

## Approved Minutes of CCRC Meeting 8-25-03

**Members Present:** Dr. Byleen; Dr. Machan; Dr. Grahn; Dr. Hathaway; Fr. Laurence, SJ; Dr. Vater; Dr. Lueger; Dr. Deahl; Dr. Eckman; Dr. Ropella; Dr. Ksobiech; Dr. Laatsch; Dr. Lough; Dr. Maranto; Mr. Lowrey; Ms. Russell; Dr. Snow  
**Members Excused:** Dr. Courtright; Dr. Quade

**Opening Prayer:** Dr. Linda Laatsch

### **Approval of Minutes of May 9, 2003:**

Dr. Laatsch approved and Dr. Deahl seconded. 12 in favor; none opposed; 4 abstentions.

**Chair's Report:** Welcome to new CCRC members: Reverend John Laurance, SJ, representing the Theology Department, and Dr. Mary Ann Lough, representing the College of Nursing. Welcome to members continuing for a 3 year term: Drs. Ellen Eckman and Ken Ksobiech. Thank you to those participating in recent CCRC events.

### **Agenda Items:**

Dr. Snow stated she will **postpone Agenda item A**, on transfer issues, until 9-2-03, when Dr. Tom Wenzel will speak to the CCRC. Dr. Lueger raised a question about scheduling an additional meeting for Sept. 2, as Dr. Snow had done. Dr. Snow had planned to request a motion and a second on NASC 185, then vote on the course on Sept. 2, and to begin discussion of AFAS 131 on Sept. 2. Dr. Lueger indicated that it would be difficult for him to attend on that day, since his schedule had been set some time earlier. Since Dr. Lueger is a member of the subcommittee that has evaluated NASC 185 and will evaluate AFAS 131, it is important for all members of that group to be in attendance. Consequently, the vote on NASC 185 and discussion of AFAS 131 will be postponed until Sept. 9, which is the next regularly scheduled CCRC meeting. A CCRC meeting will still be held on Sept. 2 with Dr. Wenzel in attendance.

Dr. Snow moved to **Agenda item B**, which is:

Request for CCRC consensus on a recommendation from the University Assessment Committee (UAC):

For a course to be qualified for the Core, the assessment plan must be approved by the UAC and the course proposal must be approved by the CCRC.

Dr. Lueger stated that the UAC has been a resource until now. Now the UAC is taking more shape and there needs to be better linkage between the two committees.

Dr. Lueger posed several questions. What is the relationship of the UAC to the faculty? We seem to be creating two separate entities that contribute to the Core course approval process. The process needs to be clearly articulated and the relation between the two committees, clarified. Perhaps the UAC can become a subcommittee of the CCRC or can report to it.

Dr. Maranto shares the view that a completely separate body that can say “no” to qualifying core courses plans is not desirable. However, information on the adequacy of the submitted assessment plan needs to be taken into account in making the decision on qualifying a course. We need to work out a coordinated arrangement between the CCRC and the Assessment Committee.

Dr. Deahl agreed. The assessment committee can give counsel to this committee and can alert this committee to problems.

Dr. Snow mentioned that the deadline for sending text for inclusion in the Undergraduate Bulletin is October 10. **[Reporter’s Note: This date was mistaken. Correct information has been obtained.]** The CCRC schedule is set up to meet that deadline. Dr. Eckman asked if the assessment committee will also be able to meet this deadline?

Dr. Lueger asked if the assessment committee could report back to the CCRC with input after a recommendation has been made on a course submission, but before a vote is taken on the course?

Dr. Ksobiech stated that assessment is important. He asked if problems will be caused if the assessment committee has to say “yes” to an assessment plan or the course doesn’t get approved – will this impede implementation of the Core?

Dr. Hathaway said the issue is education about assessment. Perhaps we should put a timeline on the articulation and submission of adequate assessment plans.

Regarding present UAC procedure, which simply provides feedback on assessment plans, Dr. Byleen questioned what approval means in this context? Submitters of assessment plans receive comments, no approval or disapproval. Would the committee approve any assessment plan submitted to date? Dr. Byleen is disappointed with comments on the assessment plan that were given to the Math department. They were of the generic variety, and did not relate specifically to learning objectives in mathematics. Some learning objectives need to be revised.

Dr. Deahl agrees that the committee has worked under the political shadow of not coming on too strongly. Where we are and where we need to be are miles apart. We need to move toward a more specific, better process, and more discipline. Specific experts need to work with the core.

Dr. Hathaway stated that the learning objectives of the Diverse Cultures knowledge area were not framed with a view to assessment. Language revision of these objectives will need to occur before the objectives can be assessed. Perhaps the Assessment Committee can work with those who teach Core courses to reframe objectives in language that is more amenable to assessment.

Dr. Snow suggested a joint meeting between the CCRC and the UAC to explore ways in which the two Committees could connect and collaborate.

Dr. Eckman suggested that UAC members could join CCRC subgroups and review assessment plans along with the course proposal templates.

