

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

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> 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

28 the multi-dimensional formation of the intellectual life of the person. To ensure that each
 29 Marquette student has the appropriate intellectual foundation to further life-long learning,
 30 the Core Curriculum Review Committee recommends a University Core of Common
 31 Studies consisting of thirty-six (36) total credit hours distributed across nine knowledge
 32 areas. All nine knowledge areas are marked by goals and learning objectives, including
 33 knowledge objectives, skills objectives, and values/dispositions objectives (see Appendix
 34 B). <http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core/toc-core-obj-goals.html> The goals and learning
 35 objectives were framed by interdisciplinary faculty focus groups.

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

- 39 1. Examining the World:
- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|----------------|
| 40 | A. Rhetoric | 6 credit hours |
| 41 | B. Mathematical Reasoning | 3 credit hours |
- 42 2. Engaging the World:
- | | | |
|----|--|----------------|
| 43 | A. Individual and Social Behavior | 3 credit hours |
| 44 | B. Diverse Cultures | 3 credit hours |
| 45 | C. Literature/Performing Arts | 3 credit hours |
| 46 | D. Histories of Cultures and Societies | 3 credit hours |
| 47 | E. Science and Nature | 3 credit hours |
- 48 3. Evaluating the World:
- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|----------------|
| 49 | A. Human Nature and Ethics | 6 credit hours |
| 50 | B. Theology | 6 credit hours |

51

52 The knowledge areas of Rhetoric and Mathematical Reasoning comprise the first
 53 tier of the Common Core. Courses in these areas are designed to ensure that students
 54 gain fundamental skills in thinking, writing, and speaking. The knowledge areas of

55 Individual and Social Behavior, Diverse Cultures, Literature/Performing Arts, Histories
56 of Cultures and Societies, and Science and Nature form the second tier of the core.
57 Building upon the fundamental skills of reasoning and expression developed in the first
58 tier of the core, courses in these additional areas challenge the student to explore the
59 complexities of persons, nature, and societies. Finally, the third tier of the core consists
60 of the knowledge areas of Human Nature and Ethics and Theology. Instruction in these
61 areas should challenge the student to move beyond descriptive knowledge to normative
62 valuation and spiritual reflection. The first tier empowers students to examine the world;
63 the second inspires them to engage it; the third challenges them to evaluate and change it.
64 These groupings not only serve pedagogical goals, they also lend themselves to
65 interdisciplinary course development.

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

74

75 **II. The Core Curricular Process: An Evolving Core**

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

77 The present core curricular review began with the formation of the Core
78 Curriculum Steering Committee in October 1998. Constituted by Dr. David R.
79 Buckholdt, Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Steering Committee was charged
80 "to meet two challenges facing the University: (1) ensuring the vitality of a core
81 curriculum for all undergraduate students, regardless of college or major; and (2)

82 developing a plan for assessing the effectiveness of that core, as outlined in the Self-
83 Study Report filed by Marquette University in conjunction with its 1993 North Central
84 Association (NCA) re-accreditation.” (Final Report of the Core Curriculum Steering
85 Committee, January 18, 2000, p. 1) <http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core/finalreport.html>

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

98 The Steering Committee published a Final Report, dated January 18, 2000. The
99 report was seventeen pages long and was supplemented by eight appendices comprising
100 another fifty pages. Copies of the report were circulated to each undergraduate dean and
101 department chair, and a copy of the report and all of its appendices were placed on the
102 Academic Affairs web page. The Steering Committee contemplated that delivery of the
103 Marquette University Core of Common Studies would be accomplished through in-class
104 learning as well as through structured experiences such as internships and service
105 learning. It also intended that courses would be sequenced and organized to contribute to
106 the goals for student learning. (Final Report, p. 5). Perhaps most importantly, it sought to
107 structure the design for the core around measurable outcomes to insure the integrity and
108 vitality of any core (Final Report. p. 5).

