

Marquette University
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Friday, January 17, 2003

The January 17 meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was convened by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU Rm 227, @ 1:10 p.m. **Members Present:** Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Michael Vater, Dr. Phil Rossi, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Lance Grahn, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Bob Lueger, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. James Courtright. **Excused:** Dr. Bob Deahl, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Ms. Stephanie Russell.

Dr. Snow welcomed the newest CCRC member, Dr. Lance Grahn, Chair of the History Department. Dr. Linda Laatsch offered the opening prayer. Dr. Snow then introduced Ms. Candi Baskerville, her assistant until April 1, 2003, who will be taking CCRC minutes. General introductions followed.

I. Minutes. Dr. Snow sought additions and/or corrections to the minutes of December 11, 2002. Dr. Heinrich questioned Dr. Snow's response in the minutes on a matter of transfer credit policy. He wondered if incoming transfer students will be expected to comply with Core of Common Studies requirements. Dr. Maranto volunteered that University policy considers all students to be bound by the terms of the Undergraduate Bulletin of their year of entrance. Dr. Snow suggested revisiting the substantive issue after approval of the minutes. She suggested a deletion to the minutes, to which Dr. Heinrich agreed. The minutes as amended were unanimously approved.

II. Chair's Report.

(a) Dr. Ksobiech's staff is assisting with the receptions/conversations. The first, or faculty who teach or are interested in teaching in the Diverse Cultures knowledge area, is scheduled for 2/5/03; the second, for Individual and Social Behavior, for 2/19/03; the third, for Literature/Performing Arts, for 3/5/03; and the third, for Science and Nature, for 3/26/03 (subject to change if a suitable location is not found).

(b) Dr. Snow reported that she met with Provost Wake regarding the announcement for the Incentive Fund. Of the \$60,000 provided for core course development, the Provost has designated \$20,000 as the Provost's Fund for Interdisciplinary Core Course Development, and \$40,000 for other purposes. The Fund Announcement and a proposed application form were discussed at some length. Several CCRC members expressed their strong desire that integration be emphasized – integration of the Core as a whole, as well as thematic integration of core courses across knowledge areas. Dr. Snow expressed Dr. Wake's wish that funding for 2003-04 be directed to the development of core course proposals. She requested advice from the CCRC about what kinds of proposals would

integrate the Core. After receiving several suggestions, she suggested that a bullet point be added to the fund announcement soliciting proposals for projects that would integrate core courses across knowledge areas. This change will be submitted to Provost Wake for her approval. Integration might also be emphasized at the receptions/conversations. Perhaps one of these events could be across knowledge areas, and could be used to suggest thematic developments to integrate courses across knowledge areas.

III. Agenda Items.

- (a) Recommendations on Core Course Credits. Before turning to a vote on the recommendations, Dr. Snow raised the issue raised earlier by Dr. Heinrich, of whether transfer students entering Marquette in the fall of 2003 will be required to satisfy Core of Common Studies requirements. Dr. Snow reiterated her belief that Dr. Maranto was correct in pointing out that all entering students are bound by the requirements set out in the Undergraduate Bulletin of their entering year. Dr. Ksobiech added that this is University policy. Dr. Heinrich stated his view that an official statement clarifying this point should be made soon.

The CCRC voted to approve the following recommendations, some of which were presented by the Subcommittee on Transfers, AP, CLEP, and IB credits:

Transfer Credits:

- (1) Given that evaluating transfer credits requires a kind and amount of knowledge that college designees already have, the Subcommittee recommends that decisions about evaluating core courses credit reside with college designees. This recommendation is strengthened by the frequent need to make transfer credit decisions quickly.
- (2) The Subcommittee recommends that core course credit be rewarded using the procedures currently used for other transfer credit evaluations. If, in the judgment of the college designee, a course for which transfer credit is requested matches the Undergraduate Bulletin description of an approved core course, and the student has earned the grade of "C" or better in the course (an "S" grade is generally equivalent to a "C"), the student should be eligible to receive core credit for that course. College designees will be provided with copies of the goals and learning objectives of the nine core knowledge areas and are encouraged to use this information as a resource in making these judgments. College designees will also be encouraged to consult with the Director of Core Curriculum in order to make these determinations.
- (3) In the interests of avoiding an unduly negative impact on the overall number of transfer students at Marquette and of avoiding an especially negative impact on

the Colleges, the Subcommittee concurs that there be no limit on the number of core credits that students can be allowed to transfer. However, the Subcommittee encourages college designees to advise transfer students to take as many of their core courses as possible at Marquette.

AP, CLEP, and IB Credits:

- (1) The Subcommittee recommended that core credit be given along with AP credits, CLEP credits and IB credits for specific core courses by college designees in consultation with the Director of the Core Curriculum.
- (2) The Subcommittee recommends that core credit be given only if AP, CLEP, or IB credit is given.

Additional Recommendations from previous CCRC discussion:

- (1) College designees may give core credit for courses that are not directly equivalent to Marquette core courses under the course number 069.
- (2) College designees should have an annual meeting with the Director of Curriculum to discuss the awarding of core credit for transfer, AP, CLEP, and IB credits. This is to ensure appropriate rigor in awarding core credits.
- (3) College designees should regularly report core credit awards to the Director of Core Curriculum and to each other. This will allow the CCRC to monitor core credit awards, and will allow a core credit equivalency database to be established. It will also provide the CCRC with potentially useful information about core curriculum experiences at other institutions.

All CCRC members present voted to approve the recommendations. **[Reporter's note: A motion and a second had been made at the previous meeting.]** Proxies to approve were entered in behalf of two CCRC members who were excused, and in behalf of one who had to leave the meeting for class. Thus, the vote was 14 in favor; no opposed; no abstentions. One member did not provide a proxy.

- (b) Discussion of term staggering proposal. At the previous CCRC meeting, Dr. Machan had agreed to provide a proposal for term staggering. Discussion on his suggestions ensued. Some members voiced a preference for three-year terms on the Committee, as opposed to the two-year terms suggested by Dr. Machan. There was also a preference for having five members rotate off the Committee at the end of this academic year, as opposed to seven or eight. Dr. Heinrich had previously e-mailed a term staggering proposal to Dr. Snow; he offered to e-mail it to her again for distribution to Committee members and discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Candi Baskerville
Assistant to Dr. Snow

Marquette University
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Thursday, January 29, 2003

The January 29th meeting of the Core Curriculum Review Committee was convened by Dr. Nancy Snow in AMU Rm 448 @ 2:10pm. **Members Present:** Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Tim Machan, Father Phil Rossi, S. J., Dr., Karl Byleen, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Bob Deahl, Dr. Bob Lueger, Dr. Lance Grahn, Mr. Jim Lowrey, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Cheryl Maranto. **Members excused:** Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Mike Vater, Ms. Stephanie Russell, and Dr. Stephanie Quade.

Dr. Snow told the group that Ms. Candi Baskerville would be leaving at 3:00pm and that Dr. Heather Hathaway graciously volunteered to continue with the minute taking of the meeting.

Dr. Bob Lueger offered the opening prayer.

I. **Minutes:**

Dr. Snow sought additions and/or corrections to the minutes of January 17, 2003. Dr. Deahl moved to approve the minutes; Dr. Byleen seconded. The minutes were approved by those present with the abstention of one CCRC member who had been unable to attend the last meeting.

II. **Chair's Report:**

Dr. Snow informed the committee that she and Dr. Tom Wenzel were visiting Departmental Chairs and delivering each department's assessment materials.

III. **Agenda Items:**

(a) **Term Staggering:** Dr. Machan did not agree with the 5/5 term staggering example suggested by Dr. Steve Heinrich's email; he said he thought that it was too complex. The committee should decide on a simpler method. Dr. Hathaway and Dr. Snow mentioned that the members who have been on the committee the longest should be the ones who should cycle off at the end of this semester. Dr. Deahl agreed. Dr. Snow suggested that 5 members rotate off of the committee and 5 new members would come on. Members of the original Core Curriculum Steering Committee would be the first to rotate off, since they have been dealing with core curriculum the longest. The following term staggering plan was drafted in Committee: **CCRC members will serve a 3-year term; 5 of the voting members will rotate off at the end of each academic year by consensus of the CCRC with a view towards a balance of representation. Replacements will be sought from the relevant areas. This process will begin in the spring of**

2003. Dr. Deahl moved to approve. Dr. Eckman seconded. Dr. Snow noted that the Committee will vote on the motion at its next meeting.

