundamental dynamics of our intellectual culture at Marquette.
We’ve talked about many particular things, but we haven’t engaged the faculty. It is not
clear that they are on board. We need challenging intellectual leadership.

Dr. Wake responded that, when thinking about a model for the Core Director, it is
important to remember that the curriculum belongs to the faculty. She favors a core
director who is a faculty member, tied to the Provost’s Office, but not tied to the
administration (e.g., a Vice Provost). She solicited the CCRC’s reaction to that approach.
Dr. Heinrich responded that it depends on who the person is. If it is somebody from the
faculty, even if that person moves into administration, he or she will continue to be seen
as a faculty member, as is true for Chris Wiseman. It is too simplistic to categorize
someone as faculty or administration. Prof. Wiseman noted that we should not confuse
how the core curriculum process got started (i.e., from Prof. Wiseman working as an
administrator) who then stepped back and empowered faculty to do it. Dr. Malin noted
that the Core Director should be a faculty person. The key is to ensure that the person
does not get layered into the bureaucracy. She or he needs to report directly to the
Provost. Distrust may be generated by a reduction in their teaching load. She expressed a
belief that it is important that the person not be in administration. Dr. Deahl agreed that
the Core Director needs to be a faculty member, and the Director should not be elected,
because that process could select someone who has no background in the core. He also
agreed that the Core Director needs to be in the Provost’s Office. Just because a faculty
member takes on administrative tasks (which would have to be done) does not mean that
they have “gone to the dark side”. It should be a faculty member who works in the
Provost’s Office and is appointed.

Fr. Rossi suggested that this position be conceived similarly to the Director of the
Honors Program. The person needs to be able to get a talented group of people to engage
together in important deliberations about how we educate our students, across
departments and disciplinary lines. The person will need diplomacy to get folks who
don’t cross paths to do so in a creative way. Spelling out particular job responsibilities is
important. The person also needs resources to enlist others, faculty to do things well that she or he cannot do well, i.e., they need to utilize a team approach. It is more than shuffling paper. The Core Director will need to diplomatically challenge faculty and departments that aren’t engaging in the process.

Dr. Snow noted that the intent of the committee in leaving the notion of the Core Director open-ended was to provide the Provost with discretion on this issue. The CCRC has tried to foster interdisciplinary discussions. But there has to be a budget for this. The paper shuffling is non-negligible (e.g., all the templates that need to be processed). It needs to be done in Academic Affairs. The core effort has been successful because it has Chris Wiseman and Dave Buckholdt as advocates of the process, and she (as Chair of the CCRC) has had access to them. The core curriculum process needs the clout of the Provost’s Office.

Dr. Laatsch asked what role Dr. Wake sees for the Provost in addressing faculty who are not embracing the core, and who see their major as the only important outcome. Dr. Wake noted that the core is what makes a Marquette education distinctive, period. If a student only wants professional education, they should go elsewhere. But that doesn’t mean that we have to force-fit a certain number of courses into every major. We do have to look at the real needs of professional education. We need to be immovable about the framework, but flexible in the details.

Prof. Wiseman turned to the issue of assessment, as required by North Central. The university Assessment Committee is not representative. It is comprised of faculty who know about assessment. That committee has a different charge. The Core Director also needs to assume responsibility for assessment of the core as a whole—not just the individual courses.

Dr. Wake then asked whether the Assessment Committee should become representative. How else can assessment be disseminated? Prof. Wiseman responded that we need people with the required expertise to spearhead the effort. They have developed a template and model for assessment. The Assessment Committee hasn’t decided how they should function relative to the CCRC. Perhaps we can “loan” members of the CCRC to the subcommittee. It is necessary for John Jones to assume leadership on this issue.

Dr. Deahl observed that a critical issue is that the autonomy, framework, organization and outcomes of the Assessment Committee have not matched that of the CCRC. This observation was not meant as a criticism. The effort has been piecemeal because of the push from particular accrediting bodies. Until assessment is placed in a very organized framework like that of the CCRC, it will remain a fragmented view. There is a need for an official position and a charge tied to the core for assessment, too.

Dr. Snow observed that assessment must come under the rubric of the Core Director. It is necessary to engage someone from the outside, like Donna Engelmann to jump-start people in this process. Prof. Wiseman noted that the CCRC needs to look at the core holistically. Some departments and colleges still don’t see assessment as necessary. We should have been doing assessment since 1993. We must do it now. Dr. Wake noted that this endeavor is exciting. She looks forward to working with the CCRC on this challenge. We’re about transformation, and the core will help the university transform. There will be some pain associated with the process. Ms. Russell noted that we need a process to link the core to the Preamble. The core framework had incredible faculty input. It came to the Academic Senate, and was discussed extensively. Someone
then asked whether the Preamble wasn’t essentially done. Why do we need to recreate it now?

Dr. Courtright observed that all templates need to refer to the Preamble, even while the Preamble has been going through a revision process. Dr. Snow noted that we are revising the Preamble because a number of faculty expressed the need to do so. Fr. Rossi asked the CCRC to discuss the Preamble, and we did so at our December 14 meeting. There has been ongoing collaboration to revise it. Fr. Rossi observed that there was no group meeting that worked in parallel with the work of the individual knowledge areas. When the work of the focus groups was done and the Preamble was completed, he felt there was no intervening moment on how they all relate to one another. He feels there was insufficient explicit engagement of the academic community in the principles that were enunciated in the Preamble. There was never an explicit discussion of it. We need to move from attention on the trees to the forest.

Dr. Wake expressed her sincere thanks to the CCRC for its work, and pledged her absolute full support for the core.

Minutes of the April 18 meeting

Dr. Malin noted that her first name was misspelled. It should be “Michele” with one l. There was a typographical error in the list of courses and in the paragraph on page 5. The course should be PHAS 417, not PHAS 147. There being no further additions or corrections, Dr. Laatsch moved to approve the minutes, and Dr. Deahl seconded. There were unanimously approved.

Minutes of the May 1 meeting

Dr. Deahl pointed out that the sentence on page 4, under Discussion on Motion 2, 4 lines down it should read “Dr. Deahl stated the foregoing issue has been raised . . .” Dr. Pustejovsky asked that a part of the sentence attributed to him be struck, so that it should read “Dr. Pustejovsky stated that History and the Philosophy of Crime and Punishment is limited in terms of how students can count the credits.” There were no other moves to add or amend the minutes. Dr. Pustejovsky moved to adopt the minutes as amended, and Dr. Wierzbicki seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved.

Chair’s Report

Dr. Snow reported receiving an email from Mary Belanger containing Dean Michael McKinney’s request for changes in the composition of the CCRC due to the full year sabbatical leave of Dr. Pustejovsky next year, and Dr. Wierzbicki’s new role as chair of the Psychology Department. These changes which will necessitate both of them to resign from the university CCRC. Dr. Snow expressed her belief that the CCRC needs to address process issues before appointment letters can issue. Dr. Machan noted that Dr. Pustejovsky represents the Diverse Cultures knowledge area, not a department. Prof. Wiseman opined that Dean McKinney’s suggestions could work, but there is a need to develop process first. Dr. Pustejovsky expressed his belief that Dean McKinney’s recommendations make sense, given the changes that are occurring. He noted that Dean McKinney’s intention is not to tell the CCRC who to appoint. Dr. Pustejovsky expressed his belief that the email, which purported to reflect Dean McKinney’s request, did not in fact do so. Prof. Wiseman understood that appointment letters were to issue immediately,
and felt that that was inappropriate. Dr. Pustejovsky expressed his belief that the email does a disservice to the college. Dean McKinney’s intention was only to request that certain individuals be considered as replacements on the CCRC for Drs. Pustejovsky and Wierzbicki, who will no longer be CCRC members.

CCRC Retreat

Dr. Snow reported that, based on the list of available dates that was generated from committee members, it was clear that it will not be possible to have a retreat in May. Dr. Snow then asked members how they felt about an overnight retreat. Dr. Maranto observed that she had not heard any ringing endorsement of that idea from committee members. Dr. Malin expressed her belief that the CCRC has to address the issue of the relationship between the core and the Preamble. Fr. Rossi agreed, that such a discussion was necessary in order to set a context for the larger issue of how to address basic principles. This is best done in a reflective way, not by developing a motion or making a decision. Dr. Malin noted that we need reflection first, and then a decision. The beauty of a retreat is that it provides a dedicated time to reflect. It can’t be done in two hour chunks separated by weeks. Dr. Deahl agreed that there was a need to be off campus for an extended time, even if it was not overnight, or over a two day period. Dr. Courtright indicated that he liked the idea of getting away, just not over night. With the exception of assessment, most of the committee’s work is behind us. The real work left is for faculty who will be teaching core courses. He suggested the need to invite people who will be teaching qualified courses. Otherwise, how long will it take for the fruits of our discussion to filter through the university? Dr. Laatsch agreed that there needs to be broad dissemination, but only after the CCRC decides how it should all come together. The CCRC needs a separate time down the road. Dr. Ksobiech agreed, as long as it’s not too far down the road. Dr. Quade asked how we can start bringing students into the process. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested the need to sit by ourselves and look at the culmination of 30 years of effort. The work of the CCRC is the continuation of the transfer of ownership of the university to the faculty. We have seen an intense commitment and the emergence of leadership from the committee. This needs to be celebrated. Dr. Courtright suggested that, when we go on retreat, it should not be to accomplish a goal, but for reflection. We need a different kind of retreat because we need to develop a goal and conclusion—we need to move further in our decisions. Dr. Pustejovsky suggested that first we need to ask what we’ve become, and we need time to do that. Ms. Russell indicated that a retreat can mean different things. We need the freedom to start with Dr. Pustejovsky’s suggestions. It’s ok to come to a retreat with specific questions, even if they do not all get answered. Come with questions, and reflect on them, but don’t expect that they will be answered. We can then lay out what we need to do after the retreat. Dr. Deahl indicated that he hears Drs. Pustejovsky’s and Rossi’s call for the need for summative reflection. He asked whether they could email the committee with some questions to provide a brief but concrete framework for the retreat. We shouldn’t just go and say “let’s talk”. Dr. Rossi indicated his belief that Dr. Deahl crystallized a two-part focus asking a) for new members on the committee—what is the story we want to tell them? b) What is it that we would hope in the work we’ve done that would attract and excite our colleagues to see it as fundamentally valuable? We also need to remember faculty who do not teach in the core. They also need to see the core as an
integral part of what they are doing, so there is not a disconnect. They must not see the core as something that merely adds on or gets in the way of what we’re really doing. Such a perspective is not motivated by ill will, but by not knowing what a core education is intending to do.

