

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

February 19, 2002

Unapproved minutes of the Academic Senate meeting of February 18, 2002, any changes will be noted at the next regular meeting.

The Academic Senate met in Room 105 of Straz Hall on Monday, February 18, 2002 at 3:00 p.m.

1. Rev. Thaddeus Burch, S.J., Dean of the Graduate School, opened the meeting with a prayer.

2. Attendance (Members of the Executive Committee are marked with an asterisk).

Members Present: Dr. Thomas Anderson, Rev. Thaddeus J. Burch, S.J., Dr. James B. Courtright, Dean Howard Eisenberg, Dr. Marilyn Frenn, Mr. Dan Goyette, *Dr. John Krugler, *Dr. Michael McKinney, Mr. Matthew Mitten, Dr. William Nagy, Mrs. Lois O'Brien, Rev. Philip Rossi, S.J., Dr. Susan C. Schneider, Dr. David L. Shrock, Dr. Barbara Silver-Thorn, Dr. Guy Simoneau, Dr. Karen Slattery, Dr. William Trebby, Dr. Madeline Wake, *Dr. Thomas H. Wenzel, Dr. Charles Wilkie and Dr. David R. Buckholdt, Chair.

Non-Voting

Members Present: Dr. Jack Augenstein, Dr. Nicholas Burckel, Mrs. Anne Deahl, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Thomas J. Jablonsky, Rev. Tom Krettek, S.J., Dr. Gene Laczniak, Mr. Ronald Ripley, Mr. Art Scheuber, Sr. Carol Ann Smith, S.H.C.J., and Mr. Anthony Tortorella.

Others Present: Ms. Suzanne Abler, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Susan Mountin, Mr. Matt Olson, Dr. John Pustejovsky, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Jerry Viscione, Prof. Christine Wiseman and Mrs. Mary Belanger

3. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of January 14, 2002.

One typographical error was noted, after which the minutes were unanimously approved.

4. Announcements

Town Hall Meeting – Dr. Buckholdt announced that the Town Hall Meeting will be held on Thursday, March 7, 2002 in the Alumni Memorial Union, Ballroom D, from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. Specific issues to be addressed at the meeting should be sent to Dr. Buckholdt at least one week prior to the meeting.

Enrollment Update – Mrs. Anne Deahl

The Spring Term 2001-2002 Preliminary Enrollment Report is available on the Academic Affairs web page for those who would like to review the entire report.

Mrs. Deahl reported that preliminary enrollment figures for the spring, 2002 semester, as compared to budget targets, indicate that we are up seven traditional undergraduate (FTEP) students.

Preliminary enrollment numbers (FTEP) for the professional programs indicate that we are over budget target by thirty-two. The largest variance in numbers is for the Law School, which is over budget target by thirty-one.

Credit hour statistics for the Graduate School show that we are 1,133 credit hours over the budget target. Of particular note are Education, Engineering and Nursing, which are over budget target by 541, 230, and 401, respectively.

Graduate School applications are up 10% compared to last year's figures. Law School applications are up 36%. Dental School applications are down 2%.

The number of new traditional freshman applications is at 7,196, which is 849 ahead of last year's figures. Advanced

Standing applications are 76 ahead of last year's numbers for a total of 325. Traditional freshman deposits are up by 149 from last year's figures.

Provost Search Update – Dr. Michael McKinney, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Chair of the Provost Search Committee, reported that the names and resumes of the three candidates for the Provost position and information on the open forums are posted on the Provost Search Web page.
<http://www.mu.edu/provost/update.html>

4. Core Curriculum Update – Dr. Nancy Snow, Chairperson of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, presented the Executive Summary and Report of the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC). The Core Curriculum Review Committee Report was approved by the University Core Curriculum Review Committee on February 12, 2002 by a vote of 13 in favor, one opposed and one abstention.

