REPORT OF THE CORE CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE

I. Introduction: A Student-Centered Core

A. The Connection with Mission

A Marquette education strives to shape life-long learners who will embrace the values of knowledge, truth, excellence, faith and leadership, through service that defines the mission [http://www.marquette.edu/about/mission.html](http://www.marquette.edu/about/mission.html) of Marquette University:

Marquette University is a Catholic, Jesuit university dedicated to serving God by serving our students and contributing to the advancement of knowledge. Our mission, therefore, is the search for truth, the discovery and sharing of knowledge, the fostering of personal and professional excellence, the promotion of a life of faith, and the development of leadership expressed in service to others.

(Marquette Mission Statement; see Appendix A)

The Marquette University Core of Common Studies takes its inspiration from this mission as it seeks to advance the rich tradition of Jesuit education. To attain these goals in the twenty-first century, Jesuit education must respond to and prepare its students for the contemporary needs of a humanity that functions in an interdependent, globalized culture. Consistent with the documents of General Congregation 34 and prior documents, a Jesuit education requires that the pursuit of these goals give focused attention to the service of faith and the promotion of justice, in dialogue with other cultures and religions.

To fulfill these ends, the core curriculum of a Jesuit university must be cohesive, discipline-inclusive, appropriately structured, and properly responsive to the contemporary human situation.

B. Structure and Function

Drawing on the wisdom of the past, a core curriculum must prepare students to live in the present and the future. At the heart of Marquette’s Core of Common Studies is
the multi-dimensional formation of the intellectual life of the person. To ensure that each
Marquette student has the appropriate intellectual foundation to further life-long learning,
the Core Curriculum Review Committee recommends a University Core of Common
Studies consisting of thirty-six (36) total credit hours distributed across nine knowledge
areas. All nine knowledge areas are marked by goals and learning objectives, including
knowledge objectives, skills objectives, and values/dispositions objectives (see Appendix
objectives were framed by interdisciplinary faculty focus groups.

The Committee also recognizes a conceptual structure to the Core of Common
Studies. It thus recommends, insofar as possible, that instruction in the knowledge areas
be sequenced in a three-tiered fashion as follows:

1. Examining the World:
   A. Rhetoric  6 credit hours
   B. Mathematical Reasoning  3 credit hours

2. Engaging the World:
   A. Individual and Social Behavior  3 credit hours
   B. Diverse Cultures  3 credit hours
   C. Literature/Performing Arts  3 credit hours
   D. Histories of Cultures and Societies  3 credit hours
   E. Science and Nature  3 credit hours

3. Evaluating the World:
   A. Human Nature and Ethics  6 credit hours
   B. Theology  6 credit hours

The knowledge areas of Rhetoric and Mathematical Reasoning comprise the first
tier of the Common Core. Courses in these areas are designed to ensure that students
gain fundamental skills in thinking, writing, and speaking. The knowledge areas of
Individual and Social Behavior, Diverse Cultures, Literature/Performing Arts, Histories of Cultures and Societies, and Science and Nature form the second tier of the core. Building upon the fundamental skills of reasoning and expression developed in the first tier of the core, courses in these additional areas challenge the student to explore the complexities of persons, nature, and societies. Finally, the third tier of the core consists of the knowledge areas of Human Nature and Ethics and Theology. Instruction in these areas should challenge the student to move beyond descriptive knowledge to normative valuation and spiritual reflection. The first tier empowers students to examine the world; the second inspires them to engage it; the third challenges them to evaluate and change it. These groupings not only serve pedagogical goals, they also lend themselves to interdisciplinary course development.

Consistent with directives from the Office of Academic Affairs, the Committee expects that each College or School in the University will structure its own core and professional curriculum to build upon the student’s common core experience at Marquette. An integrated intellectual experience is the goal of Jesuit education here at Marquette University. Capstone seminars and service learning are recommended as components of each student’s total core experience. In this regard, the Marquette University Core of Common Studies is the beginning, not the end, of this endeavor. The Core of Common Studies will be implemented in the fall semester of 2003.

