



**Gustavus Adolphus College
Faculty Retreat Materials
The Pink Book | Volume 25
August 2023**

Redesigning the Gustavus Academic Experience

Prepared by the Faculty Task Force

Contents

Agenda 2

Introduction 3

Excerpt from May 15, 2023, Email to Faculty 5

Timeline of Faculty Task Force Activity 10

Faculty Task Force Proposal (v. 2.0) 12

 Transition to Carnegie Units 12

 General Education 16

 Majors/Minors 25

 Signature Experience 29

 Academic Calendar 35

 Scheduling Grid 40

 Advising 43

 Appendix A: Other Related Changes 47

 Appendix B: Additional Policy Document Updates 48

 Appendix C: Recommended Timeline 49

 Appendix D: Campus Consultations 51

Previous Retreat Topics 53

Agenda

8:30-9:00 a.m.	Open house and refreshments at the Career Development Center
9:00-9:35 a.m.	Faculty meeting business, followed by recess to the retreat
9:35-9:45 a.m.	Welcome and retreat introduction
9:45-9:55 a.m.	Proposal overview
9:55-10:00 a.m.	Introductions at tables
10:00-11:30 a.m.	Small group work and discussion
11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.	Faculty meeting continuation

Introduction

The Faculty Task Force Summer Implementation Group was charged with developing comprehensive proposals in line with the Framework endorsed by the faculty on May 19, 2023, in response to the significant and immediate financial challenges facing the College.

When we began this process in March, the Faculty Task Force (FTF) told the faculty that our current moment provides us with a rare opportunity to holistically and strategically restructure our academic program to respond to the needs of today's post-pandemic students while also maintaining our commitments to a residential, liberal arts approach. Our priority, we said, was not simply to find places to make cost reductions, but rather to reinvent, to keep students at the center of our academic program, and to find a way to distinguish Gustavus from among our peer institutions. In the pages that follow, you will see evidence of this approach. The proposals we have developed have been carefully crafted with assistance from the Provost's Office, responding to internal and external data, conversations with key stakeholders, and feedback from faculty, administrators, and students.

Our work reflects three primary goals:

1. To create an academic program that is **financially sustainable** given the enrollment expected over the next decade.
2. To prioritize the **student experience** and improve that experience, particularly for students from historically underrepresented groups.
3. To improve the **faculty experience** particularly in terms of improving equity and reducing unnecessary workload burdens.

The first full version of this proposal was shared with the Faculty Senate in early August, and the current version of the proposal (v. 2.0) incorporates responses to their thoughtful comments and questions.

The proposal before you is estimated to cut approximately \$3 million from the academic program budget, with the savings largely derived through changes to the academic calendar and reductions in course offerings.

Under the proposal, students will have more flexibility to pursue their academic interests owing to the reduction of courses required for general education and non-accredited majors. These reductions return Gustavus to our stated one-third, one-third, one-third model of a liberal arts education.

Under the proposal, there will be more equity across faculty in terms of teaching expectations, and uncompensated work will be reduced by incorporating internships and research supervision into the Signature Experience (for faculty to receive teaching credit). The proposal also streamlines multiple processes, such as applying for general education designations, declaring a major, and assessing courses that take time for both faculty and students.

We strongly believe that the proposal we outline in this document is not something that should be adopted piecemeal, but rather requires simultaneous change on multiple fronts because each individual proposed change is contingent upon other proposed changes. This is not to say that every change ought to be implemented immediately--we have suggestions for a staggered

implementation timeline outlined in the appendix--but that the decision about making the changes should be taken as a comprehensive package.

We know there are proposed changes in this document that will upset some colleagues and, frankly, some decisions were difficult for us to make. The reality of our situation is that we cannot continue to do the work we do in the same way we have always done it. The changes we propose reflect economic realities facing the college. We understand that change is hard, both emotionally and in terms of the time and energy that we will need to expend to make necessary changes. We hope, however, that our colleagues will also find aspects of the proposal exciting. The proposal contains many provisions intended to reduce and/or compensate faculty for work that would be uncompensated if we continued "business as usual". Our goal throughout this process is not that faculty will be asked to do more with less but rather that we do less, but do it well.

We also know that some faculty will want to slow down the process. While we understand the impulse, we also know that whether we slow down the process of curricular change or not, the process of reducing our faculty FTE over the next two years will occur. The question before us is not whether or how quickly faculty FTE will be reduced--that process will occur on the timeline that Provost Kelly has described (with stepwise reductions in both 2024-25 and 2025-26)--but whether the faculty will have crafted an academic program that aligns with that reduced FTE.

We have tried to be as detailed as possible in this document, but we know it is likely that there will still be areas of confusion. This proposal will be the topic of discussion at the Faculty Retreat and standing committees will be discussing relevant pieces over the next few weeks.

We also know that there are loose ends and details that still need to be addressed. We envision that some of this work can be completed by faculty committees over the next academic year while other pieces may require the creation of ad hoc working groups of faculty and administrators. In cases where details still need to be worked out, we still strongly recommend faculty approve guiding language as part of this proposal.

We hope that you read the proposal carefully and with an open mind and we look forward to discussing it with you at the Faculty Retreat on August 31.

Respectfully submitted,

Betsy Byers (Fine Arts Division Rep)
Yurie Hong (Humanities Division Rep, Faculty Senate liaison)
Kate Knutson (Social Sciences Division Rep)
Dave Stamps (Interdisciplinary Programs Rep)
Dwight Stoll (Natural Science and Mathematics Division Rep)
Valerie Walker (Education Division Rep)

Excerpt from May 15, 2023, Email to Faculty

The following document is a portion of an email that was sent to faculty members by the Faculty Task Force in the days leading up to the faculty's vote to endorse the framework proposed by the FTF. We include it in the Faculty Retreat materials to help provide context for the FTF proposal for colleagues who were not present in the spring or who need a reminder of what brought us to this point.

A link to the full version of this email, along with links to other emails sent by the Faculty Task Force are [available here](#).

Hello Colleagues,

Several things have happened since our last email update. Based on the information we gathered from the faculty, and the overwhelming support for the proposal we saw in the faculty survey data, we drafted a full proposal centered around Framework B (what we are calling "signature experience"). The Senate unanimously endorsed the proposal with a few minor suggestions. We revised the proposal to reflect those suggestions from the faculty senators.

...

We respectfully ask for your endorsement of this proposal at the faculty meeting on Friday. If the proposal is endorsed, a summer implementation team will be convened, who will flesh out the details and specific policy language to be shared with faculty committees and the full faculty in the early fall for consideration.

As we prepare for the faculty meeting on Friday, we believe there are two important questions that frame this decision. These questions have been raised by multiple colleagues in multiple venues over the past few months and we will do our best to answer them in the section that follows. This section contains the FTF's "closing argument" in support of this proposal. At the faculty meeting, we will present a very brief overview of the proposal, in order that the remainder of the time is reserved for faculty discussion.

Question 1: Why do we (Gustavus) and we (the faculty, in particular) need to do something besides just fix the marketing of the academic experience and address student complaints about housing?

While problems in marketing and housing are part of our challenge, the FTF is convinced by the data that these things are not the full extent of the problem.

Yes, we need to do a better job of marketing the incredible work we are doing in the academic program at Gustavus.

Yes, we need to address the concerns raised by students about housing. Furthermore, we need to address some issues with campus climate, particularly for BIPOC and LGBTQIA students.

But making these changes will not be enough. A combination of cultural, political, demographic, and economic factors have collided to bring us to this moment.

Culturally, when most of us attended college, there was a strong sense in society that higher education was the ticket to a better life. This is no longer the case. In 2019, only 51% of US adults considered a college education “very important,” down from 70% in 2013.

Politically, we live in a state that values higher education, but this reality also poses a paradoxical challenge as state political leaders actively prioritize funding for state colleges and universities. The UM system already promises full tuition to any MN student with a family income below \$50,000 and the legislature is on the verge of passing legislation to make tuition at any state college or university free to Minnesota residents who are Native American and any students who come from families with incomes below \$80,000. The legislature is also currently debating a bill that would provide free tuition at state colleges and universities to all Minnesota residents. Given that the University of Minnesota is already our top competition among applicants, these programs – while commendable from an equity perspective – also pose a threat to the survival of Gustavus (and other non-elite private institutions).

As for changes in the demographics of the prospective student population, we’ve heard a lot about the demographic cliff. Closer analysis reveals that the purported cliff is more of a myth, and that the reality is more about significant demographic change. The type of student that Gustavus has relied upon most heavily over our history – the middle income, predominantly white families from Minnesota suburbs and rural towns--is shrinking. Not only is this the type of student we have historically recruited, our college and our curriculum have been developed and honed to support this type of student. The Gustie of the future is going to look different and come from a different life experience.

Economically, the cost of higher education has skyrocketed. More than ever, students and families want to know whether the investment is worth it. Does it actually translate into a fulfilling career and the promise of upward social mobility? This question is important both to students paying the full price of tuition, and to those who pay very little out of pocket to attend college.

This collision of factors is something that many have seen coming, but the pandemic both accelerated the pace of the change and masked some of the urgency for it. Now that the dust has settled, we can more clearly see the landscape of higher education and our place in it.

We are one of 19 small, private, liberal arts colleges in Minnesota. There are about 17 liberal arts colleges like us in Iowa, another dozen in Wisconsin, and a handful in North and South Dakota. We occupy a saturated market and offer a product that is hard for prospective families to distinguish from that offered by other institutions. When asked what makes us distinctive, we might point to small class sizes and devoted faculty. Our competitors can make the same claims. We might point to our commitment to Lutheran higher education. There are 26 ELCA affiliated colleges, not to mention other colleges with similar faith traditions. Market perception research tells us that prospective students, families, and high school counselors don’t view us as any different than all the other private liberal arts colleges. And prospective students don’t even view us too differently from state colleges and universities.