(b) Integration Issues: Dr. Snow stated that the term 'integration' needs to have a more detailed description. Fr. Rossi expressed his extreme disappointment that Provost Wake had not allowed a larger scope of funding to provide for more integration in the core. Another CCRC member expressed the view that departments should come together to discuss the Core of Common Studies and should not have to receive funding to do it. This member stated that, as a whole, faculty members should voluntarily meet to discuss course issues and that it would be a benefit to all departments.

Another member questioned the process as a whole in regards to the funding. For example, if a faculty member prepares a course alone does she receive the entire allotted amount of \$3,500? If she joins a group of faculty members to prepare research for the courses, then is the \$6,000 amount requested? If that is the case, it seems more profitable for faculty to work alone than to collaborate with others. What happens if one particular faculty member does more work than the other, how then is it decided who gets what amount? Another CCRC member opined that that would depend on how the budget is allocated. The investigating faculty member could allot a percentage of work to each assisting person, and/or conference, travel fees etc.

A member questioned the possibility of a faculty member preparing a proposal and submitting it and having the proposal denied.

Dr. Snow suggested that models be provided as an example/template for the faculty members to use for reference. Another member stated that the newly created courses would be utilizing old and existing courses as a building point to begin or evolve from. Dr. Snow mentioned that the sub-committees would need to go to the faculty members to discuss the core curriculum development and that it would be helpful if they/subcommittees would bring materials that would explain the initial process of submission. She suggested using the impending receptions/conversations as a vehicle for doing this.

*End of minutes taken by Candi Baskerville @ 3:00pm, beginning of minutes taken by Dr. Heather Hathaway.
Continuation of minutes of CCRC meeting, 1/29/03.*

Picking up on the discussion of integration in the Core:

Dr. Hathaway described to the committee a plan led by Susan Mountin, Director of the Manresa Project and Bobbi Timberlake, Director of Service Learning, to coordinate the various teaching workshops that take place in May. Representatives from the Honors Program and Introduction to Inquiry were present at the initial meeting. Dr. Snow asked Dr. Hathaway to approach this group to determine whether there might be a place in the agenda for a workshop focusing on integration of the Core Curriculum. Dr. Hathaway agreed to do so.

Dr. Deahl suggested that we make the issue of integration the sole agenda item for a CCRC meeting.

Discussion continued about how to make the issue of integration a point of focus for all people teaching in the Core and several possibilities were presented about how this might be accomplished. Fr. Rossi suggested that previous articles we have read on the issue might provide valuable stimulation for conversation. Dr. Lueger noted that many of the original focus groups crossed a variety of disciplines, thus necessitating conversation about shared values across disciplines from the beginning of the Core restructuring process. Now would be a valuable time to revisit those issues. Dr. Maranto noted that one obvious way to work toward integration would be to provide a single theme for all Core courses to address during a single semester. Dr. Eckman noted that the new First-Year reading program in which all incoming students will have read the same book would also create an opportunity for integration. Dr. Grahn suggested we offer to host the 2005 Jesuit Core Curriculum conference, making integration the focus. The committee agreed that this topic should be the sole agenda item for a future meeting and that specific means of intentionally promoting integration to faculty should be devised.

Dr. Maranto presented to the Committee a request that it consider early review of ARSC 080/090, the course developed in conjunction with a pending proposal to create a multicultural residence floor in one of the dorms, in order to facilitate the progression of the proposal through various university approval committees. ARSC 080/090 is a 3-credit course spanning two semesters that is devoted to issues pertaining to diversity. The committee agreed to do so, agreeing with Fr. Rossi's observation that "the role of administration is not to block but to facilitate and expedite growth."

Dr. Snow summarized the action items on the table: she will contact the directors of the First-year reading program to find out the title of the book that has been selected; Dr. Maranto will complete the template for the ARSC 080/090 course for submission to the committee; and Dr. Hathaway will approach Dr. Mountain and Ms. Timberlake to determine whether the CCRC might participate in some way in the coordination of teaching workshops in the spring.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Candi Baskerville, Assistant to Dr. Snow, and Dr. Heather Hathaway.

Approved CCRC Minutes: 2/14/03

Present: Drs. Hathaway, Ksobiech, Byleen, Quade, Machan, Eckman, Laatsch, Malin, Lueger, Vater, Grahn, Courtright, Snow, Fr. Rossi, Mr. Lowrey.

Excused: Drs. Deahl, Heinrich, Ms. Russell.

Dr. Snow called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM and invited all members to observe a moment of silence to reflect on the blessings of peace.

The sole agenda item was discussion of a proposal from the Honors Program (see attachment). Dr. Snow invited Dr. Heather Hathaway, CCRC member and Co-Director of the Honors Program, to present the proposal to the Committee. Dr. Hathaway reviewed the basic points, which is that the Honors Program would like the CCRC to consider students admitted to the Program to have satisfied their Core of Common Studies requirements in the Rhetoric knowledge area in virtue of having satisfied various criteria for admission to the Program:

1. a minimum score of 690 on the verbal portion of the SAT or minimum scores of 30 on both the Reading and English portions of the ACT;
2. grades of B or above in high school English courses;
3. two academic letters of reference in which writers are asked specifically to comment on the student's ability in oral and written expression;
4. an 800 to 1000 word essay directed specifically toward Honors Program applicants;
5. whenever relevant, a score of 4 or 5 on the English AP exam.

When Dr. Hathaway had finished her presentation, Dr. Snow read an e-mail from Dr. Heinrich stating his support for the proposal.

Dr. Snow then opened the floor for discussion. Though several CCRC members found the proposal acceptable, some expressed concern about the issue of credits. Core credit can only be given to AP, transfer, IB, and CLEP students if they are granted credit by their specific college. Honors Program students are not given credit for the courses unless they have placed out of them through the AP test; rather, by virtue of meeting admissions criteria they are considered to have demonstrated competency. Dr. Malin inquired as to whether English 005 and 006, since they require competence in rhetoric as a condition of admission, could be considered as substitutes for English 001 and 002. Moreover, the issue of precedent was raised. Will we be setting a precedent for other units who seek to have their students exempted from Core requirements? Dr. Hathaway believes the Honors Program case can be distinguished from those of other units in virtue of the facts that it is a University program that encompasses all Colleges and that admission is contingent upon demonstrated competency in rhetoric specifically.

Several CCRC members inquired whether English 005 and 006 might be submitted in fulfillment of the Rhetoric requirement. Since these courses are parts of the new Honors curriculum, perhaps students could use them to satisfy the Core requirement. Both Drs. Hathaway and Machan responded that these courses are literature courses, not rhetoric courses. They could not be used to fulfill the learning objectives in that area.

Dr. Snow raised the issue of numbers of Honors students who take AP courses in English. Dr. Hathaway responded that, of the 100 Honors students admitted each year, the numbers who take AP courses in English vary. 44 was cited as a representative number. Those students DO receive AP credit, and consequently, core credit in accordance with CCRC approved policy. That leaves a significant number who do not get credit, however. Dr. Snow inquired as to whether it would be possible to grant Honors students automatic credit, which Dr. Malin stated is a practice in the College of Nursing. There, credit is given for performance in certain areas and is demonstrated neither by an exam nor by actually taking a course, but rather by an admissions evaluation. Dr. Quade expressed concern that that would allow Honors students to take only 122 credits for graduation; this would not be in the interest of either the students or the University.

Dr. Snow also inquired about the essay, especially with regard to whether it can be cited as evidence that students have mastered the learning objectives in the Rhetoric knowledge area. Dr. Hathaway believes the essay, in conjunction with the other admission criteria of a) high test scores on the verbal, reading, and English portions of the SAT and ACT; b) letters of recommendation in which writing abilities are asked to be addressed specifically, and c) an average of no lower than a “B” do show this mastery. Drs. Malin and Laatsch inquired whether some type of assessment of the application materials that evaluate fulfillment of the Rhetoric learning objectives could be performed. Dr. Hathaway stated that providing something like this would be possible. Dr. Byleen suggested that since Marquette does give credit by examination, there is a way in which credit could be given to Honors students. Dr. Lueger noted that the Committee has already set the precedent of evaluating satisfaction of requirements without necessarily granting credit, and used “double dipping” as an illustration of such an instance. A student who “double dips” satisfies two knowledge areas but is granted only three credits for the experience.

