

CURRICULUM AND EDUCATIONAL POLICIES COMMITTEE  
ANNUAL REPORT  
JUNE 29, 2005  
ST. OLAF COLLEGE

**Members of CEPC for 2004-05:**

David Booth (IGS), chair  
Jo Beld (ARP)  
Mary Cisar (Registrar)  
Jill Dietz (NSM)  
Steve Hahn (HUM)  
Alice Hanson (FA)

Tyler Hauger (Student Senate)  
Peter Hertsgaard (Student Senate)  
Mary Sue Lovett (Library)  
Jim May (Provost and Dean)  
Donna McMillan (SAS)

**A. New Course Subcommittee (Steve Hahn, convener).**

On the recommendation of the subcommittee, CEPC recommended the faculty adopt 17 proposed new courses. CEPC reinstated one “dormant” course. See details in [Appendix A](#).

**B. Special Studies Subcommittee (Jill Dietz, convener).**

On the recommendation of the subcommittee, CEPC approved 11 new courses as part of the curriculum for interim or summer school. See details in [Appendix B](#).

**C. Foreign Language Subcommittee (Mary Cisar, convener).**

On the recommendation of the subcommittee, the committee denied three student petitions to fulfill the GE requirement for foreign language by the route of courses in translation. Next year the subcommittee should address questions raised by the emergence of more formal and widespread procedures for documenting a learning disability with respect to learning a foreign language: Is formal documentation of a learning disability specific to learning a foreign language a *requirement* for a successful petition? Or may a student, as in past years, base a successful petition simply on failure to progress in foreign language courses?

**D. Inquiry in Support of Student Learning (ISSL) (Jo Beld, convener).**

Jo Beld convened a small group of faculty who functioned as an informal subcommittee of CEPC to guide assessment efforts consistent with college commitments made during accreditation self-study. They drafted statements of intended learning outcomes for GE requirements, consulted with the office of Academic Research and Planning (ARP) to develop program review guidelines, and guided St. Olaf proposals to participate in two assessment collaborations with partner institutions. (See [Appendix C](#).)

**E. Review of College General Education Curriculum (GE).**

At the outset of the 2004-05 academic year, the Dean’s task force on GE offered specific recommendations concerning ongoing review of the curriculum. The premise of the task force recommendation was that the curriculum is excellent in design and implementation and should be fine tuned, rather than overhauled, and more specifically that the size and balance of GE should not be significantly changed. Acknowledging the excellence of the original plan, the task force recommended efforts to refocus and make more explicit the original impetus and underlying design of GE. For example, the task force called for the articulation of explicit statements of the *intended learning outcomes* of each of the GE requirements. It also called for more focused attention to fine tune certain of the requirements (MAR, NST,

BTS-T, PHA, MCS). Finally it called on CEPC to manage the continuing process of review. CEPC convened small working groups of faculty and students to review each of the five requirements the task force had singled out; the committee issued a specific charge to each working group (see [Appendix D](#)). The working groups on BTS-T and PHA issued recommendations, on the basis of which CEPC drafted motions to revise guidelines for these two requirements; these motions will be presented to the faculty in the fall (CEPC 05/06-1 and CEPC 05/06-2; [Appendix E](#) and [Appendix F](#)). The working group on MAR and NST delivered an interim report and will continue work in the fall. The working group on MCS issued a report but made no final recommendation; a new working group will be convened in the fall. CEPC moved the adoption of statements of intended learning outcomes for all other GE requirements (CEPC 04/05-9). These statements were adopted at the May faculty meeting, with the exception of the statement of intended learning outcomes for the foreign language requirement (FOL), which was removed from the motion and returned to the committee.

#### F. **Other Actions.**

##### 1. *Nursing Major.*

At the request of Chris Thomforde, the committee reviewed reports of two task forces which had been charged by him to consider the future of the nursing program with respect to costs, gains, and importance for the future of the college. In reviewing these reports, CEPC focused on questions about the importance of the nursing program to the curriculum of the college in light of the college history, mission, and identity. On this basis, the committee endorsed continuation of the program (See [Appendix G](#)). Subsequently, the committee moved the faculty approve proposed changes to the requirements for the Nursing major. Motion to the faculty passed.

##### 2. *Spanish Major.*

The committee moved the faculty approve proposed changes to the requirements for the Spanish major. Motion to the faculty passed.

##### 3. *Mathematics Major.*

The committee moved the faculty approve proposed changes to the requirements for the Mathematics major. Motion to the faculty passed.

##### 4. *0.5 Credit Internships.*

The committee moved the faculty approve an option for departments and programs to offer 0.5 credit internships. Motion to the faculty passed.

##### 5. *Non-Standard Term Dates.*

The committee approved guidelines to regulate non-standard term dates for programs of the college that offer instruction outside the regular terms announced in the college Academic Calendar. (See [Appendix H](#).)