We have struggled for many years trying to articulate what makes us distinct from a marketing standpoint. Remember that our goal is distinctiveness and not uniqueness. It is not important that we are dramatically different from our competitors. It is important that we have a common understanding of and language to articulate our distinctiveness. In order to compete effectively in our target market, we must have a clear and consistent answer to the question: Why Gustavus?

The College as a whole, and the academic program in particular, are structured and staffed for 2,400 students. Our current enrollment is 1,900 students and we will be at 1,900 students for at least the next three years. It is not financially feasible to continue operating at our current level. The societal changes and saturated market described above also point to smaller classes in the future even as we improve marketing and the student experience.

It is imperative that we reduce the size of the academic program, but reducing the number of faculty and staff without significantly streamlining and reducing the work we do will lead to even greater frustration and exhaustion. Most of us will agree that the work we do now with our current staffing levels feels unsustainable. Rather than doing more with less as we have always done in the past, we need to act now to do less so that we have the time and energy to do that well.

Question 2: Why should we support this particular proposal?

You have heard the pragmatic reasons. If we do not make a choice, the Provost's Office will make the reductions they can outside the faculty governance structure. This will result in reductions in personnel without the structural changes that will make the academic program sustainable in terms of faculty workload and energy. In other words, we will need to keep delivering the same academic program with far fewer faculty.

Some may then ask why we need to endorse a framework. Why not make only the first three changes articulated in the proposal?

One set of answers involves what we have said above: Gustavus needs a distinctive identity in order to survive and ideally thrive in our competitive marketplace. This framework has the potential to be distinctive. It is appealing to prospective students and their families. We can fundraise around it. The framework has other virtues as well: It connects us to our local community – St. Peter, Mankato, and the Twin Cities – and to our alumni. We can do it without needing a lot of resources (which we don't have).

We know that for some faculty, the "distinctive" answer makes this feel like a marketing ploy. We want to be clear—we also think that this framework is *better for our current students—and will be better for the student to come—than what we currently offer*. Again, not all of our students are thriving here. First generation, international, BIPOC, and LGBTQIA students have waved the flag to get our attention that something is wrong. They have told us this in surveys. They have told us this by withdrawing from the college. We can see this problem in our falling retention and graduation rates. Students (particularly those with identities from historically marginalized groups) are hesitant to encourage friends to attend Gustavus, furthermore, the market perception study revealed that only 26% of our current students could be classified as active promoters of Gustavus. If students who are part of the growing demographic groups in our

country are telling us now that our academic program (not just our housing and our marketing) are not serving them well, we need to do more than just do the big three reductions.

We believe that this framework will help **all** of our students. It has the three core elements that reduce the size and complexity of the curriculum, making the curriculum more accessible and opening up more space for exploration and discovery. Moreover, it embeds into the curriculum an opportunity for all students to make connections between their liberal arts education and their post-Gustavus aspirations. Many students at Gustavus have amazing experiences because they happen upon a great advisor or a great connection. They happen to find their way to Career Development or are tapped by a faculty member for a research project. However, we also know that when we leave key, transformative experiences to the vagaries of “happen upon” and taps on the shoulder, or having time between classes and work to find another office to meet another person that they don’t know, some students, often our most vulnerable students, will leave Gustavus without those experiences.

To remedy that problem, this framework embeds into the curriculum an opportunity for all students to connect their liberal arts education with their careers, vocations, and avocations. These connections may seem obvious to us (i.e., we who became professors at liberal arts colleges), but our students increasingly need explicit instruction on how to make those connections. They need a designated space in their schedule (and perhaps resources, support, and transport) to take the internship or do the research. If these places are not part of the curriculum for everyone, many of the students who will not find them or be led to them are the students who most need them.

We also believe the framework will help students because it provides them practical help with finding a job or going to graduate school. We know that some faculty worry that this focus on practicality undermines our liberal arts commitment. We disagree. Students are right to care about their future employment and career plans. Like us, they want some assurance of good salaries and healthcare. Many students are taking what looks like—and, in the short term might be—a risk by coming to a liberal arts college rather than a technical school. We know that uncertainty about future prospects causes many students and families real, understandable anxiety. It does not denigrate the liberal arts to say that, in addition to feeding your soul and your spirit, the liberal arts provide skills that translate into careers that help you feed, clothe, and shelter your body and that we believe that so strongly, we guarantee you an experience that demonstrates that to be true.

Finally, we think this framework will be good for faculty. We are tired and disheartened. Many of us have poured our hearts and souls into serving our students and supporting them through a global pandemic, the growing recognition of the impacts of systemic racism, and existential threats to their very identity raised by public leaders. We are spread thin trying to fill cracks into which too many of our students are falling; we are frustrated by the continual calls to more with less for (it seems) even fewer results.

This framework, through the core elements, sizes our curriculum to our resources and focuses our priorities. It helps us know when to say yes and when we can say no. It takes a lot of our individual endeavors at helping students who could thrive here but are not sure what they are doing here or what it will all come to mean and makes them part of an institutional commitment with institutional support. When we ask ourselves “Why Gustavus” it reminds us:

because this is a place that ensures every student has an experience that prepares them for the next step on their unique journey.

We know that many of you are asking the big question: what if the framework does not work? What if we do all of this and enrollment does not go back up? We understand that question. We are clear that, if there is to be any hope of better days ahead, more than the academic program must change. But we are left with these three things: First, the College needs a distinctive identity. We would rather the academic program lead the way in identifying it than for another division or department to do so. Second, over the next several years, the College is going to change whether we lead the way or not. This framework gives us some control over those changes. Third, this framework responds to what our faculty and our students have told us. Whether it leads us to an enrollment of 1900 or 2300, this framework is better for our current students and the students who are coming than what we currently have. It will help all students gain experiences they need for what comes after Gustavus while providing opportunities to connect the liberal arts education to their careers and aspirations.

It is our firm belief that changes to January Term, general education, and majors and minors should be packaged together with a decision about what to prioritize so that this is not just about reductions, but about future growth. We are reducing and simplifying to make space for improving something that we already do and making it central to our identity. On behalf of the Faculty Task Force, we humbly ask for your endorsement of this proposal at the faculty meeting on Friday.

Timeline of Faculty Task Force Activity

February-August 2023

February 17	Creation of a Faculty Task Force announced to faculty
March 1	FTF membership announced to faculty
March 3	FTF Meeting
March 10	FTF Meeting
March 17	FTF Meeting; Faculty Meeting ; Faculty Survey #1
March 20-23	Divisional meetings for faculty (13); Faculty Survey #2 ; student feedback
March 24	FTF Meeting; FTF Meeting with Senate
March 27	Faculty email update
March 31	FTF Meeting
April 3	FTF Retreat
April 6	FTF Meeting
April 10	FTF Meeting; Faculty email update
April 14	FTF Meeting
April 21	FTF Meeting; Faculty Meeting ; Faculty email update
April 24-26	Open meetings for faculty (6); Faculty Survey #3
April 28	FTF Meeting; Faculty Colloquium
May 1	FTF Meeting; Faculty email update
May 5	FTF Meeting
May 8	FTF Meeting
May 10	FTF-CTF Joint Meeting
May 11	FTF Presentation to the Board of Trustees
May 12	FTF Meeting
May 15	Faculty email update ; FTF-CTF Joint Meeting
May 15-18	Drop in sessions for faculty (4)
May 19	FTF Meeting; Faculty meeting (Endorsement of the Framework)
May 22	FTF Meeting
May 23-31	Faculty Survey #4
May 24	FTF Meeting; Open sessions for staff and administrators (2)
May 26	Open sessions for faculty (4)
May 30	Open sessions for staff and administrators (2)
May 31	Open sessions for faculty (2)
June 1	FTF Meeting
June 5-6	FTF Retreat
June 7-July 3	FTF Working groups, meetings with key stakeholders
June 14	Faculty email update
June 21	Virtual update with standing committee leaders following Provost's Q&A
July 5	FTF Retreat
July 6-25	FTF working groups, student feedback, meetings with key stakeholders
July 12	Faculty email update
July 20	Virtual update with standing committee leaders following Provost's Q&A

July 26 FTF Retreat
July 31 Proposal draft 1.0 shared with Faculty Senate

August 3 FTF Meeting with Faculty Senate
August 9 [Faculty email update](#)
August 14 FTF Meeting
August 14 Proposal draft 2.0 shared with Senate, AOC, CC, DEIC, Personnel
August 17 Virtual update with standing committee leaders following Provost's Q&A
August 18 Proposal draft 2.0 shared with full faculty
August 31 Faculty Retreat

Faculty Task Force Proposal (v. 2.0)

Transition to Carnegie Units

Overview

The FTF recommends Gustavus transition from assigning credit to courses on a 1.0-credit scale (full-time course) to a 4.0-credit scale – i.e., the Carnegie system.

This transition will simplify conversations with students about credits and clarify the process of transferring credits into Gustavus. The transition will be accompanied by the substantial reduction of zero-credit courses and establishing a 4-credit course as the default at Gustavus, both of which address inconsistencies in the current system.

Students are required to complete 128 Carnegie Units (32 credits in the current system) for graduation.¹

A full time tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching load will be 24 CU (6 courses x 4 CU). Full time load for other faculty will likely be 28 CU (7 courses x 4 CU). Reassigned time (one course release) = 140 hours per semester. This does not represent a change from the current teaching expectations.

Goals

1. To transition to the Carnegie system of credit assignment to courses.
2. To significantly reduce the use of zero-credit courses, which currently represent uncompensated work for both faculty and students.

Proposal

Currently, a full-time course at Gustavus has been assigned 1.0 credit. In the Carnegie system, the same course will bear 4.0 credits, or Carnegie Units (CU). Following are the changes that will accompany this transition.²

1. All courses will carry a minimum of 1.0 CU, with the following exceptions:
 - a. On-campus Signature Experience courses for which students are paid (e.g., summer research, internship, etc.). Since federal financial aid regulations prohibit the College from both awarding academic credit and paying for an internship or research experience, these experiences will have a zero-credit option.
 - b. Study away courses taken during a summer term will have a zero-credit option at the request of the student. This will allow students to only pay travel costs for a study away course. The course will appear on the student's transcript but the student would not receive credits for the course. A student wishing to receive academic credit for the study away experience would be charged for four CU. A

¹ This is a reduction by 8 CU (2 courses) due to no longer requiring students to complete two January Term courses.