The Core Curriculum review Committee Report recommends a University Core of Common Studies consisting of thirty-six (36) total credit hours distributed across nine knowledge areas. All nine knowledge areas are marked by goals and learning objectives, including knowledge objectives, skills objectives and values/dispositions objectives.

The CCRC recommends that, insofar as possible, instruction in the knowledge areas be sequenced in three tiers. The first tier empowers students to examine the world; the second tier inspires them to engage it; the third tier challenges them to evaluate and change it. In addition, the CCRC expects that each college or school in the University will structure its own core and professional curriculum to build upon the student's common core experience at Marquette. Capstone seminars and service learning are recommended as components of each student's total core experience.

Before the Core of Common studies is implemented in the fall of 2003, the chair or coordinator of each academic unit must provide evidence of commitment to a learning

objective-specific assessment plan for each core course taught by that unit.

The Report recommends that a position for Director of the University Core of Common Studies be created, a budget for the development of core curriculum and assessment be provided as well as adequate administrative support.

Dr. Snow opened the floor for discussion.

Rev. Philip Rossi, S.J., who abstained from the vote on the number of credits hours required for the Common Core, commented on what he felt was inadequate discussion during the proceedings on the structure of the core or creative alternatives. Rev. Rossi, S.J., said that the minutes of the CCRC meetings reflect the lack of discussion. Because of the urgency to implement the core in the fall of 2003, there was a lot of time spent looking at the trees but not a good look at the forest. Rev. Rossi, S.J., opined that there is an incredible amount of work to be done yet for there to be coherence. Rev. Rossi, S.J., added that the faculty will make it work if it is adopted.

Dr. Anderson, a member of the Preamble Committee, said that there was not enough discussion about the Preamble and how the Preamble should guide the formation of the core, i.e., that the core should be informed by Ignatian thought and contemplation.

Prof. Wiseman commented that there was considerable discussion of the Preamble in the focus groups and in a subcommittee of the CCRC, but that discussion has not been finalized. But, more importantly, the core curricular process has institutionalized a dynamic that allows faculty to own the core, is on-going, and will continue to evolve.

Dr. Wenzel wanted to know if a course can be substituted for one year or two, e.g., a special course developed and taught by a visiting professor or Fulbright professor. Dr. Snow said that that type of situation is not precluded and that special topics

courses were discussed.

Dr. Buckholdt noted one addition to the wording in the Executive Summary on page four, number three, that states that the approval of the President is required to amend the Core as recommended.

Mr. Tortorella noted the importance of his office receiving a continuing list of new courses and that incoming freshman also be provided with a list of the individual college core requirements. Dr. Snow said that information will be provided on what courses will count in more than one college, requirements for students transferring to a different college, students transferring in to MU, courses dropped from the Common Core, etc.

Dr. Anderson wanted to know what controls are in place to prevent unknowledgeable faculty from proposing courses. Dr. Snow said that there are guidelines for qualifying a course that must be followed. There are templates that must be completed and a checklist to assist faculty in completing the template. The signature of the chairperson of the proposing faculty member must sign off on the proposal. Assessment plans must be included and will be reviewed. Overall, the chairperson has ultimate oversight of the course.

Referring to page three, first paragraph of the Report, the following sentence Instruction in these areas should challenge the student to move beyond descriptive knowledge to normative valuation and spiritual reflection., Sr. Carol Ann asked Dr. Snow to explain the meaning of the sentence, which refers to the third tier of the core. The third tier consists of the knowledge areas of Human Nature and Ethics and Theology. The goal of this knowledge area is that the students demonstrate a principled understanding of basic human issues (identity, relationship, commitment, life in society, the nature of knowledge), can reason systematically and comprehensively on moral issues, and can reach a reasoned, reflective decision. Dr. Snow said that normative valuation goes beyond description, its how we ought to live.

Rev. Rossi, S.J., commented that he sees this as a weakness because not enough time was spent in discussion with faculty. What is lacking here is coherence. We need something that allows students to move to a level of integration. Coherence and integration of the core are not addressed. We as a faculty haven't grappled with this. There needs to be something more robust.

Dr. Anderson said that he was on a focus group and that all faculty were invited to participate. Certainly, the opportunity was there for faculty input.

Dr. Deahl said that he has never experienced such a group effort.

Dr. Pustejovsky commented that one of the accomplishments of the CCRC is that it puts core curriculum in the hands of the faculty. This is the largest experience that students have at MU. The question is will faculty use the potential we now have.

Rev. Rossi, S.J., reinforced the most crucial recommendation of the Report - the commitment of resources. First, funding that can make it possible for faculty to get together, the active engagement of faculty and second, that the Director of the Core have leadership capability and imagination to get faculty engaged.

Dr. Buckholdt affirmed that a quality enhancement fund has been approved. It will be up to the CCRC and the Provost to plan on how to use these resources.

Dr. Schneider asked if the knowledge areas and objectives can be revised. Dr. Snow said "No, they are in place for now." Dr. Schneider asked if something could be added to the Report that would allow the knowledge areas and objectives to be revisited.

Dr. Schneider asked for clarification on the approval process of the Report of the CCRC at the March Academic Senate meeting. There are a lot of approvals inherent, i.e., thirty-six

(36) credit hours for the University Core of Common Studies, nine knowledge areas, learning objectives/goals. Dr. Buckholdt said that the entire CCRC Report will be put to a vote.

5. Presentation on Plagiarism – Dr. Nicholas Burckel, Dean of Libraries, began his presentation by stating that plagiarism is not a problem for the library at this time. The topic of plagiarism was raised at a recent meeting of the Deans Council and was recommended for discussion at the Academic Senate.

Increased use of the Internet by students, the attitude that information should be free, the technology of the cut and paste, click and drop climate in which we live helps to facilitate stealing from others. Other factors are the increase in the number of web sites that sell term papers, increased pressure for grades and media attention, which downplays cases of celebrity plagiarism. Dr. Burckel cited some instances of publicized celebrity plagiarism with little or no penalty or reprimand to the perpetrator.

A number of automated anti-plagiarism tools, e.g., downloadable, licensed software programs and internet-based applications/services are available for purchase.

Dr. Wilkie said that the Chemistry Department is using an on-line service, for which they have a one-year license, for one course that is being offered this spring. The students were informed ahead of time that the service will be used for their lab reports. Each student is responsible for submitting his/her own report to the service.

Dr. Burckel posed three questions:

- 1) Is academic dishonesty more frequent than five years ago?
- 2) If so, should we do something about it?
- 3) What approaches should we consider?

Discussion among Senators revealed that some faculty have noticed an increase in the number of students plagiarizing.

Some faculty have not. For those faculty who have had to deal with this situation, there is a growing sense of frustration in not knowing how to prevent plagiarism, how to make students accountable for their actions, and what the appropriate response/penalty should be when discovered.

The following are a few observations that were discussed:

- Cheating is part of a larger social issue. Society labels whistle blowers, etc., you may be ostracized for doing the right thing.
- The current environmental factors are what students follow. The media doesn't help. Those who have done it get off scot-free.
- If you make it more difficult to cheat there may be less cheating.
- Whose problem is it? It is time-consuming to identify, prove and penalize.
- An educational process needs to be relayed to the students. These are ethical issues that last a lifetime.
- Impress upon students right from the beginning that they are planting a time bomb – the University has retracted Ph.D.s and has administratively withdrawn students for plagiarism.
- A recent on-line analysis of term papers reported that 30% of the papers showed some form of plagiarism. Is this intentional? Do we need to engage in an educational process?
- As part of the term paper, students should have to indicate how they gathered their information.
- Have students sign a statement of verification/attestation to the authenticity of their work? Should they?

The Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Business Administration are presenting a Forum on Academic Integrity, Friday, February 22, 2002, 1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m., Straz Hall 106.

There being no further business, the Academic Senate

adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ms. Mary M. Belanger
Executive Administrative Assistant