Appendix A: Foundations Tier Courses

Foundations courses are designed to help students build a combined intellectual and practical base for subsequent learning both within the Core and throughout their undergraduate studies at Marquette.* To that end, Foundations courses do not simply emphasize canonical knowledge or content. Instead, they invite students to consider from multiple angles the wholeness and diversity of knowledge and its relevance to making change in the world. More specifically, they aim to engage students in contemplating, analyzing, and communicating with others about concrete situations in multidisciplinary ways, drawing in particular on theology, philosophy, and rhetoric.

Upon completion of Foundations courses, students should have the basic tools they need to communicate effectively in writing and speaking that involves multimedia, and they should have established an initial framework for asking questions and analyzing their world informed by a Catholic and Jesuit perspective. Students' success at this level will depend not only on the efficacy of each course as well as conceptual coordination among courses but also on the reinforcement of foundational learning in the Discovery and Culminating Experiences tiers.

This tier will include four 3-credit courses:
1. Foundations in Theology
2. Foundations in Philosophy
3. Foundations in Rhetoric: Multimodal Writing and Speaking
4. Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: (Variable Themes)

Notes:
- The Departments Theology and Philosophy will develop final syllabi (or templates and parameters) for their respective courses;
- For those courses as well as Foundations in Methods of Inquiry, there will be multiple versions of course criteria that meet learning outcomes.

* While the Foundations consists of five courses, this proposal includes only four. The fifth, dedicated to engaging diversity and social value systems, is addressed in Appendix B.

Foundations in Theology Course: Finding God in All Things

Course requirements/prerequisites:

Foundations Course in Theology should be taken within the first two years of study at Marquette.

Credits: 3

Description for bulletin:
The course investigates the principle that God can be found in all things. How are we to envision ultimate reality and the virtuous life in light of the theological and scriptural understandings of God, the prophets, Jesus, and human existence from which that Ignatian conviction springs? What differentiates a faith understanding from other academic, scientific, and secular ways of thinking and drawing conclusions? How are we to assess the merits of theological truth claims? How can the Ignatian imperative to see God in all things translate into an obligation to promote justice in the world? What distinctive set of tools for advancing justice emerge from such an understanding?

Course Learning Objectives:

1. Marquette students can express a conception of ultimate reality and the virtuous life in terms of understandings of God, the prophets, Jesus, and human existence articulated in the Christian tradition, and in relation to at least one other religious or humanistic tradition.

2. Marquette students can distinguish theological ways of asking and answering questions from those of other disciplines, can analyze theological arguments, and have some foundation for assessing the merits of theological truth claims.

3. Marquette students can describe how Christian theological convictions translate into an obligation to promote justice in the world and can articulate a distinctive set of tools with which to do so.

Course requirements/prerequisites: This three-credit course should typically be taken within the first two-years of study at Marquette and prior to the Foundations in the Methods of Inquiry course.

Rationale/Summary

Theology is at the heart of Jesuit education. The first course in theology introduces students to the fundamental conceptual tools and religious literacy necessary to bring them to an understanding of how their respective faith commitments and traditions can enable them to be responsible and ethical citizens collaborating to create a more just and inclusive society. Moreover, this first course introduces students to the need for integrative, cross-disciplinary, and cross-cultural inquiry by highlighting the ways in which theology necessarily draws on the methodologies and insights of philosophy, history, literature, and the social and natural

sciences, while at the same time theology provides the foundations and imperative for an integration of those methodologies and discoveries to serve the common good of a global society.

Activities, Assignments, and Modification Options
A core of readings and thematic concerns will be common to all sections of the course. There will be an equivalence in expectations which nevertheless leaves room for a variety of pedagogical approaches including the departments successful initiatives in team-teaching. Sections will vary in which of theology's various disciplinary perspectives are emphasized (e.g., literary, historical, philosophical, social science, natural science) and which theological and humanistic perspectives are engaged (e.g., Jewish and Christian, Catholic and Orthodox, Protestant and secular, Christian and Islamic).

Pragmatics

Class size will be capped at 35. A memo of understanding will specify a core of readings and thematic concerns that will be common to all sections of the course. Each teacher will approach the common questions that the course investigates from his or her disciplinary strengths. Each section will highlight one of the many ways in which theology is engaged with other disciplinary perspectives (e.g., literary, historical, philosophical, sociological). Likewise, each section will discuss these questions in relation to at least two perspectives (e.g., Jewish and Christian, Catholic and Orthodox, Protestant and secular, Christian and Islamic). The disciplines and religious or humanistic perspectives chosen will be determined by the particular expertise of the teacher.

Foundations Course in Philosophy: Thinking Philosophically

Proposal for Foundations Course in Philosophy

Course description for the bulletin: This course aims to help students critically engage their own experience as it relates to fundamental philosophical questions about the human condition, focusing on moral value and the meaning and purpose of human life. It aims to help students articulate their own deepest questions about these issues, and to increase their understanding of, organize, and befriend these questions in light of a variety of classical and contemporary philosophical approaches.

Course Learning Objectives (tied to Core Learning Objectives 1-3): At the completion of a foundations course in philosophy students should be able to:

1. **Articulate their own deepest philosophical questions:** Articulate their own fundamental questions about the nature of the human condition, moral value, and the meaning and purpose of human life in relation to a variety of philosophical approaches to these questions. Students should be able to express in writing and orally how their own experiences have made these questions relevant for them and may influence their preliminary answers to these questions.

2. **Explain how past and present philosophers have asked and attempted to answer these and related questions:** Explain how a variety of philosophical approaches ask and attempt to answer questions about the nature of the human condition, moral value, and the meaning and purpose of human life and the logical connections philosophical approaches make among these ideas (e.g., how a philosopher's understanding of human nature or the human condition bears on their understanding of morality and meaning/purpose of human existence).

3. **Demonstrate facility with a variety of critically reflective philosophical processes of discernment:** Demonstrate facility with a variety of critically reflective processes of discernment philosophers use to address fundamental questions about the human condition, moral value, and the meaning and purpose of human life.

Course requirements/prerequisites: This three-credit course should typically be taken within the first two-years of study at Marquette and prior to the Foundations in the Methods of Inquiry course.

Rationale/Summary: Philosophy has traditionally been central to the Jesuit educational mission because it offers distinctive approaches to critically reflective discernment about questions that touch at the core of human experience. A foundations course in philosophy

serves the learning objectives of the core by aiming to enable all students with the development of interpretive, critical, analytical and communicative skills necessary to personal intellectual and moral development, cultural literacy, and achievement in the complexities of life in the Twenty-First Century. Students typically do not have background in philosophy prior to entering Marquette, so this course provides a crucial first introduction to studying philosophy. As such, it aims to develop in students an awareness of basic philosophical questions they are likely already asking and care about, help them articulate these questions clearly, and learn what it means to approach these questions philosophically.

Assignments and Activities: Assignments and means of assessing the learning objectives for this course will vary but should include consideration of the following:

a. Low-stakes assignments that help students track their own philosophical development. These would include assignments that facilitate in students an awareness of their starting points including their context/experience; critical reflection on and ways to gauge their development from these starting points (e.g., strengthening existing perspectives, challenging, modifying, revising, or 180 degree changes of heart, etc.); and culminating assignment/s at the end that help students trace the trajectory of their exploration (e.g., Do they find their initial questions as relevant? Do they articulate those questions in the same way or differently? Have new questions emerged? How do they now approach those questions? Have any of the philosophical approaches been enlightening or frustrating and why?)

b. Assignments that assist students in framing and constructing a philosophical approach to these questions.

c. Assignments that help students gain facility with how these philosophical approaches characterize what counts as convincing evidence and justification in defense of a perspective on these questions.

d. Assignments that help students learn effectively how to communicate—in writing and orally--a philosophical approach to these questions.

e. Examples of means of assessing learning objectives include: journals, D2L forums, critical reflection papers with writing prompts/questions, digital media (e.g., medium, wikis, blogs), podcasts.

