Integrated Exploration Curriculum Proposal

Submitted by the ReInvigorating Shared Education (RISE) Committee
Co-chairs: Pam Bacon and Shane Miller
Faculty members: Carol Brash, Amelia Cheever, Jeff Dubois, John Kendall, Bill Lamberts,
Anna Mercedes, Anne Sinko, Allison Spenader, and Erica Stonestreet
Student representatives: Sarah Gorman and Farrad Williams
Ex-officio: Emily Esch and Kyhl Lyndgaard

March 2, 2018

Integrated Exploration Curriculum Vision

The College of St. Benedict and St. John's University provide students an education grounded in two key traditions: The Catholic Intellectual Tradition as guided by the Benedictine principles of the colleges' founders, and the liberal arts tradition of broad, multi-disciplinary, inquiry. Based on these traditions, we built a model of general education that has students use these values to study a complex, dynamic and diverse world. Our curriculum challenges students to integrate every aspect of their learning – to see relationships among the arts, the sciences and the humanities. Our graduates learn to make connections across their studies, their lives, and their communities, and in so doing, learn how to use numerous methods and perspectives to work toward the common good.

The Formation of RISE and Its Charge

On October 11, 2017, the Joint Faculty Senate created a committee and charged it to develop a curriculum model to be voted on by the JFA by April 20th, 2018. The members of the committee, all nominated by Senators, were selected by the Executive Committee and then the slate of names was voted on by the JFS at the October 11, 2017 meeting. The committee is comprised of 11 voting representatives from at least two departments in each division, along with four Ex-Officio members.

The October 11, 2017 motion from the Joint Faculty Senate: The Senate hereby establishes the following charge for RISE: Following the Process and Design Principles from the *Making Connections* report, working with the Learning Outcomes approved by the Senate in 2016-2017 as a starting point, and taking into account feedback from the vote last spring, RISE will design a new or significantly revised curriculum model. RISE will bring the model to the Senate for discussion and input at least twice in the 2017-18 academic year, and to a meeting of the Department Chairs at least once. RISE will work with the appropriate standing committees as needed and will hold open forums at its discretion. RISE will have a final proposal ready for distribution to the Joint Faculty Assembly by March 27th, and the JFA will vote electronically on the proposal by April 20th, 2018

Table of Contents

1. GOALS OF THE INTEGRATED EXPLORATION CURRICULUM

The need for a new model of general education has been demonstrated both from outside consultants and internal faculty discussions. The decision to develop a new model was determined by the JFS in direct response to the weaknesses identified with the Common Curriculum. Those weaknesses included, but were not limited to, a lack of common, or shared, coursework or experiences within general education; a cafeteria-style approach that required breadth of coursework without any rationale or guiding purpose; the ability for students to transfer in high school credits that replaced a considerable portion of their general education; and student dissatisfaction with a set of disconnected requirements.

After much discussion with faculty, staff and students and an examination of the national scholarship on curriculum design, RISE, the committee charged with working on reforming the general education program at CSB/SJU has focused its attention on the following broad goals for a new general education curriculum.[1] In this section, we describe the goals and why we feel they are important. In the next section, we explain how the key elements of our model work toward these goals.

First, a brief note about the process. One of the more common complaints about the current Common Curriculum (and general education curriculums more generally) is the lack of cohesion among the coursework. This lack of cohesion can be traced in part to the process by which the Common Curriculum came into being, in which a grounding philosophy for the curriculum was notably absent. In an attempt to address this complaint, CCVC developed a process that would reveal the desires our faculty had for our graduates and to turn these desires into a conceptual foundation for the reforms. The RISE committee has built on this work. RISE has developed a curriculum model that meets as many of these goals as possible. These are broadly categorized under the goals of *integration*, *the intentional use of high impact practices,* and *highlighting the value of a liberal arts and sciences education,* and are the focus of this section.

Goal 1: Integration

We begin with *integration*. The lack of an agreed upon process in the creation of the Common Curriculum, and, in particular, the lack of a common understanding of what the faculty wanted a general education program to accomplish, led to a product that many found unsatisfactory.[2] The Common Curriculum is a type of general education curriculum that is called in the literature "cafeteria style." Cafeteria style curriculums ask students to choose from a variety of courses in different boxes, with little or no attempt to integrate their learning. Cafeteria style curriculums were quite common throughout the twentieth century but have recently come under heavy criticism in the literature.[3] Our own faculty also stated their dissatisfaction with this style of

---

[1] See *Making Connections: Transforming Education at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University* for a more thorough discussion of the principle guiding reform.

[2] Ottenhoff, John, Kathy Wise, and Charlie Blaich. Wabash Team Report to CSB/SJU. October 13, 2011. See also the minutes from department meetings on the CCVC website.

[3] Fong, Bobby. "Looking Forward: Liberal Education in the 21st Century." *Liberal Education* 90.1 (2004): 8-13; Kuh, George D. "Why Integration and Engagement are Essential to Effective Educational

curriculum and wanted to provide students with opportunities to make meaningful connections among their courses. This desire led RISE to put the concept of integration at the center of our model.

Goal 2: High-Impact Practices

The faculty also expressed a desire to be *more intentional with the placement of high-impact practices* in the new curriculum. High-impact practices, of which there are now 11, are practices that have been shown to improve student learning.[4] High impact practices are "institutionally-structured student experiences inside or outside of the classroom that are associated with elevated performance across multiple engagement activities and desired outcomes, such as deep learning, persistence, and satisfaction with college".[5] CSB/SJU has a long track record of using many high-impact practices, but we have not been as intentional as we could have been about making sure that all students encounter multiple high-impact practices during their college career.[6] We do not include all 11 practices in our proposed curriculum for a couple of reasons. First, some high-impact practices that are well established, for example Undergraduate Research, are better suited for the majors. Second, we have limited resources (both time and money) and we would rather make sure that those high-impact practices that we include are done well.

We have intentionally integrated 7 high-impact practices across the four years of the curriculum. Most of these are familiar from the Common Curriculum (though with revisions) and one is new. Our list includes:

> First Year Seminars and Experiences
> Writing Intensive
> Collaborative Learning
> Common Intellectual Experiences
> Diversity/Global Learning
> Service/Community Based Learning
> ePortfolio

Practice in the Twenty-First Century." *Peer Review* 10.4 (2008): 27-28; Ferren, Ann S. "Intentionality." *General Education & Liberal Learning: Principles of Effective Practice*. Ed. Paul L. Gaston. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. 2010. 25-32; Huber, Mary Taylor, Patrick Hutchings, and Richard Gale. "Integrative Learning for Liberal Education." *Peer Review* 7 (2005): 3-7; Gaston, Paul L. "Principles of Strong General Education Programs." *General Education & Liberal Learning: Principles of Effective Practice*. Ed. Paul L. Gaston. Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2010. 17-24; Gaston, Paul L. *General Education Transformed: How We Can, Why We Must.* Washington DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2015.

[4] Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities. Watson, C.E. et al. Kuh "ePortfolios: The Eleventh High Impact Practice." *International Journal of ePortfolio. 2016, Volume 6, Number 2, 65-69*.

[5] Watson, C.E. et al. Kuh "ePortfolios: The Eleventh High Impact Practice." *International Journal of ePortfolio. 2016, Volume 6, Number 2, 65-69*.

[6] See Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities for the importance of students encountering more than one high-impact practice and its disproportional affect on underrepresented students.

Where these high-impact practices are placed in the new curriculum will be discussed in more detail in the next section. Here, we provide a quick overview of what these practices are. CSB/SJU is already quite familiar with First Year Seminars and Experiences and we currently follow the best practices described in the 2008 Kuh article: "The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students' intellectual and practical competencies" (9). In the Common Curriculum, FYS doubles as the locus of our Writing Intensive practice.

Like the Common Curriculum, the new curriculum will have an experiential learning designation. Service /Community Based Learning is a subset of experiential learning, which includes using classroom experiences in real world settings in the local community to analyze and solve problems and then reflecting on these experiences in the classroom. While not all ways of meeting this designation will count as Service/Community Based learning, we expect that our current Service /Community Based Learning programs will continue in the new curriculum.

Kuh 2008 describes the Diversity/Global Learning practice as programs of study "which may address U.S. diversity, world cultures, or both—often explore 'difficult differences' such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad" (10). The Common Curriculum and our Study Abroad program go some way toward meeting the Diversity/Global Learning high-impact practice, but this area is more substantially developed in the Integrated Exploration model.

There are two high-impact practices that we have imbedded in the Integrated Exploration curriculum that we have historically not done as an institution. While many faculty use the high-impact practice, Collaborative Learning, in their classrooms – which Kuh explains as meeting two key goals: "learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one's own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others" - there is no current requirement of assessment of collaborative learning in the Common Curriculum. In addition to being a high-impact practice, being able to work effectively in a team, is consistently one of the top skills employers claim they are looking for.[7] The fourth high-impact practice listed above, Common Intellectual Experiences, is another high-impact practice that we have not pursued as an institution. While we do have a set of required courses in the Common Curriculum, there is a wide range of topics and activities within each required type of course. There are no common readings or other intellectual demands made of all students. Over the years, we have heard that both faculty and students would like to see increased attention to the development of Common Intellectual Experiences.

Goal 3: Liberal Arts and Sciences

---

[7] Hart Research Associates, "Falling Short? College Learning and Career Success." Selected Findings from Online Surveys of Employers and College Students Conducted on Behalf of the Association of American Colleges & Universities (2015).

A third goal is the development of a curriculum that recognizes more explicitly *the value of the liberal arts and sciences.* We understand the goals of a liberal arts and sciences education to include the acquisition of a broad base of knowledge, the development of general intellectual, creative and communication skills, and the ability to integrate knowledge across different domains. A liberal arts and sciences education also encourages students to appreciate how exposure to the arts, humanities, and the sciences can enrich their personal and professional lives.

In this way, our goal of highlighting the value of the liberal arts and sciences includes many subsidiary goals that were also important to the faculty: to let the mission of CSB/SJU guide the development of our new curriculum; to provide opportunities for cross-disciplinary conversation among faculty and students; to ensure that students acquire a broad base of disciplinary methods and perspectives; to develop core academic and ethical competencies, especially written communication.

2. KEY COMPONENTS OF THE INTEGRATED EXPLORATION CURRICULUM AND CONNECTION TO GOALS

There are several key components of the Integrated Exploration model, each of which contributes to the goals outlined above. How these components connect to the goals is the subject of this section. Detailed sections about each of these components are found in Section 5.

At the heart of the proposal is the *Integrated Portfolio*. The Integrated Portfolio is an ePortfolio, which is used in over 50% of colleges and universities in the US.[8] ePortfolios are both a product (a digital collection of artifacts) and a process (selection of what to add to the collection; reflection on what the artifact means and how it affected one's learning). It is a virtual space where students can collect their work (essays, research projects, photos, videos, multimedia presentations, resumes, etc.) as they move through their classes, which they can use to reflect on their learning and growth. ePortfolios are both a pedagogical activity (meant to generate learning) and an assessment tool (meant to document progress).

The Integrated Portfolio is at the center of the Writing courses, which are, perhaps obviously, the way we incorporate the Writing Intensive high-impact practice. One of the goals of the final writing course is to provide for an opportunity to integrate student learning across courses, co-curricular activities, and life experiences under the tutelage of a faculty member. We also expect that the Integrated Portfolio will help students to articulate their own understanding of the value of liberal arts and sciences education they have participated in, as well as provide one of the Common Intellectual Experiences of the students. Finally, ePortfolios are themselves considered a high-impact practice.

The proposed curriculum takes seriously faculty concerns about the writing abilities of our students, which have been raised in many settings. In contrast to the Common Curriculum, the new curriculum makes sure that Writing requirements are met throughout the student's college career. The Writing courses are full of high-impact practices: First Year Seminar, ePortfolio, Writing Intensive, and Common Intellectual Experience. These courses are crucial to the development of core academic competencies and the integration of the student's learning. In addition to the writing courses, we have also built writing requirements into The Human Experience Way of Thinking and Theology 2.