II. The Core Curricular Process: An Evolving Core

A. History of the Current Core Curricular Revision: An Overview

The present core curricular review began with the formation of the Core Curriculum Steering Committee in October 1998. Constituted by Dr. David R. Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Steering Committee was charged “to meet two challenges facing the University: (1) ensuring the vitality of a core curriculum for all undergraduate students, regardless of college or major; and (2)
developing a plan for assessing the effectiveness of that core, as outlined in the Self-Study Report filed by Marquette University in conjunction with its 1993 North Central Association (NCA) re-accreditation.” (Final Report of the Core Curriculum Steering Committee, January 18, 2000, p. 1) http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core/finalreport.html

The Steering Committee was chaired by Dr. John Pustejovsky, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. Comprised of faculty and administrators from across the University, it was initially charged to “carry out a substantive review of the current core and offer recommendations concerning its possible revision. The purpose of the review was to ensure the vitality of the core for all of our undergraduate students regardless of college or major.” (10/28/98 letter from Dr. David Buckholdt to members of the Core Curriculum Steering Committee, quoted in Final Report, p. 1). Dr. Buckholdt noted as well that the focus of a revised University core must be “continuously mindful of our heritage as a Jesuit, Catholic institution and our goals for the future as identified in our recently approved [May 1998] mission statement.” He remarked that “[o]utcomes and objectives must do justice to and elaborate on our statement of mission.” (Quoted in Final Report, p. 2)

The Steering Committee published a Final Report, dated January 18, 2000. The report was seventeen pages long and was supplemented by eight appendices comprising another fifty pages. Copies of the report were circulated to each undergraduate dean and department chair, and a copy of the report and all of its appendices were placed on the Academic Affairs web page. The Steering Committee contemplated that delivery of the Marquette University Core of Common Studies would be accomplished through in-class learning as well as through structured experiences such as internships and service learning. It also intended that courses would be sequenced and organized to contribute to the goals for student learning. (Final Report, p. 5). Perhaps most importantly, it sought to structure the design for the core around measurable outcomes to insure the integrity and vitality of any core (Final Report, p. 5).
In accord with the focus identified by Dr. Buckholdt in his charge, the Steering Committee examined the idea of a core in its larger context, and identified three essential factors definitive of the core experience: (1) a defined body of required courses; (2) a pedagogy uniquely appropriate to core; and (3) a campus culture supportive of the core’s larger goals and student learning within it. The Committee consistently asserted that the core should be seen within this larger institutional horizon, resting on three specific principles: (1) public learning objectives; (2) periodic, collegial review of core courses; and (3) the use of assessment data as the basis of decisions regarding the core. The Committee recommended that the Core of Common Studies move to a new paradigm, shifting from a required set of courses to a requirement that all students meet a set of learning objectives relevant to the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions that emanate from the Marquette University Mission Statement. To implement that recommendation, the Steering Committee identified knowledge areas, rather than traditional disciplines, by which the new University Core of Common Studies should be structured (see Final Report, pp. 11-12). As originally devised, seven knowledge areas were articulated. These included: Aesthetic, Semiotic and Symbolic (relevant areas of symbolic expression); Contemporary Human Behavior and Society; Diverse Cultures; Ethics and Values; Past Cultures and Societies; Theology; and Science and Nature (see Final Report, pp. 11-12). However, the Committee also recommended three foundational courses: one in Mathematical Reasoning and two in Rhetoric (see Final Report, p. 14). It was suggested that “[f]aculty who teach these foundational courses would be charged with assuring that students not only have the capacity to find information but also the ability to evaluate, synthesize and apply information in a variety of contexts.” (see Final Report, p. 14).