Pragmatics
- course size: capped at 35
- anticipated modes of delivery: classroom based instruction, although could also be offered in other formats (online or hybrid)
- how might it be staffed: full-time faculty, advanced graduate students, lecturers
- how courses/staff might be selected: Through the normal departmental process of assigning instructors to courses.

Examples of the kind of course we have in mind: There are a number of ways to develop a course that meets these learning objectives and we encourage faculty to develop a course that connects with their own expertise and philosophical interest.

a.   Autobiographical philosophy from either an historical or contemporary approach: Read texts from major figures in the history of philosophy who confront moments of crisis in or dawning awareness of self-understanding, one's relation to community and/or the divine (e.g., Plato's *Apology*, Augustine's *Confessions*, Hume, Marx, Russell, Simone de Beauvoir, bell hooks.) This course would help students gain facility with the critically reflective philosophical discernment processes major philosophers of the past and present use to increase self-understanding in relation to others and/or to the sacred or divine, to develop a sense of purpose, to create meaning, and to develop a critical ethical consciousness.

b.   Philosophy as articulating "forms of life" based on how different approaches understand the nature of the self/community, moral value, meaning and purpose. For example, a course that focuses on different philosophical approaches to the moral life—"the life of virtue", "the life of duty", "the life of making the world a better place," "the life of authenticity," "the life of a faith that does justice." This way of teaching the course draws attention to: (1) methodologies of philosophers in approaching fundamental questions about morality; (2) how a philosopher's answers to these questions are linked to that philosopher's conception of human nature or the human situation/condition showing logical connections between a view of humanity and a view of the moral life; and (3) how certain questions become urgent or pressing from within a particular framework and how questions which are fundamental to one framework may not even arise or be easily asked within another framework.

c.   Thematic course in "phenomenology of experience": e.g., religious or spiritual experience, courses on identity, mind/consciousness. A thematic course would need to fit within the foundations parameters, which focus on moral value and the meaning and purpose of human life. At the foundations level, this kind of course would be careful to focus on critically engaging students' experiences in light of philosophical approaches.

d.   Perennial Questions in philosophy: Explore foundational questions about human existence and experience that philosophers have raised for centuries and that we all continue to grapple with: What does it mean to be human? What can we know? What is the good life? This course explores these or related foundational questions as they arise in certain select authors as a means for students to disclose and develop their own articulation of these questions in a philosophical fashion and learn what it means to approach these questions philosophically.

Foundations in Rhetoric: Multimodal Writing and Speaking
A Praxis-Based Course

Course requirements/prerequisites: Normally, *Foundations of Rhetoric* should be taken in the first year of study at Marquette.

Credits: 3

Course learning objectives
Students who successfully complete this course should demonstrate proficiency in:
- Developing ideas and arguments informed by inquiries that involve the acquisition and critical analysis of diverse sources, including academic and nonacademic texts;
- Expressing informed ideas and arguments in multimedia writing and speaking for different audiences;
- Representing information, ideas, and points of view fairly, accurately, and in ways that are accessible to others;
- Critically reflect on their performance and growth as rhetors or good people striving to write and speak well both to and on behalf of others.

Description for *Bulletin*

Option A: Process-based introduction to applying principles of rhetoric to writing and speaking with multimedia for academic and nonacademic audiences. Emphasis on evidence-based, problem-driven, solution-seeking practices, including library research, critical analysis, and argumentation.

Option B for *Bulletin*: A process-based introduction to applying rhetorical principles to source-based writing and speaking with multimedia for diverse audiences. Incorporates undergraduate research.

Notes: Option A includes keywords and key phrases that not only help accurately describe the course but also make explicit elements of content relevant to (among other things) determining equivalences for transfer credit: "process-based," which signals "scaffolded instruction, including revision"; rhetoric; "writing and speaking," which is important to group together since not all courses include both modes of communication; multimedia; "academic and nonacademic audiences," which maybe be important to group together since many courses emphasize only one or the other; library research; critical analysis; and argumentation. Option B substitutes reference to undergraduate research for a number of otherwise keywords and key phrases.

Rationale/Summary
This course is designed to give students scaffolded, cumulative opportunities to practice researching, critically analyzing, and synthesizing their own ideas and others' in writing and speaking that involves multimedia. It is informed by rhetorical traditions including the Jesuit tradition of *eloquentia perfecta*, and it is guided by current national standards for first-year college writing proficiency, information literacy, and students' overall post-secondary success, measured in part by students' ability to marshal knowledge they gain in this course for subsequent academic and nonacademic purposes.

See in particular *Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing* developed by the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the National Writing Project (2011); *WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, v3.0* (2014);

[Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education](#) developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (2016).

Course Description (Activities and Assignments):

Unit 1: Rhetorical Analysis
Students learn key terms and praxes of the course by researching, reading, and analyzing examples of public discourse, which includes everything from academic publications to popular and social media.
  Terminal assignments: (1) In-class digital poster presentation on rhetorical analysis of a "hot topic" in public discourse; (2) praxis reflection.

Unit 2: Proposal Rhetoric
Students identify and begin researching a social problem that interests themselves and others.
  Terminal assignments: (1) white paper proposal; (2) 20-item annotated bibliography that includes both academic and nonacademic sources; (3) praxis reflection, including initial remix brainstorming.

Unit 3: Writing Rhetoric
Students continue researching while completing drafts of each section of their white papers. (See below for additional details.)
  Terminal assignments: (1) 8- to 10-page white paper draft, including references; (2) praxis reflection, including remix proposal.

Unit 4: Revising Rhetoric
Students revise their white papers, working on revision at multiple levels (e.g., macro, micro) while beginning to plan their Unit 5 remixes.
  Terminal assignments: (1) 12- to 15-page white paper revision; (2) praxis reflection, including remix update.

Unit 5: Remixing Rhetoric
Students complete and publicly present their remixes, transforming their white paper research into another type of text targeted to a specific audience.
  Terminal assignments: (1) remix; (2) oral remix presentation; (3) final praxis reflection.

Notes: The white paper is source-based, problem-driven, solution seeking genre common in many disciplines and professions. It is organized in four sections: an introduction, a "backstory" in which writers explain the genesis or history of the problems they address; a solution section in which writers advocate for solutions or steps toward ameliorating conditions related to the problems they identify; and a conclusion, which can be forward-looking (e.g., addressing next steps, imagining a world in which the problem has been solved).

The remix assignment asks students to transform their white paper research and writing into another type of text or artifact for a deliberately targeted audience. Remixes may include written, audio, visual, and audio-visual texts, including physical or digital posters, websites, paintings or photographs, booklets, brochures, and more.

As part of its "foundational" work, Foundations in Rhetoric can introduce students to several tenets of contemporary Jesuit rhetoric, including reflection and choice-making with regard to everything from words and media to topics and claims. See in particular essays in *Traditions of Eloquence* (ed. Gannett and Brereton) for recent scholarly discussion.