² [Carnegie Unit Change Resolution](#). This would be jointly endorsed by Senate, CC, and AOC and brought to faculty for endorsement, likely by AOC

- summer study away class for zero-credit will fulfill the Signature Experience requirement.
- c. Participation on a varsity athletic team (participation on an athletic team will no longer carry academic credit, but registration is helpful for tracking athletes. We can delist classes administratively).
2. All courses will carry 4.0 (default), 2.0, or 1.0 CU credit:³
 - a. 4.0 CU - nominal standard full-time course (meets 200-250 minutes per week)
 - b. 2.0 CU - half-time course (meets 100 minutes per week for the whole semester or 200-250 minutes per week for half the semester)
 - c. 1.0 CU - designation reserved for two course types
 - i. **Repeatable Courses:** Courses that are intended to be taken multiple times during a student's four-year experience (e.g., music ensembles, dance practicum, theater production, chemistry seminar, psychological science research apprenticeship, pre-law seminar, public deliberation and dialogue).
 - ii. **Laboratory Courses:** Courses normally taken in conjunction with a lecture course that require additional instructional time outside of the 200-250 minutes per week associated with the lecture course.⁴
 3. The first 4 CU of repeatable and lab courses count toward major cap restrictions, but after the first 4 CU, additional repeatable and lab courses are exempted.
 4. For repeatable (non-laboratory) courses
 - a. Up to 8 CU of the same repeatable course can count toward the 128 credits required for graduation.
 - b. Departments can decide how many CU of the same repeatable course can count toward their major.
 5. A full-time students' regular tuition will cover 12-19 CU in each of Fall and Spring semesters. Music lessons will not count against the 12-19 credits, since there is an additional fee associated with lessons for non-scholarship students. Students will be charged a prorated tuition for CUs above 19. Students will pay for credit-bearing courses taken during a summer term separately from their yearly tuition.⁵

Important Notes:

- Departments will determine a grading system (e.g., A-F or P/F) to be used consistently across their department's repeatable and lab courses to ensure equitable grading expectations for students. For example, MUS may choose to offer all music ensemble courses as P/F while CHE may choose to offer all chemistry labs A-F.
- The FTF recommends that departments/programs that have repeatable courses for purpose of performance and practice consider whether having one performance course for the department that allows students to participate in a variety of performances and

³ We will likely need exceptions for clinicals/practicums, particularly for NUR, MAT, and EDU.

⁴ It is likely that faculty teaching load for laboratory courses will continue to be assessed using contact hours as it is currently.

⁵ The tuition model is set by senior College leadership and is not subject to faculty endorsement. The FTF has provided feedback to senior leadership on proposed models for tuition.

practices would be appropriate. For example, MUS might consider a MUS-1XX course that all musicians sign up for each semester. Then the Department assigns them to the appropriate ensembles, bands, orchestras, or choirs.

Rationale

Changing to the Carnegie Unit system will bring us into alignment with most colleges and universities, including community colleges, who also use the Carnegie Unit system.

The Admission Office has requested we make this change because it simplifies communication with prospective students and makes it easier to work with transfer students.

Transitioning to the CU system creates more equity for both students and faculty. Currently, a one credit course ranges from 150-330 hours per week of in-class time. This proposal brings consistency to time spent on Gustavus courses by making the 4-CU course the default. All 4-CU courses will meet for 200-250 minutes/week.

We considered allowing an option for both 3- and 4- credit courses, but decided against it for three reasons. First, our current model already assumes that all full credit courses are worth four Carnegie Units. Second, allowing for 3-credit courses with the 48 CU cap on majors would possibly result in departments and programs choosing to offer more 3-credit courses, which would work against our ultimate need to reduce the number of course offerings. Third, allowing for 3-credit courses could result in an increase in teaching load for some faculty who would need to teach four 3-CU courses per semester to equal 12 credits.

The proposed guidelines recognize the time and effort of both students and faculty in activities such as labs and ensembles by assigning them some credit while building in reasonable flexibility for majors/minors that require such courses.

Professor A currently teaches an introductory course that meets three days a week for 50 minutes (150 minutes per week) and two upper-level courses that meet for two days a week for 80 minutes each (160 minutes per week).

Under the new system, Professor A must increase her contact hours for each course. She chooses to retain her three-day a week schedule for the introductory course, with each class meeting for 70 minutes per day (210 minutes per week). Her two-day a week classes remain as two-day a week classes but will meet for 105 minutes (210 minutes per week). At first she is frustrated with the idea that she is going to need to spend more time each week on her teaching, but her department chair reminds her that the expectation that TT faculty spend approximately 70% of their time on teaching has not changed and encourages her to consider how she can move some of the time she has spent on her courses outside of class into class.

In her upper-level course, Professor A does add some content that she has always wanted to include. In all of her courses, however, Professor A focuses on using the extra time in a variety of ways that will benefit her students and cut down on out-of-class work time for her. She plans to devote 20-30 minutes at the end of most class periods to several different activities. On some days, students will work on writing assignments that used to be completed outside of class time and that, particularly at the beginning of the semester, generated a lot of emails that Professor A had to respond to outside of class. Now Professor A will be able to respond immediately to student questions. In the days leading up to exams, Professor A will use the extra time as a review session; something she would have done outside of class hours in the past. Leading up to assignment

deadlines, she plans to use the extra time to meet individually with students for paper conferences, again, something she used to do outside of class time. She will use some of the time for group project work since her students find it hard to schedule out-of-class meetings because of their busy schedules (having the time in-class will also reduce the number of emails she has to respond to about students not being able to figure out a meeting time). And, of course, the extra time is helpful if she gets behind schedule or wants to add in time for a visit to the library or Writing Center. In the end, she finds that she has not added to her workload and has reduced some of the most frustrating out-of-class work she had to do (never again will spend a weekend setting up small groups only to find that half of them have to be rearranged because they can't find a time to meet).

Student A is a Chemistry and English double major. Under the current system, her four credits of classes each semester usually include 1-2 science courses and labs, 1 English course, and 1 elective. Chemistry 241 met four hours a week plus a four-hour lab (430 minutes per week), Physics 121 met five days a week for an hour plus a two-hour lab (360 minutes per week), English 231 met two days a week for 80 minutes (160 minutes per week), and Political Science 220 met two days a week for 110 minutes (220 minutes per week). It was pretty confusing to her how the 430 minutes she spent each week in Chemistry lecture and lab was equivalent to the 160 minutes she spent each week in English. A professor once told Student A that the amount of out-of-class work for English made the courses equivalent, but that had not been her experience. She certainly knew other students who assumed that the time-in-class difference suggested a difference in the rigor and importance of the courses.

Under the new system, Student A's Chemistry and Physics courses would each be five credits (four credits for the lecture and one credit for the lab) and her English and Political Science courses would be four credits (a total of 18 credits). With the switch to Carnegie credits, a four-credit course default, and the end of zero-credit labs, her credit load will more accurately reflect the time she spends in class and would emphasize the equal rigor and importance of all the courses she takes as part of her liberal arts education.

General Education

Overview

The FTF recommends faculty revise the general education requirements as a primary mechanism for reducing costs and improving the student experience.

At Gustavus, general education coursework provides students with opportunities to develop foundational communication and analytical skills, explore a range of disciplinary perspectives, and deepen their understanding of the complexity of living and working in diverse local and global contexts. The breadth of the general education curriculum is at the heart of a liberal arts education and is complemented by the depth provided through academic majors and students the flexibility to pursue coursework of their choice.

As we consider the size of the general education program both in the present context of fiscal constraints and enrollment challenges and the larger context of a liberal arts education, the FTF has identified several goals:

Goals

1. To reduce the number of general education requirements to an average of 11 in order to return, as much as possible, to the “one-third, one-third, one-third” curricular ideal in which general education, majors, and the self-directed or elective portion of Gustavus students’ education are each an equal third.
2. To “rightsize” the number of general education courses offered to reduce faculty FTE and reduce the number of low-enrolled courses or sections that must be canceled or combined in a given semester/year.
3. To balance the goals of a liberal arts program, including providing students with foundational skills, introducing students to a breadth of disciplinary perspectives and ways of knowing, and preparing students for life beyond college.
4. To simplify the General Education program to make it easier for students to plan progress towards graduation and select courses that meet their learning goals; for advisors to assist students with their planning; and for Admissions to present our general education program to prospective students and families in a clear and compelling way.

Proposal

This 10-12-course (depending on non-English language placement) general education model is centered around exposing students to modes of intellectual and creative expression across disciplines, identities, and cultures while developing critical reading and writing skills.⁶

⁶ [General Education Revisions \(Faculty Handbook\)](#) and [Changes to the Academic Bulletin](#). *Faculty Handbook* amendments would be brought to the faculty by the Senate with the endorsement of the Curriculum Committee. As a reminder, *Faculty Handbook* amendments must go through the Senate (with or without endorsement before coming to the faculty). Corresponding changes to the *Academic Bulletin* could happen administratively based on the changes made to the *Faculty Handbook*.