Drs. Grahn and Courtright and Mr. Lowrey all expressed concern that we reward rather than restrain advanced students such as those admitted to the Honors Program for their performance. Not doing so would have implications in terms of retention and recruitment.

Fr. Rossi moved to accept the Honors proposal and stated that the CCRC had not needed to convene an extra meeting to settle the issue; Dr. Byleen seconded. Dr. Snow called for further discussion. Dr. Maranto returned to the issue of whether a plan for assessment could be presented. Dr. Hathaway said she is willing to approach the Honors Faculty Advisory Council to ask if an assessment plan could be drafted and included as part of the proposal. Fr. Rossi amended his original motion to include approving the

proposal with such a plan. Dr. Malin seconded. In accordance with the CCRC's two meeting rule, a vote will be taken at the next meeting on March 7, 2003.

Some issues concerning the first reception/conversation were raised.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Dr. Nancy E. Snow, Director of Core Curriculum, with assistance from Dr. Heather Hathaway.

Marquette University
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Friday, March 7, 2003

The March 7th Core Curriculum Review Committee meeting was convened by Dr. Nancy Snow, in AMU Rm 252 at 1:07pm. **Members Present:** Drs. Ken Ksobiech, Linda Laatsch, Mike Vater, Tim Machan, Nancy Snow, Heather Hathaway, Stephanie Quade, Bob Lueger, Jim Courtright, Cheryl Maranto, Karl Byleen, Father Phil Rossi, SJ, and Mr. Jim Lowrey. **Members excused:** Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Shelly Malin, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Stephen Heinrich, and Dr. Lance Grahn.

Dr. Snow requested a moment of silence to reflect on the blessings of peace in our lives.

Dr. Snow and the CCRC welcomed Provost Madeline Wake to the meeting to address questions and to have an open dialog on current issues regarding the Core of Common Studies.

Provost Wake stated that she was glad to be present and thanked the CCRC for the years of commitment everyone had dedicated to the Core, she noted that what the CCRC is doing is changing how Marquette University does its work; we are all entrusted with a momentous and important project. She said that she is coming to understand the Core as a whole plan. Her job as Provost of the University is to ask, "Does the work of the CCRC match the plan?" Her role is to not disagree with the committee decisions on the core, yet she will ask questions, the curriculum belongs to the faculty of Marquette. Her belief is that knowledge is one: no one knowledge area belongs to one particular college or discipline. This does not mean that unqualified personnel can teach in a particular area. Requirements of the Core could cause a shift in classes students take.

She noted the possibility of territorial struggle with the CCRC structure as it currently is set up. The current structure favors the College of Arts and Sciences with the numbers of members being 8 voting members for A and S and 7 voting members for the other colleges. Her suggestions would be to decrease or reduce the number of AS representatives and/or increase the other members' representation. A suggestion would be that new members could be members at large. But with an 8/8 vote if there is a tie, the chair could break the tie, according to Robert's Rule of Order.

Dr. Hathaway stated that in the Diverse Cultures knowledge area representation is open to every department with expertise in teaching that knowledge area. Dr. Snow stated that she would check on this point.

Fr. Rossi commented on the fact that he had never experienced a division such as the Provost mentioned with the Committee.

Dr. Vater stated that it would be patronizing to presume an unfair voting outcome, which has never happened before with the CCRC, to his knowledge.

Dr. Ken Ksobiech reflected that with the amount of time he has been on the committee he has never experienced such a case of voting, historically.

Dr. Snow wanted to keep the structural factor in mind for future reference.

Dr. Lueger asked what could the committee do to avoid pitfalls of competition among academic units.

Provost Wake stated that some courses could be taught by any college and should be shared by all. For example, the proposed diversity course for the community project will be listed in several units.

Fr. Rossi questioned how long term planning decisions would be made in terms of the faculty with the possibility of ebb and flow with core courses. For example, if students choose one discipline now, and 2-3 years later enrollment changes, how will staffing issues be addressed? Would faculty be disadvantaged?

Provost Wake stated that first and foremost we have to ask ourselves, what does Marquette University exist for? Marquette exists for teaching students and generating new knowledge.

Dr. Hathaway acknowledged that the faculty exists for the students. However, to serve students, we need quality faculty.

Provost Wake questioned if any department should have all tenure track lines. There will definitely be ebbs and flows with the core changes and we should question how we can serve the students and be the most to and for our students. We can deal with the ebb and flow with visiting professors and instructors.

Dr. Hathaway asked what do we do when we have parents who are upset about the fact that there is an instructor or a T/A who is teaching a class and not a faculty member?

Provost Wake reminded that in utilizing visiting professors we are allowing new professors an opportunity to build their résumés and providing mentoring for teachers. It is not hiring unqualified personnel. The instructors and the students are getting something.

Fr. Rossi asked what structure would be implemented with respect to the Core? As part of the CCRC report, a three-tiered structural ideal was suggested that shows that some knowledge areas are dependent on others. This structure should not be lost in the implementation of the Core.

Dr. Laatsch interjected that the Committee knew this was an ideal, and that it might not be met by many students in pre-professional colleges such as the College of

Health Sciences, where students' requirements may prevent them from taking courses in the neatly tiered fashion suggested in the CCRC's Report.

Provost Wake agreed and pointed out that students in other colleges frequently face stiff scheduling requirements. The tiered structure in the report was not included in requirements for the new program plans for majors.

Fr. Rossi reiterated that he has felt alienated on many occasions when dealing with the design of the Core and feels that respect for the sequencing of the Core and reciprocity from other units in the University is lacking.

Provost Wake stated that as faculty member of the core curriculum committee in 1993, she experienced tension between Liberal Arts and Professional Education. With Phil & Theo, baccalaureate graduates aren't prepared to continue doing work in those areas, but in clinic lab science and business graduates have a profession upon graduating. The honing of professional knowledge, skills and dispositions is mandatory.

In the Diverse Cultures Focus Group, Dr. Hathaway commented, we didn't know what our jobs were when we were crafting knowledge area learning objectives. We were not mindful of the need to assess the learning objectives. At the beginning we had a simplistic proposal and now they are completely rigid and unchangeable.

Fr. Rossi said that we leapt over the preamble discussions. If they were talked about and resolved early on in the beginning when the problem was mentioned it would not be a problem now.

Provost Wake asked the group what is the direction of the CCRC now, what is the pleasure of the CCRC, what would they like to do as a whole.

Dr. Machan commented on the need for some oversight for the changes that will occur as a result of CCRC decisions. There is a need for a Committee to coordinate personnel and scheduling decisions in response to shifts in student enrollments. There is a need both for implementation issues, and for mission and vision issues to be addressed.

Provost Wake stated that she thinks the CAPS meeting is the group that looks at cross collaborating on scheduling issues.

Dr. Machan reiterated that the proven process can become too rigid and will need to be sorted out earlier than later by someone higher up in the ranks.

Provost Wake asked who might take care of the scheduling conflict and how would it be done?

Dr. Machan stated that whoever makes the decision would need to know and act as one to bring all areas together to combat the possibility of territorialism mentioned earlier in the meeting.

Dr. Quade reminded the group that the CAPS group changed its structure and that they are not a policy making group.

Dr. Hathaway stated that someone needs to be the coordinator who is completely and totally aware of the procedures of scheduling.

Dr. Vater asked about the sequence of scheduling and the talent recruitment to teach core classes, as well as the staffing. He pointed out that in some departments, seasoned professors do not teach Core courses. Instead, they are taught by new Teaching Assistants.

Dr. Machan stated that his department has approximately 90 freshman sections, 60 taught by regular TA's, 2 by faculty and 20 by others (visiting professors or part-time).

Dr. Vater stated that TA's teach 60% in his area (Philosophy).

Fr. Rossi mentioned that, in the Theology Department, almost all regular faculty teach required core courses, but there is still heavy dependence on adjunct/part time faculty, including advanced doctoral students to teach all the sections needed. Large class sizes are also an issue, both for effective pedagogy and serving the needs of majors.