We are in the process of developing four *Themes* that will help students make connections and integrate their learning across coursework. These themes will also contribute to the high-impact practice of a Common Intellectual Experience, as well as the development of ethical competencies. We have heard over and over again from faculty and students of their desire for cross-disciplinary conversation; teaching in a theme will provide opportunities for faculty to collaborate outside of their department and will provide opportunities for enriched conversations

---

[8] Kahn, S. "E-Portfolios: A Look at Where We've Been, Where We Are Now, and Where We're (Possibly) Going." *Peer Review* Winter 2014, Vol. 16, No. 1

among students inside and outside of the classroom. Since students will be expected to take three same-themed courses about the different Ways of Thinking (discussed below) this also satisfies our goals of giving our students a broad base of disciplinary approaches and methods. By having three different Ways of Thinking on the same topic, students will see the distinctive value different disciplines bring to bear on an issue.

This curriculum requires that students take courses in the following five Ways of Thinking: Abstract Reasoning, Artistic Creation and Interpretation, The Human Experience, Scientific Inquiry About the Natural World, and Scientific Thinking about Societies, Groups, and Individuals. Instead of using the administrative divisional structure to develop the five Ways of Thinking, RISE consulted with a variety of faculty to develop Ways of Thinking based on methodology and disciplinary approaches. This element of the curriculum is designed to fill the goals of a broad base of disciplinary methods and perspectives, core academic competencies, and explaining the value of a liberal arts and sciences education.

The proposed curriculum includes two sequential courses on Cultural Agility. These courses examine the ways in which gender, race, and ethnicity structure and impact our lives and how these differences are made to matter in society. Students will learn why none of these categories, in isolation, is sufficient to conceptualize either individual or social identity and will learn to think critically about their own gendered, racial, and ethnic identities as well as identify the social and cultural factors that shape and contribute to each. In addition, students will critically analyze the ways in which these forms of identity raise questions of justice in regard to access and participation in communal life. RISE believes that in addition to being a Diversity/Global Learning high-impact practice, as well as contributing to our desire for developing students' ethical competencies, these courses help support the mission of CSB/SJU. Additionally, development of courses that address racial, gender, and other inequities has repeatedly been supported in our conversations with students.

Reflecting the Catholic and Benedictine mission of our schools in multiple ways, the new curriculum includes two sequential courses in Theology and an engagement component with Benedictine community and practice. First, within the two theology courses, students engage in theological reasoning and analyze religious engagement in society. They will also work toward the two general education learning outcomes that were developed to reflect Catholic Benedictine Tradition. In addition to Theological Reasoning and Religious Engagement, the two Theology classes in the new curriculum carry other general education learning outcomes: the first of the two theology courses carries a Common Good outcome and the second carries a Writing outcome. In this way, the theological courses are well integrated with other outcomes of the students' general education. Further integration of the schools' mission is ensured through the Benedictine Engagement requirement—one of three Engagement requirements which can be met through a class or outside of a class as explained below.

The new curriculum includes three Engagement Requirements: Experiential Engagement, Global Engagement, and Benedictine Engagement. RISE has concluded that these three requirements are fundamentally about getting students to have certain kinds of "real-life" experiences together with a structured reflection that helps them derive meaningful lessons from these experiences. The common elements of the three Engagement requirements are an experiential activity, formal

reflection, and can be done inside or outside the classroom. The Engagement aspects of students' education will be incorporated into their work on the Integrated Portfolio.

The other components include a language proficiency requirement, a Quantitative Reasoning designation, and the FYX/College Success class.

3. INTEGRATED EXPLORATION CURRICULUM OVERVIEW

This model was developed using scaffolded learning outcomes. Students will encounter each of the 12 Core Learning Outcomes at least twice (and some three times) with increasing rigor. Students may also encounter a third level of rigor for the outcomes within their majors. These learning outcomes are not discipline-specific and were developed with the input of around 50 faculty members and are based on the learning outcomes approved by the JFS in spring of 2017. They have been integrated broadly across the curriculum with the intention that students will encounter different levels of the learning outcomes in different types of courses.[9]

As we hope is evident from the preceding section, the curriculum we propose intentionally places high-impact practices throughout the student's four years. We expect that students will encounter multiple high-impact practices during each of their four years.

In the following section, we include brief descriptions of each of the required courses and placement of the learning outcomes. To see a listing of all of the learning outcomes along with the language for each level of the learning outcome, see section 4. In section 5, we provide more detail about each of these courses. The next few pages are designed to give you a quick overview of how a student might move through the curriculum.

Writing Sequence

Writing Foundations (fall semester, first year, general education only)
This is the first in a series of two four-credit course focused on Writing and is taken by all first-year students in the fall semester. One common book is included, which will be chosen collectively by the faculty teaching the course. The course also introduces students to the Integrated Portfolio. Beyond the common book, individual faculty choose their own topic. This course cannot count toward a major.

Information Literacy 1
Metacognition 1
Writing 1

Requirement: one Fine Arts event must be incorporated into the syllabus.

Writing Exploration (2-credits, optional)

This is an optional part of the writing sequence. There are two different options, one which focuses on developing communication skills in a variety of media and one that focuses on professional development. These courses cannot count toward majors. Students can take none, one, or both.

Speaking 2

---

[9] For more detailed discussion about this issue please see pages 22-24 of *Making Connections: Transforming Education at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University*.

Writing 2

Writing Integration (4 credits; junior or senior year; completion of the thematic coursework is a pre- or co-requisite)

This is the final course in the writing sequence. It cannot be done in a major. In addition to meeting the learning outcomes, the Integrated Portfolio is completed in this course.

Common Good 3
Metacognition 3
Speak 2
Writing 3

5 Ways of Thinking and Thematic Coursework

There are five Ways of Thinking: Abstract Reasoning, Artistic Creation and Interpretation, The Human Experience, Scientific Inquiry About the Natural World, and Scientific Thinking about Societies, Groups, and Individuals. Students must take one class from each of the five Ways of Thinking. These courses can count toward majors.

Student are required to take three courses on the same theme and each of the three same-themed courses must be on a different Way of Thinking. Two of the courses on Ways of Thinking can be (but need not be) un-themed. Which Ways of Thinking will be associated with thematic content will be different for different students. One of these is the 200 level Thematic Focus course and two of them are Thematic Encounter courses, once of which needs to be at the 300 level.

Thematic Focus (*Writing Foundation* is a prerequisite and *Culture and Social Identity* is a pre- or co-requisite)

Students will take one of these courses. While these courses can count toward the major, they have several obligations to the general education program. These courses are wholly dedicated to a single theme, are associated with a Way of Thinking (or two Ways of Thinking if they are team-taught by two faculty members with different methodological approaches), include a common reading on the theme, use the Integrated Portfolio, and introduce students to the liberal arts and sciences goal of studying a diverse array of disciplinary approaches. They can be on any topic within one of the themes. In cases where these courses are team taught by two faculty members with different methodological approaches, they can count as two distinct Ways of Thinking.

Analyzing Texts 2
Collaboration 2
Information Literacy 2

Requirement: one co-curricular event on the theme must be incorporated into the syllabus. This could be a Fine Arts event but does not need to be.

Thematic Encounter

Students will take two of these courses on the same theme as their Thematic Focus course. These courses must be associated with a Way of Thinking. At least one-quarter of the course is devoted to one (and only one) of the themes.

There are no general education learning outcomes associated with the Thematic Encounter coursework. This allows for maximal flexibility. We assume that most, if not all, Thematic Encounter courses offered would also count toward the major; thus, the learning outcomes would include the department outcomes. These courses could be 100, 200 or 300 level. They can be taken in any order.

Cultural Agility Sequence

Culture and Social Identity (either semester, first year, could count toward a major)
This is the first of two courses focused on gender, race, and ethnicity. Faculty can choose their own topic, as long as it meets the learning outcomes. This course can count toward majors.

Collaboration 1
Gender 1
Race and Ethnicity 1
Speaking 1

Requirement: one event related to gender and one event related to race and ethnicity must be incorporated into the syllabus. These could be Fine Arts events but do not have to be.

Culture and Social Systems (*Culture and Social Identity* is a prerequisite)

This is the second of a two-course series on Cultural Agility. This course can be on any topic that meets the learning outcomes and criteria. It can be taught in any department and can count toward majors.

Common Good 2
Gender 2
Metacognition 2
Race and Ethnicity 2

Theology Sequence

Theology 1 (first three semesters)

This is the first of two courses focused on theology. Students think critically about sources and themes of the Christian tradition and begin to explore religious engagement with society. It is likely that this course will be developed under one course number to provide a degree of common grounding for the second theology course, though courses will vary by instructor.

This class also includes a grounding in Benedictine Hallmarks such that students are prepared for meeting their Benedictine Engagement (BEN) requirement later (The first theology class helps prepare students for the requirement but does not itself carry a BEN designation).

Analyze texts 1
Common Good 1
Religious Engagement 1
Theological Reasoning 1

Theology 2 (*Theology 1* is a prerequisite)

This is the second of two courses focused on theology. It can be on any topic that meets the learning outcomes, moving students into interpretation of theological sources and analysis of religious engagement with society. The second theology courses can be on a variety of topics. As in the current curriculum, these topics can continue to include religions other than Christianity.

Religious Engagement 2
Theological Reasoning 2
Write 2

Engagement Requirements

There are three requirements that have experiential activities at their center: Experiential Engagement (EXP), Global Engagement (GLO), and Benedictine Engagement (BEN). RISE has concluded that these three requirements are fundamentally about getting students to have certain kinds of "real-life" experiences together with a structured reflection that helps them derive meaningful lessons from these experiences. The common elements of the three Engagement requirements are an experiential activity, formal reflection, and can be done inside or outside the classroom.

Study Abroad fulfills the Experiential Learning and Global Engagement requirements. Additionally, students who study a semester abroad can take courses through the educational programming that counts toward the Ways of Thinking requirements. They may also have the opportunity to take *Culture and Social Systems*. Students are required to write an essay for their Integrated Portfolio that meets the requirements for Experiential Learning and Global Engagement. This assignment will be part of the class taught by the CSB/SJU faculty director.

Quantitative Reasoning Designation

There is a Quantitative Reasoning designation that could be met through a Way of Thinking (Abstract Reasoning, Scientific Inquiry about the Natural World and Scientific and Scientific Thinking about Societies, Groups, and Individuals are all likely to contribute) or through the major. We do not expect that this will add to the student load, but we did want to ensure that students received college level quantitative reasoning.

Language

Students must meet a proficiency standard equivalent to three semesters of language classes as they do in the Common Curriculum. Students may test out of the requirement.

Required Fine Arts and Co-Curricular Events

There are a total of 6 required co-curricular events. In addition to the requirements stated above, all courses falling under the Artistic Expression Way of thinking must include attendance at two Fine Arts events. Faculty teaching Thematic Encounter would be encouraged to consider including co-curricular events and we would have a number of events on each theme.

FYX/College Success Course

This one-credit course is taken in the fall semester. The course meets once a week for 55 minutes. The focus of this course is on transitioning to college issues and developing habits that lead to academic success. Some topics include: the importance of developing relationships with faculty, general expectations for students, and information of accessing campus resources as well as encouragement toward asking for help when needed.

4. LEARNING GOALS AND OUTCOMES

There are twelve learning goals, each scaffolded into three outcomes. (The goals are listed at the top; the outcomes are Beginner, Intermediate, and Advanced.) The twelve goals are listed in alphabetical order.

ANALYZING TEXTS: Elicit and construct meaning from texts.

Beginner: Students read or interpret a variety of texts for comprehension, adjusting strategies based on the genre, nature of the text and context of the assignment.

Intermediate: Students evaluate texts for significance, relevance to the student's goals, and make connections among texts and/or disciplines.

Advanced: Students integrate knowledge among different texts, including independently finding supplemental texts to help understand the main text(s).

COLLABORATION: Interact effectively in a group while incorporating diverse perspectives.

Beginner: Students identity the different roles in the group, engage group members by acknowledging their contributions, articulates the importance of multiple and diverse perspectives in a group, and complete all individual tasks on time.

Intermediate: Students use group roles effectively, build constructively on the work of others, incorporate multiple perspectives into the work of the group, and produces independent work that advances the project.

Advanced: Students perform different roles appropriate to the context, are self-reflective about their own roles and contributions, build constructively on the work of other and encourages advanced participation by all group members, leverages diverse perspectives of group members.