Before moving to the discussion of NASC 185, Dr. Snow mentioned that MUSI 051, Music Appreciation, is a two credit course that has been qualified in the Performing Arts area. Since students need 3 credits to satisfy the Literature/Performing Arts knowledge area requirement, Dr. Snow will call Ms. Phylis Ravel, Chair of the Performing Arts Department, to see if that course can be changed to 3 credit hours.

Dr. Snow also reported on an expectation of the Assessment Committee as we move out of the pilot phase of Core course assessment: if an objective was checked on the original course proposal template as being addressed by a course, that objective will have to be assessed.

Dr. Snow then turned to the last agenda item: Discussion and motion and second on **NASC 185**. The subcommittee is divided in its evaluation of the course:

Dr. Laatsch gave a general report on the Subcommittee's discussion of the course. She stated that 2 subcommittee members approved, and 1 did not approve it.

Reasons against – the course does not meet objectives concerning theories and methodologies.  
Reasons for – the course did address leadership and management. It is strong as an applied course.

There is some concern that NASC 185 is under more scrutiny than other courses. This raises the issue of fairness. Some courses seemed to be in a similar position, for example, courses in criminology and legal studies. Other courses that seemed comparable to NASC 185 have been approved with less scrutiny.

Dr. Lueger said that a number of courses have been approved in the Individual and Social Behavior knowledge area. The issue the focus group came together to talk about is what is common to this area – the learning objectives formulate objectives common to various disciplines that sent representatives to the focus group. All of these courses teach methodology, not for students to parrot this back, but to critically think about using this knowledge. NASC 185 has not yet gone far enough in urging students to critically evaluate research methodologies. It teaches “here's a concept, how does this theory apply this?” This is just application, not critical evaluation of research methods. There is a way to teach methodology but it's not there in the template yet.

Dr. Hathaway asked, how typical is it that one textbook is used? Is the textbook written specifically for the course? Do other Individual and Social Behavior courses use only one textbook? Dr. Hathaway stated that there is so much they are trying to get done in the ROTC courses because of governmental requirements. They have difficulty getting this done due to time shortage. How much can be done in a course like this? Do we remand the course and make them go through it again? Could the critical evaluation of research methodology be added to the course?

Dr. Lueger suggested weaving a critical approach to research methodology through the course. The text provides very little on criticism of research. On the template, the data from behavioral

sciences is thin. On the 3 last value objectives, the writers of template did a bad job. There is a total disconnect from what is asked.

Dr. Maranto commented that in terms of other approved courses, for example, in Introduction to Economics, one theory is taught – neo-classical economics. There is no critical evaluation. The courses are primarily introductions for freshman and there is not a lot of substance about to how to do research. She questions if we are trying to hold this course to a higher standard than others.

Dr. Eckman said this course will be some students' only experience of the Individual and Social Behavior knowledge area. Most of theories studied in NASC 185 are based on theories of men. There's no mention of women.

Dr. Grahn pointed out that if any of our textbooks were under this kind of scrutiny, we would say, don't tell me what kind of textbooks to use. This is an issue of academic freedom. Further, this is not a course designed to create professional psychologists.

Dr. Lough asked about context. Would this be the only ISB course the ROTC students take? In nursing, several ISB courses are required.

Dr. Snow said, the question is, does it satisfy the learning objectives?

Dr. Vater said the Navy has a salute rather than think attitude. Does the course meet the core objectives?

Dr. Laatsch opined that it does meet the objectives. Future officers learn about current leadership and management theories so they can critically evaluate the myriad of situations they may encounter. While orders must be followed, students learn about the problem-solving that is needed to motivate and lead groups of people.

Dr. Lueger stated it is critical as an introductory level course to teach critical thinking about what we know and don't know. We need to teach to begin to use the way you look at something and use methodology. There is not enough critical thinking in this course based in methodology.

Dr. Machan asked if the ROTC students take economics or Psychology? Dr. Grahn said that depends on what their major is. Enrollment in ROTC courses is open to everyone. The CCRC cannot place restrictions on departments. Core courses are open to everyone. Dr. Grahn said most ROTC courses are open to everyone but, in reality, only ROTC students are going to take this course. If the College of Arts & Sciences wants to keep this course out of its college curriculum, it can. Dr. Grahn is voting for this course.

We have approved courses for the Core that carry a prerequisite. This is sometimes needed for students transferring in from other institutions.

Fr Laurance referred to the goals of the ISB knowledge area. Given the goals as stated, a course like NASC 185 could be admitted. The goals do not state that a course must present systematic

theory. If it is generic enough, a course like this could come in methods of social sciences. Dr. Lueger responded that the learning objectives of the knowledge area are more specific than the goals.

Dr. Snow asked for a motion and a second on NASC 185. Dr. Grahn moved to qualify NASC 185 for the Core of Common Studies. Dr. Laatsch seconded the motion. Dr. Snow asked for further discussion; none was forthcoming.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 AM.