Fr. Rossi commented that other departments needed to understand scheduling difficulties. For example, regular faculty in Theology does not teach on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 3:00 – 4:30, because these are faculty-meeting times.

Dr. Machan stated there could be as many as 1800 incoming freshmen. A more accurate number provided by Provost Wake is 1725 freshmen.

Dr. Ksobiech remarked on the ebb and flow that will definitely come in the next 4-5 years.

Dr. Courtright stated that quality is definitely a function of the faculty member teaching in core courses. If high quality is there, the class will be meaningful to the student. 2-3 year instructors will not deliver quality to the student.

Dr. Ksobiech stated that the best faculty should be in the forefront to teach the most important core classes.

Provost Wake thanked the CCRC for allowing her to attend; the CCRC thanked the Provost for coming. Then the Provost left the meeting and the CCRC meeting continued with the Chair's Report.

CHAIR'S REPORT

The minutes of 1/29/03 were approved unanimously. The minutes of 2/14/03 minutes were changed to reflect Fr. Rossi's comment that it did not require a separate meeting to settle the Honors Program Proposal.

Dr. Snow suggested that the March 19th meeting be cancelled because it fell during the busy time of advising week. Given that some CCRC members would be out of time, they would not have time to meet as subcommittees to evaluate Core course submissions. Cancellation of the meeting was enthusiastically agreed upon by the committee.

Dr. Snow shared the list of Core course submissions received in accordance with the March 1 deadline. She stated that she had been asked to add as an agenda item for discussion at a future meeting the possibility that the CCRC should require proof that submissions to the Core have gone through all procedures required by the Colleges, and should not require only the Chair's signature on Core course proposals.

Fr. Rossi said that the standard should be put into a generic way to indicate all signatures from the college. Submitters should then be alerted to the timing factors involved with satisfying all procedures for Core course submission.

AGENDA ITEMS

- (a) Dr. Maranto reported that the Diverse Cultures subcommittee had been asked to give ARSC 005-006 expedited review. The subcommittee recommends approving the course. Revisions to the template requiring more specificity had been requested and received. Dr. Lueger moved to approve the subcommittee's recommendation; Fr. Rossi seconded.
- (b) Dr. Snow reported that Dr. Stephen Heinrich had requested to be relieved of his duties as a CCRC member. Interim Dean Widera had suggested Dr. Kristina Ropella as the College of Engineering representative. Dr. Ropella had agreed to join the CCRC. The CCRC agreed. Dr. Snow will begin the paperwork.
- (c) Term Staggering – 12 voted yes, 1 abstention, none opposed. Two CCRC members did not submit proxies.

Dr. Machan distributed a schema for term staggering for the present CCRC members. He commented on the need to be flexible with term staggering because things will happen so that "rank" will need to be jumped at some time. Dr. Cheryl Maranto agreed to stay one more year on the committee.

(d) Dr. Hathaway formally withdrew the initial Honors Program Proposal and presented instead the Revised Honors Program Proposal. Discussion ensued. Dr. Quade commented that the terms of the proposal seemed generous. Dr. Courtright asked if other

units would emulate the proposal; if so, we might need to revisit the issue. Dr. Maranto moved; Father Rossi seconded.

Dr. Snow stated that she would send CCRC members an e-mail during the latter part of mid-semester break week and ask for a vote on ARSC 005-006 by noon on Monday, March 17, so that the course would have CCRC approval in time for its presentation to the Academic Senate later that day. She will also request a vote on the Revised Honor Program Proposal in that e-mail.

The meeting was adjourned 2:50pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Candi Baskerville
Assistant to Dr. Nancy Snow

Marquette University
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Friday, April 4, 2003

Members Present: Drs. Tim Machan, Linda Laatsch, Ellen Eckman, Shelly Malin, Karl Byleen, Bob Lueger, Mike Vater, Lance Grahn, Heather Hathaway, Jim Courtright, Cheryl Maranto, and Mr. Jim Lowry. **Excused:** Drs. Nancy Snow, Bob Deahl, Kristina Ropella, Fr. Phil Rossi, SJ, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Stephanie Quade.

Dr. Ellen Eckman called the meeting to order at 1:12PM.

Minutes of March 7. Approved. [Reporter's note: To be revised pending receipt of information from Dr. Snow.]

Report on Jesuit Conference: Dr. Grahn commented on the Jesuit Core Curriculum Conference hosted by Xavier University. On the whole, the conference was worthwhile and helpful. Based on the several sessions and keynote addresses, it seems that Marquette is behind the curve on some core curriculum issues. In other ways, such as the process for articulating core courses, Marquette is a leader among Jesuit colleges and universities. Dr. Grahn also noted that the University of San Francisco is implementing a community service requirement for graduation beginning next year and gave the university credit for its bravery in this institutional effort to live out more fully the Jesuit mission in higher education.

Dr. Bob Lueger stated that the conference theme was globalization and service learning. They were trying to see if there was a connection with International Service Learning and Globalization. There was a lot of discussion on the demographics of the students and whether or not the new faculty members were in league with the old faculty members. The reason was cited for thought on learning within a global context. There was a lot of tension with the International Services Learning group more than with the CCRC here at MU. In regards to locality there should be recognition of the processes when dealing with certain groups of individuals. The main question is how do they interact with individual groups.

Dr. Ellen Eckman asked about the Science and Nature reception and wanted an evaluation of the receptions.

Subcommittee Recommendations:

ADPR 185 – POSTPONED.
SPAN 100 – FORWARDED TO DR. SNOW FOR ASSISTANCE (3RD TIME THROUGH PROCESS)
SPAN 184 – REMAND
NASC 186 – NOT READY

ENG 005-006 WANT NEW TEMPLATE. HONOR STUDENTS EXPEDITED
REVIEW TO QUALIFY.
PSYCH 60 DEFERRED
MATH 25 APPROVED
COMM 011 -DEFERRED
PHYS 013-014 – NOT READY
PSYCH 112, 114 – APPROVE
POSC 121, 128 – REMAND
NASC 185 – REMAND
AFAS 131 – REMAND
CEEN 192 – REMAND
SPAN 102 – REMAND
MISC 018 – APPROVE

Following the Subcommittee Recommendations, the committee discussed a variety of procedural issues that have arisen during the latest phase of implementation of the Core Curriculum. Dr. Hathaway noted that actual use of the templates by the CCRC as evaluative tools has revealed some problems with the learning objectives, skills, and values and dispositions criteria as listed on (at least) the Diverse Cultures and Performing Arts templates. The committee discussed this problem and acknowledged the procedural restrictions that essentially prohibit revision of the original templates until actual implementation and assessment of CCRC-qualified courses has taken place. The discussion then moved on to whether, in given knowledge areas, certain learning objectives or skills were considered more important than others by the evaluating subcommittees. The CCRC considered whether, if this is the case, the ordering of objectives on the templates might be rearranged (without revising their content in any way) to indicate this implicit hierarchy of significance. Further discussion of the need for such revision was deferred to a future meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Candi Baskerville, with assistance from Drs. Lance Grahn and Heather Hathaway.

Core Curriculum Review Committee April 23, 2003
Approved Minutes

1. **Dr. Snow called the meeting to order at 2:10 PM.** Opening Prayer: Ms. Stephanie Russell.
Members Present: Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Heather Hathaway, Dr. Tim Machan, Rev. Philip Rossi, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Dr. Lance Grahn, Dr. Karl Byleen, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Kristina Ropella, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Michael Vater, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Jim Courtright, and Mr. Jim Lowrey.
Members Excused: Dr. Ellen Eckman, Dr. Linda Laatsch and Dr. Robert Lueger.
2. **Welcome to Dr. Kristina Ropella**, CCRC representative from the College of Engineering.
3. **Approval of the Revised Minutes of March 7, 2003 and of April 4, 2003.** (Rev. Rossi had given Dr. Snow text for the revision of the minutes of March 7 which was not forwarded to the CCRC in her absence. The attached document contains Rev. Rossi's revisions. Dr. Snow asked the CCRC to approve the revised minutes.) Dr. Maranto moved to approve and Dr. Hathaway second the motion. The Revised Minutes of March 7, 2003 were unanimously approved. Various committee members will be sending Dr. Snow rewrites of portions of the minutes of April 4, 2003.
4. **Chair's Report:**

Web page progress: The Office of Public Affairs is constructing a web page for the Core of Common Studies. The address, which is not yet publicly accessible, will be: [www. Marquette.edu/core](http://www.Marquette.edu/core).