##### 6. *Selective Admission to Upper Level Courses.*

With reservations, the committee acknowledged a procedure proposed by the English department to manage registration for Level III writing courses selectively, by a process of portfolio review. The college has no policy regulating selective admission to courses, and there are some existing instances of selective admission. In the absence of a policy, the committee concluded it had little authority over the procedure proposed by the English department. Nevertheless, we were dismayed by implications of the proposal. In discussing the proposal, the committee affirmed that general policies governing admission to popular classes must be set by the faculty as a whole, not by individual departments or programs. The committee also strongly affirmed the egalitarian ethos of past registration practices, which have allowed any student who has completed

prerequisites to have a chance to register for upper level courses. The committee drafted guidelines to help identify rare circumstances when it might be appropriate to admit students to upper level classes selectively. In general, the committee expressed a strong sense that successful completion of prerequisite courses should be the sole criterion of student eligibility to register for an upper level course. The committee intends to introduce a motion on selective admissions in the fall.

7. *Transfer Credits.*

At the request of the registrar, the committee acted on several student petitions concerning awarding credit for course work done at other institutions, including work done in non-traditional venues, such as electronically mediated course work. With the registrar the committee began discussion of criteria for allowing transfer credit for courses delivered in venues unlike those typically found on campus (e.g., electronically mediated course work, “college in the schools” courses, post-secondary education option (PSEO) credits). Existing policies governing transfer credits do not apply effectively to new kinds of learning experiences.

**G. Issues for 2005-06.**

1. *Review of General Education.*

The committee should present finished motions to revise guidelines for BTS-T and PHA. The committee should encourage the working group considering revision of guidelines for NST and MAR. The committee should convene a new working group to continue the work begun on revision of guidelines for MCS. The committee should develop new statement of intended learning outcomes for FOL. All revisions to GE should be delivered to the General Education Committee (GEC) for implementation.

2. *Policy on Selective Admission.*

The committee should present a motion to adopt a policy to regulate proposals for selective admission to upper level courses; the committee should determine where such a policy should reside.

3. *Grades.*

The committee should develop a position and offer a statement on “grade inflation,” and ask the faculty to adopt this statement.

4. *Collaboration with Dean’s Council.*

The committee should develop routine protocols to collaborate more closely with Dean’s Council to insure that curricular decisions and resource decisions are better coordinated.

5. *Transfer Credits.*

The committee should develop new guidelines for the registrar’s office.

## Appendix A: New Courses Approved

1. Asian Studies 275: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Asia
2. Biology 263: Limnology
3. Computer Science 336: Logic Programming
4. Dance 105: The Beat Goes On
5. Dance 301: Advanced Body Movable
6. English 123: Introduction to Poetry
7. English 124: Introduction to Drama
8. English 227: King Arthur Through the Ages
9. English 272: Utopias
10. English 395: Chaucer: Literary, Historical, and Ethical Approaches  
Computer Science 315: Bioinformatics
11. Greek 370: Topics in Greek Literature
12. Latin 370: Topics in Latin Literature
13. Math 236: The Mathematics of Biology
14. Norwegian 130: Nordic Film Today: Love, Sex, and Family  
Mathematics 242: Modern Computation Mathematics  
Music 267: Advanced Acting for the Lyric Stage.
15. Physics 379: Statistical Physics (*reinstated*)
16. Political Science 254: Japanese Politics and Society
17. Religion 217: Christian and Islamic Ethics: Conflicts and Cross-Pollination
18. Sociology/Anthropology 234: Native North American Cultures and Religions

**Appendix B: New Interim and Summer Courses Approved**

1. Art 271: Gothic Art
2. Biology 133: Plagues and Pestilence
3. Classics 129: The Neverending Myth: Ovid's Metamorphoses
4. Economics 116: Consumers in Families and Communities
5. English 182: The American Dramatic Tradition: Odets to Mamet
6. English 239: Literature of the Vietnam War/American War
7. Norwegian 125: Norwegian Folklore and Folk Narrative  
Psychology 2xx: Human Development in East Asia: Perspectives from China and Japan  
English 200: Reading and Writing the Personal Essay
8. Political Science 116: Foreign Policy and Crisis Management
9. Psychology 338: Neurobiology of Psychopathology
10. Social Work 120: I Want to Help People
11. Sociology/Anthropology 115: The Anthropology of War and Peace

## Appendix C: Assessment Progress Report

**TO:** CEPC  
**FROM:** Jo Beld  
**RE:** Assessment progress report

Here is a brief summary of activities and accomplishments with respect to assessment during the 04-05 academic year

1. **General Education intended learning outcomes** – The faculty passed a statement of intended learning outcomes for all GE requirements except FOL, MAR, PHA, BTS, MCS, and NST. A working group will participate in a Summer Institute sponsored by the Collaboration for the Advancement of College Teaching and Learning to develop a proposal for assessing the extent to which these learning outcomes are developed in GE courses.
2. **Program review guidelines** – In collaboration with ISSL, ARP developed and posted guidelines for the content of program review, including suggestions for assessment. These are available at:  
  