As Marquette's sole writing and speaking course, Foundations of Rhetoric will be effective (in a larger sense) only if other courses are designed explicitly to help students transfer and further develop the knowledge they begin building in it. This means other courses must include not only writing, speaking, and multimodal composing assignments but also instruction in those praxes. Ideally, from a perspective of student learning, upper-division Core courses or courses in the major will take on this responsibility in a systematic and significant way.

Assessment
Currently, the FYE Program undertakes regular assessment of students' learning through direct measurement: namely, annual analytical scoring of randomly sampled terminal assignments from relevant course units (N=approximately 20-25% of students sampled per unit). Assessment rubrics render relevant UCCS outcomes into component matched matched to specific course activities and assignments. To ensure assessment is a feasible and meaningful activity that yields actionable data, FYE typically focuses on no more than 4 distinct data points per unit.

This procedure should transfer successfully to the new Foundations in Rhetoric course, which will also lend itself to the assessment of students' rhetorical learning across Core courses and over time.

Pragmatics
Course size: In line with national professional standards (as well as *U.S. News and World Report* metrics), the course is designed to cap at 18-20 students per section.

Course delivery: As a praxes-based course in which primary materials are students' own research, writing, and speaking, Foundations in Rhetoric is designed to be a semester-long, 100% classroom-based course that centers on in-class activities (rather than in-class lectures). It is also designed to connect students directly with campus resources, starting with Raynor Memorial Libraries and including the Digital Scholarship Lab.

Staffing: In Spring 2016, several FYE instructors taught a prototype of this course, and in Spring 2017 the FYE Program will pilot the course described in this proposal. Current FYE instructors include tenure-track, non-tenure track, and part-time faculty in English as well as graduate students in the English Department's MA and PhD programs. In the future, these instructors as well as faculty and students with similar qualifications could staff Foundations in Rhetoric.

Staff selection: Staff selection should start with prospective instructors' qualifications to teach rhetoric, which is related to but nonetheless distinct from logic, philosophy, literary criticism, and language study. Instructors' preparedness to teach a praxis-based course (as opposed to a lecture course) should also be considered a priority. Appropriate training for graduate instructors (e.g., coursework) and professional development (e.g., workshops) should not only be provided but also required.

Additional points of consideration:
Multimedia: Although the new Core learning outcomes call out "written, spoken, and visual communication," this course focuses on multimedia writing and speaking informed by two main concerns. First, the course (and related learning outcomes) must be accessible to all instructors and students, including those with visual disabilities. Multimedia writing and speaking achieves this goal by invites instructors and students alike to explore not only the ethics of inclusion but also strategies for creating texts with multiple access points to accommodate audiences with diverse abilities. Secondly, this course is informed by the way in which "the visual" has been

superseded in theory and in practice by "the multimodal" and by the ubiquity of texts that combine writing and speaking with still and moving images, sound, space, movement, and more. In this context, it is difficult to imagine preparing students to be difference-makers on campus or elsewhere while artificially limiting the modes of communication about which we ask them to learn.

Underprepared students: With the new Foundations courses, students who need more than a single course to gain proficiency in college-level writing and speaking will not be well-served. There are any number of means of identifying and supporting these students. Hopefully, significant study and preparation can take place before the new Core is implemented as well as during the first years of implementation.

Online learning: If the university determines a need for online versions of this course, we would need to hire or substantially consult with a rhetoric and writing specialist who has extensive experience with online learning. Currently, none of the rhetoric and composition faculty in English or Communication have this expertise.

Post-secondary success: There any number of indicators that students benefit from multiple opportunities for writing instruction (not just writing assignments) during their college years, and some pre-professional graduate programs may require applicants to take more than one writing, speaking, or combined writing and speaking course for admission. With that in mind, it seems imperative to discuss ways in which Marquette will ensure students have sufficient opportunities for instruction.

Nomenclature: As a rhetoric course open to both first- and second-year students, Foundations in Rhetoric is a more accurate title than COMM 1100: Contemporary Presentation, ENGL 1001: Rhetoric and Composition 1, ENGL 1002: Rhetoric and Composition 2. Likewise, First-Year English will no longer seem like a very apt title for the program that runs the course, even if it continues to be directed and (primarily) staffed by members of the English Department. How might the new course be named and the program renamed?

Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: (Insert Theme—e.g., Compassion)

Course requirements/prerequisites:

Foundations in Methods of Inquiry should be taken within the first two years of study at Marquette, after any two of the three Foundations courses in Philosophy, Theology, and/or Rhetoric have been successfully completed.

Credits: 3

Course Learning Objectives

Students who successfully complete this course will have:

1. demonstrated an understanding of how each of three different disciplinary methods of inquiry approached the selected course theme, and of the similarities and differences between them
2. articulated what specifically appealed or did not appeal to them about any of these particular approaches
3. reflected on what this tells them about themselves: their individual strengths and weaknesses, intellectual tendencies, curiosities, etc.

Description for *Bulletin*:

This variable topic course compares and contrasts the approach of three different disciplines to common theme. It asks students to reflect on what disciplinary methods they find most appealing or challenging, and why.

Rationale/Summary

A central feature of the Core education at Marquette is to provide students with a structured experience in which they can forge their own critical worldview in the complex multidisciplinary environment at Marquette and in terms of the fundamental values of a Catholic, Jesuit education.

The fourth Foundations course provides students with their first opportunity to engage a particular theme in an explicitly multidisciplinary setting, in advance of deeper multi- and interdisciplinary explorations in the Discovery tier. It builds on the skills of inquiry and communication developed in the first three Foundations courses in Philosophy, Theology, and Rhetoric, and follows the Ignatian pedagogical paradigm linking context, experience, reflection, and action.

Faculty from different departments and/or colleges pursue a given foundational theme drawn from documents such as the Marquette mission statement—e.g., social movements, global

citizenship, justice, compassion, entrepreneurship, the environment, etc., according to the methods of their particular disciplines. Working as a team, three faculty members each rotate throughout a given group/class of approximately 100 students divided into three equal sections. Each faculty member presents an approximately 4-week module (eight class meetings) to each section, exploring how one would approach the course theme in light of their own area of inquiry. A common assignment at the end of each module asks students to identify that discipline's particular approach to the theme. A shared final assignment at the end of the course asks students to consolidate what they have learned about each discipline's approach, to reflect upon which ones they find more or less compelling and why, and to consider what this tells them about their own contexts and ways of thinking.

Activities, Assignments, and Modification Options:

Students will begin with their first assigned module's professor, with adequate time reserved in the first week for general introductions and explanation of the course format and expectations. The third module will end in the penultimate week of the semester to allow adequate time for discussion and preparation of the Final Reflection paper (see below).

Within each module, which establishes a specific disciplinary **Context**, students and professor will attend to:

Experience: How do the professor's and the student's own positions, world views, values, and prior experiences intersect with this discipline's approach to the theme? This implies short assignments or discussions that explicitly require students to reflect on what they bring to the table: their assumptions, fears, affinities, prior training, and any other experience with or thoughts about this discipline. Professors may likewise wish to share their own personal experiences that led them to this discipline.

Reflection: What specific questions does this discipline bring to the theme? What for this discipline counts as convincing evidence and persuasive argument in answering those questions? This implies discussion, short reflections, and other exercises designed to clarify the fundamental methods and approaches to the theme being employed within each module.