Each of the other knowledge areas beyond Mathematical Reasoning and Rhetoric was characterized by a set of learning objectives comprised of knowledge objectives, skills objectives, values objectives, and dispositions objectives (see Final Report, pp. 11-
Finally, the Steering Committee suggested that specific numbers of courses be required in each knowledge area (see Final Report, p. 17), and recommended the formation of an all-University Core Curriculum Review Committee to begin implementation of the new University Core of Common Studies (see Final Report, p. 15).

B. The Role of the Faculty Focus Groups

Though learning objectives in the knowledge areas had been fashioned initially by the Core Curriculum Steering Committee, the Office of Academic Affairs determined to enlist the expertise of all faculty with experience or interest across the various knowledge areas to ensure a larger process with academic credibility and vitality. Consequently, in the spring of 2000, faculty focus groups from across the University were formed to discuss the knowledge areas. All University faculty were invited to join one or more focus groups, led by faculty facilitators, which might review, rename, or reframe the knowledge areas themselves or their goals and learning objectives as they saw fit. At this time, three knowledge areas were renamed. The area originally labeled “Contemporary Human Behavior and Society” was renamed “Individual and Social Behavior;” the area originally labeled “Aesthetic, Semiotic, and Symbolic” was renamed “Literature/Performing Arts;” and the area originally labeled “Ethics and Values” was renamed “Human Nature and Ethics.” An additional group of faculty devoted itself to articulating the principles of Jesuit education that animate the core curricular process and link the mission of the University with the various knowledge areas. This group produced a revised “Preamble to the Core of Common Studies.”

Over one hundred and forty faculty members (nearly one-third of Marquette’s teaching faculty) participated in the focus group process. Many of the focus groups met over the course of the summer. Final drafts were submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs on September 22, 2000.
The nine knowledge areas, goals, and objectives that resulted from the focus group discussions comprise one segment of the University Core of Common Studies. The requirement of thirty-six credit hours distributed across the nine knowledge areas in increments of three or six credit hours per knowledge area is another segment. The courses that satisfy the learning objectives in the knowledge areas comprise an evolving segment of the Core of Common Studies; these courses are evaluated and approved on an on-going basis. To the extent possible, it is expected that each individual School or College within the University will build upon this University Core of Common Studies when implementing its own core.

As the faculty focus groups concluded their work, the Office of Academic Affairs created institutional structures to establish the broader academic environment for the core envisioned by the Steering Committee. Thus, Professor Christine M. Wiseman, Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs, formed two Committees to continue the core curriculum initiative: the University Core Curriculum Review Committee http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-review-committee-roster-1.pdf and the University Core Assessment Committee http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-assessment-committee-roster.pdf (see Appendix C for current Committee rosters). The core curricular review process is currently monitored by these two committees. The Core Curriculum Review Committee was charged with establishing guidelines for the qualification of core courses and qualifying such courses. It would also address additional issues that might arise, such as sequencing and transfer policies. The Core Curriculum Assessment Committee would gather and examine assessment data from the various programs, majors or colleges across the University and work with the University Core Curriculum Review Committee to institute outcomes assessment for courses identified as core courses.

C. The University Core Curriculum Review Committee
1. Composition and Responsibilities

As fashioned, the University Core Curriculum Review Committee is comprised of eight voting representatives from the College of Arts and Sciences: one representative from the English Department; one representative from the History Department; one representative from the Mathematics Department; one representative from the Philosophy Department; one representative from the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics); one representative from the Social Sciences (Political Science, Psychology, Social and Cultural Sciences); one representative from the Theology Department; and one representative from any Department (including Foreign Languages) with expertise teaching courses in Cultural Diversity. There are seven voting representatives from each of the other undergraduate Schools or Colleges: Business Administration; Communication; Education; Engineering; Health Sciences; Nursing; and Professional Studies. There is one non-voting ex-officio representative from the Memorial Library Faculty in the area of Technology; one non-voting ex-officio representative from Academic Affairs; one non-voting ex-officio representative from the Division of Student Affairs; and one non-voting ex-officio representative from the Office of Mission and Identity. All members are initially appointed to a three-year term. Charter members are tenured professors, some of whom have substantial experience teaching core courses. Once appointed, the Committee elects its own Chair (or functions by Executive Committee) and determines a rotation procedure that will maintain departmental representation. The Committee currently functions with a three-member Executive Committee: Dr. Nancy Snow (Philosophy) serves as chair; Dr. Kenneth Ksobiech (College of Communication) serves as internal communications liaison; and Dr. Stephen Heinrich (College of Engineering) serves as liaison to the Assessment Committee. In addition, the Committee has formed certain rules of operation.