General Education Requirements (10-12 requirements in three categories of courses):

1. Foundation and Integration - 2 courses (1 First Term Seminar, 1 Challenge Seminar)
2. Liberal Arts Perspective - 5 courses (1 each: Arts, Human Behavior and Social Institutions, Humanities, Natural Science, Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Thought)
3. Living in the World - 3-5 courses (1 Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning, 1 US Identities and Difference, 1 Global Affairs and Cultures, 0-2 Non-English Language depending on high school or college-level experience)

Notes:

- All general education courses carry only one general education designation with the exception that 200-level non-English languages courses will carry GLAFC and satisfy the Non-English Language requirement.
- **Writing:** Instead of a standalone writing requirement, student learning outcomes for writing have been infused throughout the curriculum.⁷ WRIT-L and WRIT-D labels will remain so that students who complete 12 CU of WRIT-L or WRIT-D labeled courses, including one at the 300-level, may receive a Writing for Public Audiences Certificate on their official transcript. (None of the courses for the writing certificate would come from general education, though students will be learning and practicing writing skills in all of those courses.)
 - FTS will continue to address WRIT SLOs and will carry a WRIT label. This label is important for some pre-professional programs. FTS will not count for the writing certificate.
 - LAP courses will incorporate writing-to-learn but will not carry a WRIT label.
 - US Identities and Difference, Global Affairs and Cultures, Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning, and Challenge Seminars will incorporate an information literacy criterion and SLO. These courses will not carry a WRIT-L label.
 - All departments are expected to require one WRIT-L or WRIT-D course in their major(s).
 - 100-level courses that currently carry the WRIT-L label will lose the label. Departments and programs may decide to renumber a 100-level course as a 200-level in order to retain the label.
 - 200- and 300-level courses that currently carry only WRIT-L or WRIT-D will continue to do so. 200- and 300-level courses that do not carry a general education designation may retain or apply for a WRIT-L or WRIT-D label. 200- and 300-level courses that currently carry both a WRIT-L or WRIT-D label and another general education designation will choose which label/designation they wish to carry under the new requirements (the course number may need to be adjusted).

Rationale:

- These three areas (Foundation and Integration, Liberal Arts Perspective, and Living in the World) retain the breadth of our current general education curriculum while also ensuring that students have exposure to areas that employers deem as very important such as the ability to analyze and interpret data, the ability to

⁷ Proposed changes to the writing requirements, criteria, and SLOs were made in consultation with Nissa Parmar and Becky Fremo. Lauren Hecht and Laura Burrack were also consulted in this process in relation to FTS and the Challenge Seminar.

- communicate through writing, and the ability to communicate and work with people from different cultural backgrounds.⁸
- Infusing WRIT SLOs throughout the curriculum reduces the general education program, simplifies it for students, and emphasizes the import of writing to all disciplines. Infusing the information literacy elements of the WRIT-L in USIDG, GLAFC, QUANT, and the Challenge Seminar ensures that students engage and evaluate different types of information multiple times as they integrate their disciplinary learning.
 - Offering a Writing for Public Audiences Certificate that appears on a student's transcript or resume makes visible students' communication and writing skills for employers and incentivizes students taking more writing courses. Both the Admission Office and Career Development are strong advocates of adding this type of credential to our offerings.
 - Allowing courses to carry only one designation/label equalizes all general education courses, simplifies expectations for faculty, and makes course planning easier for students and advisors. It also reduces pressure on faculty to apply for multiple designations for a course.

Further Details on Categories and Courses:

1. Foundation and Integration - 2 courses (1 FTS, 1 Challenge Seminar with modifications)

These courses provide students with opportunities to develop their critical reading, writing, and oral communication skills, reflect on their education and values, and connect with resources in preparation for their academic and post-academic futures.

- **FTS:** FTS courses will remain largely the same and will continue to meet current WRIT SLOs and will be tagged with a WRIT designation.
- **Challenge:** The Challenge Seminar will remain largely the same but will incorporate an information literacy criterion and SLO; the program will continue to explore how to help students connect their liberal arts education with their personal and professional futures. Students are encouraged to take the Challenge Seminar in years 3 or 4.

Rationale:

- The FTS and Challenge Seminar provide bookends to students' general education experience and provide a clear place to evaluate the success of the general education program in meeting our learning goals.
- FTS has clear benefits for recruitment and retention in preparing students for success at Gustavus.
- The Challenge Seminar provides opportunities for students to integrate their multidisciplinary educational experience and reflect on their education in preparation for their academic and professional futures.

2. Liberal Arts Perspectives - 5 courses (Arts; Human Behavior and Social Institutions; Humanities; Natural Sciences; Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Thought)

The Liberal Arts Perspective courses introduce students to multiple modes of intellectual inquiry and creative expression. All courses include a focus on introducing students to reading in the discipline and give students opportunities to write to learn. Only 100-level courses can carry LAP credit.

⁸ [AACUE Employer Report 2021](#)

Students will be required to take one course from each distribution area (with 100-level courses automatically carrying the appropriate designation (see notes on applying for a different designation below):

- **Arts (ARTS)** = Courses in the Division of Fine Arts with the exception of Communication Studies.
- **Human Behavior and Social Institutions (HBSI)** = Courses in the Division of Social Sciences; Public Health; Geography)
- **Humanities (HUMN)** = Courses in English, Communication Studies, and History; non-language courses in Greek, Latin, and Classical Studies, Modern Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, and Scandinavian Studies; non-cross listed courses in African/African Diaspora Studies and Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies.
- **Natural Sciences (NTSCI)** = Courses in Biology, Chemistry, Geology, and Physics; non-cross-listed Environmental Studies courses.
- **Religious, Philosophical, and Ethical Thought (RPET)** = Courses in the departments of Philosophy and Religion.

Notes:

- Departments and programs may recategorize a course from their department if it does not fit within their discipline (e.g., a humanities-focused course offered by a department in the social science division may change the designation to HUMN).
- Departments and programs may wish to renumber some of their courses so that they fit within the new system. We would create a relatively easy administrative process to make these changes.
- 100-level labs do not carry the LAP designation; only the accompanying lecture section carries the designation.
- A department or program that wishes to add a new 100-level course would complete the new course proposal form and would have the option of identifying the appropriate LAP designation as part of the proposal.
- Criteria for all LAP areas include instruction in reading in the dominant genre(s) of the discipline and giving students opportunities to use their own words to describe and analyze key concepts or course materials, write to explore ideas, assimilate new knowledge, and reflect on the purpose of their learning (Writing to Learn). Writing to Learn can be informal writing and does not require grading. For example, students might write a paragraph at the end of a class summarizing their learning for the day but not turn it in. We envision workshops on effective Writing to Learn practices.
- LAP Area student learning outcomes have been parallelized and refocused on learning disciplinary methods and reading strategies. Assessment for the five LAP areas will no longer involve rubrics, but will be done through surveys at the end of the semester. This new process will reduce faculty work (faculty teaching in the five areas will only need to provide time for the survey and will no longer assess work against a rubric). Using this method will provide a direct measure of student learning and is the option that is endorsed by the Assessment Director.
- Please see specific rules about course designations for LAP and Living in the World below.

Rationale:

- Area requirements provide the breadth essential to a liberal arts education.
- 100-level courses are designed to introduce students to a topic, which makes them particularly appropriate for general education.
- The changes recommended by the FTF in this area ensure that students receive “credit” for taking a course in a given discipline
- The requirements broaden the category that involves religion to include philosophy and ethics, which creates more options for students and provides more flexibility in staffing.
- Requiring all 100-level courses to attend to reading strategies ensures that students are gaining the disciplinary knowledge and critical reading skills they need for success throughout the curriculum, something many faculty find they are currently lacking in upper-level courses.
- Requiring all 100-level courses to incorporate writing-to-learn strategies reflects pedagogical best practices and helps students develop academic skills and habits that will help them to succeed academically at Gustavus.
- Creating automatic (or nearly automatic) designations reduces faculty work applying for designations and committee work reviewing and approving designations. The burden on CAPSUB and the Curriculum Committee, in particular, is lessened considerably.
- Changing the assessment process for LAP areas reduces faculty work.

3. Living in the World - 3-5 courses (1 QUANT, 1 USIDG, 1 GLAFC, 0-2 Non-English Language)
Living in the World courses are a combination of 100- and 200-level courses that build skills essential for living and working in a diverse and complex world.

- **Quantitative and Analytical Reasoning (QUANT):** All 100-level MCS courses will automatically carry the QUANT designation, and 100 and 200 level courses in other departments may apply for the designation. Courses that currently carry QUANT will continue to do so. The QUANT designation will remain substantially the same but with minor modifications.
- **US Identities and Difference (USIDG):** 100- and 200-level courses may retain or apply for the USIDG designation. Courses that currently carry USIDG will continue to do so unless they are 100-level courses and would rather carry the LAP designation. All USIDG courses will incorporate the following SLO related to information literacy: Students will analyze arguments that different forms of information support, including primary and secondary sources. USIDG courses may not carry a WRIT-L or WRIT-D label.
- **Global Affairs and Cultures (GLAFC):** 100- and 200-level courses may retain or apply for the GLAFC designation. Courses that currently carry GLAFC will continue to do so unless they are 100-level courses and would rather carry the LAP designation. All 200-level Non-English Language courses automatically carry the designation. GLAFC courses will incorporate the following SLO related to information literacy: Students will analyze arguments that different forms of information support, including primary and secondary sources from the cultures included in the course. GLAFC courses may not carry a WRIT-L or WRIT-D label.
- **Non-English Language:** All students are required to take at least one semester of a college-level Non-English Language and reach equivalency through college-level 102 or higher. High school language experience is used to place students who do not have

college-level coursework. Students will take 0-2 semesters depending on their placement. Students are encouraged to complete this requirement in their first two years of their studies. College level experience (AP exam with score of 4 or 5, College in the Schools, and PSEO) at 102 level or higher would fulfill the requirement. International students whose native language is other than English, Heritage speakers, or others with demonstrated fluency in the language would be exempt as they are now.

Notes:

- QUANT, USIDG, and GLAFC criteria and SLOs have been streamlined and made more consistent (three criteria and three SLOs for each). They also all include an information literacy SLO. Please see the Handbook Language draft. The remaining criteria and SLOs are largely taken from the current language.
- Please see notes on course designations for LAP and Living in the World below.