Action: How does this discipline pursue the questions it asks of this theme, in real and practical terms? This implies assignments that allow students to try out the methodology of the discipline in a way that is informative without being overwhelming. For instance, a history professor might have students analyze a primary document; a mathematician might have students consider an example of real-world statistics; a professor of literature might have students read and analyze a short story; an engineer might guide students through a simple demonstration of fluid hydrostatics, etc. The goal is not for students to master a skill, but to experiment with and better understand an approach by doing some kind of well-defined exercise that allows them to put what they've learned in the module into practice.

Students will remain with their third assigned module's professor for the final week to discuss and engage the shared Final Reflection Paper. In this Final Reflection Paper, students are asked to:

1. demonstrate an understanding of how each method of inquiry approached the course theme and of the similarities and differences between them

2. articulate what specifically appealed or did not appeal to them about any of these particular approaches
3. reflect on what this tells them about themselves, their strengths and weaknesses, intellectual tendencies, curiosities, etc.

Professors are free to pursue the Context-Experience-Reflection-Action model within their module in whatever way they wish, with low-stakes assignments that cumulatively will constitute 15% (5% per module) of the student's final course grade.

To ensure fairness, promote a common understanding of the goals of the course, and increase student confidence, *evaluation* in all "Foundations in Methods of Inquiry" classes will be mostly weighted towards three identical end-of-module assignments (20% per module), and a standardized Final Reflection Paper (25%). The end-of-module assignment will be graded by the professor in charge; thus, each professor will grade every student's end-of-module assignment for his/her own module over the course of the semester.

The Final Reflection Paper (5-6 pp.) will also be identical across all "Exploring Methods of Inquiry" classes for a more common experience across groups and themes, and in keeping with the Jesuit pedagogical emphasis on "adequate reflection on experience, grasping the meaning and implications of what we study, [in order to] proceed freely and confidently toward choosing appropriate courses of action that foster our growth as human beings… whose aim is not merely the assimilation of subject-matter but the development of the person…[and which] broaden students' awareness and impel them to consider the viewpoints of others." The Final Reflection Paper will be evenly divided for grading between the three professors, either randomly or going back to the first assigned module as a 'home base.'

Mechanism for assessing Core learning outcomes

For the purposes of assessing the Core, these shared assignments can help establish benchmarks.

Pragmatics

Course size and structure: Multiple groups of at least two different variable-title "Exploring Methods of Inquiry" courses will be offered each semester. Each group will contain approximately 100 students divided into three equal sections. Each of these sections will cycle through three modules that are approximately four weeks long each (with extra days given to the first day of class, transitions between modules, and preparation for the final paper) taught by faculty from three meaningfully different disciplines, including at least one from the humanities. To provide sufficient sections for all students, there will be 10 groups per semester, each with three sections. Two groups will be linked with one theme. Faculty will get credit for teaching one three-credit course for teaching the three sections in a group. Faculty would be able to get credit for two three-credit courses by teaching in the two groups that have the same theme.

Example:
Theme: Compassion
Group 1:   ARSC 1005 101 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion
              ARSC 1005 102 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion
              ARSC 1005 103 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion

Group 2:   ARSC 1005 104 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion
                ARSC 1005 105 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion
                ARSC 1005 106 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Compassion
Theme: Social Movements
Group 3:   ARSC 1005 107 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements
                ARSC 1005 108 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements
                ARSC 1005 109 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements
Group 4:   ARSC 1005 110 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements
                ARSC 1005 111 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements
                ARSC 1005 112 Foundations in Methods of Inquiry: Social Movements

Organization of a particular group would look like this:

Group 1	Section 1	Section 2	Section 3
First Four Weeks (module 1)	Faculty A	Faculty B	Faculty C
Middle Four Weeks (module 2)	Faculty B	Faculty C	Faculty A
Final Four Weeks (module 3)	Faculty C	Faculty A	Faculty B

<u>Course delivery</u>. Professors will deliver their module according to the methods of their discipline. Sizes are capped at 33 per section to allow for personal attention and discussion. Students may expect a combination of direct instruction, small and whole group work, discussion, and active classroom learning.

<u>Staffing and Staff Selection</u>. Faculty training, administrative support, and consistency of major assignments across classes and sections are critical. Incentives should be provided to encourage the formation of creative, committed multidisciplinary teams of faculty across the university who come up with compelling themes and are supported with significant preparation before rolling out a new "Exploring Methods of Inquiry" course. Administrative support should also be properly compensated.

Faculty should understand that the course is *not team taught*. They are not required to integrate their disciplinary approaches; each faculty member need only consider the theme from the perspective of her or his own discipline. The built-in assignments do the work of integration by asking students to compare and contrast each module, and free faculty from having to re-create administrative and assignment models with each iteration.

Observations and Recommendations:

We have created this proposal with an eye towards *desired student outcomes*, *ease of faculty entry*, and *simplicity of administration*. We have also considered *potential costs*.

<u>Desired Student Outcomes</u>. This is an *entry-level* course consisting of a triad of abbreviated modules, designed to introduce the interdisciplinary emphasis of the Discovery tier. Students are not expected to learn each discipline, only to make informed observations about and distinctions between them.

Evaluation should therefore be focused on the student's engagement with each module's material regardless of skill level; discernment of each discipline's method of inquiry; and consideration of what this exploration has revealed about themselves and their worldview as well as the viewpoints and contexts of others.

<u>Ease of Faculty Entry</u>. This course also provides opportunities for multi- and interdisciplinary reflection amongst faculty, which we believe will benefit the university community as a whole. In listening sessions, faculty across colleges have reacted positively to the idea of this comparative "thought experiment."

Themes are repeatable and may be taught in different interdisciplinary team combinations, year after year if the faculty member desires. We recommend that themes be kept to a manageable number of 5, with fewer in the first years the course is offered.

Guidelines should be developed for what constitutes a desirable theme for this Foundations tier course.

<u>Simplicity of administration</u>. Each faculty team member will be teaching three hours a week for the entire semester while rotating through the three sections; thus, "Foundations in Methods of Inquiry" will count as a regular three-credit course for faculty.

Three rooms with a capacity of 35 will be required for each group of "Exploring Methods of Inquiry;" students will only meet in their sections, for ease of classroom assignment. Enrollment is capped at about 33 students per section. There are no teaching assistants.

The Core Council in consultation with the director of "Exploring Methods of Inquiry" could select themes for a two year cycle and collect and vet faculty applications to teach in the course, at no additional cost to the university.

<u>Potential costs</u>. We need a director for this course who will work with department chairs, faculty and the registrar to schedule sections for the course; manage enrollments; manage the course website/page; process urgent requests; answer general questions from students and others about the course; supervise and collect assessment data. This would require some stipend and/or a reduced load of one course per semester (at least for the first two years to determine the work involved). **This item requires administration funding over and above normal instructional costs.**

Some modest funding for faculty assigned to a section (or the sections grouped around a theme) to meet and discuss approaches to the course, pedagogies to be used, etc. We suggest stipends of $500-750 for each faculty member for 'in-service work' prior to and during the course; this translates to 30*$500-750 = $15,000-$22,500 per semester/ $30,000-$43,000 per year. If we teach the themes in a two year cycle with faculty repeating in the second year, the expense every other year might not be as high. **This item requires administration funding over and above normal instructional costs.**

Appendix B: Engaging Social Systems and Values: A Foundational Experience

---

The engaging social systems and values component is a critical element for developing key skills that students need for completing the Core. The goal of this Core requirement is to prepare students to encounter different social systems and engage with other systems of value. This requirement should allow students to experience difference and lead them to work to create conditions for equality and inclusivity. An important element of this skill requires students to acquire theoretical knowledge about diverse social systems and values and reflect upon and develop their capacity for engagement with others.