[http://www.stolaf.edu/offices/academic-planning/program\\_reviews/Recommendationsforcontentofaprogram%20Review.htm](http://www.stolaf.edu/offices/academic-planning/program_reviews/Recommendationsforcontentofaprogram%20Review.htm)  
  
[http://www.stolaf.edu/offices/academic-planning/program\\_reviews/PracticalSuggestionsforAssessmentattheProgramLevel.htm](http://www.stolaf.edu/offices/academic-planning/program_reviews/PracticalSuggestionsforAssessmentattheProgramLevel.htm)
3. **Existing survey item classification project** – St. Olaf already administers a number of surveys to St. Olaf students that include a number of items related to teaching and learning. ARP and IRP collaborated to “sort” these items into teaching and learning variables. When the project is concluded, the classification scheme with links to the actual items will be posted on the ARP and IRP websites. A summary of the classification scheme is attached.
4. **First-year information literacy assessment pilot project** – St. Olaf is part of a collaborative project with Carleton, Grinnell, and Macalester, funded by the Midwest Instructional Technology Center (MITC), to develop and pilot an instrument that assesses student experiences, behaviors, knowledge, critical capacities, and dispositions with respect to information literacy. The Director of ARP served as the lead for the development of the instrument and it is currently being piloted with a sample of 100 St. Olaf students (as well as a sample of students from Carleton and Grinnell). It will be administered to the entire first-year class in the fall of 2005.
5. **Teagle assessment collaboration** – In partnership with the same three institutions, St. Olaf has submitted a grant application to the Teagle Foundation to undertake pilot assessment of effective writing, critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and global outlook. At least one of the instruments we propose to use is the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). The Director of ARP has started collaborating with the Student Government Association to build practical support for student participation in the project. We await a decision from Teagle.

## **Appendix D: Charges to GE Working Groups**

All working groups were requested to define each GE requirement through five elements:

1. A brief descriptive statement of the essence of the requirement
2. Specific guidelines for courses that would fulfill the requirement to help instructors develop syllabuses and to help GEC evaluate course proposals
3. If necessary, comments elaborating on the guidelines
4. A list of desired student learning outcomes
5. A rationale for the requirement itself, explaining why it is part of GE at St. Olaf College

Items 1-3 parallel the elements that currently define each requirement of our GE. Items 4-5 are new elements to be included in future definitions of each requirement.

### **Excerpts From Charge to Working Group on BTS-T (Lagerquist, P. Larson, Schuurman, Zorn, Carolyn Brostrom '05, Stephanie Smith '05):**

Throughout its work with the faculty and with students, the Dean's task force on GE encountered a motif of concern about whether the aim of cultivating "theological literacy" is best served by requiring a course whose guidelines appear to specify a study of what amounts to "systematic theology" as the phrase would be understood in a seminary curriculum. Our colleagues ask questions that fall in two categories: first, questions about how our interest in theology should interact with our commitment to a global perspective (including concern for understanding other religions); and second questions about whether general education in "theology" should focus on theology narrowly construed, while downplaying other ways of understanding the history and experience of Christian communities.

In thinking about the future of BTS-T, we urge you to go to fundamentals: what is it we think students are supposed to learn in fulfilling this requirement? What is it about learning in theology that makes such learning a *necessary* part of the way St. Olaf College understands the general education of our graduates? What should be the defining elements of courses that fulfill this requirement?

CEPC asks that you address the interplay of our BTS-T requirement, our goal of "theological literacy," and our preference for a "global perspective." Is there appropriate room, in principle and in fact, for students to incorporate study of other religious traditions as they seek to fulfill the requirement in theology? Is there appropriate room, in principle and in fact, for students to incorporate diverse ways of studying religion as they seek to fulfill the requirement in theology? What is the best way for us to understand "theological literacy" in this moment of unprecedented interaction among the world's religions, both globally and in the U.S.

### **Excerpts From Charge to Working Group on PHA (Book, M. Allister, McKelvey, Klopchin):**

In thinking about the future of the PHA requirement, we urge you to go to fundamentals: what is it we think students are supposed to learn in fulfilling this requirement? What is it about learning and participation in physical activity that makes such learning a *necessary* part of the knowledge of a what St. Olaf understands to be a generally educated graduate?

In particular, CEPC asks that your reflection on PHA address these questions: What is the interest of a liberal arts college in offering instruction in “structured physical activity”? What is the relation between our concern for wellness and our concern for instruction in physical activity? Should the college include attention to physical activity in our curriculum, or simply offer rich co-curricular opportunities for physical activity and wellness education? We recognize that these are not new questions, but we think it is appropriate to reconsider whether the college and its students are best served by a curricular requirement, or by a broader institutional strategy of support for physical well-being.

Our GE curriculum is one of the best features of our college, and the best feature of GE is that it rests on the expectation that we will be able to state publicly, in terms the whole community can endorse, what the general character of learning in each required area involves. We are not, and we should not be content to say to students “you must take a ‘PE’ course.” Instead, we provide guidelines and comments that articulate our commitment to “instruction and practice in a structured physical activity” and “instruction on how to maintain a physically healthy lifestyle.” This makes the content and structure of our curriculum transparent, and increases the likelihood that students can make an integrated whole out of their learning at the college. We think that any revision to the requirements for PHA should be similarly, or even more transparent and public.