COMMON GOOD: Develop a conception of a moral life that incorporates concern for the common good.

Beginner: Students explain the moral dimensions of situations, perspectives, and actions in their lives and recognize that there are competing, yet legitimate, conceptions of what defines the common good.

Intermediate: Students evaluate different situations, perspectives, or actions, giving reasons why some are better than others. Their analyses demonstrate their understanding of the complexities of moral life and moral responsibilities on an individual and civic level.

Advanced: Students apply the moral understanding they have gained to articulate and defend some vision of a responsible life and character, and connect these to the common good. This vision demonstrates how complex values are embedded in everyday life and institutions.

GENDER: Examine the social construction of gender and related individual and systemic inequities.

Beginner: Students identify a diversity of gender identities. Students identify social and cultural factors that shape their own gender identities and how these factors influence their self- conception and worldview.

Intermediate: Students analyze historical and/or contemporary constructions of gender. Students analyze how factors such as race, ethnicity, age, class, sexuality, disability, religion, or nationality intersect with gender.

Advanced: Students analyze structural and systemic differences based on gender and articulate ways to address inequities.

INFORMATION LITERACY: Identify, evaluate, and responsibly use information.

Beginner: Students access appropriate information through common search strategies, accurately cite the source, and articulate the value of accurate citation.

Intermediate: Students locate relevant information using well-designed search strategies, evaluates and uses appropriate and multiple resources, and articulates why using information has many ethical and legal implications.

Advanced: Students use well-designed search strategies to find information, evaluate and use appropriate and diverse resources, and follows the ethical and legal standards for their discipline.

METACOGNITION: Optimize one's own thinking and learning processes.

Beginner: Students identify their intellectual abilities and dispositions, problem solving processes, and learning strategies.

Intermediate: Students reflect on the weaknesses and strengths of their intellectual abilities and dispositions, effectiveness of their problem solving processes, and efficiencies of their learning strategies.

Advanced: Students apply their metacognitive knowledge to improve their problem solving processes, and to strengthen learning strategies.

QUANTITATIVE REASONING: Solve quantitative problems and develop and communicate arguments supported by quantitative evidence. (Designation—both the beginner and intermediate will be met in the same course)

Beginner: Students draw conclusions from and describe quantitative arguments, recognizing that assumptions, errors, and fallacies may affect the argument's validity.

Intermediate: Students construct an appropriate representation of data and perform calculations to interpret a situation, drawing appropriate inferences.

Advanced: Students create their own arguments supported by quantitative evidence and clearly communicate those arguments and assumptions that may impact the argument's validity.

RACE AND ETHNICITY: Examine the social construction of race and ethnicity and resulting inequities.

Beginner: Students articulate that they have racial and/or ethnic identities. Students identify factors that shape racial and ethnic identities and how these factors influence their self- conception and relationships to their communities.

Intermediate: Students demonstrate how historical and/or contemporary constructions of race and ethnicity shape cultural rules and biases. Students analyze how factors such as gender, age, class, sexuality, disability, religion, or nationality intersect with race and/or ethnicity.

Advanced: Students critically analyze structural and systemic differences based on race and ethnicity and articulate ways to address inequities.

RELIGIOUS ENGAGEMENT: Analyze religious engagement with society.

Beginner: Students identify and explain one or more forms of religious engagement with the world.

Intermediate: Students analyze forms of religious engagement by drawing on sources that may come from a range of academic disciplines.

Advanced: Students evaluate forms of religious engagement in conversation with their primary academic disciplines or with their involvement in a campus, community, or professional project.

SPEAK: Construct ideas, opinions and information in appropriate oral forms.

Beginner: Students organize a presentation with a central message that is partially supported by relevant material(s). Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, although students may appear tentative or uncomfortable.

Intermediate: Students organize a presentation with a clear central message that is consistent with relevant supporting material(s). Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and students appear comfortable.

Advanced: Students skillfully organize a cohesive presentation with a compelling central message, support it with relevant material(s) that establish their authority on the topic.

THEOLOGICAL REASONING: Think critically about sources, doctrines, and themes of the Christian tradition.

Beginner: Students identify elements of Christian theological sources, which may include scripture, practices, texts, or art forms. They explain a theological teaching, doctrine, or theme.

Intermediate: Students interpret theological sources and their contexts. They compare perspectives on a teaching, theme, or doctrine.

Advanced: Students demonstrate creative theological reasoning in evaluating contemporary social issues, conducting interdisciplinary research, or constructing their own theological argument.

WRITE: Construct ideas, opinions and information in appropriate written forms.

Beginner: Students are aware of the context, audience, and purpose of their writing and appropriately use content to explore their ideas. They organize and present the writing in ways that are appropriate, which includes relevant evidence to support ideas. The language is clear, but may include some errors.

Intermediate: Students demonstrate consideration of the context, audience, and purpose of their writing and use compelling content to clearly support ideas. The consistently organize their arguments using relevant evidence. The language is clear and straightforward, with few errors.

Advanced: Students demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose and use relevant and compelling content. The language is clear, fluent and virtually error-free.

5. DETAILED DESCRIPTIONS

In section five we provide more details on the key components of the Integrated Exploration curriculum: Integrated Portfolio, Themes and Ways of Thinking, Writing, Cultural Agility, Theology, Engagement, Quantitative Reasoning, and the First Year Experience Course.

Integrated Portfolio

Portfolios have been used in education for a long time; as technology has evolved the paper portfolio has transformed into the electronic portfolio. Portfolios can serve many purposes – archiving a student's work, showcasing a student's best work, assessing individuals or programs. Our proposal for the Integrated Portfolio might do all of these things, but its primary purpose is to make learning visible to the student (and faculty and others) as they develop intellectually, personally, and professionally over their years at CSB/SJU and to provide an opportunity for them to integrate their knowledge across their coursework, co-curricular activities, and life experiences.

The ePortfolio is both a product (a digital collection of artifacts) and a process (selection of what to add to the collection; reflection on what the artifact means and how it affected one's learning). It is a virtual space where students can collect their work (essays, research projects, photos, videos, multimedia presentations, resumes, etc.) as they move through their classes, which they can use to reflect on their learning and growth. ePortfolios are both a pedagogical activity (meant to generate learning) and an assessment tool (meant to document progress).

ePortfolios have been widely adopted by all types of institutions of higher education (and K12). In 2016, the AAC&U added ePortfolios to its list of High Impact Practices. High impact practices are "institutionally-structured student experiences inside or outside of the classroom that are associated with elevated performance across multiple engagement activities and desired outcomes, such as deep learning, persistence, and satisfaction with college".[10] As of 2014, over half of all American institutions of higher education were using ePortfolios.

In their 2014 paper, "What Difference Can ePortfolio Make? A Field Report from the Connect to Learning Project," Eynon, Gambino, and Torok describe the Connect to Learning Project (C2L), a project started in 2011that includes 24 campuses in a community of practice around the ePortfolio. They note,

> The practices and data from C2L campuses, while not conclusive, suggest that reflective ePortfolio pedagogy helps students make meaning from specific learning experiences and connections to other experiences, within and beyond the course. Integrative ePortfolio strategies prompt students to connect learning in one course to learning in other courses, co-curricular activities, and life experiences. Ultimately, students recursively connect

---

[10] Watson, C.E. et al. Kuh "ePortfolios: The Eleventh High Impact Practice." *International Journal of ePortfolio. 2016, Volume 6, Number 2, 65-69.*

their learning to consideration of goals and values, constructing a more intentional and purposeful sense of self. (101)

Eynon, Gambino, and Torok found evidence that ePortfolios contribute to student success measures, such as retention, GPA, and pass rate (96-98). More importantly for our purposes, there is suggestive evidence that ePortfolios can have a significant effect on deep learning and integrative knowledge (Eynon, et al., 98-105; Peet et al., 18-21).

Conceptual Issues – Integrated Knowledge and Reflection

There are two key concepts in our approach to the Integrated Portfolio. First, there is "reflection." There has been a steady stream of research in educational pedagogy on the role of reflection in deep and lifelong learning. Various theorists use different terminology - self-regulated learning, self-authorship, metacognition, etc. – but we have chosen to stick with the traditional phrase "reflection," which has its roots in the philosophy of John Dewey. The second key concept is "integrative knowledge." The curriculum has been carefully designed to create opportunities for students to make meaningful connections among their courses, co-curricular activities, and life experiences.

"Reflection" is often used in vague and imprecise ways. In an effort to be more rigorous in our use of reflection in the Integrated Portfolios, we suggest following Dewey's four criteria for reflection, as discussed by Carol Rodgers (845).[11]

> 1. Reflection is a meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with deeper understanding of its relationships with and connections to other experiences and ideas. It is the thread that makes continuity of learning possible, and ensures the progress of the individual and, ultimately, society. It is a means to essentially moral ends.
>
> 2. Reflection is a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking, with its roots in scientific inquiry.
>
> 3. Reflection needs to happen in community, in interaction with others.
>
> 4. Reflection requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of oneself and of others.

RISE recommends that these four criteria guide our understanding of the kind of reflection that we expect to see in assignments for the Integrated Portfolio.

We are also using the work of the University of Michigan to ground our own understanding of integrative knowledge. The University of Michigan has developed a "conceptual model and pedagogy for portfolio-based integrative and lifelong learning," which is being used by many

---

[11] "Defining Reflection: Another Look at John Dewey and Reflective Thinking"
Teachers College Record, 104:4 (2002).

institutions.[12] These institutions include: Boston University, Clemson University, DePaul University, Norwalk Community College, Long Island University, and Mercy College, Oberlin College and Portland State University (15).

The efficacy of this model has been tested and supported by a study on over 600 students on two campuses at the University of Michigan (Peet et al, 2011).

Peet et al distinguish six dimensions of integrated knowledge (12):

1. Identify, demonstrate and adapt knowledge gained within/across different contexts (i.e., the ability to recognize the tacit and explicit knowledge gained in specific learning experiences and the capacity to adapt that knowledge to new situations);

2. Adapt to differences in order to create solutions (i.e., the ability to identify and adapt to different people, situations, etc., while working with others to create positive change);

3. Understand and direct oneself as a learner (i.e., the ability to identify one's prior knowledge, recognize one's strengths and gaps as a learner, and know how one is motivated to learn);

4. Become a reflexive, accountable and relational learner (i.e., the ability to reflect on one's practices and clarify expectations within oneself while also seeking feedback from others);

5. Identify and discern one's own and others' perspectives (i.e., the ability to recognize the limitations of one's perspective and seek out and value the perspectives of others); and

6. Develop a professional digital identity (i.e., the ability to imagine how one will use current knowledge and skills in future roles and how one will create an intentional digital identity).

The UM used these six dimensions to create what they call the Integrative Knowledge Portfolio Process Model: "The purpose of the Integrative Knowledge Portfolio Process Model (IKPP) is to facilitate learners' in identifying, integrating, and synthesizing their emergent knowledge, skills and identities over time, across contexts and in relation to others. In doing this integrative process, students develop a sense of personal agency and the capacity to respond to complex

---

[12] Peet, Melissa; Lonn, Steven; Gurin, Patricia; Boyer, K. Page; Matney, Malinda; Marra, Tiffany; Taylor, Simone Himbeault; Daley, Andrea. "Fostering Integrative Knowledge through ePortfolios." International *Journal of the ePortfolio*, v1 n1 p11-31 (2011). See Peet, M. (2012). *The Integrative Knowledge Portfolio Process: A Program Guide for Educating Reflective Practitioners and Lifelong Learners* from Open Educational Resources.

social issues" (14). As part of this process they designed several "Core Activities," which are the result of seven years of research. Examples of these core activities include, among other activities, *Identification and Organization of Key Learning Experiences*, *Structured Meta-reflection*, and *Reflection on Institutional Learning Outcomes*. RISE recommends that we begin our development of the Integrated Portfolio by studying these core activities.

Which courses are required to use the Integrated Portfolio?

While all faculty are welcome to use the Integrated Portfolio in their classes, it will be required to be used in the following: FYX, Writing Foundation, Writing Integration, Culture and Social Identity, and the three Thematic courses. Students who take the optional Writing Exploration course will also be required to use the Integrated Portfolio.

Both FYX and Writing Foundation are taken in the student's first semester, so they will be responsible for introducing the philosophy behind the Integrated Portfolio and the technical aspects of using it.