Students will take one course within the first two years that emphasizes engagement with others. Faculty can propose either a list of courses to be included as an option for this requirement or can develop a proposal for a single course that will be taken by all students. Note this course will be included in the foundational tier.

The Engaging Social Systems and Values foundation course aims to facilitate students' abilities towards achieving the fourth learning outcome:

> **Collaborators Engaging Social Systems and Values:** *Marquette students will develop skills to engage with a spectrum of people, communities, and systems of value. They will be able to analyze the sources and implications of inequity, take steps to create more inclusive and collaborative social and professional processes, acting as people with, and for, others.*

The taskforce recognizes that the above objective cannot, and should not, be not limited to the scope of one course, but we do assert the necessity for students to have some intentional learning experience that addresses the Core's 4th learning outcome early in their academic career.

Drawing upon nationally recognized best practices and from Marquette's own Catholic Jesuit tradition, the ESSV Taskforce encourages our community to embrace a foundational experience for every student wherein all students begin and/or continue to develop their ability to critically and reflectively engage one's own cultural and social values as well as those of others.

Learning Outcome for the Foundations ESSV Course is the 4th Core Learning Outcome, but in order for us to have a better sense of our students' capacities for the 4th Learning Outcome, we are looking at a variety of proficiencies across a set of skills, knowledge base, and attitudes that reflect "intercultural knowledge competency" and developing modalities of engagement with "social systems and values."

Establishing a concrete list of skills, knowledge, and attitudes will better inform faculty designing an ESSV course and will help students recognize their progress and the value of the foundational ESSV course.

Knowledge, Skills, and Attitudes
The taskforce proposes that a foundational course in engaging social systems and values should allow Marquette students opportunities to work towards proficiencies in certain **skills** (Empathy, Verbal & Non-verbal communication, Critical Self-Reflection), **knowledge** (Self-

awareness and Knowledge of Cultural Frameworks), and **attitudes** (Curiosity, Openness to Difference). In such a course a student could typically be better able to:

1. <u>Identify</u> one's own cultural rules and biases in relation to other cultural systems.
2. <u>Demonstrate</u> understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture.
3. <u>Analyze</u> ways that human actions influence the natural and human worlds and evaluate their global impact.
4. <u>Explain</u> multiple perspectives (cultural, disciplinary, and ethical) when evaluating the global impact of human actions.
5. <u>Recognize</u> the intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and <u>begin to</u> <u>negotiate</u> a shared understanding based on differences in own and other worldviews.
6. <u>Explain and connect</u> two or more cultures historically or in contemporary contexts with some acknowledgment of power structures.
7. <u>Examine</u> the roles, interconnections, and differential effects of human organizations and actions on global systems.
8. <u>Formulate</u> a range of actions from the cultural, ethical, theological, social, scientific, and environmental (multiple disciplinary) perspectives to offer solutions to global challenges that are appropriate to their contexts.
9. <u>Express</u> openness to most interactions with culturally different others; <u>begin to initiate and develop</u> interactions with and <u>suspend judgment</u> in valuing one's interactions with the culturally different others.

The above list is not a set of learning outcomes. Rather, it reflects a set of abilities that the ESSV course should move Marquette students towards attaining. They are representative of a variety of dimensions by which student proficiencies can be assessed and establishes possible frameworks for faculty to hang an ESSV course upon.

We recognize that a single course cannot establish a high level of proficiency in all, perhaps any, of the above. We do contend, though, students can: increase their knowledge, hone some skills, and develop more critically reflective attitudes. We also contend that these are measurable components that can be observed in a single course.

A discipline-agnostic approach
The ESSV course stresses proficiencies rather than disciplinary content. As such, the committee is open to the idea that departments from across the curriculum can offer an ESSV course provided that the proposed ESSV course contains exercises, activities, assessments that can demonstrate student moving towards higher proficiency in the skills, knowledge and attitudes outlined in the ESSV rubric (see Section B below).

A. **Suggested parameters for Engaging Social Systems and Values: Foundational Experience**

The ESSV task force strongly recommends the following parameters for Engaging Social Systems and Values:

1. The course should be taught by full-time faculty or well-experienced instructors with a doctorate.

2. Sections of ESSV courses should be small, certainly below 35 students.

3. The course should stress writing as the primary means for students to practice and communicate their abilities to engage ESSV knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

4. The foundations ESSV course would do well to have some experiential component to student learning.

5. Students should take the ESSV course in **the second semester of their first year** at Marquette. This will help with scheduling and establishing cross-campus academic and co-curricular events, but more importantly, this timing will insure that students are adequately prepared for the Discovery tier of courses.

6. Students should have taken two Foundations courses prior to ESSV (i.e. in their first semester at MU). The reasoning for this is that they will have been exposed to different types of inquiry and have at least some exposure to the concepts of differing world views and had an opportunity to consider multiple modes of expressing values and cultural systems.

7. As stated above, it is impossible to have a student be at a capstone competency for intercultural skills, knowledge and attitude within one 3-credit hour course.

    a. We also contend that isolating intercultural and diversity experiences within a single course or curricular requirement defeats the spirit and purpose of the ESSV foundational experience.

    b. Engaging cultural systems and values must be part of a larger arc in every student's academic career. Otherwise, intercultural competencies and engaging a wide range of people and experiences will be reduced to a simple box that must be checked off.

    c. As such, the taskforce states that there needs to be a second touchpoint for engaging social systems and values at some later point for every student.

        i. This touchpoint must involve a significant experiential component such as community-based learning/service learning, study abroad, living learning community, applicable undergraduate research experience or an internship.

        ii. This second experience can be part of a course inside or outside of the Core, but students need to have an opportunity to reflect upon their prior experience when writing about their later abilities/skills/attitudes. The second experience needs to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate greater

proficiency towards the "Capstone Level" outlined in the ESSV Rubric (see Section B below).

Call for Proposals for new/revised Engaging Social Systems and Values Foundational Experience Course

Faculty Name_____ **Rank**_____
Department_____
Proposed ESSV Course Name_____

Describe your interest in teaching an Engaging Social Systems and Values course, if pertinent please point to courses you have previously taught that indicate relevant experience and or preparation.

Course Description: (On what discipline is this particular ESSV course going to focus? Outline the practices that will lead to proficiency at the milestone levels of the modified AAC&U rubric below.)

Describe how the course is likely to help students achieve Core Learning Outcome 4:
> **Outcome 4 Collaborators Engaging Social Systems and Values:**
> "*Marquette students will develop skills to engage with a spectrum of people, communities, and systems of value. They will be able to analyze the sources and implications of inequity, take steps to create more inclusive and collaborative social and professional processes, acting as people with, and for, others.*"

In your description, it will be very helpful to provide an overview of student-centered activities that you intend to use that will most directly lead to meaningful critical reflection on social systems and inequity. Strong descriptions will highlight paths of skills development on intercultural competencies rather than assume an exposure to content will lead to proficiency in recognizing the structures and implications of social systems and values.