**Excerpts from Charge to Working Group on MAR and NST (Van Wylen, Jacobel, Walczak, Walter, Zorn, Grenberg, Nichol, Huff, Gross):**

This is an opportune moment [to review these requirements]. The college has a decade of experience with how these requirements serve our students. Moreover, recent developments in the study of math and science prompt the question, what are the right general education requirements in science and math for our students? First, as you and your colleagues amply demonstrate, research and learning in the natural sciences is increasingly interdisciplinary. Second, there is a growing sense across the campus of the importance of attending to the social context and impact of work in the sciences. And third, many of our colleagues are actively promoting the incorporation of quantitatively rich approaches to learning in the natural sciences.

In thinking about the future of the NST and MAR requirements, we urge you to go to fundamentals: what is it we think students are supposed to learn in fulfilling this requirement? What is it about learning in science that makes such learning a *necessary* part of the knowledge of a what St. Olaf understands to be a generally educated graduate?

In particular, CEPC asks that your reflection on NST address these questions: What is the rationale for requiring, as we do, two courses in different areas of science, one of which must be in physics, chemistry, or biology? Why are two courses necessary? Isn't one course a sufficient encounter with the characteristic questions and methods of natural science to satisfy the promise of general education for a student majoring in some other area of the curriculum? If we must require two courses, is this because the quantity of learning required simply cannot occur in a single term? Or is there some other rationale? And why must the two courses be in different areas? Isn't there some advantage, even for general education purposes, in allowing students to deepen their learning in a single branch of science? Aren't they in a sense better educated about science if they get more deeply involved in biology than

if they get superficially involved in biology and also in physics or some other field? And, given the interdisciplinary state of research in these fields, what is the rationale for requiring one course to be in one of the specific departments, physics, chemistry, or biology? Aren't the interdisciplinary areas of environmental studies, neuroscience, etc. just as effective areas for learning what general education in science requires?

Further, CEPC requests that the group reflect seriously on the interaction of MAR and NST and make a recommendation about how the relationship between these two areas of learning should be understood in the future. Address seriously and frankly the question whether the general education of our students must include a course in "mathematical reasoning" (or some other phrase that suggests the distinctive approach to problems that characterizes the work of our colleagues in the MSCS department), or whether general education is better served by requiring a certain level of "quantitative literacy" (or some other phrase that suggests the need for some mastery of quantitative methods in their applications to other kinds of problems). How your group answers this question will probably have a bearing on what you recommend as the future structure of the NST and MAR requirements, whether they are kept separate, or integrated in some way.

**Excerpts From Charge to Working Group on MCS (Lennox, Fitzgerald, Williamson, Emily Strand '06):**

The college has a decade of experience with how [MCS serves] our students. We have discovered ambiguities and surprises in trying to apply the MCS guidelines to particular course proposals. The world situation has only become more complex. And reflection on the principal categories of distinction underlying the two parts of MCS (as well as their conceptual partner HWC), has presented reason to be even more cautious about the use of the categories "western" and "non-western."

In thinking about the future of the MCS requirement, we urge you to go to fundamentals: what is it we think students are supposed to learn in fulfilling this requirement? What is it about learning in multi-cultural studies that makes such learning a *necessary* part of the knowledge of a what St. Olaf understands to be a generally educated graduate?

In particular, CEPC asks that your reflection on MCS address these questions: What is the proper relationship between MCS and HWC in terms of the content and modes of learning entailed in each of these guidelines? Is the description of MCS-G adequate to deal with courses treating regions and cultures characterized by the *interplay* of European heritages and others heritages. Are issues of power and enfranchisement adequately addressed in the guidelines for MCS-D? That is, should it be a component about the experiences of minority groups in the United States? Or should it be a component explicitly addressing the conditions of disenfranchisement of some groups in the United States.

Our GE curriculum is one of the best features of our college, and the best feature of GE is that it rests on the expectation that we will be able to state publicly, in terms the whole community can endorse, what the general character of learning in each required area involves. We are not, and we should not be content to say to students "you must take a 'non-western' course." Instead, we say students must take courses that develop an "understanding of cultures outside the western tradition . . . [and] of cultural diversity within U.S. society" (and we say much else that is even more specific). This makes the content and structure of

our curriculum transparent, and increases the likelihood that students can make an integrated whole out of their learning at the college. We think that any revision to the requirements for MCS should be similarly, or even more transparent and public.

## **Appendix E: CEPC 05/06-1**

To: St. Olaf College Faculty  
Fr: CEPC  
Re: Proposed Revisions to General Education Requirement for “Biblical and Theological Studies—Theology”

At the October, 2005, Faculty Meeting, CEPC will move the adoption of new statements to define the general education requirement for Biblical and Theological Studies—Theology (BTS-T). These statements include (1) description, (2) guidelines, (3) comments, (4) intended learning outcomes, and (5) a rationale for the requirement as part of St. Olaf College general education. A rationale for the proposed changes follows.