109 In accord with the focus identified by Dr. Buckholdt in his charge, the Steering
110 Committee examined the idea of a core in its larger context, and identified three essential
111 factors definitive of the core experience: (1) a defined body of required courses; (2) a
112 pedagogy uniquely appropriate to core; and (3) a campus culture supportive of the core's
113 larger goals and student learning within it. The Committee consistently asserted that the
114 core should be seen within this larger institutional horizon, resting on three specific
115 principles: (1) public learning objectives; (2) periodic, collegial review of core courses;
116 and (3) the use of assessment data as the basis of decisions regarding the core. The
117 Committee recommended that the Core of Common Studies move to a new paradigm,
118 shifting from a required set of courses to a requirement that all students meet a set of
119 learning objectives relevant to the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions that emanate
120 from the Marquette University Mission Statement. To implement that recommendation,
121 the Steering Committee identified knowledge areas, rather than traditional disciplines, by
122 which the new University Core of Common Studies should be structured (see Final
123 Report, pp. 11-12). As originally devised, seven knowledge areas were articulated.
124 These included: Aesthetic, Semiotic and Symbolic (relevant areas of symbolic
125 expression); Contemporary Human Behavior and Society; Diverse Cultures; Ethics and
126 Values; Past Cultures and Societies; Theology; and Science and Nature (see Final Report,
127 pp. 11-12). However, the Committee also recommended three foundational courses: one
128 in Mathematical Reasoning and two in Rhetoric (see Final Report, p. 14). It was
129 suggested that "[f]aculty who teach these foundational courses would be charged with
130 assuring that students not only have the capacity to find information but also the ability to
131 evaluate, synthesize and apply information in a variety of contexts." (see Final Report, p.
132 14).

133 Each of the other knowledge areas beyond Mathematical Reasoning and Rhetoric
134 was characterized by a set of learning objectives comprised of knowledge objectives,
135 skills objectives, values objectives, and dispositions objectives (see Final Report, pp. 11-

136 14; and Final Report, Appendix 8). Finally, the Steering Committee suggested that
137 specific numbers of courses be required in each knowledge area (see Final Report, p. 17),
138 and recommended the formation of an all-University Core Curriculum Review
139 Committee to begin implementation of the new University Core of Common Studies (see
140 Final Report, p. 15).

141

142 **B. The Role of the Faculty Focus Groups**

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

159 Over one hundred and forty faculty members (nearly one-third of Marquette’s
160 teaching faculty) participated in the focus group process. Many of the focus groups met
161 over the course of the summer. Final drafts were submitted to the Office of Academic
162 Affairs on September 22, 2000.

163 The nine knowledge areas, goals, and objectives that resulted from the focus
164 group discussions comprise one segment of the University Core of Common Studies.
165 The requirement of thirty-six credit hours distributed across the nine knowledge areas in
166 increments of three or six credit hours per knowledge area is another segment. The
167 courses that satisfy the learning objectives in the knowledge areas comprise an evolving
168 segment of the Core of Common Studies; these courses are evaluated and approved on an
169 on-going basis. To the extent possible, it is expected that each individual School or
170 College within the University will build upon this University Core of Common Studies
171 when implementing its own core.

172

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

188

189 **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

217 identify core courses. In the spring of 2001, the Committee issued its first call for core
218 courses and performed an initial review of twenty-nine of a total of fifty-one submissions
219 from thirteen academic units across the University. Later that spring, the Committee
220 voted (twelve in favor and three opposed) to approve a thirty-six credit hour core
221 distributed across nine knowledge areas as follows: Rhetoric (six credit hours);
222 Mathematical Reasoning (three credit hours); Individual and Social Behavior (three credit
223 hours); Diverse Cultures (three credit hours); Literature/Performing Arts (three credit
224 hours); Histories of Cultures and Societies (three credit hours); Science and Nature (three
225 credit hours); Human Nature and Ethics (six credit hours); and Theology (six credit
226 hours).

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

235 To submit a course for the core, departments or academic units must submit a
236 template (see Appendix E) <http://www.marquette.edu/acad/approved-template-sept-14.doc>,
237 along with syllabi and other course documentation, demonstrating how the
238 course satisfies the goals and learning objectives of the particular knowledge area for
239 which the proponent seeks qualification. The Committee has also fashioned a set of
240 guidelines to be followed by those submitting course proposals (see Appendix F
241 <http://www.marquette.edu/acad/new-guidelines-for-qualifying-a-core-course-12-01.doc>).
242 These guidelines alert course proponents to the criteria used by the Committee in
243 evaluating proposals. Guidelines and templates containing goals and learning objectives

