

Approved Minutes of CCRC Meeting 9-09-03

Members Present: Drs. Ksobiech, Lueger, Laatsch, Lough, Vater, Eckman, Grahn, Ropella, Deahl, Hathaway, Byleen, Quade, Snow, Fr. Laurance, Mr. Lowrey, Ms. Russell.

Members Excused: Drs. Machan, Courtright.

Dr. Snow called the meeting to order at 8:10 AM in AMU 252.

Opening Prayer: Dr. Stephanie Quade

Approval of Minutes of Sept. 2, 2003: The only correction was to Fr. Laurance's name which was misspelled throughout the minutes. Motion to approve the minutes was made by Dr. Laatsch with a second by Dr. Ropella. The motion was approved.

Chair's Report:

Dr. Snow reported that eight courses have been submitted and they are now on Blackboard. There were a few questions concerning the already approved courses. Dr. Snow noted that the library has hard copies and electronic copies of all approved CORE courses. Blackboard shows the new courses that are being considered.

Dr. Lueger commented that ARSC 140 and CRLS 198 (CRLS 161) are still in review by the CDAC – the A&S curriculum committee. He was concerned that the courses were being reviewed by the CCRC before the Arts and Sciences Dean had signed off on the courses. Dr. Snow commented that the CCRC committee reviews courses with chairs' signatures only. She agreed to check past minutes to see if earlier meetings had determined that a Chair's signature was sufficient.

Dr. Hathaway noted that ENGL 1XX still had to go through Dept. Committees in English and then in Arts and Sciences. She noted that the CCRC had offered funding for the development of this course. Dr. Snow noted that it is a "chicken and egg" question – we want to encourage course development for the CORE and assume that proposed new courses will be sent through normal departmental and college committees simultaneously with their submission to the CCRC. Dr. Ksobiech suggested that we could approve courses pending department or college approval.

There was some discussion concerning the mechanism for dealing with course modifications. Dr. Snow commented that course modifications sent to the bulletin will trigger review by CCRC.

Additional questions were raised concerning chairs consulting with Deans about new courses. Dr. Lueger noted that the chair signs the template submission to show support of the process but not approval to offer course. He felt that this process in A & S meant that the courses that CCRC is looking at will be approved by A&S in a month.

Dr. Grahn asked if A&S should send courses to the CCRC if the courses have not been approved by A&S? Dr. Lueger pointed out that it is not A&S but CCRC deadlines that require courses to move forward. Dr. Vater suggested that perhaps courses that CCRC supported this summer can be approved by the CCRC but not posted on the web site.

Agenda Items:

- A) Discussion and vote to include a line on the template indicating number of credits for courses. This motion was approved unanimously, with one proxy in favor of the motion. **[Reporter's Note: One CCRC member was absent and did not submit a proxy.]** Dr. Snow will put this line on the templates that are posted on the web site.

- B) Discussion and vote on qualifying NASC 185 for the CORE. The motion carried with 9 in favor and 5 opposed (one vote of opposition was a proxy vote). **[Reporter's Note: One CCRC member was absent and did not submit a proxy.]**

- C) Discussion on qualifying AFAS 131 for the CORE. Dr. Laatsch reported that the Subcommittee voted 2 in favor of qualifying AFAS 131 for the CORE. Those in favor feel that the course does meet the learning objectives for the knowledge area. One member of the subcommittee was opposed because he felt that the objectives with regard to research methodologies and critical thinking skills were not met by this course.

Dr. Grahn thinks this course is a quality course that merits inclusion in Core on its own merits and for programming reasons.

Dr. Lueger was opposed to qualifying this course for the knowledge area. He felt that there were major problems in the course related to the lack of exposure to research methodologies in 3 areas of the template: knowledge, skills, and values. He argued that the only methodology examined is a case study approach. The course does not have students learn and apply quantitative and qualitative research skills. It seems to Dr. Lueger that the authors of the template have confused problem solving and qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. He also noted that there were only general statements made regarding the moral implications of research.

Dr. Maranto asked if this course was stronger than Naval Sciences 185?

Dr. Lueger answered that neither course did the research piece in way that was acceptable for this core area. Some of the readings seem to be better but they are still missing critical appraisal of theories, such as Maslow's. Dr. Eckman saw some of the same weakness in both courses because there was no mention of feminist leadership theory.

Dr. Laatsch felt that this course was stronger than the Naval Science course and that it was strong in the application of theories to decision. She noted strong critical

thinking was encouraged about situations and that students were required to write and give oral presentations on situations.

Dr. Hathaway asked if is this the only course that students will take in this knowledge area, will it work – will it fulfill the learning objectives of the area? She argued that one can apply theory but there is still a need to be critical. She noted that if the course was talking about leadership, it must deal with feminist issues such as the way men and women think, respond and lead.

Dr. Ropella argued for application, not just theory. She wants students to be able to apply, not just learn, theories, and to bring theories into concrete areas. Dr. Grahn emphasized that in the MU college documents there is a focus on “applied knowledge.”

Dr. Lueger asked if the students are given the structures needed to assess theories? He is concerned that what is being promoted is the subjective; there is not enough analysis of the student’s application. He would like the course to make room for research methodology. He was told there wasn’t room in the course but he thinks there could be more balance.

Dr. Maranto commented that she was struggling with being consistent on this issue across all courses. She knows that in her area there is not always critical evaluation of the theories in basic courses. She wondered if we have been consistent on this point in all the courses that have been approved.

Dr. Grahn feels that this course addresses Marquette University’s interest in leadership in its theoretical framework and its applied reality. It is leadership applied to society. Furthermore, he felt that we need to give credit to our colleagues in ROTC that they do understand issues of values.

Dr. Lueger noted that the issue is that we need to teach moral implications of research, and to teach critical thinking. Dr. Ropella feels that in core courses in science, and introductory courses, that students aren’t ready to do critical thinking about theories.

There was a continued discussion about this course, the nature of core courses, and related issues. Committee members were struggling with issues over the nature of core; the nature and meaning of liberal arts, practicality; and critical inquiry in an introductory course. Doubts were expressed on the depth of study in a single course for this knowledge area.

Dr. Snow requested a motion and a second on AFAS 131. Dr. Laatsch moved approval of AFAS 131; Dr. Grahn seconded the motion. There was no further discussion on the course.

Dr. Maranto raised the issue of timing: if students are currently enrolled in a course that is qualified for the course this semester, will they receive Core credit for it? Dr. Snow will put this item on the next agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Ellen Eckman
School of Education