### Description:

A course on Christian theology that acquaints students with ongoing efforts to understand the essential content of Christian belief in a critical and coherent manner, and that engages students in theological reflection.

### Guidelines:

1. The principal focus of these courses must be Christian theology, understood as critical and normative reflection on the Christian church’s teachings.
2. Courses must consider substantial examples of historical or contemporary theological reflection, and attend to the context, the variety, and the coherence of the theological claims they advance.
3. Courses must include explicit attention to the church’s teachings about God and Jesus Christ; courses may include attention to significant aspects of other central teachings as appropriate to specific course goals.
4. Courses must provide opportunities for students to engage in explicitly theological reflection, and to apply their theological knowledge to matters of historical, contemporary, or personal significance.

### Comments:

1. While these courses may also consider other traditions or disciplines in relation to theology, Christian theology must be the principal focus. Theology is understood as “critical and normative reflection.” Theology is critical in that the Christian church’s discourse about God and Christ claims to be meaningful and true. Hence these courses must explore criteria of meaning and truth, and address such questions as, How, if at all, is what the church has taught about God and Christ meaningful? Theology is normative in that it intends to shape the church’s continuing discourse about God and Christ. Hence these courses must address such questions as, What should Christians say in the future, if they wish to speak truly about God and Christ?

2. Christian theology is a temporally extended and multi-cultural discussion about the church's discourse about God and Christ. Courses satisfying this requirement must introduce students into this discussion by presentation of historical or contemporary movements or figures. Where appropriate, this may also involve considerations of critics of Christianity, minority Christian traditions, other religious traditions, or theological interaction with non-theological disciplines.
3. Although these courses must include substantial attention to Christian teachings about God and Christ, they need not be exclusively concerned with them. They may also include the relation of these teachings to other Christian teachings about, for example, creation, sin, anthropology, ecclesiology, eschatology, and more. They may consider other aspects of Christianity such as religious practice, institutions, or ritual. They may include comparisons of Christian teachings with those of other religions.
4. Students in courses meeting this requirement will both acquire knowledge of Christian theology and participate actively in theological discussion, through informed engagement with a variety of theological positions.

Intended Learning Outcomes:

Students will demonstrate

1. knowledge about teachings of the Christian church, including knowledge of their historical development, their complexity and variety, and their coherence.
2. skill in reading and interpreting theological texts.
3. ability to evaluate the truth and meaning of their own and others' theological positions.
4. ability to apply theological knowledge and skills to issues of historical, contemporary, or personal significance.

Rationale for the BTS-T requirement:

The St. Olaf mission statement articulates the college's commitment to the liberal arts tradition, to Christianity, and to development of a global perspective. It promises students both "the spirit of free inquiry and free expression" and "theological literacy." The BTS-T requirement contributes to theological literacy in a fashion informed by the whole of the college's mission. As a liberal arts institution the college recognizes that study of religion is essential for understanding human culture; as an institution informed by a particular strand of Christianity, it is committed to student learning about Christianity. This combination leads neither to indoctrination nor to simplistic rejection of religion in general or Christianity in particular; rather, it cultivates informed understanding of and engagement with Christianity by believers and non-believers alike. Opportunities provided by courses meeting this requirement interact with opportunities provided by other general education courses (notably BTS-B, EIN, MCS) to help students achieve a critical understanding of Christian teaching in a global perspective.

Rationale for the motion:

Dean May's task force on General Education called for the reinvigoration of campus conversation about GE. It called for even more public statements of the convictions that underlie the curriculum. And it called for specific review of a short list of requirements. In response to these recommendations, CEPC has overseen a process of review of the guidelines and descriptions for several GE requirements (PHA, MAR, NST, MCS, BTS-T). We have asked that small working groups of faculty and students consider these requirements in light of the college's experience with them over the years since their original implementation, and in light of our appraisal of the evolving context of liberal learning. Each working group was given a specific charge developed from the original task force recommendations, and also given a free hand to consider whatever else they thought wise. In addition, each working group was asked to add two new elements to the statements that have defined each requirement up to now. Heretofore, GE requirements have been specified by (1) a definition, (2) guidelines, and (3) comments. CEPC requested that going forward GE requirements also be specified by (4) intended learning outcomes and (5) a public declaration of the rationale for including a particular subject in the GE curriculum as a whole. Hence the statements in the present motion include

1. Definition
2. Guidelines
3. Comments
4. Intended learning outcomes
5. Rationale

The present statements were drafted by CEPC on the basis of recommendations from a working group on BTS-T (Professors Lagerquist, Schuurman, Phyllis Larson, and Zorn, and Carolyn Brostrom '05). Responding to suggestions from the Dean's task force, CEPC asked this working group in particular to address two questions: first, how should our interest in Christian theology interact with our commitment to a global perspective (including concern for understanding other religions); and second should general education in "theology" focus on theology narrowly construed, while downplaying other ways of understanding the history and experience of Christian communities.