Dr. Snow suggested, based on the discussion, that it would be appropriate to have the retreat over two days, but sufficiently close to campus so that people can go home in the evening and come back. She asked whether we might be able to find some time in June to do this. Ms. Russell noted the MU Preview dates that we can’t conflict with. Dr. Wierzbicki asked who is teaching summer session. He noted that both he and Dr. Machan are. Dr. Courtright asked about at the end of summer, noting that faculty are under contract beginning on August 15, and are not yet teaching. Dr. Snow indicated she preferred doing this sooner rather than later. Ms. Russell noted that June 14 is the only Friday in June that appears to be open (given MU Preview). She asked committee members to email Kathleen Ries with dates in June and August that they are not available.

Dr. Snow reported receiving a memo from the Department of Political Science concerning assessment. She reiterated that any course previously qualified for the core that does not have an approved assessment plan will be disqualified. Dr. Snow distributed copies of the memo to all members of the CCRC and requested that each member email their suggestions for how to respond to her. She will then draft a response and ask for feedback before it is sent to the department. Dr. Courtright noted that the Dept. of Political Science is very political by nature, but stated that the individuals in that department are committed to Marquette’s mission. Dr. Snow offered that some of the questions contained in the memo are indeed legitimate issues. She reported that she has offered to meet with the drafters of the memo and to work with the department on assessment issues.

Recommendations and vote on outstanding courses

Three courses that were submitted for inclusion in the core have yet to be definitively acted upon: EDUC 048, SPAN 055 and CRLS 167. Dr. Maranto, representing the Diverse Cultures subcommittee, reported that the subcommittee was still not entirely satisfied with the revisions to the template, even though the course in all likelihood would eventually qualify. She said she would discuss the outstanding issues with the faculty member who teaches the course, as the template drafter does not teach the course herself. Thus, for now the subcommittee recommends that EDUC 048 be remanded. The subcommittee recommended approval of SPAN 055, noting a dramatically improved template and syllabus. Given the two meeting rule, these courses will be voted on by the full CCRC at our first meeting in the fall.

Dr. Laatsch asked if faculty had been reminded that there is a September 1 deadline for the next set of submissions.

Discussion then turned to CRLS 167, Women, Crime and Criminal Justice. The Individual and Social Behavior Subcommittee brought to following question to the full CCRC: Is a course that is devoted only to women sufficiently broad to meet a core requirement? The subcommittee felt that the template was imprecise, requiring the subcommittee to dig to see how the course meets the various learning objectives of the knowledge area. Once the CCRC decides that the course is sufficiently broad, the
question remains as to whether there is sufficient evidence that this course meets the learning objectives. Dr. Ksobiech queried the subcommittee about the meaning of the first objective, “Identify, define, and measure the basic concepts used to categorize or describe individual or social behavior.” He asked to what the “basic concepts” refer. Dr. Wierzbicki responded that it depends on the particular social science discipline covered by the course. It is up to the department proposing the course for the core to tell the CCRC what the basic concepts are that are being covered in the course. Dr. Ksobiech then offered his opinion that a course that focuses on women’s studies is sufficiently broad, but that the proposal does not seem to be sufficiently developed. Dr. Wierzbicki responded that many of the courses that have been approved for this knowledge area address narrow ranges of behavior (for example, economics, social psychology), but that the concepts, laws or theories covered apply to everyone. Dr. Maranto suggested that courses that address gender do apply to everyone. There are two genders, and when gender roles, and femininity and masculinity concepts are addressed, it necessarily applies to both men and women. She further opined that the fundamental question should be whether, whatever the specific content of the course, students come away with a basic understanding of how social scientists identify and analyze issues of individual or social behavior. The approach taken by the Diverse Cultures subcommittee seems to provide a useful analogy. That subcommittee’s approach has been, despite the particular culture being addressed in the course (if only one is addressed), are students provided with the conceptual tools to be able to then analyze and understand other cultures? By analogy, the question here should be whether this course provides students with knowledge of the social scientific method, so that they can apply these analytical tools to other specific content areas. Unlike a course in a major, in which the acquisition of the knowledge of specific course content is critical, for a core course, course content may be viewed as a vehicle for conveying conceptual and analytical tools. In other words, the specific content is less important than the exposure to a different way of thinking about the world. Dr. Deahl agreed that the operative question is whether the content provides a vehicle for learning concepts and tools. Dr. Rossi also addressed the question of breadth by agreeing that the outcome is not the topical knowledge, but rather “I know how the concepts work and appropriately apply to this phenomenon.” The course must provide skills to take other concepts and inquire into other areas of individual and social behavior. Since as a core course, students may not go into higher level courses in the field, the primary question is one of transferability. Do students understand how this form of inquiry works? Dr. Snow noted that the template provides examples of how to apply theories to various issues, and that there is progression throughout the course. She then asked whether someone would move to approve the course? Drs. Wierzbicki and Laatsch agreed on behalf of the subcommittee that the course should be recommended for approval.

Terms for CCRC members

Dr. Wierzbicki referred to an email he sent to the CCRC contemplating three alternative means of initiating staggered terms for the CCRC. 1) At the end of the current three year terms, there could be an election, with 1/3 of the new members each elected to one, two, or three year terms. This would implement the staggering, but there would be no guarantee of any continuity of current members. 2) Instead of all current members
completing their three year terms, allow some percentage of current members to go beyond three years, with staggered elections for their replacement or reappointment. This guarantees continuity, but then some current members will serve additional time that is not necessarily at the discretion of their units. 3) One-third of members can step down early, 1/3 can go the full three years, and 1/3 can go one extra year. Dr. Wierzbicki favors the third alternative, in part because some members need to resign this year anyway, and they can be part of the group to step down early. Additionally, he suggested that whatever scheme is established to determine the staggered terms, it might be done so that units with similar interests are set for different terms, so all their representatives do not step down at the same time. Dr. Courtright expressed his support for alternative 3. He noted that the original members of the CCRC have done so much work that it is a good idea for them to go off early. Dr. Snow asked whether we want to look at members of the original Steering Committee to be the members to go off early, or at least some of them. Dr. Malin noted that she would like to serve one more year, because she might get renewed for three years. Dr. Heinrich asked what the CCRC’s Final Report said about terms? He recalled that according to that document, the term attaches to the position, not the individual filling it.

There was a review of Dr. Wierzbicki's document and general support for Proposal # 3 in the memo: recommending one-third of the membership to have two, three and four year terms.

Fr. Rossi suggested that in terms of determining which committee members to place in which group (two year, three year or four year) priority should be given to those members who have "been around for a while," such as members of the steering committee. He also encouraged that future replacements could be easier to forecast if we ensured that we had a sense of sabbaticals and other commitments.

Dr. Wierzbicki commented that if terms were ending at the conclusion of the academic year we need to act quickly in order to have replacements lined up for the fall.

Dr. Deahl moved to enact Option 3 of Dr. Wierzbicki's memo, that terms for initial committee members span from two to four years and thereby staggering the rotation of new members added with three-year terms; Dr. Malin seconded the motion.

Dr. Wierzbicki moved to amend the previously agreed-upon motion to attend to the completion of terms by replacements.

Dr. Snow concluded the meeting by thanking the members of the committee for another year of hard work and indicated that she would be asking for schedules to set up fall semester meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Dr. Cheryl Maranto
Dr. Stephanie Quade
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Friday, September 13, 2002

Dr. Nancy Snow, Chair of the CCRC, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. 

**Members present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Rev. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Vater.

**Members excused:** Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Michele Malin.

Dr. Bob Deahl offered the opening prayer, asking for guidance as we begin another year with the process, in thanksgiving for time together, for wisdom as the process continues.

Dr. Snow welcomed three new members to the CCRC, who are replacing Drs. Wierzbicki, Snow, and Pustejovsky as representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences in the areas of Social and Behavioral Science, Philosophy, and Diverse Cultures: Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Michael Vater, and Dr. Heather Hathaway.

**Minutes of the May 17, 2002 meeting**

Change ‘faculty’ to ‘students’ in SQ report, so detailed. Rev. Rossi moved to approve the minutes, and Dr. Ksobiech seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**Remarks by Dr. Susan Mountin, Director of the Manresa Project**

Dr. Mountin distributed a status report. There was a discussion on the intersections of academics and the 5-year grant from the Lilly Endowment on Theological Exploration of Vocation. Vocation has many connotations on campus starting with students considering church ministry. The faculty Coordinator has not been hired yet. Thirty-five faculty members participated in the May workshop. Workshop participation was tied into the receipt of funds for course development.

Fifteen course proposals were received from twelve faculty members. There will be a meeting on September 20, 2002 to discuss the proposals.

The Freshman Reading Project was piloted this fall with 120 students participating. In fall 2003 the whole class with be involved. A forum will be held for the whole campus community on September 24, 2003.

As part of the Manresa Speakers Series, money will be contributed toward the speaker fee for Desmond Tutu in February 2003; the Manresa Project is trying to work with the colleges and departments to solicit names of potential speakers.

The Manresa Project Retreat fund will support participation in Jesuit retreat options.

After the presentation by Dr. Mountin, questions and comments from the committee regarding the Manresa Project were addressed.

Dr. Deahl stated that during the faculty retreat, may ideas surfaced regarding faculty workshops and other components of the Manresa Project.

Rev. Rossi noted that during the first week of October, Lilly is sponsoring a conference in Indianapolis with opportunities to share resources, ideas of other grant-
funded schools. Dr. Mountin stated that Marquette is one of fifty schools currently being funded and that the project continues to expand to other schools.

Dr. Eckman asked if there would be new courses or would current courses be revised? Dr. Mountin responded that is could be either. Some clarification should be made in terms of connection to the Core of Common Studies.

Chair’s Report

A. Retreat follow-up with Provost Wake. The committee is going to begin trying to prepare the campus for implementation of the Core of Common Studies in the fall of 2003. Provost Wake wants suggestions on vehicles to help introduce the core; she is looking for prototypes for events. The committee members are encouraged to offer additional ideas. A CCRC member asked about advisors and when their training would begin. Dr. Snow responded that a list was being put together of constituents who would need information and training.

