

**Core Curriculum Review Committee**  
**Wednesday, February 23, 2005 3-5 PM AMU 313**  
**Approved Minutes**

Members Present: Drs. Eckman, Hay, Snow, Lueger, Moyer, Ksobiech, Hathaway, Vater, Griffin, Deahl, Quade, Ropella, Block, Ramey, Bloom; Mr. Lowrey.

Members Excused: Rev. Laurance, SJ, Drs. Steinmetz, Laatsch, Quade.

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 P.M.

1. Dr. Ramey offered the opening prayer.
2. Dr. Snow turned to approval of the minutes of 2.15.05. Dr. Ropella moved to approve; Dr. Deahl seconded. The minutes were approved with two abstentions.
3. Dr. Snow turned the meeting over to Dr. Bloom, who had agreed to give CCRC members a workshop on how to revise Core learning outcomes to make them more assessment friendly. Dr. Bloom opened by reviewing the “big picture” with respect to levels of assessment at Marquette. She distributed and discussed a handout entitled, “Framework for Assessment at Marquette” which diagrams the various elements of assessment in the University and their relations to each other, including the places of the Common Core Learning Outcomes, nine knowledge area competencies, and Core course learning objectives. In response to a question from Dr. Ramey, she explained why we’re starting with Core and program level outcomes, as opposed to institutional outcomes. This is because program and Core level outcomes represent points of intersection of interest of administrators and faculty. Dr. Bloom graphed this relation on the board. She also distributed a sheet entitled, “Documentation of Focus on and Assessment of An Institution- or Program-Level Expectation for Learning Course of Educational Experience.” This latter sheet could be useful to the CCRC as it continues its revisions of the Core course proposal template.

After discussing these larger issues and taking questions from CCRC members, Dr. Bloom turned more specifically to learning outcomes. She distributed a handout entitled, “Learning Outcome Statements at Marquette University,” which describes the form and lists seven features that learning outcome statements at Marquette should display. After reviewing this document with the CCRC, she and Dr. Snow divided CCRC members into small working groups. Each group was given responsibility for adjusting knowledge area learning outcomes that had come forward from the focus groups. The groups were not to engage in content revision, but to amend the form of the outcome statements to render them more readily assessable. The idea, Dr. Bloom, stressed, is to think in terms of what every student who takes

a Core course in a particular knowledge area should get out of the experience. After some discussion, the groups reported on the changes they had made. Dr. Bloom asked them to state the original outcome, then the adjusted version. Changes consisted of minor modifications in wording or rephrasing and the excision or replacement of verbs. Dr. Bloom and CCRC members commented on and questioned the changes suggested by the groups in order better to understand the intents of the focus groups and how they could be expressed in assessable language. Dr. Snow asked the groups to continue their work of adjusting the outcomes for assessment purposes. The groups will meet on their own and will present their suggestions for adjustment at the next CCRC meeting on March 15. Dr. Bloom and Dr. Snow thanked CCRC members for their efforts with the focus groups and with the current adjustments of outcomes. Dr. Bloom distributed a document entitled, "Our Students' Best Work: A Framework for Accountability Worthy of Our Mission," which appeared in the Fall 2004 issue of peerReview from the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

4. The other agenda item for the day had been to continue revising the Core course proposal template. Since the entire meeting had been devoted to learning how to adjust outcomes, Dr. Snow asked for a motion and a second on the template as revised thus far, with the proviso that further changes would be made to the document at the next CCRC meeting. Having a motion and a second would enable CCRC members to vote on the finished product at the next meeting, in accordance with the CCRC's two meeting rule. Dr. Deahl moved to approve a suitably revised version of the form; Drs. Vater and Hay seconded.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nancy E. Snow, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Philosophy  
Director of Core Curriculum