The Committee was charged with the responsibility to specify a total number of credit hours for the core, to establish guidelines for qualifying core courses, and to
identify core courses. In the spring of 2001, the Committee issued its first call for core
courses and performed an initial review of twenty-nine of a total of fifty-one submissions
from thirteen academic units across the University. Later that spring, the Committee
voted (twelve in favor and three opposed) to approve a thirty-six credit hour core
distributed across nine knowledge areas as follows: Rhetoric (six credit hours);
Mathematical Reasoning (three credit hours); Individual and Social Behavior (three credit
hours); Diverse Cultures (three credit hours); Literature/Performing Arts (three credit
hours); Histories of Cultures and Societies (three credit hours); Science and Nature (three
credit hours); Human Nature and Ethics (six credit hours); and Theology (six credit
hours).

The Committee then devised a process for qualifying core courses. To ensure a
sufficient number and variety of core courses in all knowledge areas, calls for courses
would be made on a regular basis each semester. Thus far,
http://www.marquette.edu/acad/courses-approved-for-the-core-january3020021.doc
fifty-one courses distributed across all nine knowledge areas have been approved for
inclusion in the core. These resulted from a total of one hundred and one submissions
proposed by faculty from four Colleges, fifteen departments, and three ROTC units (see
Appendix D). Courses continue to be evaluated on an ongoing basis.

To submit a course for the core, departments or academic units must submit a
template (see Appendix E) http://www.marquette.edu/acad/approved-template-sept-
14.doc, along with syllabi and other course documentation, demonstrating how the
course satisfies the goals and learning objectives of the particular knowledge area for
which the proponent seeks qualification. The Committee has also fashioned a set of
guidelines to be followed by those submitting course proposals (see Appendix F
These guidelines alert course proponents to the criteria used by the Committee in
evaluating proposals. Guidelines and templates containing goals and learning objectives
for each knowledge area are posted on the Academic Affairs web page. Templates, syllabi, and other documentation are submitted to the Chair of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, who forwards copies to each Committee member. At its meeting of June 14, 2001 [http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-approved-June-14-2001-minutes.pdf](http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-approved-June-14-2001-minutes.pdf), the Committee approved a protocol for evaluating core course submissions (see Appendix G). As part of this protocol, the Committee is divided into four subcommittees, each dealing with two different knowledge areas. During an initial process lasting approximately four weeks, subcommittees evaluate each submission and contact academic units for additional information when necessary. Following this initial evaluation, the subcommittees recommend a disposition to the entire Committee.