In addition to these courses, students will be required to write essays demonstrating their learning in the three Engagement requirements: Experiential Engagement, Global Engagement, and Benedictine Engagement. These essays will need to be completed by the end of their Writing Integration course.

Some of the submissions to the Integrated Portfolio will be responses to standardized assignments. This is important for many reasons. First, it will allow us to design the assignments for the Integrated Portfolio in an intentional and coherent way, taking in account how the various assignments relate and build on each other. Second, this will assure that there is consistency across the Portfolios and the students' opportunities for integrated learning. Finally, having the same assignment across all students will make assessment easier and more meaningful.

In our research into schools that have already adopted the ePortfolio, a consistent theme from those who have been successful is the inclusion of students into the process (citations). We suggest that if this proposal is approved, a committee is formed that includes faculty, staff and students, which is responsible for designing the Integrated Portfolio template, which will include the standardized assignments. The Writing Center tutors should be included in recruitment of student participants, since they have experience in thinking about faculty assignments.

There is one other item from our research that we would like to suggest: an incentive for students to do their best work. Many of the schools that have successfully implemented the ePortfolio have created incentives by offering cash awards to students who do outstanding work on their portfolios.

Implementation issues –What platform will we use? What technical and other support will be available?

There are many different platforms that can be used for ePortfolios, including Canvas. There will be a committee assigned to investigating various platforms if the proposal is passed.

We recognize that implementing an ePortfolio system will be a big change for our institutions and will need to be a focus of our professional development. As Academic Affairs has noted, there are significant funds available for the next three years of professional development and we expect that a part of this will be directed toward the ePortfolio. As mentioned above, ePortfolios have been used for a long time, and there is a growing literature surrounding their use. This literature will guide us in our implementation efforts. There is a journal devoted to ePortfolios and there are a number of annual conferences either wholly or partially on the topic.

In addition to consulting these national resources, there will be intensive efforts on campus to ensure that faculty are prepared to use this technology consistent with best practices by 2020. We also plan to train staff, including the Media Center staff, the Writing Center staff, and the librarians. We expect that these staff resources will be available for ongoing student and faculty support.

Writing

The Writing requirements are spread across the student's college career. The development of core academic competencies and the integration of the student's learning are at the center of the Writing requirements. Several high-impact practices are built in: First Year Seminar, ePortfolio, Writing Intensive, and Common Intellectual Experience.

The Writing courses include many common elements to ensure that all students receive appropriate grounding in these high-impact practices and the learning outcomes. The courses also retain faculty autonomy through many class-specific elements such as instructor-chosen topics.

Writing Foundation

This 4-credit course will be taken in the student's first semester. It functions as both an introduction to their general education experience at a Catholic, Benedictine college, and as a writing-intensive course. Students will demonstrate reflection on their learning through an introduction to the Integrated Portfolio. The topics of these courses are diverse and intended to be taught by faculty from across all divisions.

Learning Outcomes

Write 1
    Students are aware of the context, audience, and purpose of their writing and appropriately use content to explore their ideas. They organize and present the writing in ways that are appropriate, which includes relevant evidence to support ideas. The language is clear, but may include some errors.

Information Literacy 1
    Students access appropriate information through common search strategies, accurately cite the source, and articulate the value of accurate citation.

Metacognition 1
    Students identify their intellectual abilities and dispositions, problem-solving processes, and learning strategies.

Common Elements in Each Section of *Writing Foundation* (program-specific)
- Common Reading – (to be decided upon by program faculty teaching the course, in consultation with general education committee)
- Introduction to Integrated Portfolio (IP)
- One Fine Arts event embedded in the course
- To assess the Write 1 learning outcome, one essay will be collected for the IP. An essay template will be created in consultation with current FYS instructors and the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness as a common starting point to aid in individual course design.
- One required class session drawing on the expertise of research librarians.

- Students will be required to attend one session with Writing Center peer tutors (inside or outside of class).[13]

Class-specific Elements of the *Writing Foundation* (determined by the instructor)
- Instructor-chosen topic of semester with appropriate topical readings and assignments
- Writing/discussion/activities of material—text, video, music, etc. (to be assessed/graded by instructor).
- These writing/discussion/activities would incorporate the Information Literacy 1 and Metacognition 1 learning outcomes. Sample activities and templates will be created with campus experts, such as research librarians or Media Services.

Writing Exploration (optional)

These optional 2-credit writing courses could be taken any time after the completion of the Writing Foundation. These optional writing courses function as writing enrichment opportunities for composing multimodal and professional writing. These courses will include one critically reflective essay which integrates relevant coursework and other related activities and goes into the Integrated Portfolio. There are two different options of this course, one that focuses on developing communication skills in a variety of media and one that focuses on professional development. These courses cannot count toward majors.

Media Focus
The 2-credit course will be developed in consultation with Media Services.

OR

XPD Focus
The 2-credit course will be developed in consultation with XPD.

Learning Outcomes (these learning outcomes are also in two required courses)

Write 2
Students demonstrate consideration of the context, audience, and purpose of their writing and use compelling content to clearly explore their ideas. They consistently organize their arguments using relevant evidence. The language is clear and straightforward, with few errors.

Speak 2
Students organize a presentation with a clear central message that is consistent with relevant supporting material(s). Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and students appear comfortable.

Class-specific Elements

---

[13] See: Rapp Young, Beth. "Using Archival Data to Examine Mandatory Visits." *Academic Exchange Quarterly* 18:4 (Winter 2014). Rapp Young's study uses empirical research on more than 80,000 writing center visits over a ten-year period to show the value of this practice. Many other studies of smaller scope have had the same findings.

- Instructors choose appropriate readings and assignments
- Writing/discussion/activities of material—text, video, music, etc. (to be assessed/graded by instructor).

Writing Integration

This 4-credit course will be taken in the student's junior or senior year after they have taken their three same-themed courses. It functions as both a culminating general education experience and a writing-intensive course. Students build on their writing skills acquired in the foundations writing class and any optional exploration writing classes, with a focus on the integration and transfer of student learning across their college experience. Students must demonstrate reflection on their learning and how they address complex values. The topics of these courses are diverse and intended to be taught by faculty from across all divisions. **This course cannot count toward a major.**

Learning Outcomes

Common Good 3
Students apply the moral understanding they have gained to articulate and defend some vision of a responsible life and character, and connect these to the common good. This vision demonstrates how complex values are embedded in everyday life and institutions.

Metacognition 3
Students apply their metacognitive knowledge to improve their problem-solving processes, and to strengthen learning strategies.

Speak 2
Students organize a presentation with a clear central message that is consistent with relevant supporting material(s). Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and students appear comfortable.

Write 3
Students demonstrate a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose and use relevant and compelling content. The language is clear, fluent and virtually error-free.

Common Elements in Each Section
- Culmination of Integrated Portfolio
- Final reflection essay (fulfillment of learning outcomes)

Class-specific Elements
- Instructor to choose appropriate readings and assignments
- Writing/discussion/activities of material—text, video, music, etc. (to be assessed/graded by instructor).

Themes and Ways of Thinking

The Thematic coursework and the Ways of Thinking coursework intersect. Students must take a class in each Way of Thinking. Of those classes, three must be themed. This requirement was developed in order to help students see the value of different methodological approaches to a single theme, which is a hallmark of a liberal arts and sciences education. The other two Ways of Thinking might not be on any theme, on different themes, or on the same theme as their other themed coursework. Based on positive feedback from students, we are working on a way to provide students who take all five Ways of Thinking on the same theme with a special notation on their transcript, similar to the way we denote completion of the Honors program.

Ways of Thinking

In order to ensure breadth across the curriculum, we are requiring students to take courses with different methodological approaches. There are five Ways of Thinking and students will be required to take a class on each of the five. While closely associated with our administrative divisions, these Ways of Thinking were developed by faculty (RISE members and other volunteers) to capture the conceptual distinctions among the different methodologies and perspectives we believe are important for students to be exposed to. It's possible (and probable) that departments will offer distinct courses that can meet more than one Way of Thinking. (For one example, a Creative Writing course from the English department would meet Artistic Creation and Interpretation and a Shakespeare course in English would meet The Human Experience.) Below is the draft language for the five Ways of Thinking developed by the ad hoc committees. The Common Curriculum Committee will be reviewing these Ways of Thinking to ensure the descriptions would allow CCC members to determine if a course met the proposed Way of Thinking.

Abstract Reasoning

This Way of Thinking gives explicit attention to the formal and/or symbolic representation of structures and relationships. In this Way of Thinking, real-world objects are set aside to concentrate on their representations, on the roles they play in structures or patterns, and on the relationships they have to one another. Abstract Reasoning is done using formal rules—that is, rules that are well-defined and systematic. Thus, courses qualifying for this Way of Thinking will refine students' skills in developing, understanding, and manipulating representations (numeric and otherwise) appropriate to the subject they are studying. They will learn to move between concrete applications and abstract representations fluidly, and in both directions. Examples of Abstract Reasoning include but are not limited to: music theory; symbolization and evaluation of arguments' validity; analysis and composition of algorithms; development and analysis of mathematical models; linguistic analysis; deductive arguments and formal proof.

Artistic Creation and Interpretation

An experiential and critical understanding of the artistic Way of Thinking emerges from artistic

expression and reflection. Students will discover and communicate their thoughts and ideas through creating original artistic work, creating interpretations of artistic work, and/or engaging the creative activities of others on a critical and comparative level, while analyzing their own and others' artistic creations within historical and contemporary contexts. The understanding of artistic creation may be cultivated through studies that are studio, performance, or workshop-based, as well as through studies that examine historical or contemporary creative work with an artistic lens.

The Human Experience

The purpose of this Way of Thinking is to recognize and understand how humans have represented and constructed the human experience, and to thereby empower students as critical and creative agents in their own lives and communities. This Way of Thinking is the study of how human beings use texts, in different times and places, to understand, represent, and shape their world, and their experience of that world. Students will investigate, interpret, and analyze texts such as written works, spoken language, visual image, film, song, performance, or other cultural artifacts, in order to explore how human engagement with the world constructs meaning and shapes particular social and historical contexts. Particular attention will be paid to the ways in which elements of expression are influenced by their place and period of production.

Students will explore human efforts to make sense of the world around them and the ways in which those efforts shape the human experience. This Way of Thinking recognizes that human experience may involve textual engagement with community, internal life, the natural world, and/or the past and future. Key to engaging this process is the act of writing, in which students learn to reflect, refine, focus, and clarify their own analysis as active participants in making meaning of the world around them.

Scientific Inquiry about the Natural World

This Way of Thinking examines the natural world: how it is structured, how it works, and how it got to be this way. The natural world comprises the physical universe, both living and non-living, as well as the forces that act on it. This empirical mode of inquiry relies on constructing hypotheses and testing them with data collected through observation and experimentation to learn about the natural world. Students will make observations, collect data, appropriately analyze their results, and communicate their findings. Students will distinguish between inquiry that aims at empirical knowledge and other forms of human inquiry and knowing. These courses will enable students to have a deeper understanding of the natural world and prepare students to evaluate scientific claims critically through an appeal to factual evidence.

Scientific Thinking about Societies, Groups, and Individuals

This Way of Thinking uses systematic methods to examine and understand social phenomena, as well as human behavior and cognition, by carefully describing these phenomena and developing theoretically grounded hypotheses. Qualitative and quantitative data are gathered and described. In addition, or alternatively, data and scientifically accepted approaches are followed to test hypotheses. The ultimate goal of such work is to draw generalizable conclusions about

29

societies, groups, and the individual that are valid beyond the context of the research. Students will consider theories, learn basic methods, and engage with data to describe the world and test ideas about societies, groups, and individuals.

<div align="center">*Themes*</div>

We are in the process of developing four *Themes* that will help students make connections and integrate their learning across coursework. There is a themes committee, composed of RISE members and other faculty from across the disciplines, that has been working on developing these themes. These themes are being designed to be broad enough that all five Ways of Thinking will be represented, yet narrow enough that the students can make meaningful connections among their coursework. The four themes will be part of the March 27 proposal.

Students will be required to take three same-themed courses from three different Ways of Thinking. By having three different Ways of Thinking on the same topic, students can see the distinctive value different disciplines bring to bear on an issue. We have heard over and over again from faculty and students of their desire for cross-disciplinary conversation; teaching in a theme will provide opportunities for faculty to collaborate outside of their department and will provide opportunities for enriched conversations among students inside and outside of the classroom.

There are two kinds of themed courses: 200 level courses that are wholly dedicated to a theme, called Thematic Focus, and 100, 200, and 300 level courses that are partially dedicated to a theme, called Thematic Encounter.

Thematic Focus

While these courses can count toward the major, they have several obligations to the general education program. These courses are dedicated to a single theme, are associated with a Way of Thinking (or two Ways of Thinking if they are team-taught by two faculty members with different methodological approaches), include a common reading on that theme, use the Integrated Portfolio, and introduce students to the liberal arts and sciences goal of studying a diverse array of disciplinary approaches. They can be on any topic within one of the themes. In cases where these courses are team taught by two faculty members with different methodological approaches, they can count as two distinct Ways of Thinking.

Thematic Encounter

The theme should be a primary lens used to frame or supplement course content, not necessarily replace course content. While instructors are encouraged to use the theme to interpret existing content, they are welcome to add course content that directly contributes to a greater understanding and/or appreciation of the theme.

One way to define the 25% threshold is to think about the hours involved both in and out of a 4-credit class (if an instructor wants to offer a 2-credit class, the threshold increases to 50%). If we begin with the assumption for every hour in the class students should spend two to three outside

the class, then 25% of course content in a 4-credit class amounts to a total of 30-40 hours. While presumably the course would spend time addressing the theme both during class time and through outside readings and assignments, the division of those hours is up to the individual instructor's discretion. The time spent on the theme could be achieved in a single unit and/or woven throughout the class.

By committing to theming a class, faculty agree to require an assignment that incorporates the theme and can be submitted to the student's Integrated Portfolio. The theme is used to help the student make connections across their themed coursework and is not an assessment artifact. The assignment can be any artifact authentic to the individual course. A paper, a recording of a performance, an image of a work of art, a musical composition, a recording of a presentation, a model or computer program, or a lab notebook are all examples of acceptable artifacts.

Faculty who teach a 25% themed course can satisfactorily address the theme by some combination of the following:
- Using readings that address the theme;
- Requiring assignments (some of which will be graded) that demonstrates students have used the Way of Thinking to engage with the theme;
- Dedicating class time to addressing the theme, either in lecture, discussion, or in-class activities.

Example 1
- Have three weeks of the syllabus (spread out or in a unit) dedicated to reading material on the theme, which is discussed in class or the focus of in class activities. (23 hours)
- Have a big project that integrates the theme. (10-15 hours)

Example 2
- Have four weeks on of the syllabus (spread out or in a unit) dedicated to reading material on the theme, which is discussed in class or the focus of in class activities. (30 hours)
- Have a number of small assignments outside of class that integrated the theme (5-10 hours).

Cultural Agility

Students take two, sequential Cultural Agility courses. These courses examine the ways in which gender, race, and ethnicity structure and impact our lives and how these differences are made to matter in society. In the *Culture and Social Identity* class students will learn why none of these categories, in isolation, is sufficient to conceptualize either individual or social identity. Students will learn to think critically about their own gendered, racial, and ethnic identities as well as identify the social and cultural factors that shape and contribute to each.

In their *Culture and Social Systems* class students will demonstrate an understanding of how constructions of race, gender, and ethnicity shape cultural rules and biases and how these constructions vary across time, cultures, and societies. In addition, students will critically analyze the ways in which these forms of identity raise questions of justice in regard to access and participation in communal life.

The ways in which gender, race, and ethnicity intersect must be given prominent attention in both classes. An understanding of intersectionality requires recognizing that gender, racial, and ethnic identities are dynamic and that each is experienced differently, depending on how they combine in any one person. An exploration of intersectionality will also involve study of how these and other identities dynamically connect to systems of power. In other words, efforts to achieve justice in any one of these areas must take the others into account.

Culture and Social Identity

This is the first of two courses focused on gender, race, and ethnicity. Faculty can choose their own topic, as long as it meets the learning outcomes. This course can be taught in any department and can count toward majors. This course must be completed in the first year.

Learning Outcomes

Collaboration 1
Students clarify that team members have different roles, engage team members by acknowledging their contributions, articulates the importance of multiple and diverse perspectives in a group, and complete all individual tasks on time.

Gender 1
Students identify a diversity of gender identities. Students identify social and cultural factors that shape their own gender identities and how these factors influence their self- conception and worldview.

Race and Ethnicity 1
Students articulate that they have racial and/or ethnic identities. Students identify factors that shape racial and ethnic identities and how these factors influence their self- conception and relationships to their communities.

Speaking 1
Students organize a presentation with a clear central message that is consistent
with relevant supporting material(s). Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and
students appear comfortable.

Co-curricular
Requirement: one event related to gender and one event related to race and ethnicity must be
incorporated into the syllabus. These could be Fine Arts events, but do not have to be.

Culture and Social Systems
(Culture and Social Identity is a prerequisite)

This is the second of a two-course series. This course can be on any topic that meets the learning
outcomes. It can be taught in any department and can count toward majors.

Learning Outcomes
Common Good 2
Students evaluate different situations, perspectives, or actions, giving reasons why
some are better than others. Their analyses demonstrate their understanding of the complexities
of character and moral responsibilities on an individual and societal level.

Gender 2
Students analyze historical and/or contemporary constructions of gender. Students analyze how
factors such as race, ethnicity, age, class, sexuality, disability, religion, or nationality intersect
with gender.

Race and Ethnicity 2
Students demonstrate how historical and/or contemporary constructions of race and ethnicity
shape cultural rules and biases. Students analyze how factors such as gender, age, class,
sexuality, disability, religion, or nationality intersect with race and/or ethnicity.

Co-curricular
Requirement: one event related to gender and one event related to race and ethnicity must be
incorporated into the syllabus. These could be Fine Arts events, but do not have to be.

Sample Course Proposal Questions

1. Describe the texts that you plan to use in this course and what topics you plan to cover. (We
recognize that you might not have yet committed to specific texts; if this is the case, please
describe texts you are considering using in the course.)

2. Explain how these texts and topics bear on the issue of intersectionality.

3-7. Please explain how students will demonstrate [learning outcome]?

4. This course requires that you build two Integrated Exploration-approved activities outside the classroom into the syllabus. Please acknowledge this requirement by checking the box below.

Theology

Reflecting the Catholic and Benedictine mission of our schools in multiple ways, the new curriculum includes two sequential courses in Theology and an engagement component with Benedictine community and practice. First, within the two theology courses, students engage in theological reasoning and analyze religious engagement in society. They will also work toward the two general education learning outcomes that were developed to reflect Catholic Benedictine Tradition. In addition to Theological Reasoning and Religious Engagement, the two Theology classes in the new curriculum carry other general education learning outcomes: the first of the two theology courses carries a Common Good outcome and the second carries a Writing outcome. In this way, the theological courses are well integrated with other outcomes of the students' general education. Further integration of the schools' mission is ensured through the Benedictine Engagement requirement—one of three Engagement requirements which can be met through a class or outside of a class as explained later in this proposal.

The first of the theology courses will likely be offered under a single course heading (as with the current THEO 111). The second of the theology courses will likely be met through a variety of courses designated as the second theology course (as with the current TU). The second theology course can be on a range of topics, include religions other than Christianity, as long as the course is designed to meet the learning outcomes in theological reasoning, religious engagement, and writing. Given the Catholic and Benedictine character of our schools, the theological reasoning outcome requires students to "think critically about sources, doctrines, or themes of the Christian tradition," and thus theology courses in all topics will need to bring Christian sources into the dialog of the course in order to help students to meet the outcome.

As in the current curriculum, we anticipate that most sections of the second theology course will be offered by members of the Theology department, but that colleagues in other departments will also continue to offer sections. Faculty will apply for their courses to be designated as a second theology course through the standing curriculum committee (as in the current curriculum). For the Benedictine Engagement designation, faculty from any department can seek the designation for their courses in order to serve students choosing to meet the requirement through a designated class. We anticipate, based on conversations with CBTAI and the Theology Department, that BEN designated courses will primarily be taught outside the Theology Department.

Because all students already take two classes in theology in this model, theology classes cannot be taught within the Ways of Thinking path. While theological thinking is admittedly a method of thinking, and while theological classes could address the themes, keeping theology courses out of the ways of thinking path ensures that theology adds to the breadth of disciplines for students rather than potentially competing for space with other disciplines. RISE hopes that some theology classes will address the themes simply because professors seek to include intentional resonance.

Theology 1

This is the first of two courses focused on theology. Students think critically about sources and themes of the Christian tradition and begin to explore religious engagement with society. It is likely that this course will be developed under one course number to provide a degree of common grounding for the second theology course, though courses will vary by instructor.

This class also includes a grounding in Benedictine Hallmarks such that students are prepared for meeting their Benedictine Engagement (BEN) requirement later (The first theology class helps prepare students for the requirement but does not itself carry a BEN designation).

Learning Outcomes

Analyze Texts 1
Students read or interpret a variety of texts for comprehension, adjusting strategies based on the genre, nature of the text and context of the assignment.

Common Good 1
Students explain the moral dimensions of situations, perspectives, and
actions in their lives and recognize that there are competing, yet legitimate, conceptions of what defines the common good.

Religious Engagement 1
Students identify and explain one or more forms of religious engagement
with the world.

Theological Reasoning 1
Students identify elements of Christian theological sources, which may include scripture, practices, texts, or art forms. They explain a theological teaching, doctrine, or theme.

Theology 2

This is the second of two courses focused on theology; Theology 1 is a prerequisite. It can be on any topic that meets the learning outcomes, moving students into interpretation of theological sources and analysis of religious engagement with society. The second theology courses can be on a variety of topics. As in the current curriculum, these topics can continue to include religions other than Christianity.

Learning Outcomes

Religious Engagement 2
Students analyze forms of religious engagement by drawing on sources that may come from a range of academic disciplines.

Theological Reasoning 2

Students interpret theological sources and their contexts. They compare perspectives on a teaching, theme, or doctrine.

Write 2
Students demonstrate consideration of the context, audience, and purpose of their writing and use compelling content to clearly support ideas. The consistently organize their arguments using relevant evidence. The language is clear and straightforward, with few errors.

Sample Course Proposal Questions

1. Describe the course you are proposing to teach, including the topics you plan to cover and texts you may be considering. We recognize that you might not have yet committed to specific texts; if this is the case, please describe texts you are considering using in the course. If you have already developed a syllabus, you may attach it below.

2. Explain how these texts and topics will address learning outcomes for the course.

3-7. Please explain how students will demonstrate [learning outcome]?

4. This course requires that you submit assessment materials for the general education learning goals as requested. Please acknowledge this requirement by checking the box below.

Engagement Requirements

There are three requirements that have experiential activities at their center: Experiential Engagement (EXP), Global Engagement (GLO), and Benedictine Engagement (BEN). RISE has concluded that these three requirements are fundamentally about getting students to have certain kinds of "real-life" experiences together with a structured reflection that helps them derive meaningful lessons from these experiences. The common elements of the three Engagement requirements are an experiential activity, formal reflection, and can be done inside or outside the classroom.

All three of these requirements could be met in a class; after going through the appropriate faculty governance committees, the course could be designated as Experiential Engagement, Global Engagement, or Benedictine Engagement.[14] Crucially to our vision, however, these engagement requirements could also be filled through structured activities outside of the classroom. In these cases, a student would need to apply to have their experience classified as Experiential Engagement, Global Engagement, or Benedictine Engagement. Opening these requirements beyond course designation further enhances the integrative character of this curriculum.

Here are examples of the types of activities that students might count toward an Engagement requirement if they do not take an Engagement-designated course: for EXP, Internships, Service-learning by Bonner Leaders or Jackson Fellows; for GLO, Study Abroad, Alternative Break Experiences; and for BEN, programs developed by the Benedictine Institute or the School of Benedictine Spirituality.

These requirements are bound together by their experience-centered approach. They are all three forms of experiential engagement, and, as such, are not primarily about skill development; instead they engage the pedagogical approaches developed by experiential learning models that connect action with reflection. Faculty teaching courses with these designations must follow the best practices of experiential learning, which are part of the criteria to apply for the designation.

