

Approved CCRC Minutes 9/24/03

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

Dr. Snow called the meeting to order at 3:10 PM.

1. **Opening Prayer:** Dr. Lance Grahn.
2. **Minutes of 9/9/03** unanimously approved without changes; no abstentions; none opposed.
3. **Chair's Report:** Dr. Snow said the question of whether submissions to the Core should be approved by Deans or college curriculum committees will be on CCRC meeting agendas for the month of October.
4. **Agenda Items**
 - A.) **AFAS 131** discussion

Dr. Hathaway: She is still concerned by syllabus, in particular by the section on Critical Analysis. She went to the Course Syllabus and found material, now understands political implications of ROTC and their need of CORE approval. Concerned about critical thinking issue in AFAS 131. She shared the section of syllabus from AFAS packet. Critical thinking is being described, not used. All military programs not same.

A.F. 22 credits
Navy different-45 credits
Army
All military programs are not alike.

Dr. Maranto: This is interesting information. We need to apply the same standards to all course submissions.

Maranto: For CORE should we have different standards for ROTC?

Lueger: Critical thinking is not the same as research methodologies.

Hathaway: It is critical analysis, not methods.

Maranto: How does AFAS 131 compare to the Naval Science Course?

Lueger: Three questions in field. What is social science? Meaning? Methods?
Neither course address three basic questions.

Eckman: We don't know this level of information on other courses.

Machan: We can't ignore the information we have.

Lueger: We asked for details because we needed more information.

Sub Committee: 2:1 split

R.opella: How many items on the AFAS 131 template don't meet objectives?

Lueger: Thought three or so; but these are features for all courses objectives.

Can we add something in course to cover material that's missing is his preference.

Vater: There is question—can it keep coming back? This has come three times.

Grahn: All three in committee said this was better than Naval Science. Two thought it deserves approval.

Snow: Called the question.

Vote: 9 in favor; 4 opposed; 1 abstention; 1 absent (did not submit proxy).

B.) Subcommittee Reports

Hist 077 Qualify This will be dual application.

Maranto: Good course, uniqueness of Africa and because of slave trade's impact on race relations in U.S. Little assessment in template. Course has materials, though it needs more detail.

ARSC 100 Qualify (Various courses are offered under the ARSC 100 number. This course – “Arts in a Democratic Society” is what is being approved. This course will need its own #.)

Maranto: Great Course!

Eng 1XX Remand is recommended

Maranto: Course was funded, but not ready. Not enough information/detail.

Tim Machan pointed out CORE in Lit will be met by prerequisites for this course so may not need approve or remand.

Core Courses: Need own #'s.

Deahl: Assessment Committee question on Hist 077.

Hathaway: We need to educate faculty on assessment.

Discussion by a number of members:

Eng 1XX brings up issue of upper division course being part of CORE if there is a prerequisite. This course maybe redundant.

This prerequisite issue will have to be discussed later.

Group II: Defer discussion to end of subcommittee reports.

Group III: Physics 013/014—Report given by Ropella, who distributed materials.

Recommend to defer pending receipt of requested materials.

Group IV: ARCS 140 and CRLS 198—Defer these courses
ARCS 140

Grahn: Course is under review in Arts and Sciences right now. Course might be different after review. Let Arts and Sciences go forward.

Lueger: Course is interdisciplinary. The proposal is to change format to one instructor.

CRLS 198

Grahn: New course from incentive grant. Issue of procedure; the course still needs department consideration.

Grahn: There are qualitative and procedural issues. Is the course sufficiently broad for the core? The course title, “Community Corrections: Offender Rehabilitation, Reentry, and Reintegration” suggests narrowness.

Discussion about courses developed out of CC incentive fund

Grahn: It is O.K. if it takes a while for a course to be developed to the point where we can determine if it will be approved for inclusion. It is still a good investment. May need to be approved first as a departmental course and then by college.

Hathaway: We may also need to consider in giving grants out in the future, the ramifications of course prerequisites.

Snow asked for a motion and a second on subcommittee recommendations: HIST 077: Qualify; ARSC 100: Qualify; ENGL 1XX: Remand; PHYS 013-014: Defer; ARSC 140: Defer; CRLS 198: Defer.

Hathaway moves to approve subcommittee recommendations at next meeting. Ksobiech seconds motion.

C.) Discussion on COMM 011:

Ksobiech: We have re-vamped COMM 011 to enhance writing requirements, and want to bring it forward again.

Byleen.: It's better now that ENGL 001 is now a prerequisite for COMM 011.

Tim Machan: Requested a copy of a report on COMM 011 that was given to Ksobiech (or department chair). Machan asked for a copy of the report and was not given a copy. Finds this peculiar and wants to know why.

Snow: Requested input from committee, evaluation tools, etc. Practice followed historically has been to turn documents over to department chair.