Dr. Snow has been having **meetings with advisors** in the various Colleges to update them on the new University Core of Common Studies.

Dr. Snow reported that **funding proposals have been reviewed** by a CCRC subcommittee. Notification letters will be sent out the week of April 28. Since there will be funds leftover, Dr. Deahl asked if there was some other way to use the money. Dr. Courtright asked about intersession courses that could be a category. Dr. Hathaway asked if we should push the issue of integration and possibly pay people to attend a workshop on filling out the templates. Dr. Snow said that she would pursue the matter with Provost Wake, and ask if the budget could carryover to the next fiscal year.

5. Agenda Items:

- (A) **Dr. Snow presented requested approval by CCRC consensus:** Core course credit numbers for transfer courses that do not directly equivilate to approved Core courses:

089 for all current MU course acronyms to represent lower division U-core transfer in current department subjects that do not have an exact match. The title would be: University Core of Common Studies lower-division.

Then we would have the following for each college. A&S would need all of them. Some colleges may not need any, and some may need only a few. For example,

ARSC 009 & 109 UCCS Rhetoric
ARSC 019 & 119 UCCS Mathematical Reasoning
ARSC 029 & 129 UCCS Individual and Social Behavior
ARSC 039 & 139 UCCS Diverse Cultures
ARSC 049 & 149 UCCS Literature/Performing Arts
ARSC 059 & 159 UCCS Histories of Cultures and Societies
ARSC 079 & 179 UCCS Science & Nature
ARSC 089 & 189 UCCS Human Nature and Ethics
ARSC 099 & 199 UCCS Theology

There were no objections. All CCRC members agreed to the numbers by consensus. Dr. Courtright asked if UCCS is somewhere else in the document. Dr. Snow stated that 'UCCS' is the acronym for 'University Core of Common Studies,' a designation which will appear in the 2003-04 Undergraduate Bulletin.

(B) Discussion and vote on Subcommittee recommendations:

For the benefit of those members, including herself, who had been absent at the last meeting, Dr. Snow asked the subcommittee members to recap their reports on Core course submissions from the last meeting.

Dr. Cheryl Maranto reported on behalf of **Subcommittee I** with in put from Dr. Hathaway: SPAN 184: Remand; SPAN 100: Subcommittee takes no action, but forwards materials to Dr. Snow for assistance (3rd time through process); ENG 005-006 recommended for expedited review pending submission of revised materials.)

The learning objectives were not in the Spanish 184 syllabus, which does not correlate with the template. However, the Subcommittee felt that the template was good.

ENGL 005-006 syllabi were not sufficient.

The Subcommittee commented that there is some confusion as to what counts as a Diverse Cultures Core course. Various different cultures must be studied in a Diverse Cultures course; core courses study more than a single culture.

Dr. Grahn stated that a part of this is learning how to fill out the templates, specifically filling out the template on what diverse cultural knowledge is really about.

Dr. Ropella stated that the templates are very hard to read. We need to take some time to teach how to fill out templates.

Dr. Snow said that we need to direct people to a more efficient way to do it. Recasting ourselves as a resource committee to help people with their templates would decrease the frustration felt both by those who struggle to complete the templates, and by those who review them.

Dr. Malin suggested, why don't we have some workshops, or identify teams of resource people who could help with templates?

Dr. Deahl suggested that we need to be less of a gatekeeper and more of a resource.

Subcommittee 2: MATH 025: Dr. Ksobiech reported that the subcommittee unanimously recommends qualification.

Subcommittee 3: PSYC 112, PSYC 114, MISC 018: Qualify; POSC 121, POSC 128, NASC 185, AFAS 131, CEEN 192, SPAN 102: Remand.

Dr. Snow asked Dr. Grahn, on behalf of Subcommittee 3, to change the recommendation on PSYC 112 and PSYC 114 to defer. The Assessment Committee asked that Subcommittee 3 review their evaluation of the assessment plans of these two courses before making a recommendation on their status regarding the Core. Accordingly, Dr. Grahn changed the Subcommittee's recommendation on these two courses to "defer" so that the Subcommittee could review the information provided by the Assessment Committee.

Dr. Hathaway suggested that the CCRC reviews the template, and the Assessment Committee reviews assessment plans. It is important to clarify procedurally how all these pieces will work together, now that assessment plans must be submitted at the time the template is submitted. Dr. Snow agreed that the procedural issue should be addressed.

Dr. Grahn explained the Subcommittee's other recommendations. POSC 121 and 128 require the signature of the Chair of the Political Science Department before they can be considered. Dr. Snow stated that it was her understanding that the Aspen Center is an independent unit that reports directly to the Office of the Provost. Consequently, she did not realize the need to have the signature of the Department Chair. However, since the courses are listed as Political Science courses, she agreed that the Chair's signature should be obtained for the resubmitted template. She has spoken with Chris Murray of the Aspen Center, who had agreed to consult with the Chair of the Political Science Department on these submissions. Dr. Grahn shared some other concerns regarding the way the templates had been filled out.

Dr. Grahn also informed the CCRC that the Subcommittee would be meeting with the Commanding Officers of the Navy and Air Force ROTC units to discuss NASC 185 and AFAS 131.

Dr. Grahn recommended that Spanish 102 and CEEN 192 be remanded; MISC 018 should be qualified.

Dr. Snow asked if there were any questions, then asked for an amended motion and a second on subcommittee recommendations on Core course submissions. Dr. Ksobiech moved to amend the previous motion; Dr. Hathaway seconded.

The amended motion passed unanimously. Fr. Rossi had Dr. Lueger's proxy vote.

(C) Subcommittee recommendations; request for a motion and a second:

- (1) **Subcommittee I:** ADPR 185; COMM 021. Dr. Hathaway reported on ADPR. The course is one of the few that takes information literacy seriously. It has a strong focus on justice and hits the Diverse Cultures learning objectives head on. The weakness is that it is limited to 25 people. The Subcommittee's recommendation is to qualify. The Subcommittee is struggling with their evaluation of Comm 021. They plan to meet with Ms. Phylis Ravel, who chaired the Performing Arts focus group, to clarify the learning objectives of the knowledge area. The Subcommittee defers a recommendation on this course until after this meeting with Ms. Ravel takes place.
- (2) **Subcommittee II:** PSYC 060; COMM 011. The Subcommittee would like to see more learning objectives in the PSYC 060 syllabus. The Subcommittee defers a recommendation on PSYC 060 pending receipt of the evaluation of the assessment plan.

Dr. Ksobiech reported that the Subcommittee is divided on the merits of Comm 011, with one member opting to qualify and the other against qualification. The third Subcommittee member is concerned about the flow of Comm 011 with the other required course in the Rhetoric knowledge area. Consequently, Comm 011 will go to the entire CCRC for discussion and a vote. Dr. Ksobiech distributed materials, as did Dr. Machan. A special CCRC meeting will be scheduled during the evening to allow all members to participate in the discussion.

Subcommittee IV: PHYS 013-014; NASC 186: remand. The Subcommittee maintains that Physics 013 and 014 do not provide enough information to be adequately reviewed. Their qualification in the Core is needed for Math majors.

Naval Science 186 - The Subcommittee had decided to remand it. Though the template was filled out well, the Subcommittee is unable to recommend approval. There is a concern that Leadership & Ethics is presented from 1 point of view, and that the course is organized around ethics first, then leadership. A question arose about the freedom of speech of military personnel during wartime. If they are not able to speak openly about government policy or are not able to disagree publicly with the commander in chief, how can an open discussion of ethical issues, such as just war theory, be conducted in the classroom?

Dr. Courtright said that the Ethics course should be taught by a philosopher. There needs to be discussion, potential dialogue. Dr. Machan said that Core courses shouldn't sequester people. People

in class should have some commonality. NASC 186 works against this commonality. One possibility, suggested by Dr. Malin, is for NASC 186 to be team taught with someone from Navy ROTC and someone from the Philosophy Department. There was some difference of opinion among Subcommittee members as to whether NASC 186 is a core course. Ms. Russell asked about course overload: is there too much content in NASC 186? Dr. Grahn remarked that the discussions on Individual and Social Behavior courses that are planned with ROTC Commanding Officers might take some of the pressure off of NASC 186. He also indicated how firmly dedicated ROTC is to working within framework of the University. They are doing a good job.