Study Abroad fulfills the Experiential Learning and Global Engagement requirements. Additionally, students who study a semester abroad can take courses through the educational programming that counts toward the Ways of Thinking requirements. They may also have the opportunity to take *Culture and Social Systems*. Students are required to write an essay for their Integrated Portfolio that meets the requirements for Experiential Learning and Global Engagement. This assignment will be part of the class taught by the CSB/SJU faculty director.

Experiential Learning Best Practices

The criteria developed for the Engagement designations is based on the National Society for Experiential Education (NSEE), which is the leading organization of educators, business leaders, and community leaders devoted to the improvement of experiential education.

---

[14] We anticipate based on conversations with CBTAI and the Theology Department that BEN designated courses will primarily be taught outside the Theology Department.

The following are 4 of the 8 Principles of Best Practice according to NSEE. (Bolding added)

Intention: **All parties must be clear from the outset why experience is the chosen approach to the learning that is to take place and to the knowledge that will be demonstrated, applied or result from it**. Intention represents the purposefulness that enables experience to become knowledge and, as such, is deeper than the goals, objectives, and activities that define the experience.

Preparedness and Planning: **Participants must ensure that they enter the experience with sufficient foundation to support a successful experience**. They must also focus from the earliest stages of the experience/program on the identified intentions, adhering to them as goals, objectives and activities are defined. The resulting plan should include those intentions and be referred to on a regular basis by all parties. At the same time, it should be flexible enough to allow for adaptations as the experience unfolds.

Authenticity: **The experience must have a real world context** and/or be useful and meaningful in reference to an applied setting or situation. This means that is should be designed in concert with those who will be affected by or use it, or in response to a real situation.

Reflection: **Reflection is the element that transforms simple experience to a learning experience.** For knowledge to be discovered and internalized the learner must test assumptions and hypotheses about the outcomes of decisions and actions taken, then weigh the outcomes against past learning and future implications. This reflective process is integral to all phases of experiential learning, from identifying intention and choosing the experience, to considering preconceptions and observing how they change as the experience unfolds. Reflection is also an essential tool for adjusting the experience and measuring outcomes.

Criteria

The criteria that we will develop for each of the three Engagement designations will be derived from the four best practices described above. We are working with the Office of Experience and Professional Development, the Center for Global Education, the CBTAI Committee, monastic members and other relevant groups as we develop these criteria for the three different requirements.

As we mentioned, the Engagement requirements can be met in two ways, by an individual project or by taking a designated course. In both cases, students will be required to submit work to the Integrated Portfolio. We expect that both the faculty applications and the individual student applications would have to meet similar criteria.

Students can meet this designation by filling out an individual proposal and submitting the required work to their Integrated Portfolio. Faculty can get their course designated as Experiential Engagement, Global Engagement, or Benedictine Engagement by filling out an online course proposal. In some cases, one experiential activity or course may meet multiple Engagement requirements.

Quantitative Reasoning

Quantitative Reasoning is the construction, communication, and evaluation of arguments involving numerical information.[15] Quantitative Reasoning involves applying numerical information to real or authentic contexts. Specifically, students can:

1. Interpret graphs, tables, and/or schematics and draw conclusions from them
2. Represent data visually, numerically, and verbally
3. Analyze/estimate numerical information in order to determine reasonableness, identify alternatives, and/or select optimal results
4. Draw conclusions, in context, based on analysis of numerical information
5. Use and understand quantitative arguments

Importance of QR

The ability to make sense of numerical information is essential in our data-driven world. Due to our increasing reliance on data, poor quantitative reasoning skills can lead to serious consequences when numerical information is misunderstood or deliberately made misleading. Also due to the ubiquitous nature of data, this skill is one that is increasingly necessary for all adults. Quantitative Reasoning is one of the Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) developed through AACU's Liberal Education for America's Promise (LEAP) initiative. Furthermore, mathematics communities have advocated for Quantitative Literacy Reform and many liberal arts colleges, such as Carleton College, have emphasized the role of Quantitative Reasoning in general education models.

Because Quantitative Reasoning skills are required in a wide variety of disciplines, the Integrated Exploration model includes a Quantitative Reasoning designation, which allows any course that meets the learning goals to offer this designation. However, many students will experience a second or third general education course that involves quantitative reasoning as many of the Abstract Reasoning, Scientific Inquiry About the Natural World, and Scientific Thinking about Societies Ways of Thinking courses will offer the Quantitative Reasoning designation. Additionally, courses in a major or program that are not part of the Ways of Thinking courses could also offer the Quantitative Reasoning designation.

---

[15] The "construction, communication, and evaluation of arguments" comes from Carleton College. The language used in the bullet points is an amalgamation of the Mathematical Association of America and the QR criteria language developed by one of the ad hoc Way of Thinking groups.

College Success Course
Submitted by FYX Course Working Group: Mike Connolly, Sarah Gewirtz, Kate Graham, Jason Kelly, Erica Rademacher, and Steve Stelzner

Background

One part of the SD 2020 Liberal Arts for Life vision was the development of a "First-Year Experience." The First-Year Experience Committee, led by Student Development and Academic Affairs, began studying both our own institutions and national research in this area in 2015-2016. In 2016-2017, this Committee entered into the Foundations of Excellence program of the John N. Gardner Institute for Excellence in Undergraduate Education to develop a comprehensive First Year Experience (what came to be called "FYX") as part of the SD2020 goal of meeting "the needs and aspirations and exceed the expectations of a 21st century student body." Following the Gardner Institute *the FYX Committee envisioned FYX not merely as a program or set of programs, but as an environment that encompasses all the students' experiences and relationships with the institutions from the time of their deposit until they return for their sophomore year.* The College Success course proposal is one piece of this larger mission.

Foundations of Excellence provided a way to systematically and candidly evaluate programs, policies, and procedures across departments and programs. The self-study is the basis for an action plan designed to improve student learning, persistence, and personal development. With the collaboration and guidance of the John N. Gardner Institute, project leaders Karen Erickson, Emily Esch, Mary Geller, and Doug Mullin organized a working task force comprised of faculty, administrators, staff, and students from across both campuses. One of the highlights of this work was the rich collaboration between departments that do not often have opportunities to collaborate.

To meet this charge, the FYX Implementation Task Force was created and offers the following proposal.

Rationale

The FYX Implementation Task Force has designed this course in response to feedback from faculty, staff and students. Much of this feedback was gathered during 2016-2017 as we worked on the self-study. We have pulled a few examples from the report; if you are interested, the full report can be found here: http://www.csbsju.edu/fyx.

First, there is evidence that from the surveys we need to do more in the areas of academic success, future enrollment plans, standards of behavior, ethical conduct, and academic honesty. Interestingly, faculty and students diverge on whether we are successful in these areas:

The areas rated most successful by faculty were not nearly as well regarded by students: a. Faculty rated the degree to which they discuss what it takes for students to be academically successful overwhelmingly high/very high (88.4 percent compared to 57.2 percent in the student

41

survey) and what students' future enrollment plans are (88.4 percent compared to 35.9 percent for students)....b. Areas in which student ratings were substantially more positive than faculty ratings include important of standards of behavior (85.8 percent of students rated high/very high compared to 50.7 percent of faculty), ethical conduct (84.4 percent compared to 52.6 percent), and academic honesty (86.1 percent compared to 61.4 percent).

In a different section of the report the authors conclude that adding a more robust academic component to Orientation is not enough:

[S]tudents are missing direct contact with faculty members and would perhaps also benefit from more concrete information regarding study skills, time management, talking with faculty, utilizing office hours, etc. This information can be introduced during orientation, but that will not be sufficient in terms of actual skill development or academic success.

While many FYS sections have addressed some of the topics that will be addressed by the College Success course, these topics are not explicitly included in the learning outcomes for FYS, and thus are inconsistently taught. In creating the College Success course, we were motivated to ensure that all entering students received the same information and had the same opportunities. This seemed especially important as we seek to serve the changing demographics of the CSB/SJU population. We have been working on the College Success course in conversation with the RISE committee. We hope that removing some of the topics currently offered in FYS will provide for a more smooth transition from a two-semester first-year seminar model to the one-semester first-year seminar currently proposed by the RISE committee.

College Success Course Structure

Class Structure:

Size: 24 students
Meetings: 55 minutes
Frequency: Once a week during any full week of the fall term (14 periods)
Support: One CSB and One SJU TA for each class

All entering first-year students will be required to take this one-credit class in their fall semester. This class will be offered every day of the week at the usual class times and some evening classes. It will carry a letter grade. The guidelines for one credit hour, as stated in the Academic Course catalog, are: "One credit ordinarily represents three hours of work each week, including private study and research as well as scheduled class meetings." This is understood to be 30-40 hours total for the student.

The course will be standardized to assure a consistent experience for all students; each section will use the same syllabus, use the same texts, and require the same assignments. This should cut back on the amount of preparation instructors will need to do. There will be a textbook; it may be one of the many textbooks designed for these kinds of courses or it might be a customizable, online course pack so we can make it specific to the CSB/SJU experience. Alongside the first semester Writing Foundation this course will introduce the Integrated Portfolio.

The students will complete readings, activities, and attend events outside of class. They will bring these experiences back to classroom discussions and short reflection papers in order to demonstrate their learning and share their learning with others in the class. The facilitator is not responsible for "knowing everything," but rather facilitating the learning process and appropriately referring students to campus resources.

The course will be taught by faculty and staff who have at least a Master's Degree. The instructor will be assisted by two TAs, who will help with the grading, facilitation of discussion, and other tasks as needed. There will be professional development programming, which will cover the topics covered on the syllabus, how to manage and mentor the TAs, and maintaining an inclusive classroom, and there will be opportunities to meet with a small cohort of other FYX course instructors during the semester.

We offer the following sample syllabus as a draft to provide faculty and staff with the types of course topics to be covered, what kinds of activities outside the classroom will be attended, and ideas about what assignments will be required. This is only a draft. Once the text for the course has been chosen this will be refined and presented in more detail. We expect that, if approved this spring, we will pilot a few sections in the fall of 2018 in order to make revisions before it is fully implemented. We have chosen these topics as the result of the work done under the auspices of the John N. Gardner Institute. The full report can be found at: http://www.csbsju.edu/fyx.

While the FYX Implementation Task Force has focused on creating a syllabus for entering first-year students, there will also be a transfer section of the course taught each term. The academic advising office will determine during if a student needs to complete the FYX course during the transfer student's personal registration appointment.

Assessment Plan

There are eleven basic learning outcomes associated with the course. Most of the learning outcomes require that students complete certain tasks – the most common verb used in the learning outcomes is "identify." Students will be submitting items to the Integrated Portfolio and we will be using a random subset of these assignments for assessment at the program level.

Success at CSB/SJU--COLG 100

Course Purpose
The purpose of COLG 100 is to help new students make a successful transition to CSB/SJU. This course aims to foster a sense of belonging, promote engagement in the curricular and co-curricular life, articulate expectations of students, and help students continue to clarify their purpose, meaning, and direction.

Learning Objectives

Developing a Meaningful Life Purpose
Students will reflect on their core values as they map out their personal, academic, and career goals. They will explore opportunities to further the pursuit of these goals both on and off campus. Students will recognize the interrelatedness of their own wellbeing and the common good, and reflect on their obligations to others in the CSB/SJU and broader communities.

Assessable learning goals:

1. Students identify their core values, interests, and skills.
2. Students articulate potential pathways to succeeding at their goals both on and off campus.
3. Students will reflect on their obligations to others on campus and in the broader community.
4. Students can identify resources that can help them develop and implement their goals.

Personal Well-being

As Catholic, Benedictine institutions, we are committed to educating the whole person. Students will develop habits for sustaining healthy living, relationships, and for making good decisions. Students will demonstrate their knowledge of a holistic approach to physical, mental, and spiritual well-being.

Healthy habits include: nutrition and healthy eating, adequate sleep, stress management, financial management, social connections, interpersonal relationships, substance use, sexual health, mindfulness and spirituality, physical activity and exercise, and an appropriate response to challenge.

Assessable learning goals:

1. Students identify habits associated with a healthy lifestyle.
2. Students will identify and know how to access resources that can help them develop these healthy habits.