B. Preamble Subcommittee. Ms. Russell reported that focus groups have been completed. A brief history of work on the Preamble and previous documents were distributed at these focus groups. Another meeting was held with the previous Preamble group. Several new members have joined the Preamble Subcommittee. Two groups are now being formed to draft two separate documents, one internal and one external. Drafts will come back to the CCRC and be given to faculty as a whole. Dr. Snow thanked Ms. Russell for her work in getting things this far.

C. Assessment Committee Update. Dr. Snow will be meeting with Dr. Tom Wenzel, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs, in a week. Provost Wake, Dr. Wenzel and Dr. Snow have conferred and plan to re-configure the Assessment Committee, and give it a new charge. The Assessment Committee will be meeting by the end of September. Assessment plans for core courses need to be in place by November 1, 2002. CCRC will not review assessment plans. Dr. Snow will serve on the newly constituted Assessment Committee and Dr. Deahl will be a member. Rev. Rossi stated that there are questions on the campus regarding how the assessment plans will be implemented and evaluated. Some clarity is needed to provide guidance to faculty and departments. He wondered if learning objectives might be simplified as courses are being added to core. Dr. Snow suggested to Dr. Wenzel that guidelines should be created and publicized as soon as possible. Dr. Ksobiech asked about the timing of the request for assessment plans. Do courses that were submitted by September 1, 2002 also have to abide by the November 1, 2002 assessment plan deadline? Dr. Snow answered “yes.” Chairs have been notified. Dr. Heinrich asked if approval was already given for the assessment plans already submitted. Dr. Snow responded that assessment plans for all courses need to be re-submitted for Assessment Committee review in accordance with North Central guidelines.

D. Dr. Snow advised that procedures for reviewing qualified courses that have been modified need to be created.

E. Appointment of Subcommittee on Transfers and Advanced Placement: Volunteers are being sought to serve on this Subcommittee.

Agenda Items:
A. Subcommittee recommendations on courses from the previous CCRC meeting of May 17, 2002: EDUC 048, “Inquiry into Contemporary Educational Issues: Developing a Knowledge Base for Teaching in a Diverse Society.” New information was received in response to a CCRC request. Group I recommends qualifying the course for the core. Spanish 055, “Spanish Literature I”: qualify; CRLS 167, “Women, Crime and Criminal Justice,” qualify. Dr. Snow called the question [motion was pending from the CCRC meeting of May 17, 2002]. Three abstained; all others voted to approve. Two CCRC members submitted proxies in approval.

B. Subcommittee recommendations:

Group I:

Diverse Cultures:
PHAS 417 Ethics and Diversity in Health Care: qualify
HIST 082 Survey of East Asian Civilization: remand
HIST 071 Latin America: qualify
JAPA 101 Japanese Culture and Civilization: remand
ITAL 101 Myths of and about Italian Cultures: remand
PHTH 512 Culture and Disability: qualify
SPAN 100 Culture and Civilization of Spain: remand

Several points were raised during the discussion of course submissions in this area. First, students who take diverse cultures courses should be able to generalize issues learned about one culture to other cultures so that key concepts, such as those of race and ethnicity, can be used as general analytical tools for the analysis of cultures. Courses that satisfy the learning objectives in the diverse cultures knowledge area do not study only a single culture. Instead, they analyze cultural diversity within and across cultures. Terms such as ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ have technical meanings in this knowledge area, as in the other knowledge areas that comprise the core. Faculty who teach these courses must show that they understand the meanings and uses of terms as they function in the knowledge area. Second, a distinction was made between courses that were remanded because of insufficient information on the template and/or syllabus, and courses that were remanded because the course design indicates that it is not appropriate for the Core of Common Studies. That is, for inclusion in the Core, some courses among those submitted would have to be completely redesigned. These points should be made clear on Evaluation Tools. Third, it was noted that some parts of the templates had been filled out through “cutting and pasting” of material that had been used on other templates or on templates that had been previously submitted. The use of “cut and paste” material detracts from the quality of submissions.

Literature/Performing Arts:

SPAN 050 Introduction to Hispanic Literature: qualify
THAR 123 History of Clothing 1: remand
THAR 125 History of Clothing 2: remand
FILM 110 History of Film: remand
DANC 040 Tap Dance 1: remand
DANC 041 Tap Dance 2: remand
DANC 042 Beginning of Dance Technique 1: remand
DANC 043 Beginning of Dance Technique 2: remand
Concerns were raised about the manner in which templates had been completed and about whether some of the courses submitted in the knowledge area are appropriate for the core. The same template was submitted for several different courses. Further, syllabi were not sufficiently detailed to substantiate claims made on templates.

**Group II** was unable to meet and so did not offer recommendations on course submissions in the area of Mathematical Reasoning.

**Group III:**

**Individual and Social Behavior:**
- PSYC 114 Human Factors Engineering: submission withdrawn by the department chair
- SOWJ 080 Introduction to Social Welfare and Justice: defer, pending receipt of requested information
- AFAS 131 Air Force Leadership Studies: remand

Dr. Snow will contact the submitters of SOWJ 080 for the necessary information. It was suggested that the submitters of AFAS 131 should meet with faculty from the psychology department for advice on possible resubmission of AFAS 131.

**Histories of Cultures and Societies:**
- NASC 022 Seapower and Maritime Affairs: qualify
- LATI 170 Roman Civilization and Art: remand
- HIST 077 History of Africa: qualify

Submission of NASC 022 resulted from collaboration between the History Department and the Department of Naval Science. Collaboration will be ongoing.

**Group IV:**

**Science and Nature:**
- BISC 001 Current Topics in Science and Health: remand
- PHYS 003 General Physics with Introductory Calculus 1: qualify
- PHYS 004 General Physics with Introductory Calculus 2: qualify
- PHYS 008 Astronomy and Space Science: qualify

No recommendation on Theology submissions at this time.

All of the science submissions are resubmitted courses. All show improvement over previous efforts. However, Group IV does not believe that BISC 001 is appropriate for the core. It does not meet the learning objectives, lacks sufficient depth, and does not involve experimentation. One CCRC member stated that BISC 001 was designed to be a core course and an interdisciplinary offering involving several different scientific disciplines. She opined that the CCRC may need to be patient with interdisciplinary submissions since we want to encourage these types of courses. As interdisciplinary courses are developed we may need to provide more feedback and mentoring than is needed with existing course submissions. Another CCRC member asked whether there should be a limit on the number of times the same course is submitted for the core. Yet another member asked whether we should use the term ‘reject’ in addition to ‘remand.’ A CCRC member stated that we should stick with ‘remand.’ Another member offered that the CCRC should provide faculty with more guidance on developing new courses for the core. It was stated that the
CCRC should be more explicit in commenting on when a course would need to be completely redesigned to qualify for the core.

Before concluding the meeting, Dr. Snow mentioned the question of whether we should elect new members to the CCRC Executive Committee had been raised. She stated that this issue would be included as an agenda item at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Quade
Nancy E. Snow
I. Opening Prayer
Dr. Nancy Snow, Chair of the CCRC, called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. Members present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Bob Lueger, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phil Naylor, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Fr. Phil Rossi, and Dr. Michael Vater. Excused: Dr. Steve Heinrich, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Bob Deahl.

Dr. Linda Laatsch led the committee in prayer, giving thanks for another opportunity for colleagues to come together, and for our friendship, and asking God for the stamina to continue our work in the months and years ahead. She celebrated the collegiality that shines through in our work, and our charge to help Marquette students have the best educational experience possible.

II. Approval of the Minutes of September 13, 2002
Dr. Heinrich noted that his name was misspelled. Dr. Machan noted his name is “Tim”, not “Timothy”. Dr. Quade pointed out her typographical error, that it should read “Lilly Endowment on Theological Exploration of Vocation”, not “Vacation”. Dr. Hathaway recommended changes in the depth and characterization of the Committee’s discussion on the submissions for the Performing Arts knowledge area. She will submit her suggested revisions to Dr. Snow, who will distribute them to the committee via email for approval. Dr. Maranto noted that the discussion of the Diverse Cultures submissions was less clear than it might be. The issue is not that one course needs to cover more than one culture per se. Rather, that any course in this knowledge area must provide students with an understanding of the analytical tools and concepts (race, ethnicity, prejudice) needed to study culture, rather than only the characteristics of a particular culture. A general discussion ensued concerning the need for the level of detail in the minutes that has become the CCRC’s custom. Dr. Machan expressed concern that the statement regarding the need for procedures to review previously qualified courses as it relates to the modification of ENGL 001 and 002 was misleading, as the revisions were done in ways that were explicitly consistent with the learning objectives. Dr. Snow volunteered to re-work the minutes, taking all these suggestions into account. Approval of the minutes was deferred, pending receipt of the revisions.

III. Chair’s Report
Dr. Snow reported that she met with Mr. Roby Blust, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, regarding revisions to the admissions materials, to reflect the changes in the Core of Common Studies. She sent text describing the core to them. She will be attending Discovery Days, a major recruiting
event on campus, to talk to groups of prospective students and their parents about the core. She noted the need to develop new text for various communications and publications, including the Big Book.

There is a need for additional members of the Subcommittee on Transfer and Advanced Placement. Dr. Hathaway volunteered. Other volunteers were solicited.

Prototypes for events on campus to publicize the core were briefly discussed.

Dr. Snow also reported on the continuing work on the Preamble. Two documents have now been written. One is intended for internal audiences (those with a background in the Jesuit educational tradition), and one for external audiences (parents, students, alumni). The Preamble subcommittee has met once, and will meet again next week.

Dr. Snow also reported that copies of approved templates are being put on reserve in the Memorial Library. Dr. Maranto raised the question of whether it would be better to distribute some of this material electronically (i.e., via e-mail) rather than killing so many trees. Dr. Machan suggested that some faculty view their syllabi as their intellectual property, and that electronic distribution increases the risk of syllabi being distributed more widely than authorized or intended. Mr. Lowrey suggested that the documents could be scanned into Adobe and make pdf files. Perhaps they could be uploaded into Blackboard, which is very secure. Dr. Snow said she would check out any possible legal issues with Legal Counsel.