In response to the first question, the working group reaffirmed that St. Olaf's vision of GE requires a course in "critical and normative reflection" on the contents of Christian faith. But they also observe that any conception of "theological literacy" for St. Olaf graduates in the 21<sup>st</sup> century should ideally involve a fairly sophisticated understanding of the place of Christian faith among the world's religious traditions. This goal cannot be achieved in the BTS-T course, since the work of cultivating critical and normative reflection on a religious tradition is already consuming. Nonetheless, the total effect of the BTS-T course is to be understood through the interplay of learning in courses that fulfill that requirement with learning in courses that fulfill other requirements, especially MCS and EIN.

In response to the second question, the working group reaffirmed the emphasis on "critical and normative reflection," and recommended that the guidelines be revised to clarify some ambiguities in existing guidelines, and give clear expression to a consensus understanding of the requirement that has emerged among instructors of approved courses and the GEC in the years since the curriculum was introduced.

## **Appendix F: CEPC 05/06-2**

To: St. Olaf College Faculty  
Fr: CEPC  
Re: Proposed Revisions to General Education Requirement for “Physical Activity”

At the October, 2005, Faculty Meeting, CEPC will move the adoption of new statements to define the general education requirement for Physical Activity (PHA), and to rename this requirement Studies in Physical Movement (SPM). These statements include (1) description (with administrative guidelines), (2) guidelines, (3) comments, (4) intended learning outcomes, and (5) a rationale for the requirement as part of St. Olaf College general education. A rationale for the proposed changes follows.

Studies in Physical Movement (SPM) (Foundation Studies)

### Description:

Studies in Physical Movement: Two courses, each focused on a different activity or mode of movement, that expand students’ experiences in and understanding of movement, and promote lifelong health and wellness of the whole person. Each course may be of any credit value (0.25 – 1.00).

### Administrative Guidelines:

Participants in intercollegiate sports may receive credit for one of the two required courses by enrolling in one of P ED 170-194: Intercollegiate Athletics.

A student may fulfill the SPM requirement with two courses in one department as long as the courses represent two different modes of movement. For example, Ballroom I and II (DANCE 106 and 206) would not satisfy the SPM requirement, nor would Racquet Sports and Badminton (P ED 150 and 151); on the other hand, Modern Dance I and Ballet I (DANCE 111 and 121) would satisfy the requirement, as would Tennis and Racquetball (P ED 157 and 153).

### Guidelines:

1. Courses must introduce and develop a physical technique and theory by engaging students in physical movement.
2. Courses must include a cognitive component where students learn about moving.
3. Courses must provide information about lifelong health and wellness of the whole person.
4. Courses must provide historical and cultural background relevant to the activity illustrating the wide range of roles of physical activity in human development.

### Comments:

1. Attention must be given to the proper interpretation of physical and tactile sensations experienced during the activity, with the goal of educating students in the wealth of information that flows from the body during any physical activity, and healthy responses to that information.
2. Courses must include information for properly preparing for the safe participation in the activity: stretching, conditioning, nutritional issues, etc.
3. The combination of physical activity and allied information such as sensation, intuition, imagination, and expression presented in the SPM course will have the potential for significant impact on the lifelong physical, social, or artistic well-being of students.

Intended Learning Outcomes:

Students will demonstrate

1. competence, confidence, and appreciation of human physical movement.
2. their understanding of the physical realm as a primary means of learning about themselves and others in the world.
3. an understanding of a life centered in movement as the basis of health and well-being.

Rationale for the SPM requirement:

The college mission states that the institution “fosters the development of the whole person in mind, body, and spirit.” Our curriculum is intentional and sophisticated in support of the mind and spirit; it is also intentional and sophisticated about learning physically. Courses satisfying the SPM requirement recognize that humans learn physically, and create learning environments that are engaging, challenging, and meaningful for the body. Opportunities afforded by these courses will allow students to become more skilled and articulate movers.

Rationale for the motion:

Dean May’s task force on General Education called for the reinvigoration of campus conversation about GE. It called for even more public statements of the convictions that underlie the curriculum. And it called for specific review of a short list of requirements. In response to these recommendations, CEPC has overseen a process of review of the guidelines and descriptions for several GE requirements (PHA, MAR, NST, MCS, BTS-T).

The present statements were drafted by CEPC on the basis of recommendations from a working group on PHA (Professors Allister, Book, Klopchin, and McKelvey). Responding to suggestions from the Dean’s task force, CEPC asked this working group in particular to address three questions: first, what is the interest of a liberal arts college in offering instruction in “structured physical activity;” second, what is the relation between our concern for wellness and our concern for instruction in physical activity; and third, should the college include attention to physical activity in our curriculum, or simply offer rich co-curricular opportunities for physical activity and wellness education.