244 for each knowledge area are posted on the Academic Affairs web page. Templates,
245 syllabi, and other documentation are submitted to the Chair of the Core Curriculum
246 Review Committee, who forwards copies to each Committee member. At its meeting of
247 June 14, 2001 [http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-approved-June-14-2001-](http://www.marquette.edu/acad/core-curriculum-approved-June-14-2001-minutes.pdf)
248 [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
249 (see Appendix G). As part of this protocol, the Committee is divided into four
250 subcommittees, each dealing with two different knowledge areas. During an initial
251 process lasting approximately four weeks, subcommittees evaluate each submission and
252 contact academic units for additional information when necessary. Following this initial
253 evaluation, the subcommittees recommend a disposition to the entire Committee.

254 When determining whether a course is qualified, the Committee has implemented
255 a two-meeting procedural rule. Any discussion or subcommittee recommendation on a
256 course proposal, together with a motion on that recommendation, is made at a first
257 meeting. Further discussion and a vote on recommendations occur at a second meeting.
258 The Committee's consideration of subcommittee recommendations usually takes
259 approximately two weeks. The entire process, from beginning to end, covers a period of
260 approximately six weeks and ensures thoroughness in evaluating each submission. As
261 part of the evaluation process, subcommittee members complete a written Evaluation
262 Tool. A copy of this document is sent to department chairs or unit heads to provide
263 academic units with documentation of the Committee's determinations as well as
264 feedback on the content and quality of each submission. A copy of the original template
265 and the corresponding evaluation tool is archived in the Office of Academic Affairs as
266 well. Submissions that are remanded to departments may be revised and resubmitted no
267 sooner than the semester following the initial submission. The Committee has
268 determined that no course will be qualified in perpetuity. Depending upon results of the
269 assessment process, the Committee may review and withdraw a course from the Core of
270 Common Studies.

271 Since the core curricular process is new to Marquette University, the Core
272 Curriculum Review Committee has sought to disseminate its processes and deliberations
273 as widely as possible. This is accomplished in a number of ways. First, as noted,
274 templates containing goals and learning objectives are posted on the Academic Affairs
275 web page, as are guidelines and other Core Curriculum documents. Secondly, the Core
276 Curriculum Review Committee has posted minutes of all of its meetings on the Academic
277 Affairs web page (as has the Assessment Committee) and has e-mailed them to Deans,
278 Unit Coordinators, Department Chairs, and Chairs of College or School Curriculum
279 Committees as well. Finally, the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Office of
280 Academic Affairs sponsored a day-long, University-wide conference entitled, “Faculty
281 Conversations: Next Steps in the Core Curricular Process,” held on September 28, 2001.
282 Conference goals were to foster reflection on the core curricular process and the faculty
283 role within that process; to help faculty understand and apply approaches to assessment;
284 and to further communicate the process of qualifying a core course. The conference was
285 introduced by Reverend Robert A. Wild, S.J., President of Marquette University. The
286 conference also featured a guest speaker on assessment, Dr. Virginia Anderson of
287 Towson State (n/k/a Towson) University. Complimentary copies of her co-authored book
288 on assessment, *Effective Grading: A Tool for Learning and Assessment*, were distributed
289 to participants. More than one hundred participants, including faculty and administrators,
290 attended the event.

291

292 **2. Programmatic Issues**

293 The Marquette University Core of Common Studies is intended to provide a
294 foundational educational experience for all Marquette undergraduates. Thus, the
295 Committee has addressed two programmatic considerations as well in the process of
296 constructing the core: (1) how to ensure that transfer students benefit from the Marquette
297 Core of Common Studies, and (2) how to ensure that ROTC students benefit as well. A

298 special Subcommittee on Transfers and ROTC students was formed during the fall of
299 2001 to address these considerations.

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

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

323 Different considerations are presented by the experience of ROTC students. Air
324 Force, Army, and Navy ROTC students must satisfy standard national curricula and

325 complete their major requirements, leaving little time to satisfy additional core course
326 requirements. The Subcommittee on Transfer and ROTC students has worked with
327 ROTC personnel to identify areas of overlap between knowledge areas and existing
328 ROTC requirements. Other departments or units have come forward to offer assistance
329 in creating new core courses that meet the needs of ROTC students and satisfy the
330 learning objectives in a given knowledge area, such as the Histories of Cultures and
331 Societies.