Dr. Snow mentioned that at the last meeting she forgot to ask for a formal motion and second on the subcommittee recommendations concerning the courses discussed at the 9/25 meeting. Thus, she did so via e-mail. Dr. Deahl moved and Dr. Maranto seconded those motions. Dr. Snow asked if anyone objected procedurally. Hearing no objection, Dr. Snow called the question.

IV. Agenda items

A. Discussion and vote on pending motion on subcommittee recommendations. The recommendations were as follows:

Group I
Diverse Cultures:
Qualify: PHAS 417, HIST 071, PHTH 512; Remand: HIST 082, JAPA 101, ITAL 101, SPAN 100.

Literature and Performing Arts:
Qualify: SPAN 050; Remand: THAR 123, THAR 125, FILM 110, DANC 040, DANC 041, DANC 042, DANC 043.
Group III
Individual and Social Behavior:
PSYC 114 was withdrawn by the department, defer recommendation on SOWJ 080, Remand: AFAS 113.

Histories of Cultures and Societies:
Qualify: NASC 022, HIST 077; Remand: Latin 170

Group IV
Science and Nature:
Qualify: PHYS 003, PHYS 004, PHYS 008; Remand: BISC 001

Dr. Snow called the question. Those present voted 11 in favor, 0 against the subcommittee recommendations. Proxies in favor from Drs. Heinrich, Eckman and Deahl were added, for a total of 14 in favor, 0 against.

B. Further Subcommittee Recommendations

Group II
PRST 020: Remand. Dr. Ksobiech reported the subcommittee’s assessment that it is not taught at a sufficient level to be a core course.
PRST 060: Qualify. Dr. Byleen expressed concerns as to whether students outside Professional Studies should be allowed to take this course to fulfill their core requirement. Dr. Ksobiech expressed the opinion that it isn’t the role of the CCRC to determine who should or should not be able to take an approved course for the core, but that any unit can restrict which approved courses will be allowed for their students.
PSYC 060: Defer. There was no syllabus, and other paperwork was missing.

Dr. Machan questioned whether we have or should have a limit on the number of times one course can be submitted. The PRST 020 submission clearly involved a lot of work, but probably will never be qualified. Dr. Hathaway suggested that the feedback provided on the Evaluation Tools should indicate the subcommittee’s sense of the likelihood that a resubmission would be successful. She questioned how to handle courses taught by Professional Studies that use the regular course numbers of other departments: should they fall under the core qualification of those that are taught by the unit? Dr. Snow reported that the Provost will rule on whether those courses are transferable to other colleges, and would therefore count toward core requirements for other students. Dr. Snow noted that it is not within the CCRC’s jurisdiction to limit which students can take which courses for the core: if a course is qualified and on the books, clearly a student can take it, subject to availability of seats. Dr. Ksobiech asked whether individual units or colleges can restrict who can
take it, and assumed the answer would be yes. Dr. Machan asked whether, if the College of Professional Studies won’t restrict who can take their courses, and if the CCRC can’t do so, if that would change Dr. Byleen’s willingness to support the inclusion of PRST 060 for the core? Dr. Byleen expressed his hope that Dr. Deahl would be at the meeting to address some of these questions. He expressed concern about a situation when PRST offers courses without coordination with the unit whose designation it used. Dr. Snow suggested that we defer discussion on this issue until Dr. Deahl could be present. Dr. Rossi noted that Dr. Wake needs to address how to ensure that such courses meet the standards of the originating unit.

Dr. Maranto questioned why a college could not require that students take a specific approved core course for a knowledge area, if that course is also a required course for the major. Dr. Snow stated her opinion that colleges cannot tell students that they can only take certain qualified courses to fulfill their core requirement. However, if they take a different qualified course for a knowledge area requirement instead of the qualified course that is required for their degree program, it will add to the total credits needed for graduation. Dr. Courtright asked about colleges that need to restrict access to their courses to their own students, for capacity reasons. It was agreed that colleges must have the ability to do so.

Group IV: Dr. Malin reported that the subcommittee recommended that THEO 100, 102, 104 and 110 all be qualified. However, she reported that the subcommittee continued to have a nagging question how the THEO department would ensure that any two qualified courses would meet all the learning objectives of the knowledge area. Specific comments on each submission include:

THEO 100 – The subcommittee wants to request extensive editing of the template, though they are willing to recommend approval.
THEO 110 – This is a neat example of a course that is very centered on student learning. It is very creative and well done.
Dr. Malin noted that the subcommittee only received one syllabus for each course. The Theology Dept. will need to coordinate to ensure that all sections meet the knowledge area’s learning objectives.

Dr. Snow asked whether subcommittee chairs would be willing to meet with the department chairs whose courses are being remanded. All subcommittee chairs agreed to do so.

Dr. Hathaway asked how we were to assess the values and dispositions objectives. The faculty focus groups never thought about how they would be measured. Dr. Snow responded that we will have to find a way to do so, for example by contacting alumni. It does pose a real challenge. Dr. Rossi noted that it would be more appropriate to look at values and dispositions in the assessment of the core as a whole, rather than individual courses.
Dr. Courtright moved to approve the recommendations of Groups II and IV. Dr. Hathaway seconded.

Dr. Laatsch noted that previously SOWJ 080 had been deferred pending receipt of additional information, as the subcommittee had some questions and concerns. The subcommittee was very satisfied with the responses they received, and are now recommending that SOWJ 080 be qualified. Dr. Malin moved to approve the recommendation, and Dr. Rossi seconded.

C. Discussion then turned to Dr. Heinrich’s email articulating suggestions for use of an incentive fund for activities to prepare the campus for implementation of the core. In particular, he suggested that a call for proposals be issued to promote creative ways to achieve the lofty goals of the core. His recommendation was forwarded to Provost Wake, who wanted a more specific proposal. Dr. Machan noted that it costs $3,000 to hire an adjunct to teach a course. Dr. Hathaway asked for clarification. Dr. Snow responded that we are searching for ways to solicit new courses, especially multidisciplinary courses, for the core. Dr. Malin expressed concern about funded buy-outs. It is hard to replace faculty in some areas, and more expensive to do so. She prefers funding for summer or overload teaching. She supported the CCRC putting out a call for proposals. Dr. Rossi asked if we are just talking about new courses, then does this parallel what the Manresa Project is doing. He suggested we need to do something that distinguishes the CCRC’s call from that of Manresa. He suggested focusing on creativity, e.g., faculty interaction with students to support core courses and core teaching. We could brainstorm possibilities, e.g., generate two or three categories of proposals to encourage different ways of thinking. Dr. Lueger agreed with Dr. Rossi, that the call should go beyond offering money for new courses. Dr. Naylor suggested that CCRC members should draft some examples for the committee to look at at our next meeting. Dr. Hathaway suggested that team teaching incentives would make the call distinctive, and aid our efforts to integrate courses across the core. Dr. Courtright noted that the Manresa call offers $3,000. If we make our call more generous, does that hurt the Manresa effort? In areas of lecture-intensive courses, why would a faculty member invest in this call? Proposals need to be sustainable, and to address the department’s long-term needs. Dr. Lueger and Dr. Naylor suggested that these issues could be among the criteria for funding. Dr. Snow asked for volunteers to serve on a subcommittee to address this issue. Dr. Malin volunteered. Dr. Naylor suggested that we invite Mr. Chuck Lamb, VP for Finance, to meet with the CCRC, to talk to him about the need to financially support the core. Dr. Snow noted that she gave a presentation to the University Leadership Council (the new designation for the meeting of Deans and Vice Presidents), and that Chuck was there.

D. Term-staggering
Discussion then turned to Dr. Wierzbicki’s proposal for a formal procedure to stagger terms of CCRC members. Dr. Courtright opined that natural attrition and turnover/sabbaticals was likely to take care of this issue. Dr. Machan liked the idea of regularizing how turnover on the committee would occur, but acknowledge that there are practical difficulties of doing so. We gain regularity with Dr. Heinrich’s approach, and have to take into account the needs and availability of people in the unit that needs to be represented. Dr. Byleen asked about the possibility of term limits. Dr. Courtright noted that we believe we represent a constituency, but that units might want a change in representation (e.g., a different department might want a chance to be represented, in knowledge areas that cross departments). Dr. Malin noted that Dr. Heinrich’s proposal tries to address these issues. Dr. Rossi noted that in that proposal, representatives from Arts and Science started three-year terms this year. Next year, non-Arts and Sciences representatives could start three-year terms. Then randomly assign the remaining 5 representatives at the end of this academic year. Dr. Malin noted that 4 people on this committee have been doing this for a very long time—before the current committee was created—Drs. Malin, Laatsch, Ksobiech, and Deahl. They should go off the committee first. Dr. Snow suggested that there is no need to make a decision on this now. There would be time for further discussion. Dr. Courtright asked whether there is any sense of support for Dr. Wierzbicki’s proposal for a five-year term. Should we at least vote it down? Dr. Snow noted that there was a motion and second in support of Dr. Wierzbicki’s proposal on May 17, 2002.

E. Discussion of an Election for a new Executive Committee

Dr. Machan expressed his thought that, analogous to the concerns for continuity for the CCRC as a whole, should we not also be concerned about continuity while also circulating membership on the Executive Committee, in order to increase involvement and distribute workload more equitably. Dr. Hathaway then asked what the function of the Executive Committee is. Dr. Snow replied that Dr. Heinrich’s role was primarily as liaison to the assessment committee, and that Dr. Ksobiech’s function was to deal with communications internal to the CCRC. She noted that the Executive Committee only met 3-4 times last year. She agreed that it would be a good idea to rotate membership. Dr. Naylor suggested that, while clearly the CCRC needed an Executive Committee last year to organize our tasks, with Dr. Snow as Core Director, it is not as clear that the Executive Committee is still needed. Dr. Malin asked what the Core Director needs. Dr. Rossi noted that, when the Executive Committee was initially formed, it was in part because no one person wanted to chair the CCRC by him or herself. Now that there is a formal Core Director, who is not a voting member, it was less clear an Executive Committee is needed. Should the Executive or an Advisory Committee appropriately be the Core Director and 2 or 3 voting members? In order to promote our continued work, what would be most helpful to the CCRC and the Core Director? Should formal statutes for the operation of the CCRC be developed? Dr. Naylor asked whether there is a consensus that we need this type
of body. Dr. Laatsch noted that, since it is difficult to convene the entire committee, there might be times that the Core Director needs help and feedback. Dr. Snow suggested in particular, that she could use help organizing the internal subcommittees. She noted that the following tasks are still to be done: publicizing the core, speaking to various groups about it, writing text for various publications, and meeting with each ROTC department. So she suggested that it would be helpful to have an Executive Committee to help with some of these tasks. Executive Committee members would chair the various subcommittees and meet periodically with the Core Director.