When determining whether a course is qualified, the Committee has implemented a two-meeting procedural rule. Any discussion or subcommittee recommendation on a course proposal, together with a motion on that recommendation, is made at a first meeting. Further discussion and a vote on recommendations occur at a second meeting. The Committee’s consideration of subcommittee recommendations usually takes approximately two weeks. The entire process, from beginning to end, covers a period of approximately six weeks and ensures thoroughness in evaluating each submission. As part of the evaluation process, subcommittee members complete a written Evaluation Tool. A copy of this document is sent to department chairs or unit heads to provide academic units with documentation of the Committee’s determinations as well as feedback on the content and quality of each submission. A copy of the original template and the corresponding evaluation tool is archived in the Office of Academic Affairs as well. Submissions that are remanded to departments may be revised and resubmitted no sooner than the semester following the initial submission. The Committee has determined that no course will be qualified in perpetuity. Depending upon results of the assessment process, the Committee may review and withdraw a course from the Core of Common Studies.
Since the core curricular process is new to Marquette University, the Core Curriculum Review Committee has sought to disseminate its processes and deliberations as widely as possible. This is accomplished in a number of ways. First, as noted, templates containing goals and learning objectives are posted on the Academic Affairs web page, as are guidelines and other Core Curriculum documents. Secondly, the Core Curriculum Review Committee has posted minutes of all of its meetings on the Academic Affairs web page (as has the Assessment Committee) and has e-mailed them to Deans, Unit Coordinators, Department Chairs, and Chairs of College or School Curriculum Committees as well. Finally, the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs sponsored a day-long, University-wide conference entitled, “Faculty Conversations: Next Steps in the Core Curricular Process,” held on September 28, 2001. Conference goals were to foster reflection on the core curricular process and the faculty role within that process; to help faculty understand and apply approaches to assessment; and to further communicate the process of qualifying a core course. The conference was introduced by Reverend Robert A. Wild, S.J., President of Marquette University. The conference also featured a guest speaker on assessment, Dr. Virginia Anderson of Towson State (n/k/a Towson) University. Complimentary copies of her co-authored book on assessment, *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment*, were distributed to participants. More than one hundred participants, including faculty and administrators, attended the event.

2. Programmatic Issues

The Marquette University Core of Common Studies is intended to provide a foundational educational experience for all Marquette undergraduates. Thus, the Committee has addressed two programmatic considerations as well in the process of constructing the core: (1) how to ensure that transfer students benefit from the Marquette Core of Common Studies, and (2) how to ensure that ROTC students benefit as well. A
special Subcommittee on Transfers and ROTC students was formed during the fall of 2001 to address these considerations.

In terms of transfer credits, equivalencies between some Marquette courses and courses at other institutions have already been established. Records are kept in the Registrar’s Office. The authority to decide course equivalencies already rests with the Associate Deans of many Colleges or Schools. Thus, the Committee proposes to create a standing Subcommittee on Transfer Students that will function in a consultative or advisory capacity to Associate Deans who will assume the responsibility for determining core course equivalencies within their respective schools or colleges. The Subcommittee’s duties will include: (1) supplying Associate Deans with copies of the learning objectives for each of the nine knowledge areas; (2) providing Associate Deans with a checklist to complete when determining core course equivalencies (copies of the checklists will be archived with other core curriculum documents in O’Hara Hall); (3) consulting with Associate Deans on any questions that may arise in the process; (4) furnishing Associate Deans with a set of guidelines that limit the number of courses that can be transferred as core course equivalencies; and (5) supplying Associate Deans with a list of core courses for which no transfer credits are possible. Items (1) - (3) are justified by the need to assure that Associate Deans make informed and consistent decisions about core course equivalencies, where possible, and that appropriate and useful records of these decisions are maintained. Items (4) and (5) are justified by the need to ensure that all students benefit from Marquette’s distinctive core curricular experience.

The Core Curriculum Review Committee recommends that the issue of Advanced Placement (AP) credits be handled similarly to that of transfer students. The standing Subcommittee on Transfer Students should have responsibility to oversee this issue. Items (1)-(5), as listed in the preceding paragraph, should be followed.

Different considerations are presented by the experience of ROTC students. Air Force, Army, and Navy ROTC students must satisfy standard national curricula and
complete their major requirements, leaving little time to satisfy additional core course
requirements. The Subcommittee on Transfer and ROTC students has worked with
ROTC personnel to identify areas of overlap between knowledge areas and existing
ROTC requirements. Other departments or units have come forward to offer assistance
in creating new core courses that meet the needs of ROTC students and satisfy the
learning objectives in a given knowledge area, such as the Histories of Cultures and
Societies.

The policy of the Core Curriculum Review Committee is to work collaboratively
with others in the University to seek creative ways to ensure that all Marquette students
benefit from the University’s Core of Common Studies. The Committee continues to
meet on a bimonthly basis to approve courses for the core and to establish policy
guidelines for the ongoing evolution of the University Core of Common Studies.