Identify assignments that will use the ESSV Rubric (see attached):
Assignment A   [Title]
- **This assignment will measure student proficiency in (check all that apply):**
    - **Skills   ( ) Empathy   ( ) Verbal and Nonverbal Communication ( ) Critical Reflection**
    - **Knowledge   ( ) Personal Contexts   ( ) Cultural Worldview Frameworks**
    - **Attitudes   ( ) Curiosity   ( ) Openness**

- **Description of assignment, activity, exercise:**

Assignment B   [Title]
- **This assignment will measure student proficiency in (check all that apply):**
  - **Skills   ( ) Empathy   ( ) Verbal and Nonverbal Communication ( ) Critical Reflection**
  - **Knowledge   ( ) Personal Contexts   ( ) Cultural Worldview Frameworks**
  - **Attitudes   ( ) Curiosity   ( ) Openness**

- **Description of assignment, activity, exercise:**

(Continue to add assignments as necessary to insure that all proficiencies are assessed)

Identify any experiential learning that will occur in the course (e.g. service learning/community based learning; study abroad; living learning community, etc.) that will be part of this course:

Explain any plan for revising the course for future iterations. What evidence will be used to determine what works or does not work?

Additional comments:

Submission Checklist:
  - ✓ **Proposal complete**
  - ✓ **Commitment to teaching the course more than once.**
  - ✓ **Department Chair approval of the above two points**
  - ✓ **Availability for faculty preservice (if applicable)**
  - ✓ **Syllabus**

B. Measuring the outcomes of an ESSV course

The ESSV taskforce highly recommends that courses accepted as part of the ESSV Foundational Experience have a plan for measuring student proficiency in the course. Using a modified version of the well-researched AAC&U VALUE rubric (see modified rubric below), not only can Marquette faculty calibrate the ESSV courses with a common standard of assessment, they can engage the national literature for resources and support.

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Knowledge *Cultural self-awareness*	Articulates insights into own cultural rules and biases (e.g. seeking complexity; aware of how her/his experiences have shaped these rules, and how to recognize and respond to cultural biases, resulting in a shift in self-description.)	Recognizes new perspectives about own cultural rules and biases (e.g. not looking for sameness; comfortable with the complexities that new perspectives offer.)	Identifies own cultural rules and biases (e.g. with a strong preference for those rules shared with own cultural group and seeks the same in others.)	Shows minimal awareness of own cultural rules and biases (even those shared with own cultural group(s)) (e.g. uncomfortable with identifying possible cultural differences with others.)
Knowledge *Knowledge of cultural worldview frameworks*	Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates adequate understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates partial understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.	Demonstrates surface understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.
Skills *Empathy*	Interprets intercultural experience from the perspectives of own and more than one worldview and demonstrates ability to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.	Recognizes intellectual and emotional dimensions of more than one worldview and sometimes uses more than one worldview in interactions.	Identifies components of other cultural perspectives but responds in all situations with own worldview.	Views the experience of others but does so through own cultural worldview.
Skills *Verbal and nonverbal communication*	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication (e.g., demonstrates understanding of the degree to which people use physical contact while communicating in different cultures or use direct/indirect and explicit/implicit meanings) and is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Recognizes and participates in cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Identifies some cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication and is aware that misunderstandings can occur based on those differences but is still unable to negotiate a shared understanding.	Has a minimal level of understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication; is unable to negotiate a shared understanding.
Attitudes *Curiosity*	Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	Asks deeper questions about other cultures and seeks out answers to these questions.	Asks simple or surface questions about other cultures.	States minimal interest in learning more about other cultures.
Skills *Critical Reflection*	Identifies meaningful connections in written communication between personal contexts and experiences with more complex course concepts, theories and/or objectives and is able to tie these connections to one's own vocation and commitment towards social justice.	Makes significant connections between course concepts, theories and/or objectives and personal experience with well-written communication on how these connections can inform future learning and guide personal action.	Identifies simple connections between course concepts, theories and/or objectives with personal experiences and can provide limited description of how the insights can inform or guide future learning.	Has difficulty identifying connections between course concepts, theories, objectives and personal experience or the connections made are inappropriate.

All ESSV courses need to have activities, exercises, and/or assessments that can be measured by the above rubric. A single exercise or assessment may measure one or more proficiency (for example a survey at the beginning and end of a course might capture students' progress towards higher levels of curiosity and cultural self-awareness). Likewise, an exercise might assess if students have achieved a particular level of competency in a single area (for example, in the final exam, students are asked to connect course content to social inequity to demonstrate a particular level of knowledge about cultural worldview frameworks).

C. Investing in our faculty as a pathway for student success.

Given the importance of the ESSV course as part of the overall foundational experience, faculty on the ESSV taskforce believe that there should be adequate support for faculty to insure the successful implementation of this component of the new Core Curriculum. We imagine that similar types of support will be afforded faculty in other areas of the Core development and add our voices of support with the following recommendations.

    a. Pre-service opportunity for faculty
    b. Assistance from the Center for Teaching and Learning
    c. Course development funds
    d. Communities of Practice opportunities

Appendix C: Discovery Tier

Overview of the Discovery Tier

The Discovery courses are designed to build on the Foundations tier's emphasis on different approaches to inquiry and the multi-disciplinary investigation of important topics. Courses in this tier are organized under a set of themes. The themes represent issues of contemporary importance, each of which is the focus of study by a great variety of scholarly disciplines. Consequently, under each theme, courses are divided into three categories: Humanistic, Social Scientific, and Natural Science and Mathematical Reasoning.

By building on the Foundations tier and further preparing the student for the Culminating tier, the Discovery courses are an important part of the vertical integration of Core courses. Each of the Discovery tier's themes brings together a group of Discovery courses around a common topic, while also systematically organizing them by type of approach to the study of that theme. As a result, students also experience a deeper for of the horizontal integration introduced in the Foundations tier.

Students will complete 4 Discovery courses. The first three courses will come from the selection of one course from each of the three areas under that theme (i.e., within a theme, a student will take one Humanistic course, one Social Scientific course, and one Natural Science and Mathematical Reasoning course.) The fourth course will be an elective course, chosen from the remaining courses within any of the three areas of that theme.

Because this tier involves a large number of courses taught by a variety of departments, the next section of this appendix includes a detailed discussion of the process for selecting and maintaining the themes of the Discovery tier and the courses available to students under each theme.

Structure and Course Selection

1. **Course Proposals**

Course proposals should include the following:
   a. *Course description*: This should include
      --summary of course content
      --learning objectives

   b. *Justification*: Explanation of how course will integrate methodology that fulfills the "questioning, investigating, interpreting" imperative of the Discovery Tier.

   c. *Syllabus*: A detailed syllabus that lays out key themes to be covered, related assessments, and active learning opportunities for students.

For the evaluation committee as well as for proposing faculty, a rubric is provided as a guideline for course selection at the end of this document.

2. **Course Themes and Threads**:

Courses must directly and substantially address the theme through content, methodology, and written assignments. Within each theme, courses will be classified in one of three threads.

a. Courses in the Humanities Group

The humanities are the study of how people document and describe the human experience through philosophy, literature, religion, art, music, history and language. Drawing largely on documentary and literary sources, courses in this group will apply humanistic methodologies to question, investigate, and interpret the human experience through lectures, discussions, written assignments, and other active learning opportunities. Together with other classes in the UCCS, courses in the Discovery Tier's Humanistic group will:

- help students develop critical thinking and writing skills;
- introduce students to languages, cultures, and literary traditions from around the world and through the ages;
- provide students with the analytical and communicative skills necessary to personal intellectual and moral development;
- impart historical and political contexts to make them more responsible citizens;
- give students the tools to investigate and understand their own and others' faith traditions.

b. Courses in the Social Science Group

The disciplines represented in this group share an interest in describing human socio-cultural phenomena and interactions at a variety of scales, ranging from the global to the individual. Disciplines commonly included in this group are anthropology, communication studies, criminology, economics, education, geography, international affairs, legal studies, linguistics, management, organizational behavior, leadership, human resources, ethics, consumers and marketing, political science, psychology, public policy, and sociology. The social sciences can be characterized as encompassing a range of methodologies. Some social scientists seek to understand socio-cultural phenomena in generalizable ways using a range of methodologies, both qualitative and quantitative. Others focus on nuanced and detailed descriptions that explain individual cases.