Academic and Professional Skill Development

Students will demonstrate growth in the skill areas associated with professionalism and academic success.

Assessable learning goals:

1. Students recognize and practice basic habits and attitudes associated with professional behavior.
2. Students will prepare a four-year academic and experiential plan.
3. Students identify and demonstrate skills and habits associated with deep learning and academic success.
4. Students will begin to understand and develop professional skills.
5. Students can identify resources available to help them be professionally and academic successful.

Course Materials

Textbook: TBD--there are several textbooks that the committee has reviewed. We do envision customizing a textbook or creating a course pack so that we can incorporating popular content along with materials specific to the CSB/SJU community. An example textbook for customization is:
https://www.macmillanlearning.com/Catalog/product/stepbysteptocollegeandcareersuccess-seventhedition-gardner#tab

Canvas: Integrated, Electronic Portfolio—being developed right now

Course Requirements and Grading:

	Points:
Attendance: 3 points per class meeting	39
Participation: 3 points per class meeting	39
Journal entries: 5 points per entries	45
Campus Clarity Module: 5 points	5
Financial Literacy Module: 5 points	5
Paper #1: 2 pages	10
Paper #2: 4 pages	50

GRADING SCALE:

A	94%
AB	88%
B	82%
BC	76%
C	70%
CD	64%
D	58%
F	Below 58%

Attendance and Participation:
You are expected to attend all class meetings and outside events. This is a seminar course in which attendance and participation are vital. Participation will be evaluated based on your engagement in the class, substantial contributions to class discussions, evidence of having completed the readings, completion of the assignments, and a positive attitude.

Journal Entries:

You will be required to submit regular journal entries via the e-portfolio in Canvas as a means of reflective writing. Your journal entries should demonstrate considerable reflection and thought and should be around 300 words.

Papers:

You will be required to submit a paper near the start of term via the e-portfolio in Canvas. This paper will kept and revisited as the foundation for the end of term paper. The first paper is outlined here:

    Who are you and why are you here?

1) This paper is a reflective paper. The paper should be double spaced, one-inch margins, and 12-point font. The paper will be two pages (500 words). The focus of this paper is to answer the questions, "Who are you?" and "Why are you here?"

2) In order to answer the first question well, you should share with the reader as much as you feel comfortable sharing about your background and what it is that currently constructs your identity. Items you may choose to reflective on include:

        Where did you grow up?
        How would others describe you?
        Faith?
        Family?
        Passions?

3) In order to answer the second question you must think of the multitude of potential meanings for the word "here". On the specific end of the spectrum, "Here" means the chair you are currently sitting in or the class you are enrolled in. On the grander, altruistic end of the spectrum, "Here" could mean why you are on this earth? Some questions you may choose to answer in your paper are:

        Why are you taking this class?
        Why did you choose to attend CSB/SJU?
        What experiences have brought you to this place in life?
        What do you expect to gain from attending CSB/SJU?
        What are your academic, career and life aspirations?
        How will you meet them here?

4) Are there any things that you think I should know about you as begin a semester together?

Course Meetings (Fall 2018 dates are used to represent a typical year):

Orientation (August 24): The College Experience: What will you get out of this course? What opportunities does college offer? What is your purpose for attending college? Why do you need to take courses outside your major? How is college different?

Week 1 (August 27): Who are you and why are you here? Building relationships, cultural adjustments
    Pre-class Activity: Orientation

Assignment: Journal entry #1: Orientation Reflections
Readings: TBD

Week 2 (September 3): How you learn (motivation, resilience and emotional intelligence)
        Pre-class Activity: Common Meal/Challenge Course
        Assignment: Paper #1: Who Am I? And Why Am I Here?
        Readings: TBD

Week 3 (September 10): Life Skills and Success Strategies-Time management, prioritization, organization, professionalism
        Pre-class Activity: Involvement Fair
        Assignment: Student Development Module and Journal Entry #2:
                         Opportunities for Campus Involvement
        Readings: TBD

Week 4 (September 17: Academic Skills: Getting the most from Class (Test-Taking, Reading, Access Online Resources; Working with Instructor, Connecting with Faculty, Tutors, understanding a syllabus, Canvas,)
        Pre-class Activity: Meet with one of your course instructors during their office hours
        Assignment: Journal Entry #3: Reflection on Meeting with Faculty Member
        Readings: TBD
(Last day for perm drop, September 19)

Week 5 (September 24): Effective Learning Strategies
        Pre-class Activity: Learning Inventory
        Assignment: Journal Entry #4: Reflection on how you learn
        Readings: TBD

Week 6 (October 1): Making the most out of your time at CSB/SJU: Academics, Experiences, and Connections
        Pre-class Activity: Interest Assessment
        Assignment: Journal Entry #5: Reflection on interest assessment
        Readings: TBD

Week 7 (October 8): Free Days--*No class period*
        Pre-class Activity: Academic Exploration/Opportunities Fair
        Assignment: Complete StrengthsFinder Assessment

Week 8 (October 15): Academic Planning (Navigating Banner, DegreeWorks, Registration Process)
        Assignment: Journal Entry #6: What did you learn at the Academic
                         Exploration/Opportunities Fair?
        Readings: TBD

Week 9 (October 22): Mid-Term Grades: Now what do I do? (Motivation & Stress, How do I explain my courses/performance to my parents?)

Assignment: Journal Entry #7: Mid-term grades (How do you feel about these?)
Readings: TBD

Week 10 (October 29): StrengthsFinder Results; Connecting to Alums/Mentors
      Pre-class Activity: Meet with advisor in your area of study
      Assignment: Registration plans for second semester and draft four year plan
      Readings: TBD
(Registration starts November 1)

Week 11 (November 5): Making Connections on Campus and Developing Relationships
(Collaborative Teams, Effective Communication, Imposter Syndrome, How do I fit?
Homesickness)
      Pre-class Activity: Participate in one aspect of Career Expo: FY specific seminars on
                            liberal arts and sciences/major and career, Mentor Meet-Ups with
                            Alumnae/i
      Assignment: Module on Financial Literacy (pre-existing materials from Khan,
                            Banks, MN Private Colleges)
      Readings: TBD

Week 12 (November 12): Maintaining Wellness: Sleep, Exercise, Balancing social activities
      Pre-class Activity: Students make individual appointments with FYX
                    instructor. How are you doing? Do you need help with
              something? What are you doing for Thanksgiving?
      Assignment: Journal Entry #8: Reflection on Career Expo experience
      Readings: TBD
(Last day to withdraw from a course November 12)

Week 13 (November 19): Thanksgiving week--*No class period*
      Pre-class Activity: Visit Outdoor Rec, etc.
      Assignment: Journal Entry #9: Maintaining wellness (balancing academics,
                          work, and social activities)
      Readings: TBD

Week 14 (November 26): Community: Have you found your community campus? Friends,
Faculty, Religious? Respect for others.
      Pre-class Activity: Attend a lecture on the Benedictine value "Community"
      Readings: TBD

Week 15 (December 3): Setting Goals for Second Semester: Grades, Housing, Changing
Courses, Employment, Picking an Advisor, Deadlines, Involvement, Club and Institutional
Leadership, Thinking about Career
      Assignment: Paper #2: Who am I and Why am I here: Re-visited
      Readings: TBD

Week 16 (December 10): Reflection Period. *No class period*
(Start of finals December 12)

6. IMPLEMENTATION

Outline for Implementation Plan for the Integrated Exploration Model

Introduction

Following approval of a new general education curriculum, an implementation plan and process will need to be developed to ensure a functioning and effective general education program. Based on a review of practices at other institutions, this work typically begins after a faculty vote on a final curriculum model, but an outline of some of the operational components of the implementation phase can be sketched out in advance of a vote to reassure stakeholders that resources will be available to support a new curriculum and that an assessment plan is in place to evaluate its effectiveness in supporting student learning outcomes. It should be stressed that this is a draft outline of an implementation plan to be developed fully in the spring/summer 2018.

One of the key first steps in this process is for a team from CSB/SJU to return to the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Institute on General Education and Assessment, held annually in June. CSB/SJU first sent a team to the AAC&U Institute in 2015 to develop a process document to guide the work of general education reform on our campuses. After the team returned from the institute, it drafted an extensive report, *Making Connections*, which it submitted to the Joint Faculty Senate in the fall semester 2015. The JFS adopted unanimously the recommendations of the *Making Connections* report, which allowed the Common Curriculum Visioning Committee (CCVC) to move forward with developing a vision statement and learning outcomes in 2015-2016.

Should the JFA approve the revised curriculum proposal drafted by the ReInvigorating our Shared Education (RISE) committee in the spring semester 2018, a team will return to the AAC&U Summer Institute on General Education and Assessment in June 2018—this time to create a draft of the implementation plan, including a timeline for the work, the types of development needed to train faculty to teach new courses in the revised curriculum, the process of submitting and approving course proposals, the staffing requirements of the new curriculum, and the assessment activities that will need to be in place to determine the outcomes of these changes. The AAC&U Institute is framed around a set of principles and guidelines for redesigning, supporting, and evaluating general education programs, curricula, and pedagogy. According the AAC&U materials, teams will work to "identify strategies and practices for successful implementation" that include the development of "meaningful assessment strategies that target learning outcomes (including those critical personal and social responsibility outcomes often demonstrated through high-impact practices), produce useful data that can be widely communicated, and lead to improvement in teaching and learning practices." By the end of the summer institute, teams create a plan for action.

Participants at the AAC&U Summer Institute will also have extensive opportunities to work with other teams and with experienced faculty consultants. Dr. Terry Rhodes, the Vice President for the Office of Quality, Curriculum and Assessment at AAC&U, will be on the staff at the institute. Dr. Rhodes visited CSB/SJU as a consultant in the fall and is familiar with our

institutions and with our work on general education reform. In addition, there will be two consultants on the AAC&U staff from Virginia Tech. This is significant because Virginia Tech recently approved a new general education curriculum (the "Pathways Curriculum Plan") and has just finished its own implementation plan.

A. Faculty Development

The implementation phase of a new general education model will require substantial resources. As Tim Riordan and Stephen Sharkley explain in their article, "Hand in Hand: The Role of Culture, Faculty, Identity, and Mission in Sustaining General Education Reform," "*If student learning is to be at the heart of an institution's mission, we have learned, recognition of that work and allocation of resources in support of it must be of the highest priority*" (2010, p. 214, emphasis in original).[16] Faculty development to support general education pedagogy will be necessary. Faculty will likely need to retool existing courses and design new courses to ensure that their students are meeting the revised learning outcomes of a new general education curriculum. In their article, "Utilizing Change Theory to Promote General Education Reform: Practical Applications," Stephen C. Zerwas and J. Worth Pickering contend, "Ongoing efforts to provide training and professional development for instructors will be required" (2010, p. 235).[17] Fortunately, the colleges have committed attention and resources to faculty development, as promised in SD 2020, which states: "Develop and implement a Professional Development program that strengthens the faculty and staff's ability to meet the needs of the student body." **The presidents have committed $300,000 to these faculty development efforts, with $100,000 for each of the first three years of the implementation phase.**

The experiences at other colleges prove this is a wise investment, even as institutions face budgetary pressures. For example, despite "the pressures of budget cuts in a lean economic year," the provost at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro "approved funding for faculty development grants to assist faculty in retooling their syllabi to address the revised learning goals and to achieve a successful course recertification" as part of a successful general education reform effort (Rountree, Tolbert, and Zerwas, 2010, p. 34).[18] There is evidence that such investments pay off. Citing the research of Jerry G. Gaff, the *Journal of General Education* reports "at universities across the country, faculty have responded to development programs with a good deal of enthusiasm. Increased collaboration across disciplines, enhanced pedagogical effectiveness, and improved student satisfaction with their learning experiences in general

---

[16] Riordan, Tim and Stephen Sharkley. "Hand in Hand: The Role of Culture, Faculty, Identity, and Mission in Sustaining General Education Reform." *A Process Approach to General Education Reform: Transforming Institutional Culture in Higher Education*. Eds. Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett. Madison WI: Atwood Publishing, 2010. 199-220.

[17] Zerwas, Stephen C., and J. Worth Pickering. "Utilizing Change Theory to Promote General Education Reform: Practical Applications." *A Process Approach to General Education Reform: Transforming Institutional Culture in Higher Education*. Eds. Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett. Madison WI: Atwood Publishing, 2010. 221-138.

