

CCRC Meeting
April 19, 2006, 8.30-10AM Raynor 301R
Approved Minutes

Present: Coan, Eckman, Franzoi, Hay, Laurance, Maranto, Moyer, Ravel, Ropella, Thorn Vandavelde, Krueger (chair)

Excused: Boly, Howes, Laatsch, Ramey

1. Meeting called to order 8.30 AM, Krueger offered reflection
2. Unanimous approval of Minutes of March 24, 2006

Old Business

3. Assessment—faculty feedback
 - Krueger announced that thus far faculty response to the draft UCCS Assessment plan is generally positive. Feedback is still being accepted.
4. Core course proposals: review committee preliminary reports
 - 4.1 **Motion:** “That SPAN 102 be approved for the Diverse Cultures Core requirement” (Maranto moved, Ravel seconded)
Discussion: The committee expressed satisfaction with the syllabus revisions
Vote : Yes (unanimous)
 - 4.2 Diverse Cultures review sub-committee reported on CEEN 190 Diverse Cultures proposal
Report and Discussion:
 - The template and syllabus may imply an exclusionary Christian perspective. Islam especially appropriate to audience in Milwaukee. Demanding discussion of Islam in this course unreasonable because faculty expertise is unavailable.
Motion: “To change proposal wording regarding Judeo-Christian moral imperative on housing to ‘an awareness of the need for just housing can be supported by the Judeo-Christian tradition.’” (Franzoi moved, Laurance seconded)
Discussion: Other insensitive language that appears to reinforce stereotypes should also be revised. Rewording would make for a great course.
Motion: Move to table CEEN 190 (Maranto moved, Eckman seconded)
Vote: yes (unanimous)
CEEN 190 proposal tabled until next CCRC meeting. Diverse Cultures review sub-committee and CCRC chair agreed to meet with CEEN 190 faculty to discuss revisions.

New Business

5. Procedures sub-committee report

- 5.1 **Motion:** "That the CCRC adopt the 'Application for UCCS Course Approval'" (Ravel moved, Thorn seconded) Appendix A
Discussion: Wording revised.
Vote: Yes (unanimous)
- 5.2 **Motion:** "That the CCRC adopt the 'Protocol for Reviewing Core Course Submissions'" (Hay moved, Eckman seconded) Appendix B
Discussion: Rationales for delaying vote on courses submitted for the UCCS until the meeting after the review sub-committee reports include CCRC members obligation to solicit feedback from their constitutions and for the review subcommittee to report CCRC response back to faculty proposing course.
Vote: Yes (unanimous)
- 5.3 **Motion:** "That the CCRC adopt the 'Form for Subcommittee Evaluation of Core Course Template Submissions'" (Thorn moved, Ravel seconded) Appendix C
Discussion: This form is solely for the use of review sub-committees and can be amended as needed in the future.
Vote: Yes (unanimous)
6. Meeting adjourned 9.59

Appendix A

Application for UCCS Course Approval

Review Process

Depending on the knowledge area, from 3-6 credits (1-2 courses) must serve to meet the learning outcomes of each knowledge area. Therefore, the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) must see evidence that the proposed course specifically addresses the knowledge area learning outcomes and is comparable in depth and breadth to other courses that fulfill requirements in the particular knowledge area. Knowledge area learning outcomes are available at:

<http://www.marquette.edu/coreinfo/>

Because the CCRC assumes that all courses offered at Marquette are of high quality, it evaluates only the suitability of a submitted course for the University Core of Common Studies (UCCS). With the integrity of the Core program in mind, the CCRC must also consider the relationship of a proposed course to those already approved for the knowledge area. Applicants are reminded that the CCRC is a multidisciplinary committee, and proposals should be written in language accessible to non-experts. Templates and syllabi must be written in English. The CCRC will provide feedback on unsuccessful applications, and revised applications may be submitted for subsequent deadlines. Questions about the application process should be addressed to Dr. Christine L. Krueger, Director of the University Core of Common Studies.

Submission Instructions

Forms: A core course application consists of 3 hard copies and one electronic copy of the following: 1) a completed template for the relevant knowledge area signed by the faculty member proposing the course and by the appropriate department chair and dean; 2) a representative course syllabus. Templates are available at:

<http://www.marquette.edu/coreinfo/faculty.shtml>

Deadlines: Course Proposals must be submitted by October 15 (decision by December 15) and March 15 (decision by May 15)

Addresses: Proposals should be submitted to Dr. Christine L. Krueger, Director of the University Core of Common Studies, Raynor Library, 320G (mailbox in the office of the Dean of Libraries), email: christine.krueger@marquette.edu