D. The Core Curriculum Assessment Committee: Composition and
Responsibilities

Assessment is key to the success of the Core of Common Studies. The learning
objectives in each of the nine knowledge areas must be capable of measurement and must
actually be measured to gauge the effectiveness of the new core. Before the Core of
Common Studies is implemented in the fall of 2003, the chair or coordinator of each
academic unit must provide evidence of commitment to a learning objective-specific
assessment plan for each core course taught by that unit. The University Core
Curriculum Assessment Committee, chaired by Professor Christine M. Wiseman,
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, has been charged with monitoring
assessment. Members of this Committee are appointed to three-year terms because of
their expertise or interest in assessment. Members of this Committee currently include
faculty and administrators from the Departments of English, Foreign Languages and
Literature/Performing Arts, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Social and Cultural
Sciences, and Theology within the College of Arts and Sciences, Clinical Laboratory Science within the College of Health Sciences, and Industrial Engineering and Electrical Engineering within the College of Engineering. There is representation as well from the School of Education, the College of Professional Studies, the Memorial Library Reference Department, the Office of Student Development, and the Office of Institutional Research. The Committee is charged with gathering and examining assessment data currently available from the various programs, majors, or colleges across the University, and working with the University Core Curriculum Review Committee to institute outcomes assessment for core courses.

In accord with this charge, the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee has collected models of assessment plans from Philosophy, Spanish, and Sociology and posted them on the Academic Affairs web page. It also has reviewed and discussed assessment plans currently in place for English 001 and 002, and for History 001. Committee members also collaborated in bringing to campus Dr. Virginia Anderson, an assessment expert, who spoke at the core curriculum conference. Copies of Dr. Anderson’s book were distributed to conference participants. Videotapes of her presentation are on reserve at the Marquette Memorial Library.

On January 9, 2002, the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Core Curriculum Assessment Committees met jointly to discuss next steps in the Core Curriculum and Assessment processes. At that meeting, it was determined that the next critical step in the process would be to proactively assist academic units whose courses had been approved for inclusion in the Core of Common Studies so that they might develop and implement assessment plans for those courses. In particular, these assessment plans must address the learning objectives of the knowledge area for which the course is qualified. Assessment plans for core courses must be devised by the fall of 2003 when the new core is implemented. However, it is advisable for units sponsoring
core courses to develop assessment plans before the fall of 2002 so that their core courses can be listed as such in the Undergraduate Bulletin.

**IV. Budget and Recommendations**

To date, financial and secretarial support for the core curricular process has been provided by the Office of Academic Affairs. In addition, Dr. Nancy Snow, Chair of the Core Curriculum Review Committee, has investigated extramural funding to stimulate core curricular development, particularly of an interdisciplinary nature. A funding request for core curriculum development was included in a grant proposal to the Lilly Endowment in support of the Manresa Project at Marquette University. An award of $2 million was made to Marquette University. Of this total, the sum of $200,000, to be disbursed in $40,000 increments over a five-year period, has been allocated to course development and enhancement. Some of these monies will be used for core curriculum development. Other extramural funding for core curricular development might be sought through NEH Focus Grants for curriculum development in the Humanities.

Grant funding alone will not ensure the resources necessary to launch and sustain the vital, transformative Core of Common Studies that Marquette University has committed to develop. Nor will the current level of financial and secretarial support from the Office of Academic Affairs prove sufficient. Consequently, the Core Curriculum Review Committee makes the following recommendations concerning structure, processes, and budget:

**Recommendation 1**: The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should be installed as a standing University committee and should be inserted into the University by-laws as such. Membership on this Committee should continue to be suitably representative of the various academic and non-academic units, as outlined in section II.
C.1, paragraph 1. Continuity should be maintained by staggering the membership to achieve a mix of veteran and new members. At the expiration of a member’s three-year term, it shall be the responsibility of the department(s)/college (as designated in section II.C.1, paragraph 1) to find a suitable replacement. In the event that a member cannot complete his/her term (e.g., sabbatical, medical leave, retirement), the unit shall identify a replacement to complete that term.