Having exhausted the items on the agenda, Dr. Rossi moved for adjournment, and Dr. Hathaway seconded.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl Maranto
Approved Minutes of the University Core Curriculum Review Committee
October 9, 2002

Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Vater.
Excused: Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Linda Laatsch.

Opening Prayer

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Nancy Snow at 2:40. Dr. Snow opened the meeting with a prayer, asking for God’s help to maintain our sense of equilibrium as we progress through the semester, and for continued collegiality and civility as we continue our work on the Core of Common Studies.

Review of Minutes

The minutes of the Sept. 13 meeting as revised by Dr. Snow were reviewed. Dr. Lueger moved for their approval, Dr. Deahl seconded. They were unanimously approved. The minutes of the Sept. 25 meeting were reviewed. Hearing no suggested amendments, Dr. Eckman moved to approve, Dr. Vater seconded, and they were unanimously approved.

Chair’s Report

Dr. Snow reported that the revisions on the Preamble were proceeding. It has turned into two documents: one is intended for internal use, and is about 2 pages long, and another that will be used externally, to help market the university to prospective students and their parents, and for others who may be less familiar with the Jesuit tradition of education. The internal document is close to completion and will be distributed in the near future. The external document has been through 4 revisions and has been sent to several groups for feedback. Dr. Quade noted that a continuing issue has been to identify and then appropriately address the intended audience.

Mr. Lowrey reported on the options that were available to the CCRC to “go electronic” with the distribution of syllabi, templates, etc. He noted that several options are available to us, one obvious one being Blackboard. A common working area can be created for the committee. Several different levels of access can be allowed. CCRC members could be designated as “instructors,” providing us greater ability to upload material into Blackboard, etc. Other faculty on campus could be designated as “guests” by the administrator or each faculty member could enroll in the course to get access to the materials that are posted. One question that arose was how much access should be allowed for different groups. Dr. Deahl noted that the advantages of Blackboard for sharing documents is evident. However, he questions if it is the best mechanism for disseminating announcements and other external dissemination. Dr. Eckman suggested
that we should continue to use the Office of the Provost web site for external access. Mr. Lowrey said he would proceed to work on a Blackboard site for the CCRC.

Dr. Snow reported on the work of the Subcommittee on Transfers and AP Credit. She, Dr. Hathaway and representatives from each college, the Registrar’s Office and Admissions are working to develop procedures for equivalencies, how requests will be processed, etc. So far, they have only discussed issues involving transfer credits. They still need to tackle issues concerning Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credits.

Dr. Snow reported that she has continued her dialogue with Provost Wake concerning prototypes for ways to promote buy-in to the core and stimulate the development of cross-disciplinary dialogue among faculty and multidisciplinary core courses. Dr. Wake is receptive to the idea. Dr. Snow has obtained estimates for a dinner for 30 at the Third Street Pier, lunch and “mixers” at the Union, the price of which would depend on the number of people attending. Dr. Snow asked for more ideas for an incentive fund so that she can generate a total budget. Fr. Rossi noted that we shouldn’t lose sight of the need for web site development for dissemination of core documents to both internal and external audiences. Dr. Snow responded that web site development is on the list for inclusion in the budget. Stephanie Russell has a web person working with her, and she has offered his help to the CCRC. Hanson-Dodge has worked on an overall design for all units of the University. Dr. Naylor noted that Dr. George Corliss has students who could also help with web development. Dr. Vater noted that web access would be extremely helpful for advisors, particularly if the information retrieved from it could be sorted in different ways.

Dr. Snow turned to discussion of the recent article in the Marquette Tribune concerning the core and assessment. The Provost’s Office has submitted a statement on assessment that is to appear in tomorrow’s Tribune.

The Assessment Committee has met three times in an attempt to finalize documents to help faculty with their assessment plans. They will have “office hours” after every meeting for faculty who seek help. November 1 is still the deadline for assessment plans for all approved core courses. Guidelines for assessment will be posted on the Provost’s web site very soon. Dr. Snow mentioned that an assessment workshop by an outside organization would be held on campus Oct. 18, and has a $165 fee. Interested faculty should see Vice Provost Tom Wenzel to sign up.

Agenda Items

A. Discussion of pending motion on subcommittee recommendations:

PRST 060 and PRST 020: Dr. Snow asked Dr. Byleen to elaborate on his concerns regarding Professional Studies courses. His concerns are twofold: 1) the quality of instruction – faculty who teach in the college are not necessarily in a department or discipline at Marquette and he is concerned that they have no opportunity to discuss their courses with regular faculty who teach courses with the same designation within departments, and 2) the schedule of class meetings–he expressed concern for the
compressed meeting schedule of these courses, particularly for math courses, which are skills focused, and practice is needed to develop the skills. For traditional MU students, such a schedule would not be the best way to take a math course. Dr. Deahl responded that CPRST has a 9 year history of offering courses in this manner (that pre-dates for formal establishment of the College of Professional Studies). The CPRST has worked with Deans and Department Chairs to secure recommendations for faculty to teach these courses, and all are part-time adjuncts. They would like at least one full-time faculty member in each of the 4 areas/programs offered by the college. CPRST has a different relationship with different departments. Dr. Deahl estimates that 90% of instructors have been teaching for the college for 9 years, all have M.A.s or Ph.D.s. About 80% of the math instructors have degrees from MU, 3 instructors have Ph.D.s. There is a long history of how they manage the relationship between disciplinary departments and the college. Dr. Buckholdt recommended an advisory board of faculty from Arts and Sciences, but it no longer exists. The college is now looking at how to reinstitute a structure to provide a regularized relationship with other colleges. CPRST is also considering peer review of teaching. Since the college was established, it has been working on a structured faculty development process. CPRST provides 3 faculty development days per year, with discussions on assessment, pedagogy, and student outcomes. Dr. Deahl expressed confidence in the adequacy of the faculty. Regarding the class structure and meeting schedule, he noted it was a question of audience. The classes meet in 8-week, 4-hour sessions, and they tap into and draw out adult learners. They have moved away from lectures and are more interactive. Various traditional students have taken PRST courses when they have needed a quinmester course in order to graduate on schedule. He recognizes that this meeting schedule poses a challenge for some disciplines, but students have access to an Instructional Assistant (i.e., a TA) that meets with students mid-week. This is especially useful in math, stats, and science. Math drives anxiety levels high for adults. PRST 060 is structured specifically to alleviate this anxiety. He noted that all “regular” MU courses are taught in 8 weeks during the summer. It was clarified that, while occasionally traditional students take PRST courses, it is rare. Dr. Courtright asked whether there would be any limit of access of traditional students to PRST courses that are approved for the core, i.e., so that math-phobic students looking for an easy way to fulfill requirements won’t cause an influx into these courses. Dr. Deahl responded that interactivity requires small class size, and they have never been confronted with an influx of traditional students. Dr. Malin asked if the limited number of approved statistics courses might lead to more pressure on PRST courses. The average class size in PRST courses is 17.5.

**Vote on pending subcommittee recommendations:**

**Group II: Math Reasoning**

PRST 060: unanimous approval of subcommittee recommendation to QUALIFY

PRST 020: unanimous approval of subcommittee recommendation to REMAND
PSYC 060: unanimous approval of subcommittee recommendation to REMAND due to insufficient information provided.

**Group III: Individual and Social Behavior**
SOWJ 080: unanimous approval of subcommittee recommendation to QUALIFY

**Group IV: Theology**
THEO 100, 102, 104, 110: unanimous approval of subcommittee recommendation to QUALIFY

There were no opposed to the above votes, no abstentions, and no proxy votes.

**B. Discussion of Election/Rotation of Executive Committee Members**

The question was raised by Dr. Machan in a previous meeting about whether the executive committee should be either an elected or rotating body. He noted, along with other department chairs present, that departmental executive committees are generally formed by rotating faculty. Dr. Courtright then raised the question of whether a fixed executive committee need exist at all or whether a new one should be appointed each academic year as various members of the CCRC retire and join. Discussion followed about whether the members of the executive committee should be designated according to college—one from Arts and Sciences, one each from non-A&S colleges. It was noted that rotation of the committee by semester or year would prevent necessitating this.

Dr. Malin raised the related issue of whether the responsibility of taking minutes for the CCRC meetings should also be rotated among members.

In order to determine how the executive committee should be constituted, the CCRC as a whole agreed that Dr. Snow and the current Executive Committee (Snow, Heinrich, and Ksobiech) should provide a description of what the functions of a CCRC executive committee were likely to be. Dr. Snow stated that one notably useful function that has already become evident this year would be the management of subcommittee activity, a burden which now falls solely upon the shoulders of the Core Director.

Knowledge of such duties, the CCRC agreed, is required in order to determine how and if to appoint or elect executive committee members. Dr. Snow agreed to create a description and list of functions for the next meeting, at which point the CCRC will make a decision about the form and function of its potential executive committee. Determination about whether and how the responsibility for taking minutes will also be made at the next CCRC meeting.

**C. Procedural Issues Regarding Core Courses**

Discussion of two issues pertaining to procedure were raised.

1) **Limits on resubmissions:** The committee considered whether a limit should be imposed on how many times a course may be resubmitted for consideration and whether the CCRC should offer departments and/or faculty the opportunity to conference with
subcommittee members prior to resubmission. It was agreed that this would be beneficial for both the submitting departments/faculty as well as the CCRC, while concerns were also raised about the efficiency of such a process.

2) Designation of Appeals Committee: The committee discussed whether an Appeals Committee should be designated and it considered a variety of means by which this appeals board might be staffed. One possible composition would include the chairs of all knowledge area subcommittees, excluding that of the knowledge area in question. Another possibility would involve appointing members of the CCRC who have recently rotated off, in order to insure that those evaluating the course would possess the necessary contextual knowledge about the CCRC and its procedures. Various members of the CCRC noted that the general principle guiding all appeals processes at the university involved restricting appeals to procedural concerns only. If a CCRC appeals board were appointed, it too would likely be confined to evaluating procedural rather than content issues concerning course submissions.

Adjourned
All of these matters of unfinished business will be allocated as agenda items for future meetings. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Associate Dean, College of Business Administration and Dr. Heather Hathaway, Associate Professor of English and Co-Director, University Honors Program
Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Nancy Snow

Excused: Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Cheryll Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Dr. Michael Vater.

Opening Prayer
The meeting was called to order by Dr. Nancy Snow at 1:10 p.m. Ms. Russell opened the meeting with a prayer.

Review of Minutes
The minutes of the Oct. 6 meeting were reviewed. No corrections or comments were offered. Dr. Malin moved for their approval; Dr. Eckman seconded. They were unanimously approved.

Chair’s Report
Transfer and AP Credit
Dr. Snow reported that progress on policy related to transfer and AP credits is a complex issue. She is currently compiling information on transfer credits, AP credits, CLEP, and the International Baccalaureate program. She expects to have materials prepared for discussion next semester.

Prototype Events
Dr. Snow reviewed a proposed schedule of events over the next several weeks, including mixers and brown bag lunches. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that these events need to be more ‘special’ than simple gatherings. Dr. Eckman suggested combining CCRC events with other campus efforts, for example the KoThi Dance Company performance. Fr. Rossi noted that these events need a ‘theme’ or ‘draw’ so the events would be more than open discussions. Dr. Ksobiech and others expressed concern about the short time frame for the proposed events. Dr. Snow agreed, and concluded that perhaps the practical solution would be to plan with a brown bag event this semester and recruit volunteers to assist with planning more substantive events. Dr. Ksobiech, Dr. Quade, and Dr. Malin volunteered to coordinate future events.

Incentive Fund Ideas
Dr. Snow indicated that the development of core courses is a high priority with Provost Wake and stressed that more creative initiatives were needed, such as those ideas expressed by Dr. Heinrich. The discussion of the Incentive Fund will continue at the Nov. 6 meeting.
In-service for admissions counselors
Dr. Snow reported that Roby Blust agreed to an in-service session for Admissions counselors during the 1st or 2nd week of classes next semester. This session will be an informational meeting related to the Core of Common Studies. Dr. Snow also distributed a new Admission info sheet on the core curriculum that will be sent to accepted students.
Dr. Snow noted that we need a “student-friendly” link on the Core web page.

Remand issues
Dr. Snow related that CCRC groups met with various departments regarding specific templates, and suggested that the meetings worked well. Dr. Malin noted that in-person meetings appeared much more effective than email or phone conversations.
Dr. Snow noted that the issue of consistency between subcommittees in applying standards is an issue requiring future attention.

Agenda
(A) Preamble draft
Ms. Russell briefly reviewed the history of the Preamble. The current draft is the result of the work of a combination of a number of groups and individuals. In particular, the contributions of Dr. Michael Patrick Gillespie, Dr. Mary Beth Gosline, Fr. John Laurance, Dr. Krista Ratcliffe, Fr. Phil Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Dan Zitomer and Dr. Stephanie Quade were noted.

Dr. Snow reported that feedback from faculty has been positive, and that some revisions to the document had been made by the Preamble Subcommittee based on that feedback. Dr. Ksobiech noted that the change in length from 5 pages to 2 pages makes the document more useable for the entire community. Fr. Rossi suggested that the document might be useful as a framework for assessment. Dr. Ksobiech noted that the new document might also be valuable for orientation of new faculty.

In terms of substance, Dr. Quade and Dr. Machan suggested the change from 'them' to 'us' in the following sentence:

“Thus, an appropriately ordered sequence of courses, informed by philosophical and theological principles, moves students toward the goal of a truly Jesuit education: the development of an integrated vision of humanity and of the world entrusted to <them> us by a gracious God.”

Dr. Eckman moved to accept the document with changes. Dr. Ksobiech and Dr. Malin seconded. The committee will continue discussion and vote on the revised preamble on Nov. 6th. The Academic Senate is scheduled to vote on the preamble on November 11th.
(B) Jesuit Justice Conference
Dr. Malin distributed materials from the recent “Justice in Jesuit Higher Education” conference and suggested that the format of the conference, which employed case studies and panels, could be considered for CCRC events. Dr. Malin elected to postpone more detailed discussion of the conference until the Nov. 6th meeting, in order to address more CCRC members.

(C) Procedural Issues
Standardized template for core course syllabi
Dr. Malin suggested that there be required standard elements for core curriculum course syllabi, which would assist greatly in evaluation of courses. Some examples of elements are; course descriptions (consistent for all sections); clear student learning objectives; and how learning objectives are evaluated. She further suggested that a notice be added to syllabi for approved courses to read ‘Approved Course in <knowledge area> Knowledge Area’. Dr. Eckman noted that the School of Education has a template for syllabi, and that the course description in the bulletin is the same as in the syllabi. Dr. Rossi suggested that we avoid calling it a “template”. Dr. Eckman agreed that perhaps ‘elements’ was the appropriate term.

Dr. Snow raised the issue of academic freedom as related to syllabi elements and the sensitivity to any proposal to ‘standarize’ syllabi. Dr. Eckman suggested that there was really no relationship of academic freedom to the syllabi, and that this was not an attempt to regulate the methods and/or materials of teaching. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that the focus on ‘student learning objectives’ was the most important element. Fr. Rossi suggested that there were a number of “discipline specific” issues as regards syllabi and that such variation in style should be accommodated. He further suggested that the committee make a variety of syllabi models available. Dr. Snow agreed that model templates and syllabi should be available via the CCRC website. Dr. Ksobiech agreed, indicating that examples of well-done courses should be available to other faculty.

Dr. Malin agreed to prepare a checklist of elements.

Documenting Changes in Core Courses
Dr. Snow began the discussion of how changes in approved courses would be documented. Dr. Machan noted that a key concept is what constitutes a ‘significant change’. Dr. Snow suggested that course changes which result in the course no longer meeting learning objectives was the focus of any review. Dr. Malin noted that changes in course objectives in the College of Nursing need to be approved by college curriculum committee. Dr. Laatsch suggested an annual check of course descriptions coinciding with the publishing of the bulletin. Dr. Byleven agreed, noting significant course changes requires changes in the bulletin description. Fr. Rossi noted that most course changes -items such as specific readings and choices of assignments - are more in the ‘how’ of a course and don't call into question the learning
objectives. Therefore, if the knowledge area objectives need review, that is one issue, but let’s not overdo the review.

Dr. Snow suggested that future assessment data might help to identify review candidates. Dr. Machan suggested that we wait for assessment data, as the core program really hasn’t started yet, and we should let it work and look programmatically across the curriculum. Everyone changes courses, and the key is how to decide when change goes beyond the expected ‘tinkering’. Furthermore, it is important to do this analysis in a uniform manner and not by selecting occasional courses for review. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that perhaps “substantive change” in course descriptions in the Bulletin might be the mechanism to trigger review. Dr. Machan and Dr. Eckman agreed that focusing on course descriptions in the Bulletin might be a reasonable method. Dr. Eckman also noted that it is incumbent with the departments to monitor course changes. Dr. Ksobiech noted that it was essential to leave the trust in place with faculty and departments and assume that courses will be presented as they are described. Dr. Snow will check with Vice Provost Wenzel to determine if there are any North Central issues related to this topic.

With the agenda completed, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm. Fr. Rossi moved for adjournment, and Dr. Eckman seconded.

Minutes submitted by James Lowrey.
CORE CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE (CCRC)

Approved Minutes of the November 6, 2002 Committee Meeting

Present: Karl Byleen, Jim Courtright, Ellen Eckman, Heather Hathaway, Linda Laatsch, Jim Lowrey, Robert Lueger, Shelly Malin, Phillip Naylor, Stephanie Quade, Philip Rossi, Stephanie Russell, Nancy Snow (presiding), Michael Vater

Excused: Ken Ksobiech, Tim Machan, Robert Deahl, Stephen Heinrich, Cheryl Maranto

Call to Order and Opening Prayer
Dr. Nancy Snow called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. Bob Lueger opened the meeting with a prayer.

Review of Minutes
The minutes of the October 25, 2002 meeting were reviewed. No corrections or comments were offered. Dr. Malin moved and Dr. Eckman seconded approval of the minutes. They were approved by a vote of 12 yes and 1 abstention.

Dr. Deahl had inquired of the Chair whether the minutes of the October 9th meeting could be amended to insert the following phrase: “Adult learning pedagogy is focused more on interaction learning in the classroom than it is on a straight lecture format.” Dr. Snow noted that minutes that have been approved couldn’t be amended once they have been discussed and approved. The committee expressed consensus support for this position.

Chair’s Report
The Assessment Committee has been meeting to review assessment plans for the 111 courses that have been qualified for the University Core Curriculum. To date, assessment plans have been submitted for 109 of the courses.

The Subcommittee on Transfers has been meeting to consider how transferred courses and Advanced Placement credit will be evaluated in relation to satisfaction of University Core of Common Studies (UCCS) courses. A report with recommendations will be coming to the CCRC early in the Spring Semester.