Courses in this group will apply a range of social scientific methodologies to question, investigate, and interpret socio-cultural phenomena through lectures, discussions, written assignments, experiential/applied assignments. Together with other classes in the UCCS, courses in this group will:

- introduce social science content and perspectives relevant to the theme;
- be able to communicate effectively about this content demonstrating critical thinking skills;
- require application of this content and perspective to an understanding of specific issue, community, or current event;
- critically reflect on the ethical dimensions of this theme with respect to various sociocultural contexts.

c. Courses in the Mathematics, Natural and Physical Sciences Group

Courses in this group will examine the theme through the lens of mathematics and the natural and physical sciences, technology, and engineering, which together represent ways to explain the natural and physical world. Disciplines commonly included in this group are mathematics, computer science, finance, accounting, information technology and information sciences, biology, chemistry, physics, health sciences and engineering. Together, these focus on the application of methodologies involving collaboration, inquiry, experimentation and problem

solving to examine natural phenomena, through investigating, questioning, collecting, and analyzing information. Courses in this category will:
- introduce students to examination of natural and physical phenomena using a range of methodologies;
- help students develop critical analytical skills to address the above skills;
- provide students with the written and communication skills necessary to share their understanding of the natural and physical world;
- equip them with knowledge to be responsible citizens and make a difference.

3. **Course Inclusion and Retention Process**

a. Course proposals will be sent to the Discovery tier coordinator for consideration for the Discovery Tier (DT).

b. The DT Committee may use the provided rubric or other formal, objective mechanism to determine the appropriateness of the course for inclusion in the Discovery Tier (see end of section). Outcome of the process may be:
- Accept for inclusion;
- Revise and resubmit for consideration;
- Propose for a different tier;
- Reject.

c. The DT Committee should maintain a map of themes and threads and how accepted courses fall within this map. The intent would be to ensure that there is a good balance of course offerings across themes and threads and that no one area is over or under supported.

d. Accepted courses may be revisited every 3 years to ensure that content and delivery continues to remain aligned with the objectives of the tier. Should a course be found not to be meeting the objectives, some course revision may be involved or new courses may be solicited.

e. As needed, the DT Committee may solicit courses from across campus for under-represented themes and threads.

4. **A Process for Selecting, Maintaining, and Changing Themes for the Discovery Level of the Next Core Curriculum**

a. Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC) or its future version will send an invitation (together with the learning objectives for the Core and for the Discovery level of the Core) to the MU community for possible themes.
   i. A theme should come from different faculty members working together from at least three or four departments or colleges.
   ii. A theme proposal should include a list of potential courses in theme and how they specifically connect to the humanistic, social scientific, and natural science and mathematical reasoning threads within the proposed Theme.
   iii. A theme proposal should include endorsement from each relevant department or college assuring that there is capacity to offer the courses listed.
   iv. A theme proposal should demonstrate its consistency with the University's mission and should detail its pursuit of the learning objectives of the Core.

b. CCRC will sort through all of the proposed themes. It will merge "similar" themes where appropriate, seek out additional information for less detailed themes, etc. CCRC will present to the MU community a list of proposed themes with courses arranged in them according to the three threads in each theme.
c. The MU community will provide feedback to the CCRC on that list.
d. CCRC will send to the Provost's office its initial list, a summary of MU feedback on that list, and recommendations on a final list.
e. After consulting with college deans and chairs, the Provost's office will decide on the list of themes and their courses arranged in three threads for each theme.
f. Rules for replacing themes and for bringing in new ones:
    i. A theme has to last for at least five years to give students time to graduate in a theme they have started. There is no limit as to how many years a theme can be in place.
    ii. No more than two themes can be replaced in the same year to keep workload on maintenance of the Core at a reasonable level.
    iii. A cap on the number of themes will be set by the Provost's office or by the CCRC and never exceeded. The CCRC and the Provost's office will encourage departments and colleges to offer a number of themes as close as possible to the cap. Down the road, there could be some incentive/resources available for departments wishing to develop new themes. A theme that is in the process of being introduced or cancelled (see "v" below) will not count as a whole theme in calculating the number of themes in comparison to the cap. It will count as 1/4, 1/2, or 3/4 in accordance with the year in the introduction or cancellation process (see "v" below).
    iv. Themes can be cancelled (by the Provost's office) for undersubscription if enrollment in them falls below a minimum set by the CCRC for a number of semesters in a row that the CCRC determines. A theme can be cancelled for other good reasons (for example, another theme seems better but its introduction would exceed the cap). The CCRC or the Provost's office must conduct ample consultation with relevant departments and colleges before cancelling a theme.
    v. Introduction of a theme and cancellation of a theme will happen gradually: in the first year, just for freshmen; in the second year, for freshmen and sophomores; etc. The idea here is that no student should have a theme removed once that student has started going through the courses in the theme. Further, we want to discourage (without forbidding) students already launched on a theme from jumping to new themes they believe they will like better.
g. Rules for modifying the course list of a given theme:
    i. Courses may be added or deleted from a theme after it has been introduced, with the approval of the CCRC or the Provost's office.
    ii. The CCRC or the Provost's office cannot approve the deletion of a course from a theme already introduced without ensuring the theme or thread in question has enough courses after the deletion.
    iii. The CCRC will determine a cap on the number of courses for each theme and for each thread in each theme. No course may be added to a theme already introduced if that addition will bring the number of courses beyond the cap for the theme or the thread.