Recommendation 2: The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should retain the right to make decisions regarding its internal structure and processes.

Recommendation 3: The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should retain jurisdiction over all matters concerning the Core of Common Studies, including the power to amend the core with due notice to all constituencies. The power to amend the core includes the power to create a process for the periodic review and possible removal of courses from the core, as well as a process for the periodic review of other parts of the core, including knowledge areas and learning objectives. The President has final approval over the Core of Common Studies and its amendments.

Recommendation 4: A position for Director of the University Core of Common Studies should be created as follows:

- The Director should be selected from among the faculty and bring significant experience with core curriculum.
• The Director should be situated within the Office of the Provost and should sit ex officio as a non-voting member of the University Core Curriculum Review Committee and a non-voting member of the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee.

• In conjunction with the University Core Curriculum Committee and the University Assessment Committee, the Director of Core should lead all core curricular efforts, including assessment of the core itself and of particular courses within the core, as noted in Recommendations 5 through 8 below.

• To ensure the integrity of the core development process, the Director of Core must be included in any discussions between the Provost and the various Deans regarding the development of new or interdisciplinary core courses.

• The Director position should carry a budget for development of core curriculum and assessment, together with adequate administrative support.

**Recommendation 5**: The Director of the Core of Common Studies should be responsible to encourage academic units to implement core courses in the tiered fashion outlined in section I, B, insofar as that is possible. In addition, capstone seminars and service learning are recommended as components of each student’s total core experience.

**Recommendation 6**: Monies should be allocated to assist academic units in developing and implementing learning objective-specific assessment plans for core courses.
Recommendation 7: Monies should be allocated to facilitate continuous monitoring and assessment of the core as a whole, as well as continuous monitoring of core impact on various University programs.

Recommendation 8: The Director of the Core of Common Studies should sponsor regular University-wide fora concerning the core. These should include regular meetings (e.g., conferences, workshops, etc.) of instructors in each of the knowledge areas.

Recommendation 9: The Director of the Core of Common Studies should publicize the core to academic support units, other relevant academic bodies, and non-academic units of the University, such as academic advisors, college curriculum committees, the Office of Admissions, the Office of the Registrar, the Office of Student Development, the Office of Mission and Identity, and University Advancement.

Recommendation 10: The sum of $50,000 should be allocated as a start-up fund for assessment in core courses in order to assist departments and faculty in devising assessment plans for core courses. The University should provide a parallel sum to fund the development of cross-disciplinary initiatives for the core. These funds should be administered by the Core Director.
V. Conclusion: Challenges

Progress on core curricular reform has come at a substantial price, paid by faculty, administrators and staff who have generously contributed their time, energy, expertise, and good will to realizing this transformative effort. Marquette is poised to enter a new phase in that effort. As noted earlier, each College or School within the University will be expected to build its own core upon the students’ common core experience at Marquette. In this new phase, the issues of transfer credits and Advanced Placement credits must be addressed and monitored as well on a continuing basis by the Core Curriculum Review Committee. Assessment of learning objectives in particular courses, and assessment of the Core of Common Studies as a whole, will also require special attention. In addition, care must be taken to ensure that the Core of Common Studies provides an integrated educational experience for students. An integrated experience will require ongoing cross-disciplinary faculty discussions about how the knowledge areas interrelate and about how the various individual courses integrate with each other, both within and across the knowledge areas. Colleges and schools are urged to maintain the tiered approach to the core and to institute capstone seminars and service learning to foster the integrated experience. It is expected that these initiatives will be augmented by other creative approaches in the future. In this fashion, Marquette University will commit to creating a campus culture that supports the new Core of Common Studies. This report marks the beginning of that endeavor.