Machan: Have there been other instances when a Core committee member asked to see a document written on behalf of the Committee and was refused? [No examples were offered.] If there is no precedent, what reason did you have for denying me the opportunity to see the report on COMM 011? [Dr. Snow did not respond.]

Machan: What procedural steps were taken to coordinate ENGL 001?

Ksobiech: Discussed relationship—not coordination of 001. COMM 011 is seen as a Public Sphere Literacy course, a la ENGL 002.

Ksobiech studied ENGL 002 syllabi gathered from students to consider context. Did not discuss with English department leadership in relationship to the courses.

Ksobiech was building the syllabus for COMM 011 from his understanding of syllabi for ENGL 001 and 002.

Machan: ENGL 001 and 002 courses emphasize strategies for writing papers—COMM 011 appears to emphasize modal writing, e.g. persuasion, process not strategy-based. Strategy-based is more fluid than a modal approach.

Ksobiech: The 2003 text that we are using continues to use modern approach—we do choose mechanisms to encourage students to make written arguments and convert to oral arguments and vice versa. This is a different approach than ENGL 001 and 002.

Ropella: Does the template indicate that either a strategic or modal approach better fits the template?

Machan: Question the prudence of taking a vote on this issue when we are missing a number of people. We are making all-University decisions; hard to do when numbers and meetings dwindle. I've made this point about absences before.

Grahn: Ten voting members are present; we have a two-meeting rule.

Lueger: Question regarding connection of ENGL 001- what is the learning from ENGL 001 that is essential to success in COMM 011.

Ksobiech: Academic literacy principles; access to research information.

Lueger: The presentation of COMM 011 quotes the *ratio studiorum*—but the presenters seem also to have taken umbrage at issue of “rigor”—which seems to be built into *ratio* course succession.

Ksobiech: COMM 011 will be as rigorous as other courses that we have approved.

Lueger: Some articulation of succession should be made to show that connections exist.

Lueger: What about logistics: Lecture for 120 students once a week plus two labs meeting per week with five writing projects—will each TA have to look at 400 writing projects? Will there be drafts/revisions?

Ksobiech- No.

Lueger thinks that under the proposed staffing, TA’s will be able to provide feedback only a limited number of times.

Ropella: This question seems much more specific—more than has been applied to other courses. In physics, for example, TA’s grade multiple lab reports. This standard has not been applied in other situations.

Hathaway: Teaching writing is the purpose of these courses; it’s not the purpose of physics courses.

Machan: Yes, this is a pedagogical issue. Writing is the essence of the class. ENGL 001 and 002 include workshops in class, conference with instructors to build total portfolio.

Five pieces of writing will be completed in 12 50-minute classes.

Ksobiech: Yes.

Grahn: ENGL TA’s have 40 students generally products = 480?

Machan: I don’t know. We could bring in Kris Ratcliffe.

Lueger: The upper limit of the class may not allow for rigor in terms of paper review.

Laatsch: In terms of oral presentations what assessment mechanisms are used?

Ksobiech: Oral presentations are graded as they are presented.

Machan: 240 students total over the first year limited to 120 in first semester - will it go up?

Ksobiech: Yes. Number is based on freshman enrollment.

Ksobiech: Numbers will be limited by resources and decisions that other colleges make that may impact on COMM courses.

Machan: What if course is filled and no spaces are left?

Ksobiech: Sections will have to be shifted - as it already is handled in other areas.

Machan: What would mechanisms be for subscribing as enrollments change—if cap is set at 120 impact will also be felt in ENGL 001 and 002 as COMM 011 would be moved in, since it would not be limited to communications students.

Course needs to be flexible enough to accommodate shifts in enrollment.

Ksobiech: It's possible that the College of Communication intends to drop CMST 012.

Laatsch, Ropella, and Lough stated that students in their Colleges would likely be interested in taking COMM 011.

Ksobiech: Is this the core committee's responsibility to handle "enrollment management" issues—the question is what is to be done about this class.

Machan: The committee needs to be concerned about the quality of the education of Marquette University.

Ropella: This decision about impact of one course on balancing enrollments should be in the Provost's Office.

Lueger: Faculty governance is the key—we need to take ownership and leadership. Our committee should consider issues of resources and delivery.

Ropella: There needs to be another committee that decides “enrollment” issues—monitoring of courses, enrollments—we should be about the business of approving courses. The level of detail being applied to this course is in areas that we have not given to other courses.

Snow: are we ready for a motion and a second?

Ksobiech: We can continue to discuss this at the October 7 meeting as long as we get a motion for a vote at the October 22 meeting.

Snow: We’ll continue discussion of COMM 011 on October 7, and get a motion and a second. We can vote on October 22. That will give Communications time to submit required Bulletin paperwork to the Provost’s Office by the October 24 deadline.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Ellen Eckman
Assistant Professor of Education

Dr. Stephanie Quade
Associate Dean of Student Development