5. Guiding Rubrics

Criteria	Weight	High	Medium	Low
Reflection of Discovery Methodology in Course	*High*	Course strongly incorporates all three elements of questioning, investigating, and interpreting throughout the course. The course content and active student learning opportunities encompass all three. The presence of these three elements are clearly reflected in the syllabus and course content.	Course incorporates all three elements of questioning, investigating, and interpreting to some degree. The course content and active student learning opportunities relate to at least two of these elements. Not all three elements may be clearly evident in the course content and syllabus.	Course only incorporates one or two of the three elements of questioning, investigating, and interpreting throughout the course and the elements present are weak. Course content and active learning opportunities do not clearly support the methodology.
Fit with Themes and Threads	**High**	The course clearly fits within one of the proposed themes of humanities, social sciences, and natural/physical sciences described in previous sections and has the potential of being offered across multiple themes or threads.	The course clearly fits within one of the proposed themes of humanities, social sciences, and natural/physical sciences as described above but may not have the potential to be offered across multiple themes and/or threads	It is unclear how the course fits within one of the proposed themes of humanities, social sciences, and natural/physical sciences. The course proposal also does not seem to fit in more than one proposed thread/theme.
Learning Objectives align with Core Objectives	**High**	The course clearly supports both the key objectives of the discovery tier – developing leaders in discovery and global problem solvers. The course content, assessments, and active learning opportunities align strongly with developing skill sets to support both the objectives.	The course clearly supports at least one the key objectives of the discovery tier. The course content, assessments, and active learning opportunities align strongly with developing skill sets to support at least one the objectives.	The course does not seem to support even one of the key objectives of the discovery tier. The course content, assessments, and active learning opportunities do not seem to develop skill sets to support even one of the objectives.
Active Learning	**Medium**	The course provides a clear path towards active learning and student engagement through problem solving that promotes analysis, synthesis, and reflection on class content. Active learning and student engagement is deeply entrenched in the course design.	The course design is suggestive of active learning and student engagement through problem solving that promotes analysis, synthesis, and reflection on class content. However, not all elements might be central to the content delivery.	The course does not seem to actively engage students in synthesis of knowledge and reflection on content.
Potential Student Interest	**Medium**	The course topic/theme can garner significant and sustained student interest. The topic is current and is expected to sustain strong relevance for 3-5 years. Proposed delivery of course can keep students actively engaged.	The course topic/theme can garner a good amount of student interest. The topic is current and is expected to be relevant for 3-5 years. Proposed delivery of course can keep students interest.	The course topic/theme demonstrates low potential for sustained student interest. The topic not expected to sustain strong relevance for 3-5 years. Proposed delivery of course can may not engage students.
Syllabus is Well Developed	**Medium**	Syllabus provided is thorough, well planned, and clearly demonstrates all rubric criteria discussed earlier.	Syllabus provided is mostly well planned and demonstrates all rubric criteria discussed earlier.	Syllabus provided needs further development and must better demonstrate many of the criteria discussed earlier.
Fit with Other Two Tiers		TBD	TBD	TBD
Terms That May Best Describe the Course Proposal		- Excellent - Thorough - Very strong alignment with the mission - Very strong contribution to student development - Very strong fit with the core	- Very Good - Well Developed - Aligned with the mission - Good contribution to student development - Good fit with the core	- Weak - Needs Further Development - Inadequate or unclear alignment with the mission - Insufficient contribution to student development - Needs better fit with the core
Score				

Appendix D: Culminating Experience Template

Proposed Title: The Service of Faith and Promotion of Justice

Course Description

This three-credit course is designed to integrate the Marquette core by emphasizing the reflection on and application of knowledge and skills developed in the core for life beyond Marquette University. A special focus on vocation and discernment invites students to evaluate their coursework at Marquette alongside their own worldview and transcendent commitments in order to identify ways they are uniquely equipped to work for justice in the world. A collaborative, interdisciplinary analysis of a lasting problem in the local or global community presents a test-case for this integration of academic experience and personal faith for the promotion of justice, providing the foundation for an analogical application to student's lives and work after Marquette.

Core Learning Outcomes

All six, with focus on _Global Problem Solvers_: Marquette students are well-practiced in cooperative and cross-disciplinary problem-solving skills and they can present innovative solutions that draw from theological, philosophical, qualitative, and quantitative perspectives to address the increasingly blurred lines between local and global challenges.

Course Learning Objectives

By the end of this course students will be able to:
1. Articulate their own overarching commitment(s) to values transcending self-interest in order to define their post-graduate plans in vocational terms.
2. Apply different methods of inquiry to analyze a social problem affecting the local or global community.
3. Use the tools of discernment to evaluate personal and social decisions in light of the implications for diverse communities and the common good.

Course Structure

Part I: Common readings focusing on integration and transcendent commitment, vocation, and discernment.

Part II: Collaborative analysis of a common social problem defined by the instructor for each section. This analysis will require students to:
1. assess the effects of this problem on diverse populations in order to explain why addressing this problem is a matter of justice;
2. employ the different methods of inquiry studied during the core to identify the root causes contributing to the persistence of their chosen problem;
3. specify the kinds of changes to personal choices and social systems that would be required to address this problem.

Part III: Reflection assignment in which students use the collaborative analysis to describe how their personal commitments translate to a vocational path that improves the common good. (In terms of the proposed title, how their _faith_—broadly conceived—_serves_ as the basis for a commitment to the _promotion of justice_). This assignment should engage the common readings as well as other course content developed by the faculty teaching the specific section.

Common Readings

The precise list can be specified, but it would likely be helpful to think of the readings in a few categories:

1. Integration/Transcendent Commitment
   a. Adolfo Nicolas, SJ's "Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education Today" which talks about confronting the "globalization of superficiality" is a potential example (and, in the words of James South encourages students to think about a deep integration across their classes that goes beyond "mere eclecticism")
   b. Sharon Daloz Parks et al., "Commitment: The Power of the Double Negative," in *Common Fire: Leading Lives of Commitment in a Complex World* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 193–311.
   c. Mark Roche, "Integrating the Values of the Liberal Arts," in *Why Choose the Liberal Arts* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2010), 147–172 [or shorter excerpt]
2. Vocation
   a. Donna K. MacMillan, "Vocation, Psychologically Speaking," in *Claiming our Callings: Toward a New Understanding of Vocation in the Liberal Arts*, ed. Kaethe Schwehn and L.DeAne Lagerquist (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 72–82.
   b. Marge Piercy, "To Be of Use" (short poem)
   c. We might also find useful resources in a forthcoming volume *Vocation across the Academy* (out in Feb.) that talks about the unifying potential of vocation in higher education.
3. Discernment
   a. James Martin, S.J., has an accessible and practical chapter on Ignatian discernment in *The Jesuit Guide to Almost Everything*
4. Concluding Reflection
   a. I really like the idea of a piece by Sam Wells here, "Rethinking Service," that uses a distinction between doing things "for" people and doing things "with" people to critiques the tendency to think only in terms of solving problems

NB: common readings will not be the only readings for the course. Each faculty member will have discretion to add to the readings in any/all of the areas of the course in order to design a coherent section.

EXAMPLES FOR PART II

Example 1: Sweatshop Labor
1. Assess the effects of [sweatshop labor] on diverse populations
   a. read first-person accounts of sweatshop conditions in Asia and Latin America as well as first-person accounts of Rana Plaza factory collapse.
   b. Compare with Catholic social teaching on the dignity of labor and worker justice.
2. Employ the different methods of inquiry studied during the core to identify the root causes contributing to the persistence of [sweatshop labor]. Potential directions include:
   a. Economic analysis of supply and demand forces pressuring companies to generate cheap goods.
   b. Social/cultural analysis of "fast fashion" as a cultural assumption in the United States, encouraging consumers to seek new apparel regularly.
   c. Rhetorical analysis of successful public relations campaigns pressuring companies to address sweatshop labor.
   d. Theological analysis of structural sin in the personal and collective self-interests served by masking the role of sweatshop labor in final products.

      e. Organizational analysis of the challenges involved in identifying this problem and in maintaining compliance, perhaps achieved through student-led investigations of their favorite clothing companies.

      f. Interviews with businesses committed to ethically legitimate supply chains, highlighting the obstacles of living wages, just working conditions, etc.

      g. Historical analysis of self-regulation as a policy tool, especially in the apparel industry.

      h. Political science analysis of free trade deals and international relations.

3. Specify the kinds of changes to personal choices and social systems that would be required to address [sweatshop labor]

      a. Personal choices: research into ethically sourced apparel and other goods; identification of resources for ethical shopping; consideration of priorities in apparel and appearance (e.g., fast fashion v. "slow" fashion; replacement v. repair, etc.)

      b. Social changes: legal requirements v. industry self-regulation; model legislation; cultural changes around idealization of fashion; tariffs and trade policy