Guidelines for Completing the Template

- Column 2 -- Course Objectives tied to Learning Outcomes: A successful proposal will demonstrate that the objectives of the proposed course substantively align with the learning outcomes in a knowledge area.
- Column 3 -- Demonstration of Achievement tied to Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes: A successful proposal will demonstrate how the content and activities of the proposed course will achieve those outcomes and how faculty will determine whether students in the course are achieving those outcomes.
- Column 4 -- Outcome not Addressed: A course proposed in a 6-credit knowledge area need not fulfill every learning outcome of the knowledge area in order to be approved. An explanation must be provided indicating how this course, in conjunction with any other course in the knowledge area, fulfills all the learning outcomes.
- Courses proposed for two knowledge areas must substantively fulfill the learning outcomes of both knowledge areas. One application form must be completed for each knowledge area.
- Administration of the Course: The Committee will consider student need for the specific course being proposed, the department's commitment to staffing the course, and the frequency with which it can be offered.
- Integration Issues: The Core Curriculum Review Committee will consider what the proposed course contributes to the current offerings in the knowledge area and to the UCCS as a whole.

For an example of an acceptable completed template, go to [XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX](#)

Appendix B

Protocol for Reviewing Core Course Submissions.

The standard upon which core course submissions will be evaluated is as follows: **“Clear evidence upon which the Committee can conclude that the learning objectives are substantively addressed in this course.”**

The CCRC will use a subcommittee structure, defined by the knowledge areas and the division of membership, with at least one member of the subcommittee directly associated with work in the designated knowledge area. Those divisions are as follows:

<u>Group</u>	<u>Knowledge Areas</u>
I	Diverse Cultures Literature
II	Mathematical Reasoning Rhetoric
III	Individual & Social Behavior Histories of Cultures & Societies
IV	Human Nature & Ethics Science & Nature Theology

Review Protocol

1. The subcommittees will meet independently with regard to particular course submissions in each of their respective knowledge areas.
2. When necessary, a designated representative from the subcommittee will consult with the department about course issues that might arise during subcommittee deliberations.
3. Subcommittee members normally will be allowed one month from the date of receipt of submissions to meet and review submissions.
4. The subcommittee will complete a Template Evaluation for each course. Ordinarily, the subcommittee chairperson will type the formal Template Evaluation and distribute it to subcommittee members for their approval and signatures. This form will then be appended to the template and supporting course materials and submitted to the Director of the Core of Common Studies. The subcommittee chairperson will prepare a summary (either written or oral) of the Evaluation to present to the full CCRC.
5. The subcommittee will make one of the following recommendations to the full CCRC that the submitted course:

- a) be approved for inclusion in the core of common studies
 - b) be remanded pending further information about the course
 - c) not be approved for inclusion in the core of common studies
6. The subcommittee's recommendation regarding the submission will be forwarded to the Director of the Core of Common Studies who will then place it on the agenda for the next meeting of the CCRC.
 7. The CCRC will consider the subcommittee recommendations, summoning representatives from the affected departments only when necessary to inform its collective deliberations.
 8. The CCRC will vote on the acceptability of a course for inclusion in the Core at the next regularly scheduled meeting following the meeting when subcommittee recommendations and CCRC discussion have occurred.
 9. If members of a subcommittee cannot reach consensus regarding the acceptance of a submitted course, the submission will then be brought to the full CCRC for discussion. Sufficient notice of this discussion will be given to members of the CCRC so that they have ample time to review the submission and submit comments if they are unable to attend the meeting. A final vote, however, will not be taken until the next regularly scheduled meeting.
 10. The Director of the Core of Common Studies or the Director's designee will communicate the CCRC's determination to the department and instructor who made the submission.
 11. The Director of the Core of Common Studies will maintain a file of each submission, accompanied by the CCRC Template Evaluation.
 12. Unapproved courses may be revised and resubmitted.

Appendix C

Approved by the CCRC, April 19, 2006

Form for Subcommittee Evaluation of Core Course Template Submissions

Course Number and Title:

Core Knowledge Area:

Does this course	Yes	No	Comments
-------------------------	------------	-----------	-----------------

submission:			
1. Include a course syllabus that lists specific learning objectives for the course?			
2. Have course objectives that demonstrate that the course substantively addresses the learning outcomes of the knowledge area?			
3. Address issues of sequencing and integration within the knowledge area? (e.g. If two courses are proposed to jointly satisfy the learning outcomes in a knowledge area, is it clear which course satisfies which learning outcomes?)			
4. Explain how students will demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes?			
5. Indicate how often the course will be taught and in how many sections?			
6. State how many faculty are available to teach this course?			
7. Indicate how the course contributes to other knowledge areas, the Preamble, or justice education?			

Evaluators' Summary:

Evaluators' Signatures:

Date of Evaluation: