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