In response to the first two questions, the working group noted that the college is certainly invested in the lifelong health and wellness of its students. SPM courses develop an understanding that a life centered in movement is the basis for health and well-being. Specific instruction on safe participation in activities, on the physical and tactile perceptions of movement, and on health and wellness issues will impact a student's lifelong physical, social, and artistic self.

In response to the third question, the working group acknowledged that the student body is generally quite physically active, but mere activity does not teach students how to interpret the wealth of information that flows from the body during physical activity. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence is one of the multiple intelligences that comprises both motor skills and kinesthetic awareness of the body. Courses adhering to the new requirement will provide instruction in both skill and kinesthesia, as well as put the activity into historical and cultural contexts.

The new SPM requirement reaffirms the importance of physical learning in a liberal arts curriculum, but introduces both a stronger cognitive component than the current PHA requirement and a stronger connection to health and wellness of the whole person.

The statements in the present motion include

1. Definition (with administrative guidelines)
2. Guidelines
3. Comments
4. Intended learning outcomes
5. Rationale for the requirement

**Appendix G: Letter from CEPC to President Chris Thomforde in response to reports of two Task Forces on the Nursing Program**

November 4, 2004

President Chris Thomforde  
St. Olaf College

Dear Chris,

At your request members of the Curriculum and Educational Policies Committee reviewed and discussed the report of the second nursing task force. In consideration of the revisions to the requirements and structure of the program proposed in the task force report, *CEPC supports the continuation of the program.*

We did not address questions about the cost of the program relative to the costs of other programs of the college; we leave those questions to dean's council and the cabinet. Instead, first, we considered the general question of the place of a pre-professional program in the curriculum of a liberal arts college. Then, second, we focused on the integrity of the proposed nursing curriculum, and the value of its contribution to the curriculum as a whole (we paid close attention to the set of principles for appraising the contributions of departments that we developed last year). And third, we explored questions about certain features of the proposed nursing curriculum, especially the dependence on clinical and laboratory adjunct instructors (CAI's and LAI's).

CEPC is convinced that in general, pre-professional majors are not consistent with the character of a liberal arts college, but that in deference to the history and principles evident in the guiding documents of the college, certain pre-professional majors are entirely consistent with the liberal arts as pursued at St. Olaf college. Nursing, as presented in the report of the task force, strikes us as a major admirably suited to a college whose vision of the liberal arts includes a claim to prepare students for "lives of unselfish service to others." We are further persuaded that the character of training for the profession as laid out in the report embodies key elements in liberal education, such as critical thinking, analytical problem solving, sense of history, moral sensitivity, awareness of global contexts, etc.

The nursing program has always offered significant benefits to the curriculum in terms of certain of the principles CEPC articulated last year. For example, the nursing program offers courses in a distinctive field closely related to the mission and identity of the college. And its subject attracts to the campus students whose presence we value. In the past, however, the nursing program has been a weak contributor in other respects because its fte has been consumed offering very specific courses required for the major; but if the nursing program were revised according to the task force proposal, it would be of significantly greater value to the curriculum as a whole. For example, the redeployment of nursing fte made possible by a reliance on CAI's and LAI's would enable the program to serve greater numbers of non-nursing students, and make a greater contribution to GE and to other majors. We wish this could happen to an even greater extent. If you choose to continue the program, CEPC will work closely with nursing faculty, in the process of reviewing proposed revisions to the major requirements, to try to increase even more the interplay between teaching in the major and learning across the campus.

The reliance of the proposed revisions on CAI's and LAI's prompted considerable discussion and mixed opinions. We find it is possible to view the function of CAI's in the proposed new nursing curriculum in a very positive light. They could be the cornerstone of a creative, praxis based pedagogy that enables students to profit from the mentorship of professionals in clinical settings, while enabling St. Olaf nursing faculty to provide more classroom teaching. They could be the point of enormously fruitful contacts between the campus and the community. The pedagogy that revolves around the CAI's could serve as an inspiring model for other kinds of experiential learning across the curriculum. However, we could also view the proposed reliance on CAI's less favorably, as a strategy to displace real program costs, unrealistically, on to practitioners. We do not think it is wise to rely on CAI's if the principal motive is cost savings. For one thing, the model for CAI's must be predicated on reasonable compensation for them, or it won't be sustainable. For another, if the college values nursing, which we believe it should, dean's council and the cabinet should secure the program in our routine budget planning, rather than fund it by shifting instructional costs to CAI's. Moreover, we are concerned to know how the campus standard of excellence in nursing instruction will be guaranteed in the clinical settings. To insure the integrity of a curriculum that relies heavily on CAI's there would have to be close monitoring of the program by St. Olaf nursing faculty, probably with an automatic review scheduled after a brief period. Nevertheless, even having expressed these cautions, the committee is enthusiastic about the potential present in an optimistic view of the role of the CAI's.

Finally, CEPC expressed some reservations about the idea of an immersion semester. We wondered whether the stated need to socialize aspiring nurses to the culture of the profession doesn't implicitly presume a greater tension between the profession and liberal learning at the college than we believe is really there. We look forward to discussing with the nursing faculty the arrangement of the major requirements, with the goal of insuring the greatest possible integration of learning in the major with learning across the campus.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer advice as you contemplate this decision.

Sincerely,

David Booth

*Chair, CEPC  
(for the committee)*

Copy: Jim May, Dean of the Faculty

## **Appendix H: Policy Regarding Variable Term Dates**

To: CEPC  
From: Mary Cisar  
Subject: Policy regarding variable term dates  
Date: April 21, 2005

Approved by CEPC on April 27, 2005

There has been some question about allowable exceptions to published term dates and the relationship between the published on-campus term dates and mostly (but not exclusively) off-campus experiences where those on-campus term dates do not apply easily. The Registrar convened a group of faculty and staff with an interest in this issue during the academic year 04-05. From those meetings, and a consultation between the Assistant Provost and the college lawyer, come the following general policy guidelines and recommendations for implementation.

### **Policy Guidelines:**

Term dates are not a legal issue per se but more of a college-wide convention that governs the organization of our curriculum.

The current document concerns off-campus experiences, not on-campus ones (with a couple of specific exceptions). For all other on-campus courses, the posted term dates in the academic calendar govern the start and end dates of courses and should be seen as absolute.

For off-campus experiences: A course/program may begin or end before or after normal on-campus term dates on campus as long as the instructor fully discloses to the students in writing (in advertising, acceptance letters, course syllabus) what they must do for the course, what the time frame is, and when the grades will be recorded. Students must know this information by the time they sign up for the course.

Our students are covered by insurance coverage as long as they are enrolled in a credit-bearing activity, and the notification of term dates noted above records the dates of enrollment.

### **Implementation:**

This document contains a draft set of general principles that govern the conditions under which such deviations are allowed, for future reference. These general principles indicate by how much course terms can deviate from the on-campus norm. CEPC is being asked to approve these principles as they stand or with necessary amendments.

Also part of this document is a list of programs/conditions where it is allowed that course term dates deviate from our normal on-campus calendar going forward. I request that CEPC approve this list.

The Registrar's Office will then determine appropriate procedures and timetable for posting of grades for these cases. This is rather simple, since the recommendation is that the grades will be posted at the time when grades are posted for the on-campus term that most closely matches the non-standard dates of the specific case.

### **General Principles governing Non-Standard Term Dates (4 12 05 mc):**

Term dates may deviate from the standard on-campus dates when the experience provided through the program depends on cooperation with an outside agency or institution (e.g., university abroad, internship site, federally-funded program, student teaching experience).

Deviations must allow faculty to submit grades in time to post them for the on-campus term the deviating program most closely matches.

**Allowable Programs/Courses:**

SSS Program: Once the course taken by the SSS Bridge students is approved by CEPC and the faculty, administrative negotiation between the program and the registrar determines when the students take the course and whether students receive credit for summer term II or semester I. Right now, the Bridge students receive the credit for the Bridge program after completing semester I. The main point is that students must be aware in writing of the dates at the time that they sign up (see above). (The biology course offered through the Bridge program has been approved by the faculty.)

Education Department, Student Teachers: These students may have their grades posted early (for purposes of job seeking) provided, once again, that this has been worked out in advance and the students have been informed in writing by the time they enroll in the experience of the end dates of the student teaching term and the specific date when grades will be posted.

Education: non-credit experiences off campus (e.g., volunteering): Some type of volunteer experience is required for teaching licensure, but we do not specify how they must do this volunteer service. In this non-credit type of volunteer experience, the helpful way of looking at this is that the Education Department should facilitate contact with agencies by providing leads to students. It is up to the student to set up the experience. The relationship is thus between the student and the agency. An informed consent waiver is recommended.

[What about 0 credit courses in Education? Because they bear no credit, students are not charged directly for the credit; we do pay the instructor, and the course appears on the transcript. If this occurs on campus this is not an issue.]

Nursing: Nursing students already get liability insurance provided by the college. In most cases of off-campus experiences, St. Olaf College bears insurance liability of students are injured etc. while enrolled, unless they have signed a waiver (and even with a waiver, the matter could still go to court). For Nursing students placed in summer internships, though, it is the institution where the students are placed that bears the liability.

Internships: The application should contain specific dates that direct the student concerning start and end dates for the experience. The department and the registrar must sign, along with the student. Students need to receive explicit instruction to take those dates seriously. The registrar's office makes the policy concerning when the office posts the grades to the transcript.

International Programs: The general principle articulated at the beginning of these notes applies to all international programs (including that proposed by Ted. Johnson, which is also considered an internship for summer 2005 [?])

Transportation for off-campus programs of any kind (principle governing the period between when the student leaves campus and when they arrive at the site): If the college provides transportation, the college is liable; if the students are responsible personally for the transportation, it's the individual's insurance that covers it. If an experience is a requirement for a college program (=as part of coursework), the college should provide the transportation. What about Internships that are required for a major or concentration? We can provide a mechanism for informed consent, and in that case it becomes the responsibility of the student to provide transportation to and from the site.