Dr. Snow asked for a motion and a second on the Subcommittee recommendations. Dr. Deahl moved. Dr. Courtright seconded.

Dr. Ropella questioned the sequence in which things are taught. If everyone follows a cookbook approach, we might as well just give the student a book and say, "do it." Can we get satisfy the learning objectives of the knowledge area using different approaches?

Rev. Rossi stated that it is not a question of how the course is presented. It is adequacy in the area of Ethics. The lesson plans for NASC 186 are like cookbooks. Two courses have been merged together.

Dr. Hathaway stated that the course is too crowded.

Dr. Courtright suggested we look at other Jesuit schools to see how they deal with ROTC.

- (D) **Term Staggering:** Determination of members to rotate off at the end of this academic year. Five members should rotate off. Since Steve Heinrich should be considered as having rotated off, that leaves four to be decided. Since Fr. Rossi will be out of the country for part of next semester, he will rotate off. Several others are eligible in virtue of their length of service on the CCRC and the Core Curriculum Steering Committee: Drs. Ksobiech, Malin, Laatsch, Maranto, and Deahl. Dr. Deahl expressed a preference for staying on the Committee. We need to choose three more people to rotate off. With this, the meeting was adjourned at 4 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Gruentzel
Assistant to Dr. Snow

Marquette University
Approved Minutes of the Core Curriculum Review Committee
Tuesday, May 6, 2003

The May 6th Core Curriculum Review Committee meeting was convened by Dr. Snow, in AMU Rm 313 at 7:40 PM. Adjourned at 9:30 PM. **Members Present:** Dr. Kris Ropella, Dr. Michael Vater, Dr. Karl Byleen, Rev. Philip Rossi, Prof. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Dr. Heather Hathaway, and Dr. Ellen Eckman. **Members Excused:** Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Lance Grahn, Dr. Michele Malin, Dr. Stephanie Quade, Ms. Stephanie Russell, Mr. Jim Lowrey, and Dr. Robert Lueger.

Chair's Report: Report on minutes: Dr. Snow still awaits text for the minutes of April 4, 2003, from Drs. Grahn, Hathaway, and Malin. Minutes of April 23 will be ready for approval at the next scheduled CCRC meeting on Friday, May 9. Minutes of this meeting should also be ready.

Report on term staggering: Dr. Malin will be rotating off the CCRC; Drs. Eckman and Laatsch are eligible, but have expressed the desire to remain for another year to see the Core through its first year of implementation. Dr. Snow has advised both to consult with their respective Deans. Dr. Ksobiech is also eligible; he, too, will consult with his Dean. If Drs. Laatsch and Eckman do stay on, Drs. Maranto, Byleen, and Machan comprise the next tier of CCRC members who are eligible to rotate off.

Agenda Items:

(A) Report from Subcommittee I:

Subcommittee I recommended qualifying COMM 021 and qualifying ENGL 005 – 006 pending receipt of syllabi with learning objectives in the fall. Dr. Hathaway commented that COMM 021 – is neither a Literature course nor a Performing Arts course. She reiterated her view that the knowledge area should be renamed, and suggested “Literature and the Arts.”

Dr. Machan wondered why English 005-006 were being singled out. Dr. Maranto commented that other courses have been remanded because of syllabi that did not state the learning objectives of the knowledge area or course-specific learning objectives that correspond to knowledge area learning objectives. Drs. Ksobiech and Byleen observed that Psychology 060 has been remanded because of this issue – a lack of syllabi with adequate learning objectives. Dr. Snow observed that the English 005-006 case differs from that of Psych 060 inasmuch as a staffing problem has prevented the Psychology department from crafting appropriate learning objectives for this course. Since no such staffing problem exists in the case of English 005-006, we can expect syllabi with appropriate learning objectives in the fall. Dr. Snow asked Dr. Ksobiech to consult with Dr. Wierzbicki, Chair of the Psychology Department, to ascertain whether the Psych 060 staffing issue would be resolved and syllabi with appropriate learning objectives forthcoming.

(B) Report from Subcommittee III: Dr. Linda Laatsch reported that the Subcommittee had met with the Commanding Officers of the Naval and Air Force ROTC units about NASC 185 and AFAS 131. Dr. Lueger had agreed to collaborate with them on the resubmission of their templates, which would be put forth for expedited review. Dr. Laatsch remarked that the templates were not bad, but did, in the Subcommittee's view, require further work. She also reported on Psychology 112 and 114. Dr. Snow had asked the Subcommittee to defer its recommendation on those courses pending review of the Evaluation of the Assessment Plan (the Assessment Committee had asked the CCRC to consider this evaluation). Dr. Laatsch reported that the Subcommittee had discussed the issue, and decided to reinstate their original recommendation to qualify these courses for the Core of Common Studies. The Subcommittee views the Assessment Plans as a separate piece, not falling within the purview of CCRC review.

Dr. Hathaway raised a procedural issue that had arisen in a prior meeting, namely, how the review of assessment plans by the Assessment Committee should relate with CCRC reviews of course submissions. Drs. Ksobiech and Byleen commented that their subcommittee had asked to review the Assessment Committee's evaluation of the assessment plan for Psych 060, in an effort to clarify the learning objectives. The evaluation, they reported, was not especially helpful. The procedural issue remains to be discussed at a future meeting, but raises the deeper concern of the need to ensure consistency among subcommittees in their review of course submissions.

Dr. Hathaway also raised the question of whether core credit could be granted retroactively; i.e. could a student receive core credit for having taken a course before it was qualified for the Core? Dr. Eckman responded that this could not be done; Dr. Maranto offered that the issue is the timing of when a student takes a course relative to its being approved. Students are bound by the listing of Core courses in the Undergraduate Bulletin for the year of their entrance. Dr. Snow commented that students are advised in the Bulletin to consult the web for an updated listing of core courses. Dr. Machan suggested consulting legal counsel about the web postings.

Dr. Courtright asked whether all of the freshman courses have been submitted to the Core, and whether Dr. Snow had been exercising oversight. Dr. Snow responded that she had not. Units are simply entrusted with the responsibility of submitting the courses their students will need to satisfy their Core requirements.

Dr. Snow then asked for a motion and a second on the Subcommittee recommendations. Dr. Vater moved; Dr. Courtright seconded.

(C) Discussion of Comm 011: Dr. Ksobiech opened the discussion of Comm 011. (The course is being discussed because of a divergence of opinion on Subcommittee II. Dr. Ksobiech favors qualification; Dr. Machan opposes. Dr. Byleen has raised questions. Materials for this meeting were distributed by Drs. Ksobiech and Machan at the CCRC meeting of April 23, 2003.) This is a new course coming out of the

College of Communication. The College thinks that it satisfies the learning objectives of the rhetoric knowledge area. He offered a clarification in response to a concern articulated by Dr. Byleen regarding the possible sequencing of Comm 011 with English 001 and English 002, which have already been qualified in rhetoric. Dr. Ksobiech stated that the prerequisite for Comm 011 is English 001. Comm 011 combines instruction in writing and speaking. Dr. Maranto offered that the College of Business currently requires 9 credit hours in rhetoric, and could want its students to take Comm 011 in addition to English 001 and 002. Dr. Hathaway raised the question of whether the CCRC could qualify the course for College of Communications students only. Dr. Eckman responded negatively; the CCRC cannot restrict University Core courses to students from certain colleges.

Dr. Hathaway questioned Dr. Ksobiech as to how many sections would be needed; Dr. Ksobiech responded that the course would be phased in and that priority registration would probably be given to Communications students.

Dr. Machan stated that he does not believe that Comm 011 meets the learning objectives of the rhetoric knowledge area at a fundamental level. Examining the syllabus shows that the course is about two-thirds speech and one-third writing. He has not seen the way writing is taught in this course for about 25 years. The text used, Strunk and White, is, in his view, not the problem, but a symptom of the problem. He further contended that Comm 011 in no way builds on English 001. The course, he claimed, does not meet the template needs, and does not meet the needs of our students. It disadvantages our students.