[18] Rountree, Kathleen, Lisa Tolbert, and Stephen C. Zerwas. "Culture as Process: Using Cultural Factors to Promote General Education Reform." *A Process Approach to General Education Reform: Transforming Institutional Culture in Higher Education*. Eds. Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett. Madison WI: Atwood Publishing, 2010. 23-38.

education courses have been among the reported results (White 1994, p. 200).[19] Recent evidence confirms the importance of faculty development initiatives. In a multi-year study conducted by Carleton College and Washington State University, professional development activities were shown to positively affect student learning and classroom pedagogy (Condon, et. al., 2016).[20]

Academic Affairs has recently begun conversations about the possibility of creating a new Teaching and Learning Center to replace the Learning Enhancement Service. Many institutions committed to a vibrant general education program have a teaching center to support and promote effective pedagogy. For example, the Center for Innovation in the Liberal Arts (CILA) at St. Olaf College provides support for faculty conversation and collaboration about learning, teaching and scholarship. In addition, these centers can assist with the transition and implementation of general education reform. At the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning serves as a resource for teaching, provides workshops and web resources on research-based teaching and learning practices, and funds projects for faculty research. "Thus, the center became an important foundation for the general education reform effort." Lori J. Carrell, the director, noted, "The center helped with the cultural transformation on campus and readied the campus for change" (Kuh and O'Donnell 2013, p. 42).[21]

The specific details involving faculty development initiatives during the implementation phase would be developed by the CSB/SJU team to attend the AAC&U Summer Institute in the summer of 2018. Items that would need to be considered include:

- By that point, select a new general education director to replace the Common Curriculum director. This would be a faculty position.
- Work with the Dean of the Faculty to create a proposal for a Teaching & Learning Center.
- Draft a position announcement for a director for the Teaching & Learning Center in fall 2018. This would also be a faculty position.
- Create a general education implementation steering team responsible for planning, directing and monitoring implementation of the revised general education curriculum. All academic units whose function relate to the delivery of general education will be included.
- Continued conversations between curriculum designers, general education implementation steering team, and the Common Curriculum Committee and/or RISE to ensure community understanding of the new general education program.
- Development of the requisite courses, focusing at first on those needed for incoming students.

---

[19] White, Charles R. "A Model for Comprehensive Reform in General Education: Portland State University." *The Journal of General Education* 43.3 (1994): 168-237.

[20] Condon, William, Ellen R. Iverson, Cathryn A. Manduca, Carol Rutz, and Gudrun Willett. Faculty Development and Student Learning: Assessing the Connections. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016.

[21] Kuh, George D., and Ken O'Donnell. *Ensuring Quality & Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013.

- Faculty development to assist with course revision, the creation of new courses, and the development of theme cohorts.
- Training programs and workshops to facilitate pedagogy and course development during the transition.
- Develop course approval process to assist the Common Curriculum Committee.
- Work with the Dean of the Faculty to develop a new mentoring process that could include course visits and evaluations, similar to course visits in departments.
- Proposal writing workshops to guide faculty in new course development.
- Training for committees responsible for proposal reviews.
- Training for faculty to provide advising support to students.
- Assessment plans are integrated into the planning process.
- APBC will assist in determining transition costs.
- Work with appropriate offices, such as Communications & Marketing, on public relations related to the new curriculum.

B. Assessment

Purpose: Assessment and evaluation of the *Integrated Exploration Curriculum* will drive refinements in pedagogy, teaching effectiveness, curriculum design, resource allocation, learning outcome articulation and assessment/evaluation techniques with an ultimate goal of *improving student learning*.

Methods: 3 methods will be used to assess each of the learning goals (uppercase) and the subsequent outcomes (lower case).
1. Course-embedded signature works (direct measure).
    a. Faculty assign a short (1-3 page) assignment where students demonstrate the learning outcome.
    b. Assignments are evaluated using a normed rubric; we will use the AAC&U Value Rubrics whenever possible. Newly created rubrics will follow the AAC&U template. See an example below.
    c. Results are aggregated and reported to those teaching to this outcome.
    d. Results are discussed and an action plan for improvement is devised.
2. Senior exit survey (indirect measure internal comparison).
    a. Administered annually by the Office of Institutional Research
3. Nationally-normed student profile (indirect measure external comparison).

Process: Taskstream is the Assessment Management System that is used to coordinate our assessment and evaluation processes. As in the current system, faculty will volunteer to help out with assessment of the general education learning outcomes.

1. A workspace is created by the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness for each curricular component.
2. Faculty evaluating a component are given access to the workspace. A faculty team leader is designated.

3. In this workspace, faculty will find the student signature works and rubric. These have been uploaded into Taskstream through a Canvas/Taskstream interface mechanism.
4. Faculty evaluate the signature works and results are aggregated in the workspace.
5. Faculty discuss results and create an action plan for improvement.
6. This entire process is supported by the Office of Academic Assessment and Effectiveness.

Timelines: For courses conducted in fall semester, faculty teams commence in spring to complete their review, discussion, and recommendations. For courses conducted in spring semester, faculty teams commence in fall semester to complete their review, discussion, and recommendations.

Sample Rubric

There are 12 Core Learning Goals, which are listed in section 4. Each of these has three tiers, so students will see each of the learning goals multiple times (at least two, sometimes three).
We are placing each of the three scaffolded learning outcomes into a single rubric for the learning goal. All faculty teaching a general education course that includes the learning goal will use the same rubric. In this example, everyone teaching Theology 1 and Thematic Focus courses, where the Analyzing Texts learning goal is placed, will be using this rubric for the general education assessment. We expect that the majority of the students in Theology 1 will meet level 1 in all dimensions by the end of the course and that the majority of students in Thematic Focus will meet level 2 in all dimensions by the end of the course. It is likely that some student might progress faster – meeting level 2 in Theology and level 3 if Thematic Focus. Below is an example of what a rubric for the Analyzing Texts learning outcome might look like.

ANALYZING TEXTS: Elicit and construct meaning from texts.

Beginner: Students read or interpret a variety of texts for comprehension, adjusting strategies based on the genre, nature of the text and context of the assignment.

Intermediate: Students evaluate texts for significance, relevance to the student's goals, and make connections among texts and/or disciplines.

Advanced: Students integrate knowledge among different texts, including independently finding supplemental texts to help understand the main text(s).

	3	2	1	0
Comprehension	Recognizes possible implications of the text for contexts, perspectives, or issues beyond	Uses the text, general background knowledge, and/or specific knowledge of the author's	Evaluates how textual features (e.g., sentence and paragraph structure or tone) contribute to the author's	Apprehends vocabulary appropriately to paraphrase or summarize the information the text

	the assigned task within the classroom or beyond the author's explicit message (e.g., might recognize broader issues at play, or might pose challenges to the author's message and presentation).	context to draw more complex inferences about the author's message and attitude.	message; draws basic inferences about context and purpose of text.	communicates.
Relationship to text	Evaluates texts for scholarly significance and relevance within and across the various disciplines, evaluating them according to their contributions and consequences.	Uses texts in the context of scholarship to develop a foundation of disciplinary knowledge and to raise and explore important questions.	Engages texts with the intention and expectation of building topical and world knowledge.	Approaches texts in the context of assignments with the intention and expectation of finding right answers and learning facts and concepts to display for credit.
Analysis and integration of texts	Evaluates strategies for relating ideas, text structure, or other textual features in order to build knowledge or insight within and across texts and disciplines.	Identifies relations among ideas, text structure, or other textual features, to evaluate how they support an advanced understanding of the text as a whole.	Recognizes relations among parts or aspects of a text, such as effective or ineffective arguments or literary features, in considering how these contribute to a basic	Identifies aspects of a text (e.g., content, structure, or relations among ideas) as needed to respond to questions posed in assigned tasks.

			understanding of the text as a whole.	

Integrated Exploration Curriculum Map
This chart shows where the learning outcomes will be assessed.

Goal/Outcome	Write 1	Cultural Agility 1	Theo 1	Write 2 (Optional)	Theme Focus	Cultural Agility 2	Theo 2	Write 3
Analyzing texts			x		x			
Collaboration		x			x			
Common good			x			x		x
Gender		x				x		
Information literacy	x				x			
Metacognition	x					x		x
Race and ethnicity		x				x		
Religious engagement			x				x	
Quantitative Reasoning								
Speaking		x		x				x
Theological reasoning			x				x	
Writing	x			x			x	x

C. Staffing

How many FTE will the Integration Curriculum require?
Were all courses and designations required of students taken as a separate course (and did not "count" for anything else), the Integrated Exploration curriculum would, at a minimum, require approximately 90.5 FTE for 69 total credits. The FTE required is similar to the current Common Curriculum (see Table 1). This estimate is based on student enrollment, a four-year plan, and class sizes identified in Table 2.

In addition, the model requires 161 sections of Ways of Thinking courses. Were these divided equally among the different Ways of Thinking, 32 sections of each Way of Thinking would need to be offered each semester. (We currently offer more sections than this with the Divisional Designations each semester.) Within each Way of Thinking, the different themes would need to be offered, but not all courses would require themes. If four themes are offered, if students selected the themes equally, and an equal number of courses did not have a theme, the different ways of thinking would require at least 6 courses per theme (with 6 courses containing no theme). However, based on our current offerings, scheduling conflicts, and the numerous needs of our students, we will likely need more. Academic Affairs will be working with APBC to begin refining these rough estimates.

Table 1. Size Comparison of Integrated Exploration and Common Curriculum

	Integration Curriculum	*Common Curriculum*
Total credits	*57-69 (counting EXP. GLO, BEN, and FYX)*	*62-68*
Total FTE required	*90.5 (no overlap)* *83.5 (EXP/GLO/BEN overlap)*	*92 (no overlap)* *83 (IC/EL overlap)* *78 (IC/EL/GE overlap)*

Note: EXP = Experiential Learning; GLO = Global Engagement; BEN = Benedictine Engagement.

Table 2. Estimates of Sections Needed for Each Course in the Integrated Exploration Curriculum

Course	Credits	Course Limit	Timing	Enroll-ment	Sections Needed	Faculty FTE	Notes
FYX	1	24	First-Year	965	40	1.38	100 level course
Writing Foundations	4	18	First-Year	965	54	9.00	100 level course: attend in first semester of first year
Culture & Social Identity	4	30	First-Year	965	33	5.50	100 level course: attend in first or second semester of first year
Theology 1	4	30	First-Year	965	33	5.50	100 level course: attend in first or second year
Way of Thinking	4	30	First-Year	965	33	5.50	100 level course: likely take in first or second year
Way of Thinking-Theme	4	30	First-Year	965	33	5.50	100-200 level course; after 1st semester
Theology 2	4	24	Second-Year	851	36	6.00	200-300 level course; third or fourth year

Culture & Social Systems	4	24	Third-Year	797	34	5.67	200-300 level course; third or fourth year
Way of Thinking	4	30	Second-Year	851	29	4.83	100-200 level course; second year
Writing Integration	4	20	Fourth-Year	765	39	6.50	fourth year (300 level course)
Thematic Focus	4	24	Fourth-Year	765	32	5.33	first, second, third or fourth year (100-300 level course)
Way of Thinking-Theme	4	24	Third-Year	797	34	5.67	third or fourth year (300 level course)
Lang_1	4	28	First-Year	965	35	5.83	1 level course
Lang_2	4	28	First-Year	965	35	5.83	2 level course
Lang_3	4	28	Second-Year	851	31	5.17	3 level course

Experiential Engagement *	4				14	2.33	60% of students study abroad; other students complete on campus (if all in a course, would require 14 courses on campus)
Global Engagement *	4				14	2.33	60% of students study abroad; other students complete on campus (if all in a course, would require 14 courses on campus)
Benedictine Engagement	4	24			16	2.67	60% of students study abroad; other students complete on campus (if all in a course, would require 14 courses on campus)
Total	**69**			**Total FTE**	**90.54**	

*Study Abroad: Approximately 60% of our students study abroad. This is approximately 462 students from each third year class. The remaining students would need to take a course on campus for Experiential Learning and Global Engagement which equals to approximately 14 sections.