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

337

338 **D. The Core Curriculum Assessment Committee: Composition and**
339 **Responsibilities**

340 Assessment is key to the success of the Core of Common Studies. The learning
341 objectives in each of the nine knowledge areas must be capable of measurement and must
342 actually be measured to gauge the effectiveness of the new core. Before the Core of
343 Common Studies is implemented in the fall of 2003, the chair or coordinator of each
344 academic unit must provide evidence of commitment to a learning objective-specific
345 assessment plan for each core course taught by that unit. The University Core
346 Curriculum Assessment Committee, chaired by Professor Christine M. Wiseman,
347 Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, has been charged with monitoring
348 assessment. Members of this Committee are appointed to three-year terms because of
349 their expertise or interest in assessment. Members of this Committee currently include
350 faculty and administrators from the Departments of English, Foreign Languages and
351 Literature/Performing Arts, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physics, Social and Cultural

352 Sciences, and Theology within the College of Arts and Sciences, Clinical Laboratory
353 Science within the College of Health Sciences, and Industrial Engineering and Electrical
354 Engineering within the College of Engineering. There is representation as well from the
355 School of Education, the College of Professional Studies, the Memorial Library
356 Reference Department, the Office of Student Development, and the Office of Institutional
357 Research. The Committee is charged with gathering and examining assessment data
358 currently available from the various programs, majors, or colleges across the University,
359 and working with the University Core Curriculum Review Committee to institute
360 outcomes assessment for core courses.

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

369 On January 9, 2002, the Core Curriculum Review Committee and the Core
370 Curriculum Assessment Committees met jointly to discuss next steps in the Core
371 Curriculum and Assessment processes. At that meeting, it was determined that the next
372 critical step in the process would be to proactively assist academic units whose courses
373 had been approved for inclusion in the Core of Common Studies so that they might
374 develop and implement assessment plans for those courses. In particular, these
375 assessment plans must address the learning objectives of the knowledge area for which
376 the course is qualified. . Assessment plans for core courses must be devised by the fall of
377 2003 when the new core is implemented. However, it is advisable for units sponsoring

378 core courses to develop assessment plans before the fall of 2002 so that their core courses
379 can be listed as such in the *Undergraduate Bulletin*.

380

381 **IV. Budget and Recommendations**

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

393

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

400 **Recommendation 1:** The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should
401 be installed as a standing University committee and should be inserted into the University
402 by-laws as such. Membership on this Committee should continue to be suitably
403 representative of the various academic and non-academic units, as outlined in section II.

404 C.1, paragraph 1. Continuity should be maintained by staggering the membership to
405 achieve a mix of veteran and new members. At the expiration of a member's three-year
406 term, it shall be the responsibility of the department(s)/college (as designated in section
407 II.C.1, paragraph 1) to find a suitable replacement. In the event that a member cannot
408 complete his/her term (e.g., sabbatical, medical leave, retirement), the unit shall identify a
409 replacement to complete that term.

410

411

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

414

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

422

423

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

- 426 • The Director should be selected from among the faculty and bring significant
427 experience with core curriculum.

- 428 • The Director should be situated within the Office of the Provost and should
429 sit *ex officio* as a non-voting member of the University Core Curriculum
430 Review Committee and a non-voting member of the Core Curriculum
431 Assessment Committee.
- 432 • In conjunction with the University Core Curriculum Committee and the
433 University Assessment Committee, the Director of Core should lead all core
434 curricular efforts, including assessment of the core itself and of particular
435 courses within the core, as noted in Recommendations 5 through 8 below.
- 436 • To ensure the integrity of the core development process, the Director of Core
437 must be included in any discussions between the Provost and the various
438 Deans regarding the development of new or interdisciplinary core courses.
- 439 • The Director position should carry a budget for development of core
440 curriculum and assessment, together with adequate administrative support.

441

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

446

447 **Recommendation 6:** Monies should be allocated to assist academic units in
448 developing and implementing learning objective-specific assessment plans for core
449 courses.

450

451 **Recommendation 7:** Monies should be allocated to facilitate continuous
452 monitoring and assessment of the core as a whole, as well as continuous monitoring of
453 core impact on various University programs.

454

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

459

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

465

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

471

472 V. Conclusion: Challenges

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