Dr. Courtright interjected that he teaches juniors and seniors whom he hopes would have mastered writing, but they have not. Dr. Machan asked how much writing Dr. Courtright assigns? The whole University must be invested in writing.

Dr. Ksobiech concurred absolutely with Dr. Machan's view on the need for writing. Comm 011 has three major writing assignments and three major speaking assignments.

Dr. Machan stated that Comm 011 is a speech course.

Dr. Eckman volunteered that examining English 002 syllabi would be helpful.

Dr. Rossi stated that the rhetoric requirement is 6 credit hours. In some cases, there has been a clear demarcation; not every course is expected to build on the first one. What struck him about the template is the claim that Comm 011 meets all of the learning objectives of the knowledge area. It does not attempt to build on the learning objectives addressed by English 001.

Dr. Hathaway stated that she thought that English and Communications were working to build speech and rhetoric together.

Dr. Machan reviewed the history of his interactions with the College of Communications. He has found those interactions frustrating and noted that following two different meetings with representatives of the College, he had not heard from them about the possibility of further interaction. He noted that representatives of other Colleges now sit on the Freshman Writing Board, but the College of Communication has not responded to invitations for representation. He also noted the minutes of an Executive Committee meeting to which he responded with a written memo presented to the CCRC at a meeting last year. In short, he has not gotten cooperation from the College of Communication. Most recently, he has not received a response from the meeting of March 24, 2003, nor any offers of cooperation initiating from Communications.

Dr. Ksobiech stated that at the meeting of March 24, they talked about the possibility of Communications T.A.'s teaching sections of English 001 and 002.

Dr. Ropella asked if this was a money issue, or does it come down to expertise. She stated that, in her College, she made the suggestion that faculty work with the English department to teach technical writing, and encountered resistance from her faculty with regard to expertise.

Dr. Ksobiech denied that the issue is money. Dr. Ksobiech stated that the College thinks that Comm 011 is a good course. He brought up the student focus groups that had been formed during the time of the Steering Committee. Students in those groups stated the need for instruction in speaking. Dr. Laatsch concurred.

Dr. Hathaway requested several points of clarification from Dr. Ksobiech regarding the syllabus of Comm 011; Dr. Ksobiech replied to her questions. Dr. Vater asked Drs. Machan and Ksobiech for the qualifications of English and Communications instructors. Dr. Machan replied that instructors for English 001 and 002 included regular faculty, adjunct faculty with Ph.D.'s and M.A.'s, T. A.'s with an M.A., and about 7 with only a baccalaureate degree per year in a faculty of 60. Dr. Ksobiech replied that Communications T. A.'s are in the M.A. program; there is no Ph.D. program.

Dr. Machan stressed the extensive nature of the training and supervision of the English T. A.'s; Dr. Ksobiech pointed out that Communications T.A.'s will have orientation, classroom visitations, and regular staff meetings with supervisors.

Dr. Machan expressed his belief that Comm 011 would be valuable for speech writing, but not for writing as such.

Dr. Maranto commented that if this course meets the learning objectives, it should be qualified for the Core.

Dr. Ropella repeated the question of whether the course satisfies the learning objectives.

Dr. Maranto asked whether an unwritten criterion is being applied to Comm 011.

Dr. Machan repeated his belief that the course does not meet the template. He stated that you must get beyond the checked “yes” on the template to see that it does not meet the template.

Dr. Laatsch pointed out that there are different kinds of writing, and that some kinds of writing, such as technical writing, would be more valuable for some student groups.

Dr. Machan indicated that the CCRC’s concern is with what meets the requirements of the University Core. Comm 011 might meet the needs of the College of Communications, but that does not make it suitable for the University Core.

Dr. Ksobiech replied that Comm 011 is not intended only for Communications students. He expressed the view that students should be able to take a health report, for example, or other technical reports, and make them accessible to laypeople.

Dr. Hathaway asked whether the training provided by English 001 would be enough background for students who took Comm 011. She said she was trying to sort out the relationship between English 001 and English 002 and Comm 011.

Dr. Ropella paraphrased by asking whether students really need the full year of English 001 and 002, or is English 001 alone enough background for students to take Comm 011?

Dr. Hathaway asked, if we allow Comm 011 to follow English 001, do we open the door to other possible combinations, such as English 001 and a technical writing course?

Dr. Ksobiech responded that Comm 011 is another writing course. There are two different operational definitions of how to fulfill the writing requirement.

Dr. Machan stated that the issue is whether Comm 011 fulfills the writing component of the rhetoric template.

Dr. Machan expressed concerns about the relatively few numbers of weeks on the syllabi devoted to writing, as well as about the utility of large lecture classes.

Fr. Rossi stated that he saw no effort made to make a connection between English 001 and Comm 011. In Theology, there is some conception of what builds on what. He does not see Comm 011 as an appropriate follow-up to English 001. We have made the various pieces of the process so determinative of how we go through this; we face the tyranny of the template. All of this has made the bigger picture harder and harder to get into focus. We did not engage the issue of how the knowledge areas relate to

each other and have had difficulty with dual application courses. You cannot be interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary until you have mastered the disciplines. The Comm 011 template has been done in splendid isolation; that has not helped it.

Dr. Machan observed that not much is to be gained by needlessly duplicating things.

Dr. Vater noted that we should not think that English 001 and 002 are the only way of meeting the goals of rhetoric. Students cannot speak publicly or lead discussions by the time they're juniors or seniors. Something important is being missed.

Dr. Hathaway contended that we have a Core without enough credit hours in it. She asked Dr. Ksobiech, if this issue isn't about counting beans, what is it about?

Dr. Ksobiech responded that it is about material. The English courses have more writing. The Comm course has more speaking. There ought to be multiple operational definitions of how you meet the rhetoric knowledge area.

Dr. Machan noted that the issue is whether you have writing courses.

Dr. Ropella observed that the knowledge area isn't called "writing." It's called "rhetoric."

Dr. Eckman indicated that we can't know a priori that the Comm 011 course won't teach effective writing.

Dr. Maranto asked whether any College is considering eliminating English 001 and 002? In reality, most Colleges do require 3 courses in rhetoric.

Dr. Eckman observed that public speaking is crucial for educators.

Dr. Maranto asked how much rhetoric the College of Health Sciences has?

Dr. Laatsch responded that the College does not have a core, but individual departments do. She expressed the view that departments would require a technical writing course, if one were to be offered.

Dr. Machan volunteered that a responsible technical writing course could not be offered on only the basis of English 001.

Dr. Ropella commented that what is most valuable is for students to learn how to construct arguments on the basis of evidence.

Dr. Snow then halted the discussion to ask for a motion and a second on Comm 011. Dr. Eckman moved to qualify Comm 011 for the Core; Dr. Vater seconded.

Dr. Byleen commented that Dr. Ksobiech has clarified the relation of the course to English 001. However, the proposal does not do this; Dr. Byleen views this as a weakness in the proposal.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

Core Curriculum Review Committee
Friday, May 9, 2003 2:00-4:00 PM AMU 313
Approved Minutes

Dr. Snow called the meeting to order at 2:08 PM

Opening Prayer: Dr Linda Laatsch

Members Present: Dr. Lance Grahn, Dr. Tim Machan, Dr. James Courtright, Dr. Ellen Eckman, Rev. Philip Rossi, Dr. Robert Lueger, Dr. Cheryl Maranto, Mr. James Lowrey, Dr. Linda Laatsch, Dr. Kristina Ropella, Dr. Nancy Snow, Dr. Robert Deahl, Dr. Ken Ksobiech, and Dr. Karl Byleen.

Members Excused: Dr. Michael Vater, Dr. Michele Malin, and Dr. Heather Hathaway.

Dr. Snow asked for the approval of 3 sets of minutes. Dr. Snow got text from Dr. Hathaway and Dr. Grahn for suggested changes to the April 4, 2003 minutes. After some suggested changes by various CCRC members, Dr. James Courtright moved to approve the minutes. Dr. Lance Grahn seconded the motion. The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

Next **April 23, 2003 Minutes.** Again, several changes were made. Dr. Robert Deahl moved to approve the amended minutes; Dr. Tim Machan seconded the motion. The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

Next **May 6, 2003 Minutes.** Several changes were made. Dr. Linda Laatsch moved to approve; Dr. Lance Grahn seconded the motion. The amended minutes were unanimously approved.