Agenda Items
1. Preamble
   Dr. Snow highlighted the communications that had been submitted to her by Drs. Hathaway, Ksobiech, Maranto, and Wolfe. Their suggestions were included in the materials distributed to CCRC members at the beginning of the meeting. Dr. Snow reminded the Committee members that the CCRC had received a motion to approve the Preamble presented at the October 25th meeting. She consulted with a parliamentarian who advised that any amendments could be incorporated and any amended motion acted upon at this meeting without violating the two-meeting rule for approval of such motions. Ms. Russell offered that she had presented the proposed changes in the Preamble to the Preamble Subcommittee, and that there was little support in the Preamble Subcommittee for the changes being suggested. One CCRC
member opined that the changes were not necessary and that the document is well-written as presented. Another member offered support for a change of wording suggested by Dr. Wolfe (“freed through” vs. “called to”). There was a discussion of which phrasing was more congruent with Ignatian spirituality and the extent to which persons of different religious backgrounds might or might not resonate with the meaning of each phrasing. The question also was raised whether the Core is “Ignatian-based” and that such wording might create an inconsistency between the Preamble and the Core. Several committee members expressed support for the original wording of “freed through.” The Chair noted that the consensus of the CCRC seemed to reflect a preference for the original wording. Dr. Maranto had expressed concern that the language, “Jesuit education is grounded in a Catholic, Christian understanding of God, the human person and society,” might be interpreted more narrowly than intended. Instead she suggested a revision to include the phrase, “because Catholicism at its best seeks to be inclusive, we are open to all who share our mission and seek the truth about God and the World.” In an e-mailed communication, Dr. Ksobiech suggested a shorter version of Dr. Maranto’s revision in the following words, “As such, it is inclusive of all who share our mission and seek the truth about God and the world.” The committee discussed these two proposed changes, with several members expressing support for each submission. After consideration and discussion of this and several other minor possible changes, Dr. Snow noted that the committee seemed to be expressing favor for Dr. Ksobiech’s addition to the Preamble. Dr. Malin moved that the original Preamble that was presented on October 25th be amended by inserting Dr. Ksobiech’s phrase after the first sentence under “I. The Purpose of Marquette as a Jesuit University.” That first paragraph then would read as follows:

I. The Purpose of Marquette as a Jesuit University

Jesuit education is grounded in a Catholic, Christian understanding of God, the human person and society. As such, it is inclusive of all who share our mission and seek the truth about God and the world.”

The second for amending the motion was by Dr. Hathaway. The Committee voted unanimously to approve the amended Preamble. Dr. Snow noted that four proxy votes also were in favor of the motion. The amended Preamble passed by a vote of 13 in favor, none opposed, no abstentions. [ Reporter’s note: Two CCRC members submitted proxies in favor of the amended Preamble too late to be included in the vote.]

2. Dr. Malin’s Report

Dr. Malin reported on her attendance at the Faith and Justice Conference that was held in Chicago on October 11-13, and wished to make a couple of points about the conference that were relevant to the Core. At the conference a self-assessment tool was described that might be useful to current Core assessment efforts. Dr. Malin asked whether MU is doing enough with the Core, and whether there are any areas that should receive attention but currently aren’t represented, particularly with respect
to faith and justice. She proposed that the CCRC form a subcommittee to address these questions. There followed a general discussion of her questions. Committee members noted that there are many resources on the American Jesuit Colleges and Universities (AJCU) website. The Santa Clara Bannon Institute’s work on faith and justice was noted. One member suggested the possible use of the incentive fund to encourage work on the Core in this area. The next interim Heartland Conference will be held during the Spring Semester and might be a source of discussion and ideas. The MU Centers for Teaching Excellence and Ethics might be resources for addressing Core, faith and justice. It was agreed that many events are happening at MU on faith and justice, but that it is important to make those opportunities known to students and faculty. Dr. Snow asked for CCRC volunteers to serve on a subcommittee examining the relationship of the Core to faith and justice issues. Possible non-CCRC members might include Drs. Buckholdt, Friman, and Gibson. Drs. Vater and Malin indicated interest in serving on a subcommittee for this purpose. Dr. Hathaway asked that subcommittee minutes be distributed to her.

3. Incentive Fund Ideas

Dr. Snow asked for suggestions for use of the Core incentive fund. One member suggested that the incentive fund be used for courses that promote justice in the Ignatian tradition. Other members suggested that funds be available for any discipline and not just for curriculum applications. The AJCU is giving grants for web-posted justice courses. The committee discussed the issue of faculty buyouts from regularly scheduled courses for the purpose of developing or delivering Core course development or delivery. One member asked how much money was available, and if that money is limited, whether a list of priorities should be established to govern decisions of disbursement. Another question was whether incentive funds would be applicable to college efforts to extend the University Core with college curricula. One suggestion was to use some incentive funds to help in the development of a model assessment plan. One member suggested that team-teaching should be a criterion of awarding of funds. Another suggested that the committee define the use of the word “interdisciplinary” if it is to be a criterion of award. Several members asked how credit for team-taught courses is to be awarded. The question was raised whether the funds should be used for teaching a course or developing a course. The potential adverse impact of the responsibility centered management fiscal accounting was discussed. Several members noted the importance of sustainability of developed team-taught courses if faculty or department resources are lost through retirements, sabbaticals, or resignations. One member noted the importance of developing a permanent framework for cross-disciplinary exchange. The possible delivery of core courses on the internet was discussed. Again, long-term sustainability of developed courses was emphasized. A member suggested coordination with the Manresa project so that Core interdisciplinary efforts don’t duplicate Manresa efforts. One member asked how the incentive fund was to be administered, and Dr. Snow indicated that she did not know at this time. The possibility of a three- to five-member subcommittee was discussed.

4. Procedural Issues Concerning Core Courses
The question was raised whether a course that had been qualified for inclusion in the Core could be subsequently offered on-line without it’s resubmission to the CCRC.

One member asked whether the on-line delivery changed learning objectives. Another noted that the human dynamic of course delivery must be considered. Dr. Snow cautioned against making policy on a case-by-case basis, and noted that some criteria or principles might be identified in guiding a decision. One member noted that the human dynamic particularly could be lost in an on-line course in an area such as Diverse Cultures. Several committee members expressed the opinion that plans for on-line course delivery should be made available to the CCRC. A question was raised whether an on-line delivered course taken by a transfer student would transfer and satisfy a core course. Dr. Snow also informed the CCRC that it had been brought to her attention that the course description for BIOL 001, a previously qualified course, had been modified. There was no change of course objectives. The committee consensus was that the course did not need to be reviewed. The question was asked when the CCRC needed to review a course. Dr. Snow replied that at the October 25th meeting the CCRC had agreed that any change of the Bulletin course description would result in a review of a qualified course.

5. Other Business
The definition of a CCRC “quorum” arose during one of the discussions. One member asked whether a subcommittee should meet to propose a definition of “quorum.” One member suggested that one-third of the voting members could constitute a quorum. Another member suggested that the CCRC might want to have one definition for convening a meeting and another definition for holding a vote. The committee did not reach consensus on the definition of a quorum.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Dr. Robert Lueger
Approved Minutes of the University Core Curriculum Review Committee  
November 22, 2002

Present: Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phillip Naylor, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Dr. Nancy Snow

Excused: Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Phillip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Michael Vater

Due to sparse and changing attendance, an official CCRC meeting was not held. The attendees used the opportunity to continue discussion on a number of committee issues.

Opening Prayer
The meeting was called to order by Dr. Nancy Snow at 1:10 p.m. Dr. Snow opened the meeting with a prayer.

Chairs’ Report

Justice Education on Campus
Dr. Snow reported that a volunteer group including CCRC members Drs. Snow, Vater and Malin would be meeting with other interested parties on campus to discuss justice education in Core courses and beyond.

Subcommittee on Transfer Credits and Advanced Placement
Dr. Snow will have a subcommittee report at the Dec. 11 meeting on recommendations for AP, CLEP, transfer, and International Baccalaureate credits within the Core.

Dr. Snow reminded the committee members that the Academic Senate approved the revised Preamble.

Reception and Conversation
Dr. Snow reviewed the schedule for Reception and Conversation events. All will be from 4-5:30 pm. These events are to encourage faculty to think about how being in the Core will change their approach to their course, to allow them to interact with other faculty from different departments who also have courses in a knowledge area, and to promote the Incentive Fund (see below) to faculty who might be thinking about submitting a course for the Core.

The schedule is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Jan. 22</td>
<td>Diverse Cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td>Individual &amp; Social Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mar. 5</td>
<td>Literature/Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed</td>
<td>Mar. 26</td>
<td>Science and Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Note: The Jan. 22 event has been rescheduled for Feb. 5.]
Jesuit Core Curriculum Conference
Dr. Snow reported that Drs. Lueger, Vater, Wenzel, and Snow will attend the Jesuit Core Curriculum Conference, Mar. 20-21.

Assessment
There are only 3 assessment plans not yet received from the total of 111 approved courses.

Publicity
Dr. Snow attended Discovery Days to provide information on core issues. She reported that there was particular interest from parents on AP/transfer credits. The outstanding issue of CCRC web site maintenance is not resolved.

Admissions
Dr. Snow has provided descriptive materials for the Admissions counselors, such as Q&As for new students. Materials for the Undergraduate Bulletin are in development. There will also be an in-service session on the core curriculum for Admissions staff.

Electronic Submission
Mr. Lowrey updated the committee on progress with developing a less paper-dependent process, and distributed some draft guidelines for departments for submitting materials. He will meet with Dr. Snow to discuss workflow issues. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that Dr. Snow definitely needs more administrative assistant support.

Agenda
Incentive Fund Ideas
To begin the discussion, Dr. Snow presented some sample options for encouraging and supporting core course development. For example, funding for 5 courses per year @ $6,000 each, for 3 years, could be used for courses including interdisciplinary topics, justice education and/or dual application courses. The $6,000 could be divided into a $3000 development grant and a $3000 ‘buyout’ or ‘supplement’. The attendees agreed that ‘supplement’ was a better term.
Dr. Ksobiech stressed that the supplement was for the preparation of the course, not the teaching of it. Teaching is a ‘normal’ activity.
Dr. Maranto stressed the need for formal chair endorsement of any new course. Dr. Lueger agreed, and noted that departmental sustainability is critical and should be a major criteria. Dr. Snow will check w/ Stephanie Russell to discuss whether the existing Diversity and Enhancement Grants may be model for this effort.

Dr. Snow proposed that a grant could be ‘up to $6000’ and involve multiple faculty members. Dr. Lueger stated that any potential recipients should submit a budget and justification for review, and a commitment from department to offer the course.

As regards timing, the idea of using the existing core submission deadlines (Mar. 1 and
Sept. 1) for course development was raised. Dr. Ksobiech proposed that proposals be submitted in March/April, the funding would be available in at the beginning of the FY (July), and the courses submitted for core consideration on September 1 or March 1. Dr. Maranto added that these should be fully-developed courses including assessment plans. Dr. Eckman noted that the new course(s) could be offered before qualification for the core curriculum. Dr. Lueger suggested that the committee call for proposals early next semester.

Dr. Snow summarized:
This fund would be announced to faculty early in the spring semester of 2003. Proposals for funding should come to Dr. Snow no later than April 15, 2003. Funded courses should be submitted to the CCRC for consideration for inclusion in the Core by either September 1, 2003 or March 1, 2004. We anticipate that money will come from the budget for the fiscal year starting July 1, 2003, and will be available to recipients July, 2003, August, 2003, or the fall and spring semesters of AY 03-04. Though consideration will be given to all proposals, the CCRC is especially interested in the following:
· Cross-disciplinary courses
· Dual Application courses
· Diverse Cultures courses
· Courses involving justice education
· Courses meeting the “special needs” of students in certain areas, e.g., Biomedical Engineering
· Courses that address the integration of core courses with courses in a major
· Courses that show promise of long-term sustainability

Procedural Issues
Dr. Snow appointed a subcommittee consisting of the chairs of the Knowledge Area groups in order to consider consistency in the evaluation of core submissions.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Minutes submitted by Jim Lowrey
Core Curriculum Review Committee  
Approved Minutes of the December 11, 2002 Meeting

**Present:** Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Steve Heinrich, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Phil Naylor, Dr. Phil Rossi, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Vater.

**Excused:** Dr. Jim Courtright, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Ms. Stephanie Russell.

Dr. Nancy Snow called the meeting to order. Dr. Phil Naylor reflected on the work of the CCRC as he prepares to leave this committee. He quoted Islamic scholars as a source of inspiration as we continue our work.

The minutes of the November 6 meeting were reviewed. No corrections were noted. Dr. Laatsch moved to approve the minutes, and Dr. Naylor seconded. They were unanimously approved.

The minutes of the November 22 meeting were then reviewed. Dr. Laatsch noted two typographical errors. Those having been corrected, Dr. Lueger moved to approve, and Dr. Eckman seconded. The 11/22 minutes were then unanimously approved.

**Chairs Report.** Dr. Snow reported that, with Dr. Naylor going on sabbatical leave next semester, Dr. Lance Grahn would fill in for him as a substitute for spring semester. Dr. Snow indicated that Provost Wake has asked the CCRC to revisit the question of term staggering, and noted that our committee’s recommendation on that issue would need to go to the April Academic Senate meeting or approval.

Next Dr. Snow reported on the incentive fund. She has submitted a request to Provost Wake, through Vice Provost Tom Wenzel, for $60,000 per year for three years. This does not include money for reception/conversational meetings for faculty teaching core courses in each of the nine knowledge areas at $625 per event. The request has not yet been formally acted upon. Drs. Ksobiech and Quade are working on the knowledge area conversational meetings. However, in the absence of formal approval of funding for the event, and with no room reservations having been made, Dr. Snow suggested postponing the first such meeting, for the Diverse Cultures area, until Feb. 5.

**Agenda Items.**

A. Discussion of Memo from Subcommittee on Transfers, AP, CLEP and IB credits.

Dr. Snow reported that the subcommittee on transfer credits, AP, CLEP and IB credits has met five times to address the issue of how to treat these credits within the framework of the new Core of Common Studies. The subcommittee’s recommendations are contained on page 2 of a 4-page memo from the subcommittee to the CCRC, which was distributed in advance of the meeting. Fr. Rossi noted that the recommendations basically reflect current practice on these issues, with additional consultation. Dr. Heinrich noted that there was a greater difference: under current
policy, a department can give credit for a 069 course (a course number that has no actual course equivalent at Marquette University) to fulfill a humanities requirement. The recommendations contained in the memo suggest that will no longer be possible. Dr. Machan suggested that there is still no need for a direct equivalency between a Marquette course and a transfer course under the new core and the proposed system. Dr. Deahl suggested that the paradigm shift entailed in the new core, going from content to outcome, could provide a workable system within which to address issues of transfer credits, with consultation where necessary. Fr. Rossi noted that there are really two questions involved: 1) Do we want a procedure allowing for prudent judgment, given the probable lack of a direct equivalency between a transfer credit course and a Marquette course? 2) How should that be reflected in the statement of procedures? Dr. Byleen opined that the current language in the memo leaves plenty of room for judgment. The current recommendation does not say what happens when there is no exact equivalency, so latitude remains. Dr. Machan noted that Vicki Trautschold has asked departments to re-evaluate decision rules on transfer credits for AP, IB, etc. These alternative routes to college credit are becoming increasingly popular, and we don’t want to discourage students from coming to Marquette by placing too many restrictions on what will satisfy core requirements. Allowing a 069 course to count toward the common core would be in that spirit. He further noted that there is a practical cap on the number of credits that can be obtained through these alternative routes. Of the 1850 freshmen, he estimated that fewer than 100 have AP scores that would allow them to receive college credit, though he noted that the IB (International Baccalaureate) program has less quality control than the AP (Advanced Placement) program. Dr. Lueger noted that students often want to take summer courses elsewhere, and they must get these courses pre-approved in order to receive credit. If courses do not have an exact match, the College of Arts & Science usually asks the departments offering such courses whether to approve them. Thus, he wondered whether the new procedures require another layer of approval. Dr. Eckman noted that the School of Education sends requests for pre-approval of summer courses to Vicki Trautschold, and that this could continue.

Dr. Heinrich asked when the “clock” for the new Core of Common Studies would start for transfer students, such as the 2+2 students coming from WCTC. When do they become bound by the new core? Dr. Snow noted that they are under the rules that are in place under the articulation agreement. These agreements will need to be reviewed, and possibly revised. Dr. Eckman suggested that the chart attached to the memo from the subcommittee to the CCRC is interesting, as it contains the number of students enrolled with transfer credits. The numbers are not huge, even though the decisions can be complicated in individual cases. Dr. Naylor asked what we should do now? Dr. Snow suggested the need for a motion and a second, so we could follow the 2 meeting rule and vote on the procedure for transfers, AP, CLEP and IB credit. Dr. Heinrich expressed concern about the amount of authority given to college designees in making these decisions. What if someone gets into one of these positions who is loose with these decisions? Could this potentially become a problem with our North Central accreditation review? Dr. Hathaway suggested that the current procedure is not really “hands-off.” The procedure implies significant interaction with
academic units. All individuals who are in these college designee positions are quick to consult if a substantive question arises. Dr. Heinrich noted that college designees do not make these decisions in a vacuum; thus, there remains the possibility of a “looseness” factor. Dr. Snow suggested that perhaps we need to add a layer of checks and balances to the procedure. In further dialogue, it was determined that the college designees routinely consult with the departments offering the equivalent courses, so checks and balances do currently exist. Dr. Deahl suggested adding language to have an annual conversation between the Core Director and the college designees. Any problems would come out in that conversation. Dr. Laatsch asked if there is a way to gather information on what courses are currently awarded credit. Dr. Hathaway reported that the college designees already have a huge database on this that would enable a comparison with what happens under the new core. Dr. Naylor noted that this database could even be used to help us look at new course development. Dr. Snow liked the idea of having an annual conversation on this issue, and to ask for reports to track these decisions, so the CCRC can review them.

Dr. Hathaway then asked about credit for study abroad courses. Dr. Lueger noted that these also require pre-approval. Dr. Heinrich asked about courses taken through the Les Aspin Center. Dr. Snow reported that the Les Aspin Center plans to submit its courses to the CCRC for approval as part of the core. Dr. Snow then asked whether the CCRC wished to continue to allow use of the 069 course designation for accepting non-identical transfer credits, adding language about checks and balances, and an annual conversation of the Core Director with college designees. Dr. Deahl asked if we could move to approve the subcommittee recommendations subject to approval of changes crafted by Dr. Snow with respect to the additional concerns raised in the meeting. Fr. Rossi suggested that any recommendations should not add more bureaucracy to the current system. Dr. Deahl moved to approve the subcommittee’s recommendations and other recommendations to be formulated by Dr. Snow, based on the CCRC discussion noted above. Dr. Laatsch seconded the motion.

B. Term Staggering Options.

Dr. Snow noted that the May 17, 2002 minutes indicate that there was a motion to approve option 3 in the memo authored by Mike Wierzbicki concerning options for staggering terms on the CCRC. Dr. Machan observed that this option included ending some members’ terms early—i.e., it should have occurred as of fall of ’02. We cannot end terms retroactively, so this motion is no longer timely. However, as the motion was on the floor, it was put to a vote. It failed to pass: 0 in favor and 11 opposed, with one abstention. Fr. Rossi then suggested that we could build on the fact that there are three new members of the committee by virtue of some members stepping down due to other commitments. He further suggested that half of all committee members should go off the committee at the end of this year. Dr. Snow suggested the need to be careful which half would step down, given the distribution of members across knowledge area subcommittees. Dr. Laatsch suggested starting the rotation off the CCRC with individuals who were on the original steering committee, which would be one member of each subcommittee. Dr. Heinrich opined that there was no need to worry about subcommittee
composition. However, Dr. Eckman noted that precedents have been established by subcommittees during reviews of course submissions; that they have developed a history. Dr. Hathaway suggested that perhaps consistency could be ensured in other ways, e.g., look at previous evaluation tools. Perhaps the subcommittees could describe their operating procedures in written documents. Dr. Laatsch suggested that a subcommittee of subcommittee chairs could do this.

Dr. Machan then suggested that half the current committee members be replaced this year, with replacements serving two-year terms; and next year replace the other half of committee members, again with two-year terms. Dr. Deahl agreed, and noted that this plan would clean up the problem of turnover quickly. Dr. Machan then suggested that we simply ask for volunteers to step down at the end of this year. Dr. Naylor expressed concern in light of Dr. Snow’s three-year term as Director of the Core—that essentially in the third year there would then be a completely new committee, and Dr. Snow would be the only element of continuity. Dr. Eckman then asked how other standing committees of the university work. Dr. Machan indicated that there is no standard operating procedure for standing committees. Dr. Lueger wondered if we could determine which members were stepping down in time to have elections within the academic units they represent. He also suggested the need for some flexibility in terms of the timing of who would step down from the committee—that it should depend on finding a suitable replacement in the represented unit. For example, there might be an excellent candidate, but s/he might not be available to serve for another year. Dr. Machan then suggested drafting a proposal that would simply indicate that half of the committee’s members would step down at the end of this year by consensus. He suggested that a proposal could be worded so as to allow the necessary latitude in its implementation. He volunteered to draft such language for consideration at the next meeting of the CCRC.

Dr. Eckman then moved to adjourn. Dr. Lueger seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Cheryl Maranto