Chair's Report: Dr. Ksobiech and Dr. Ellen Eckman will rotate off the CCRC at the end of this academic year. Since Fr. Rossi is also going off, new representatives will need to be sought from the College of Communication, the School of Education, and the Theology Department.

Agenda Items:

(A) Dr. Snow sought the CCRC approval by consensus: The new CCRC Member from the College of Nursing (at the end of this academic year) will be Dr. Mary Ann Lough. Dr. Linda Laatsch volunteered to serve for another three year term; the Dean of the College of Health Sciences, Dr. Jack Brooks, consented. The CCRC unanimously approved the appointments of Drs. Lough and Laatsch.

(B) Discussion and votes on the following pending motions:

Motion 1: Motion to approve the recommendations of Subcommittees I and IV (motion made and seconded 4/23/03)

Subcommittee I: Recommends qualifying ADPR 185 for the Core of Common Studies.

Subcommittee IV: Recommends remanding NASC 186 and Physics 013-014. Dr. Snow asked if there was any further discussion, then called the question. The motion passed unanimously, with Dr. Snow entering three proxy votes in favor.

Motion 2: Motion to approve the recommendations of Subcommittees I and III (motion made and seconded 5/6/03)

Subcommittee I: Recommends qualifying Comm 021 for the Core of Common Studies. Recommends qualifying English 005 and English 006 for the Core of Common Studies, pending receipt in the fall of syllabi with learning objectives.

Subcommittee III: Recommends qualifying Psychology 112 and Psychology 114 for the Core of Common Studies.

Dr. Karl Byleen asked if the Chair would entertain a motion to split the motion. He felt that the wording regarding the receipt of syllabi with learning objectives is ambiguous, and stated that he would prefer that the CCRC take an e-mail vote on English 005 and 006 in the fall after revised syllabi have been received and reviewed by the appropriate subcommittee. Dr. Snow said that she would entertain a motion to split the motion. Dr. Ksobiech asked if Psychology 060 should be treated similarly to English 005 and 006. Dr. Maranto commented on the need to formulate policy regarding syllabi with learning objectives. We should have this policy ready for the fall. Dr. Snow stated that she had met with subcommittee chairs during the Christmas break to talk about the issues of possibly inconsistent evaluations from the subcommittees. She said that she would convene another meeting of the subcommittee chairs before the end of this Academic Year, with the aim of providing recommendations on policy issues for a CCRC meeting before the next round of course reviews in the fall. We will need to address the treatment of syllabi with learning objectives, as well as the question of how evaluations of assessment plans should factor in to CCRC reviews of course submissions.

Dr. Snow asked if there was a motion to split motion 2. Dr. Grahn moved to split motion 2; Dr. Ksobiech seconded. Dr. Snow asked for further discussion. Nine CCRC members voted in favor of splitting the motion; three were opposed. The motion carried.

Dr. Snow asked for further discussion on the first part of the motion: the recommendations from the subcommittees to qualify Comm 021 and Psyc 112 and 114. She then called the question. Eleven voted in favor; one opposed. The motion carried.

Dr. Snow asked for a motion to amend the subcommittee's recommendation regarding English 005 and 006.

Dr. Byleen moved to amend the motion as follows: The Chair will be authorized to conduct an e-mail vote to qualify English 005 and/or English 006 after syllabi with appropriate learning objectives are received by August 18, 2003 and reviewed by the appropriate subcommittee. Dr. Courtright seconded the motion. Dr. Snow asked for discussion.

Dr. Machan expressed the view that English 005 and 006 are being singled out. Dr. Ropella observed that Physics 013 and 014 are being remanded for lacking syllabi with learning objectives. Dr. Snow pointed out that Psych 060 has been remanded for the same reason. Dr. Machan asked if we can qualify English 005 and 006 in time for them to count as core courses for students who will be taking these courses next year. Dr. Snow responded affirmatively.

Dr. Byleen offered that the learning objectives for English 005 and 006 could be done by a group of instructors. This is an opportunity for the Chair of the department to initiate this kind of collaborative discussion.

Dr. Snow called the question. Eight voted in favor; four were opposed. The motion carried.

Motion 3: Motion to qualify Comm 011 for the Core of Common Studies (motion made and seconded 5/6/03). Dr. Snow asked for further discussion. She called the question. Six voted in favor; eight were opposed; there was one abstention. The motion failed. Comm 011 will be remanded. Dr. Snow commented that this is the first time the CCRC has voted in full committee to remand a course. Further, the chair of the relevant subcommittee presented the course to the Committee. Consequently, she will prepare the Evaluation Tool for Comm 011. Dr. Snow requested justifications and other input via e-mail from Committee members regarding Comm 011 to be incorporated into the Evaluation Tool.

Dr. Snow asked if there was any other business. Dr. Ksobiech moved to treat Psych 060 like English 005 and 006, that is, to authorize the Chair to conduct an e-mail vote to qualify Psych 060 after syllabi with the appropriate learning objectives are received by August 18, 2003 and reviewed by the appropriate subcommittee. Dr. Laatsch seconded the motion.

Dr. Snow will conduct a vote on this motion by e-mail by the end of May.

Dr. Laatsch moved that, if NASC 185 and AFAS 131 are resubmitted by August 18, 2003, the Chair is authorized to conduct an e-mail vote on the subcommittee recommendation.

Dr. Eckman seconded the motion. Dr. Snow asked for discussion.

Dr. Lueger opposes on the ground that more than the learning objectives are involved in this case. In his view, the templates have serious problems. Dr. Snow observed that that was not the report that she obtained from the Subcommittee Chair. Dr. Laatsch reported that on the basis of the meeting with the ROTC Commanding Officers, she thought the templates were close to successful completion. Dr. Grahn also disagreed with Dr. Lueger and stated his view that he was ready to vote in favor of the templates after meeting with the ROTC personnel.

Dr. Machan stated that he is leery of e-mail votes. We need discussion on opinions about these courses. This case is not like English 005 and 006, which is needed for students this fall. We could review these courses again in the fall.

Dr. Laatsch stated her view that the courses should be approved for advising purposes. Given the lockstep nature of the ROTC curricula, the units need to know how to advise their students. She thinks the courses are closer to being approved.

Fr. Rossi expressed concerns about procedural conditions and circumstances of expedited review. These procedures have not been thought through.

Dr. Snow stated that we have used both e-mail votes and expedited review in the past. The CCRC unanimously agreed to give ARSC 005 and 006 expedited review, and took e-mail votes on them and on the Revised Honors Program Proposal. No procedural concerns had been raised for those cases, nor for the expedited review of English 005-006.

Dr. Machan stated that this is different from ENG 005 and 006. Only the syllabi are missing. We need to approve changing procedure. Dr. Lueger expressed the opinion that expedited review applied to cases in which minor things needed to be fixed.

Dr. Snow offered her opinion that expedited review is simply faster review. Her understanding from the subcommittee is that there is not a lot to be done to the templates. If major changes are needed to the templates, now is the time to say so.

Dr. Maranto stated that if there is a difference of opinion on the subcommittee after the new template is reviewed, we cannot proceed with an e-mail vote. If the subcommittee's recommendation is unanimous, we should vote by e-mail.

Dr. Courtright asked if we need to give ROTC expedited review. Dr. Snow stated that she had already offered them expedited review. Dr. Courtright questioned how serious ROTC advising issues are?

Dr. Laatsch commented that the ROTC curricula are tightly packed. They will have difficulty dealing with the Core and with advising students on how to meet their requirements. ROTC does not have much flexibility.

Dr. Machan repeated the question of expedited review and how people stand on it, is it appropriate or not?

Dr. Deahl remarked that, as we have said before, we need to be careful we are less of a gatekeeper and more of a resource.

Dr. Machan commented that we are 50/50.

Dr. Maranto said that we need to include in the motion that the subcommittee recommendation has to be unanimous.

Dr. Laatsch amended her motion as follows: if NASC 185 and AFAS 131 are resubmitted by August 18, 2003, and there is a unanimous subcommittee recommendation on these courses, the Chair is authorized to conduct an e-mail vote on the subcommittee recommendation. Dr. Eckman seconded the motion.

Dr. Snow will conduct an e-mail vote on the motion by the end of May.

Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Snow adjourned the meeting at 3:40 PM.