Rationale:

- These courses help prepare students for professional and civic life. They focus on introducing skills and content helpful in navigating a complex and diverse world.
- Courses in this area may be offered at the 100- or 200-level because some of them are introductory but others are a bit more specialized. 200-level courses assume a capacity for the independent acquisition of material and the mastery of methods and subject matter in 100-level courses. 300-level courses might also cover relevant material, but these courses are oriented toward the major and require a basic factual and theoretical knowledge of the discipline that is unrealistic to expect of students in their first or second years of college, when students take most of their general education courses.
- The changes recommended by the FTF to requirements in this section aid in the reduction of overall general education courses by integrating information literacy SLOs into USIDG and GLAFC and reducing the number of required non-English language courses for students with significant previous experience in a non-English language while incentivizing continued language study through the attachment of GLAFC to upper-level language courses.
- Reducing the number of criteria and SLOs will reduce faculty workload by simplifying the proposal process and assessment.
- Creating automatic (or nearly automatic) designations for some designations (QUANT, GLAFC, Non-English Language) reduces faculty work applying for designations and committee work reviewing and approving designations.

Notes on course designations for LAP and Living in the World:

- All 100-level courses automatically carry a Liberal Arts Perspectives designation (based on the categories above) or QUANT designation (default for courses in Mathematics, Computer Science, or Statistics). 100-level courses may apply for a different LAP designation or for a QUANT, USIDG or GLAFC.
- 200-level courses that currently carry a LAP area designation will lose the designation. Departments and programs may decide to renumber a 200-level course as a 100-level in order to retain the designation or apply for redesignation as QUANT, USIDG, or GLAFC.
- 300-level courses that currently carry a LAP designation or a Living in the World designation will lose the designation.

Notes on Interdisciplinarity:

- We recognize the value in the designations that are not included. The FTF and Provost's office is actively investigating possible interdisciplinary cluster "badges" such as Health Humanities, Sustainability, Wellbeing and Community, etc. The FTF sees these badges as something the College might consider pursuing in the future, not a part of the current curriculum revision process. The Admission Office and Career Development are particularly strong advocates of introducing badges because of demand from prospective students and families. Our conversation with current students also indicated an enthusiasm for badges.
- The Provost's Office is also considering ways to incentivize interdisciplinarity in the curriculum via team teaching and linked courses.

Notes on Transition from Challenge Curriculum:

- This proposal provides a seamless transition from the existing curriculum and would not require a name change (Challenge Curriculum) because it retains the same general education student learning outcomes and the retention of the Challenge Seminar.
- Most courses would retain their current designation, though faculty may need to decide between two designations for courses that currently carry two. [This spreadsheet](#) displays how existing courses would be treated under the revised curriculum.
- Because the new requirements do not add anything new, current students would not need to take additional general education courses beyond what they have already taken or planned to take. The challenge here (with current students) will be counting courses that previously had two designations. We recommend generosity toward the student in these cases, but there will be some individualized, student-by-student work that will need to take place to ensure a relatively seamless student experience.
- We anticipate much of this transitional work happening automatically and administratively rather than going through a proposal process. Departments would receive a list of their courses with information about which ones will automatically convert to the new system, which are ineligible for conversion, and which would need to make a choice between two designations. Department chairs and program directors would have the opportunity to request appropriate changes (i.e., this course should be a HUMN rather than HBSI even though it is offered through an HBSI-affiliated department).
- We would also want to create a relatively easy process for departments/programs that want to convert a 100-level course to a 200-level, or vice versa, due to a more appropriate fit with the new curriculum. Again, we envision this as a process that could happen administratively rather than requiring new proposals from departments/programs.
- Courses requesting a new designation (i.e., 200 level courses requesting QUANT or USIDG) would need to submit a proposal through the standard course approval process.

Rationale

The proposed general education curriculum maintains the strengths of the original Challenge Curriculum while addressing concerns about its size, complexity, and fiscal sustainability. When the faculty adopted the Challenge Curriculum in 2018-19, Gustavus had an enrollment of 2,200-2,300 students and a FTE faculty of 200. Moreover, the College was beginning (and expected to continue) an upward enrollment trend toward 2,300-2,400. The modeling for the

Challenge Curriculum was based upon those figures. The conditions of the college and the world of higher education have changed substantially since that time. As the College moves to a lower faculty FTE in response to lower enrollment, we can no longer staff the Challenge Curriculum. We have also heard from faculty and students that the current Challenge Curriculum is difficult to navigate and reduces opportunities for exploration through electives.

Reducing the size of general education, which serves to reduce the number of courses that we need to offer and the corresponding number of faculty required to offer courses, results in significant cost reduction. It is an essential step to take if we hope to ensure financial sustainability for the College. This proposed general education curriculum, when paired with other parts of the FTF proposal including reduced majors and minor sizes, higher enrollment minimums, and a stronger under-enrolled course policy, is staffable with our goal FTE.

This proposal, however, does not sacrifice a strong general education program for the sake of fiscal responsibility. This proposal maintains essential components of the previous Challenge Curriculum including a breadth requirement (the LAP requirements), a focus on the skills necessary for living well in a globally connected world (the Living in the World requirements), and an integrative component (the Challenge Seminar), which assessment data and faculty and student feedback indicate has achieved its goal of providing a previously missing place in the curriculum for students to integrate and apply what they learned in general education courses. The proposal maintains the FTS program—again, a longstanding strength of our program—and continues the focus on writing across the curriculum by embedding writing and information literacy across courses. Finally, the new proposal focuses increased attention on skills faculty increasingly report our students lack, specifically the ability to read academic writing and to identify the tools and methods different disciplines use to ask and answer questions. Changes to criteria and SLOs will focus our teaching on these skills while simplifying the course proposal and assessment processes. In sum, the curriculum will continue preparing students to engage challenges through a robust liberal arts curriculum as it directs College and faculty resources (both time and money) toward what is most essential for the current generation of students.

Professor B teaches an introductory course that currently carries a HBSI designation, a 200-level elective that carries an HBSI designation, and a 300-level course for majors that carries a WRIT-D designation.

Under the new system, Professor B's 100-level HBSI course would retain its designation (the criteria and SLO have been slightly revised since Professor B applied for HBSI, but the revisions simply clarify the disciplinary focus of the course and he will not need to reapply). Professor B will add some information to the course to help students learn to read materials that are common to the discipline and will incorporate writing-to-learn exercises into the class like short, ungraded reflection papers and exit cards. At first he was concerned about the critical reading focus, but finds that explicit instruction on how to read in what he assigns leads to better discussions and better work from the students. He won't need to submit a new course proposal for this course and he will no longer need to use the general education rubric to assess student work at the end of the semester; instead, he will administer a brief assessment survey to students at the end of the semester (he will get the results, but the assessment director will be doing the summarizing and aggregating).

Professor B's 200-level course can no longer carry the HBSI designation (only 100-level courses will carry the designation), but since the course has a global focus, he will apply for a GLAFC designation for the course. He will add a focus on finding and critically evaluating information in the course so that it meets the revised course criteria and student learning outcomes. He is

pleased that the SLOs and criteria for GLAFC have been reduced and simplified—that makes the proposal process easier. Professor B will use an electronic form to apply for the new GLAFC designation and the HBSI label will be automatically removed.

Professor B's 300-level course will retain the WRIT-D designation and students who take the course along with other WRIT-D or WRIT-L designated courses will receive a Writing Certificate.

Student B took some 100-level courses in his first year at Gustavus but not all of them counted as general education courses, which was a bit confusing. He had taken the first semester of Biology but decided to major in Philosophy and didn't understand why his Biology course didn't satisfy the Natural Science requirement. During his first registration period, Student B tried hard to get into a class that fulfilled three general education requirements even though he wasn't very interested in the topic, but it seemed like a good way to get some requirements out of the way. He was also unclear about what, other than lots of different content, he was learning by taking courses in various areas.

Under the new system, all of Student B's 100-level courses would carry a general education designation. Faculty teaching these courses would be explicit about how the methods and tools of their discipline ask and answer questions (enabling him to see general education as more than just a smorgasbord of unconnected content); would introduce him to strategies for how to effectively read in the discipline (turning him from someone who thought academic reading meant highlighting entire paragraphs in his textbook to someone who writes marginal notes and end of chapter summaries) and would teach him some writing-based techniques to help learn the material and retain the information (changing writing from a scary, high-stakes activity to an integral part of his learning process). Since each course held only one general education designation, Student B would make decisions about courses based on what sounded most interesting rather than which ones would get the most requirements out of the way. In the best case scenario, he ends up taking a course he would not have before (it only carried one designation) that leads him to an interdisciplinary minor, which he now has time to complete because he has fewer general education and major requirements.

Majors/Minors

Overview

The FTF recommends a reduction to the size of non-accredited majors as a primary mechanism for reducing costs.

At Gustavus, majors provide students with the opportunity to focus on a subject or discipline within the larger context of a liberal arts education. Such an education provides students with breadth through general education and depth through a major. Moreover, a well-balanced liberal arts education should allow students to explore through electives. Some students will decide to use these electives for more breadth, others for more depth. In either case, a Gustavus education should provide students ample opportunity for self-directed exploration in addition to the more directed requirements in the major and general education.

Goals

As we consider the size of majors (and to a lesser extent, minors) both in the present context of fiscal constraints and enrollment challenges and the larger context of a liberal arts education, the FTF has identified several goals:

1. To return, as much as possible, to the “one-third, one-third, one-third” curricular ideal in which the self-directed or elective portion of Gustavus students’ education, general education, and majors are each an equal third.
2. To emphasize that all of our majors are *liberal arts majors*. They are, first and foremost, intended to provide an area of focus within a larger liberal arts experience. Most students will still be well prepared for graduate school with a 12 (or less) course major, but departments and programs can also recommend additional courses that may be useful for graduate school.
3. To reduce some FTE. A more consistent size for majors will provide some FTE reductions and make the reductions across campus more equitable (although not equal).
4. To provide students greater clarity about the number of credits needed to complete a major through greater transparency and consistency in how we count the number of courses required for majors.

Proposal

1. All non-accredited majors are capped at 12 courses credits/48 Carnegie Units.⁹
2. The 12 course credit/48 Carnegie Units cap is inclusive of all prerequisites and cognate courses with three exceptions related to reasonable, assumed College-preparation. Majors do not need to count the following in their 48 Carnegie Units:¹⁰
 - a. MCS 118/119 or 121 (Calculus) or 142 (Statistics).
 - b. The first two semesters of non-English languages commonly offered in high schools, specifically Spanish 101 and 102. (Non-Spanish languages should count

⁹ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#). This amendment would be brought to the faculty by the Senate with the endorsement of the Curriculum Committee. As a reminder, *Faculty Handbook* amendments must go through the Senate (with or without endorsement before coming to the faculty).

¹⁰ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#).

- 101 and 102 in their major because these are less common course offerings in high schools.)
- c. Two-course sequence options that provide the same content coverage as a regularly offered one-semester course in cases where the one-semester course is the option designed for the majority of Gustavus students (e.g., CHE 106/108 and CHE 107).
3. The 12 course credit/48 Carnegie Units cap includes the first 4 Carnegie Units of labs, music ensembles, dance practicums, and theater productions. Additional labs and repeatable courses (i.e., courses that students can enroll and obtain grades in, in multiple semesters) including music ensembles, dance practicums, theater productions, and chemistry seminar are exempt from the cap.¹¹
 4. A moratorium on increasing the size of majors for those majors that currently require nine or more course credits (36 Carnegie Units), including prerequisites and cognates, will go into effect in Fall 2023. This moratorium will be reviewed and could be rescinded in 2026-27.¹²
 5. All majors must require students to take at least one designated writing course in the major (WRIT-L or WRIT-D).¹³
 6. The 12 course credit/48 Carnegie Units cap applies to honor's majors. For those departments and programs whose honors majors exceed the 12 courses, we recommend:¹⁴
 - a. Using GPA to decide honors.
 - b. Basing honors about the quality of work in a capstone or thesis course.
 - c. Offering extra or extended projects within an extant capstone or thesis course.
 7. Minors are capped at 6 course credits/24 Carnegie Units, inclusive of prerequisites and cognates.¹⁵
 - a. Gustavus maintains its position that minors are not required for graduation and so will have lower priority in staffing than general education or majors.
 - b. The FTF proposal also includes elimination of the requirement that students have a faculty advisor for a minor (see [Advising section](#)).
 8. The Academic Bulletin will have a standard format for indicating the total number of credits required for the major (inclusive of prerequisites and cognates) and what the addition of MCS-121, MCS-142, the first two semesters of a non-English language, or a two-sequence course option will add to that credit count.¹⁶

¹¹ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#).

¹² [Curriculum Committee resolution](#). This resolution would be brought to the faculty by the Curriculum Committee.

¹³ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#).

¹⁴ Any changes to honors majors requirements would come from the department/program to the Curriculum Committee and then to the faculty through the [Changes to Majors/Minors form and process](#).

¹⁵ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#)

¹⁶ The Provost's Office and Registrar will work with departments as we transition to a new catalog format. This does not require approval from the faculty as the intent is clarity and standardization for students and faculty advisors.

Rationale

In the framework passed by the faculty, majors were to be capped at 11 courses plus two additional courses outside the major. Originally, the +2 was intended to increase interdisciplinarity. However, faculty feedback and FTF discussion indicated that many of the departments that would avail themselves of the +2 largely to keep prerequisite courses, often in mathematics or a cognate STEM field, needed for thorough preparation for upper-level courses. The +2, then, disadvantaged majors whose preparatory courses are within their own majors. More specifically: of the majors that required more than 12 courses (counting prerequisites and cognates) the 11 +2 was helpful to STEM fields and not-helpful to non-English languages.

In order to be consistent across disciplines and to preclude a situation in which the Curriculum Committee was asked to adjudicate departmental need for preparatory courses, the FTF decided to assume a certain level of college-preparation. We decided that it was reasonable to assume that college-bound high school students had access to two years of Spanish in high school and calculus and/or statistics.

We propose requiring a standard format in the Academic Bulletin for indicating the total number of major credits to increase transparency and aid advising. We would also encourage majors to consider how they might create the flexibility necessary so that a student can begin without MCS-121/MCS-142 or previous language experience and complete the major in four years.

[Credits Per Major 2022-23.xlsx](#)

Department C currently requires 13.25 credits and one semester of calculus is a prerequisite for one of the required courses. Eight of the courses include a required lab along with the lecture course. Under the Carnegie Unit system, this equates to 53 CU.

Under the new guidelines, the department needs to reduce their major by 1.25 credits to bring it in line with the 48 CU cap. Department C does not need to count calculus (MCS 121) toward the 48 CU, but it will be listed as a requirement in the Academic Bulletin since it is a prerequisite for a required course. Under the new policy, Department C will need to count 4 CU of labs; it will not need to count the other 4 labs against its cap even though students will still earn 1 CU for each of those labs. With each full course being worth 4 CU, this means that Department C will have an 11 course major (44 CU of courses + 4 CU of labs (8 labs total) + MCS 121, which doesn't count toward the cap = 48 CU). Department C can decide how to reduce requirements for the major to fit within that cap. The department decides to stop requiring all students to take an upper-level elective that can be useful for students applying to graduate school. The department will still offer that course, but slightly less frequently, thereby freeing up faculty to teach other department and general education courses.

Student C is a current Management major who is thinking about double-majoring in Spanish. Figuring out how to fit the two together, however, has been kind of frustrating. Student C has to go through the Academic Bulletin and count the number of courses required for each major. In their first count, it looks like Management is 14 courses (13 for them because they are transferring in the required Statistics course) and Spanish is 9. Only after talking to their advisor, however, Student C realizes that all Spanish courses before 250 are prerequisites. That makes the major 11 courses for them because they took CIS Spanish through the equivalent of 102.

Under the new system, the course count changes slightly for Student C. Their Management major will now be 12 courses. Management can require Statistics as a prerequisite without it counting

against their 12 courses; since Student C is transferring it in, it does not change their credit count. Student C's SPA 103 and SPA 200 will now count toward that major (they have already fulfilled the two courses SPA can count as prerequisites through their CIS work). The slight reduction in both major and general education requirements has made double-majoring seem more feasible; the greater clarity in the Academic Bulletin has made it more navigable.

Signature Experience

Overview

The FTF recommends that Gustavus implement a Signature Experience requirement to better prepare students for post-graduate opportunities and to provide a point of distinction that will be useful in recruitment efforts.

At Gustavus, justice is one of our core values and a key feature of Lutheran higher education. The Signature Experience graduation requirement prepares students to connect this value, developed on campus, to their life beyond Gustavus by preparing them to be thoughtful and ethical leaders in the workplace, in their communities, and in the world.

The Signature Experience graduation requirement emphasizes Gustavus' commitment to justice in preparing students for lives of leadership and service by providing a meaningful learning experience that bridges the gap between academic knowledge and practical application of that knowledge in outward facing contexts.

Signature Experiences will be highlighted at an annual event (e.g., Signature Experience Day), an opportunity to showcase the work and experience of students who have participated in a signature experience over the year.¹⁷

Goals

1. To develop a signature experience that is distinctive and marketable for the purposes of recruitment and fundraising.
2. To formalize and enhance opportunities for students to build skills and experiences that will help them transition into professional life after graduation.
3. To use existing infrastructure, resources, and strengths to minimize the cost of developing and administering the program.

Proposal

Gustavus students must complete one Signature Experience as part of graduation requirements.¹⁸ Students have four options for completing this requirement and, with the guidance of an advisor, are encouraged to pursue the option that is most appropriate given their individual vocational goals and interests. Students may complete more than one Signature Experience. Students must have successfully completed a minimum of 32 credits (Carnegie Units) before enrolling in a Signature Experience. Students prepare for their Signature Experience either through a bootcamp-style workshop taken before the experience or preparation embedded in the experience itself. After completing the experience, students receive a badge related to the experience that will appear on the student's official transcript and can be shared on social media (e.g., LinkedIn) and resumes.

¹⁷ AOC would need to recommend the creation of a Signature Experience day. This could be included in the academic calendar proposal or as a separate proposal.

¹⁸ [Amendment to the Faculty Handbook](#). This amendment would be brought to the faculty by the Senate with the endorsement of the Curriculum Committee. As a reminder, *Faculty Handbook* amendments must go through the Senate (with or without endorsement before coming to the faculty). The Academic Bulletin would need to be amended (Career Development, Core Requirements, Requirements for Graduation, Internship program), which does not require faculty approval.

It is important to note that for internships, research experiences, and study away, the experience itself need not necessarily be related to the value of justice. The preparatory work that happens before the experience and the concurrent supervision that happens during internship and research experiences emphasizes how justice is embedded into real-world experiences and everyday life, helping students to view their experiences through the lens of justice. Course-based Signature Experiences will have a more explicit focus on justice woven throughout the course.

Program SLOs

1. Students will articulate how justice-related values (e.g., values related to the questions of how others should be treated, what people owe to each other, and what systems would make those things possible) shape their perspective, approach to, and experience in outward facing contexts (such as the workplace and local and global communities).

Program Criteria

1. Signature Experiences bridge the gap between academic knowledge and practical application by immersing students in outward facing contexts.
2. Signature Experiences address one or more issues of justice through either the associated bootcamp or the experience itself.
3. Content and student work includes opportunities for professional development and/or vocational reflection.

Pathways

1. Internships (SIG 268/368): Students participating in an internship (on or off campus) complete a 3-hour pre-internship boot camp, register for the course, meet weekly with the internship cohort (facilitated by a faculty member), and complete the internship itself. (0-16 CU total toward graduation)
 - a. Criteria
 - i. 4 CU = 140 hours of work plus weekly cohort meeting with faculty supervisor (generally 10 hours per week for 14 weeks). Students may select a zero credit option for an on-campus, paid internship.
 - ii. 8 CU = 280 hours of work plus weekly cohort meeting with faculty supervisor (generally 20 hours per week for 14 weeks).
 - iii. 12 CU = 420 hours of work plus weekly cohort meeting with faculty supervisor (generally 30 hours per week for 14 weeks).
 - iv. Weekly meetings with internship cohort facilitated by the faculty supervisor.
 - v. Approved site supervisor.
 - vi. Offered P/F
 - b. Students receive *Workplace Professionalism* badge for the first internship experience and *Navigating a Diverse Workplace* badge for the second internship experience.
 - c. The pre-internship boot camps for this pathway will be facilitated by Career Development (268) and the Center for Inclusive Excellence (368) in conjunction with faculty internship supervisors.
 - d. The SIG internships will replace departmental career explorations and internships (i.e ART 268/368). Faculty will no longer supervise individual internships, a practice that is currently uncompensated. The departmental

internship option will be removed from the Academic Bulletin. Instead, all internships will be supervised using a cohort model in which one faculty member will receive teaching credit for supervising a cohort of students. Departments and Programs can still choose to count relevant internships toward the major or minor. Some departments (i.e., NUR or EDU) may need a cross-listed departmental designation for external accreditation purposes.

2. Study Away (SIG XXX): Students participating in Study Away complete a 3-hour pre-study away boot camp and either an approved full semester or summer term study away opportunity. (0-16 CU per study away experience)
 - a. Criteria
 - i. Study away program or course must be pre-approved by the Center for International and Cultural Education
 - b. Students will register for SIG instead of NDL-00
 - c. Students receive *Intercultural Fluency* badge for a study away experience.
 - d. The pre-study away boot camp for this pathway will be facilitated by the Center for International and Cultural Education.

3. Student-Faculty Research and Creativity Collaboration (SIG 2XX/3XX): Students participating in student-faculty collaboration research complete a 3-hour pre-research experience boot camp and meet weekly with the research cohort, both facilitated by the Director of Undergraduate Research, and work collaboratively with a faculty member. (0-16 CU)
 - a. Criteria
 - i. 4 CU = 140 to 160 hours of work plus weekly cohort meeting with faculty supervisor (generally 10 to 12 hours per week for 14 weeks or 40 hours per week for summer term). Students may select a zero credit option for an on-campus, paid research.
 - ii. Approved faculty research supervisor.
 - iii. Regular meetings with the research cohort facilitated by the Director of Undergraduate Research
 - iv. Offered P/F
 - b. Students receive *Responsible Conduct of Research* badge for the first research experience and *Ethical Collaboration* badge for the second research experience.
 - c. The pre-research boot camps for this pathway will be facilitated by the Director of Undergraduate Research.
 - d. The SIG research experiences will replace departmental independent studies (291/391) and research experiences, which currently involve uncompensated faculty work. Faculty who supervise SIG research experiences will be compensated by a “banking” system, where each unique student in each semester is counted as 1. As soon as a faculty member reaches 9 students, the compensation will be equivalent to 4 CUs (one course). Students being supervised by a faculty member who is already being compensated will not be included in the banking system (e.g., if a faculty member is being paid through an internal/external grant during the supervisory period)

4. Course-Based Signature Experiences/Practicum (SIG 2YY/3YY): Students participating in a course-based Signature Experience register for the course, and components related to the theme of justice are embedded within the course.

- a. Criteria
 - i. Course does not carry other general education designations but may count toward major/minor requirements and/or carry a WRIT designation.
 - ii. A component of the course must focus on justice-related themes (ethics, equity, fairness, etc.)
 - iii. The course must include work with an external group of constituents (external to the course) consistently throughout the course (at least 50 percent of the course focus, including discussion, assignments, and/or activities related to the experience that are not directly on-site).
- b. Students will earn *Ethical Leadership* or *Civic Leadership* badge for a course based experience/practicum.
- c. Examples of course-based experiences/practicum could include:
 - i. Peer MALT course
 - ii. Student leadership course for leaders of student organizations, athletic teams, etc.
 - iii. Reflection course for students who have completed a Signature Experience (internship, study away, research) and want an opportunity to reflect more deeply on the experience, mentor students preparing for their first experience, and/or help facilitate the Signature Experience Day.
 - iv. Significant event planning courses (e.g., Nobel Conference)
 - v. Course involving a significant community-based learning component.
 - vi. Practicum courses (e.g., Education, Nursing)
- d. Some departments (i.e., NUR or EDU) may need a cross-listed departmental designation for external accreditation purposes.

Note: The Signature Experience requirement will not apply retroactively to current students. This graduation requirement will begin for students beginning entering in fall 2024. Current students would need to complete 128 CU (32 credits in the current system) but not a Signature Experience. The first group of students completing the Signature Experience would be in summer 2025 (students doing summer research who just completed their first year at Gustavus).

Rationale

The Signature Experience builds on our core value of justice, creating a distinctive approach to bridging the gap between academic knowledge and professional life. Gustavus needs a distinctive identity in order to survive and ideally thrive in our competitive marketplace and the Admission Office believes this proposal offers something prospective students and families want but with a twist that is distinctive to Gustavus.

In an earlier summary of our plans, we used the title “Justice in Action” or “Just Act” to describe the proposal. Further conversations with the Admission Office revealed a strong preference for using the title “Signature Experience” while maintaining the program’s focus on justice. While the title, Signature Experience, is not distinctive, it is recognizable to external audiences and easy to explain. The details of the Signature Experience, however, make Gustavus’ version distinctive and attractive to prospective students.

The Signature Experience embeds into the curriculum an opportunity for all students to connect their liberal arts education with their careers, vocations, and avocations. These connections may seem obvious to us (i.e., we who became professors at liberal arts colleges), but our students increasingly need explicit instruction on how to make those connections. They need a designated space in their schedule to take the internship or do the research. If these places are not part of the curriculum for everyone, many of the students who will not find them, or be led to them, are the students who most need them

The proposed Signature Experience connects us to our local community – St. Peter, Mankato, and the Twin Cities – and to our alumni through internships and course-based experiences. It creates multiple opportunities for fundraising.

The proposal builds on many successful courses, programs, and opportunities that already exist on campus, which will help to reduce the start-up costs and ensure that it is financially sustainable.

The proposal, with its focus on justice, is deeply rooted in the College's Lutheran tradition, making the Gustavus Signature Experience a key way of living out our mission and vocation as a college.

We recommend using the prefix SIG for these experiences for a variety of reasons. Most importantly, it helps students find the courses that satisfy the Signature Experience requirement. It also creates an easy replacement for departmental internships and independent studies that will help to reduce uncompensated work. For accredited departments that must have a departmental designation on clinical or practicum experiences, those courses could be easily cross-listed. Study away experiences already use a non-departmental designation for registration (NDL), so this makes only a minor change to that practice. Tracking students who are participating in a Signature Experience is much easier using a shared designation. For example, if students were to register for internships or collaborative research using departmental internship or independent study designations, the faculty internship supervisor for the semester or the Director of Undergraduate Research would have to manage multiple email aliases.

Professor D has been looking for ways to incorporate students into her research, but teaching three courses while also advising and supervising an average of two students doing internships each semester has made it difficult to find the time to do so.

Under the new system, Professor D won't supervise internships (unless she is serving as an Internship Supervisor for the semester, in which case, that task would take the place of one of his courses). With the extra time, Professor D invites two students to participate in research during the semester as their Signature Experience. The students register for academic credit and are part of a research cohort supervised by the Director of Undergraduate Research. They spend about 10 hours a week working on research with Professor D and they meet with other research students and the Director of Undergraduate Research to learn about and discuss being an ethical researcher. Professor D doesn't get a course release for this work in the semester, but after he has supervised a total of nine research students, he is eligible for a course release to compensate him for the extra work. While supervising research students requires a lot of work, it also helps him prioritize his research in the midst of a busy semester and he benefits both from the extra assistance and from the eventual course release.

Student D wants to become a lawyer and has decided to do an internship in a law office. He works with the Career Development office to find an internship and then has to find a faculty member to oversee the internship. His first two asks say “no” owing to their too-busy schedules. The third faculty member he asks says yes. That faculty member does meet with him and his site supervisor, but the internship seems fairly separate from his work at Gustavus. While at the law firm, he sees things he has questions about (it turns out that law offices can be pretty hierarchical. Is that a problem? What’s the line between efficiency and treating people like machines?), but there is no clear place to ask them.

Under the new system, Student D would use the internship as his Signature Experience. He works with the Career Development office to locate an internship and registers for the Signature Experience. When he asks if the internship can be a Signature Experience if it doesn’t focus on justice—he is working in a tax law firm—he is told that it certainly can because part of the point of the Signature Experience is to think about how questions of what is just arise in everyday professional and civic life. Rather than starting his internship with very little preparation, Student D participates in a three-hour preparatory workshop that focuses on workplace professionalism facilitated by the Career Development office (which is helpful because he has never worked in a professional context before and now knows more about how to navigate one).

During the semester, Student D will spend 10 hours a week at his internship and he will also meet weekly with a faculty supervisor and other student interns. Even though the students are doing a variety of internships, their weekly meetings will give them a place to discuss some of the common challenges they are facing in their internships, learning how to effectively navigate those challenges in an ethical way. That group provides Student D a place to raise questions about how the firm operates and how he should think about it. Toward the end of the semester, his faculty supervisor helps guide him (and the other students in his internship cohort) in updating his resume to highlight the experience and gives him opportunities to practice talking about his internship experience in a hypothetical job interview and writing about it for his law school admission essays. After completing his Signature Experience, Student D will earn a *Workplace Professionalism* badge that he can post on his LinkedIn page and list on his resume.

Academic Calendar

Overview

The FTF recommends changes to the academic calendar as a primary mechanism for reducing cost and improving the student experience.

The proposed academic calendar will include two 15-week semesters with a one-week break midway through each semester and the elimination of a separate finals week. The new calendar will eliminate January Interim term and replace it with non-required summer terms. Commencement will occur before the start of summer terms.

Faculty contracts will remain 9-month contracts, likely starting in mid-August and running through mid-May.

Goals

1. To create an academic calendar that aligns with a sustainable financial model for campus.
2. To create a financially sustainable summer term.
3. To create an academic calendar that supports student, staff and faculty needs for curricular and co-curricular activities.

Proposal

We propose a calendar focused on two 15-week semesters that begins fall semester after Labor day and concludes spring semester at the end of April, followed by a summer term.¹⁹

Details: [Suggested 2024-25 Draft Academic Calendar](#)

1. Fall and Spring semester are 15 weeks long with one-week long breaks
 - a. Fall Semester (~66 class days)
 - i. Start the fall semester the Tuesday after Labor Day.
 - ii. Includes two days currently allocated for the Nobel Conference (when faculty are encouraged to cancel classes and have students engage in the Nobel Conference).
 - iii. Includes a 1-week fall break. This may be used for class field trips, domestic music tours, and student life-facilitated programs like Habitat for Humanity.
 - iv. Includes one Advising Day when no classes are held, but students have the opportunity to engage in academic, advising-, and career-related programming
 - v. Maintains a 3-day Thanksgiving Break.
 - vi. Classes end on Wednesday of the 15th week, but Thursday and Friday of that week is reserved for make-up exams, extension deadlines for final papers, etc. The final day of the semester is Friday of the 15th week.
 - vii. Removes the designated “finals week”.
 - viii. Final grades are due five business days after the final day of the semester.

¹⁹ [Academic Calendar proposal](#). The AOC would bring this proposal to the faculty.

- b. Spring Semester (~68 class days)
 - i. Start the spring semester on the Monday of the second full week of January.
 - ii. Maintain Martin Luther King Jr. Day as a holiday featuring special programming. (No classes are held)
 - iii. Create a day for a MayDay!/Building Bridges-combined event when no classes are held.²⁰
 - iv. Include a 1-week spring break. This may be used for class field trips, domestic music tours, and student life programs like Habitat for Humanity.
 - v. Includes one Advising Day when no classes are held, but students have the opportunity to engage in academic, advising-, and career-related programming.
 - vi. Create a day for an event highlighting the Signature Experience when no classes are held, but the campus would be engaged in the day
 - vii. Maintain a 1-day Easter recess (Good Friday).
 - viii. Classes end on Wednesday of the 15th week, but reserve Thursday and Friday of that week for make-up exams, deadlines for final papers, etc. The final day of the semester is Friday of the 15th week.
 - ix. Removes the designated “finals week”.
 - x. Final grades are due five business days after the final day of the semester for all students (including seniors).²¹
 - c. 8-10 business days are needed between the end of the fall semester and start of spring semester to allow for academic standing and communication with students.
2. Eliminate January Interim²²
 3. Create Gustavus summer terms²³
 - a. Summer courses may count towards course credit and graduation requirements
 - b. Allow students to register for summer term without the calculation of academic standing (current process with summer term)
 - c. Summer term A will begin the Monday after Commencement (generally, the first week in May).
 - d. Summer term B will begin one week after summer term A ends
 - e. Summer term A and B will be 19-20 days in length with a minimum of 15 hours of in-class instruction per week.
 - f. Summer term C, D, and E will be the 8- and 12-week versions of the above, along with the term that begins in July for the Master-Athletic Training students.

²⁰ Since the spring semester will end before May, we are proposing that we devote an entire day to some event that merges elements from MayDay! and Building Bridges focused on social justice. We have not yet consulted with Building Bridges leadership about this idea.

²¹ A later deadline for senior grades is possible because seniors will no longer receive their diploma at commencement.

²² [Academic Calendar proposal](#). Students receive the same financial aid whether we have January Term or not. Faculty may request teaching in summer term as part of their teaching load.

²³ [Academic Calendar proposal](#). The number of classes students can take per summer term would need to be decided by faculty.

Summer Term	May	June	July
A (4 week)			
B (4 week)			
C (MA in AT)			
D (8 week)			
E (12 week)			

- g. Summer term grades will be due 5 business days after summer term ends
 - h. Most courses in the summer term will be online. Exceptions will include on-campus signature experiences, Master-Athletic Training on-campus courses, and courses approved by the Provost including faculty-led travel courses.
 - i. Students will pay for summer term if they are enrolled in courses for credit.
 - i. Students may register for a zero credit Signature Experience that is Study Away or research-based
4. Commencement will be scheduled before Summer term, on the Saturday after the final day of the semester²⁴
 - a. Diplomas will not be distributed at graduation but will be mailed upon completion
 5. Eliminate finals week²⁵
 - a. Instructors may schedule a final exam during the final class week during regularly scheduled class time.
 - b. Reading day will be eliminated.
 - c. The final day of classes will be two days before the end of the semester
 - d. The last two days of the semester will be reserved for additional time for student projects, papers and/or makeup exams. Faculty may not use this time for all students to take a required exam, but faculty may use this time for individual students to make up a final exam.
 - e. Five business days between semester end and grade submission
 6. Recommend that we keep AOC syllabus language requirement
 - a. **Academic Accommodation for Religious Observance:** *A student whose religious observance conflicts with a course requirement may request an academic accommodation from the instructor. Students should normally make such requests in writing by the end of the second week of classes, but there may be exceptions. Students may also request accommodations for religious traditions surrounding death and dying when the need arises. The Chaplains' Office annually publishes a multifaith holiday calendar with accommodation notations. You can find it here: <https://gustavus.edu/chaplain/multifaith/>. However, this list is not exhaustive and observances are not necessarily days when individuals will not attend work or school. There are also different levels of observance in different traditions. The Chaplains' Office is available for consultation on any requests for accommodation that are not included in their calendar.*

²⁴ [Academic Calendar proposal.](#)

²⁵ [Academic Calendar proposal.](#)

Rationale

This academic calendar will be financially sustainable for the college due to the elimination of the interim term.

A revised calendar will give students an additional month for summer work and internships due to an earlier graduation date. Our students will be more competitive with students from other institutions that end the spring semester at the end of April/first week of May.

The revised calendar gives students the opportunity to take a course for credit offered during summer term to earn credit toward graduation requirements and/or make up for lost credit due to course withdrawal/s or failing a course.

The intensive summer terms preserve the opportunity for faculty-led study away trips and international music tours.

Faculty would not be required to teach during the summer term. Faculty contracts would remain at 9 months, likely starting in mid-August and running through mid-May. This would allow us to build course prep time and time for faculty development (i.e., Faculty Development Day and KCEL or FTS workshops into time on contract).

Professor E has a well-developed off-campus January Term course, but with the new academic calendar, they face a decision about its future. They have several options: convert the course into a regular semester course without the travel component, convert the course into a regular semester course with a week-long field trip over the fall break or spring break, or offer the course as a travel course during one of the summer terms (The month of June would work especially well for this course because of the travel costs. June will also allow some music students who will be on tour in May to participate in the course.).

Professor E opts for June and teaches the course as part of their course load. At first Professor E had been reluctant to travel in June because they did a lot of course prep (uncompensated) in June. With the new calendar, Professor E has committed to confining course prep to on-contract time. They will do some course prep for the next academic year in May, after classes end but before contracts do. They will then resume in mid-August, when contracts begin again. That pattern allows for the travel course Professor E enjoys and for a real break in July and early August.

When Student E came to Gustavus, January Term sounded fine, but it has turned out to make her summer plans difficult. Every year, Gustavus students get out of classes after students at the University of Minnesota and Student E has yet to find a summer job that doesn't schedule its training day based on the U's schedule. To compound the problem, finals week pushes everything even deeper into May. Last semester Student E had a final on Saturday and one on Monday, which made it difficult for her to get home in time to start her summer job. It would be one thing if she saw the value of finals, but she really doesn't. Her other two classes had spread out assignments throughout the semester and she had already turned in her final work before their scheduled exam times. It was frustrating to have to take an exam on a weekend and to wait around for the very last day to take her last exam.

With the new academic schedule, Students E's school schedule is more aligned with what employers expect. Not having finals week (or, really, weekend) has been good too. Although she was a little concerned that the last week of class would be crazy, Student E has final papers, presentations, and exams spread out over the last few weeks of the semester. None of her finals

conflict because they happen during class time. Her last class is on a Wednesday, but she asked for an extension on that paper until Friday, which her professor granted. The earlier start time to the spring semester means that Student E is done with school when most of her high school friends who went to the U are also done. She is able to jump right into her summer job without needing to ask for extra time from her boss.

Scheduling Grid

Overview

The FTF recommends changes to the scheduling grid to support the transition to the Carnegie system and to address problems in equity for both students and faculty.

The academic scheduling grid provides guidance for scheduling classes with the intention of minimizing scheduling conflicts for students and facilities. With the switch to Carnegie Units (CU) and the decision to have all regular courses count as 4 CU, it is important to create consistency across courses by having them meet for the approximately same amount of time whether they meet two, three, four, or five days per week.

Goals

1. Create a scheduling grid based on 4 CU courses that meet a minimum of four contact hours per week to create more consistency across courses and equity for faculty.
2. Reserve time for major music ensembles to alleviate scheduling conflicts for students.
3. Maintain time each week for sabbath activities, where no courses are scheduled.
4. Maintain a weekly common meeting time for faculty, where no courses are scheduled.
5. Simplify the scheduling grid to assist students, faculty, department chairs, and advisors in planning.

Proposal

Scheduling Grid (AOC)

1. Courses that wish to meet three days per week meet on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays for 70 minutes (210 minutes total per week) [Block A].
2. Courses that wish to meet two days per week meet on Tuesdays and Thursdays for 105 minutes (210 minutes total per week) [Block B].
3. Courses that wish to meet four or five days per week meet during the 8:00, 9:00, or 10:00 a.m., or 2:00 p.m. hours for 50 minutes per day (200-250 minutes total per week). Non-FTS four day a week classes may choose which day they do not meet [Block C].
4. FTS courses will meet for 50-minute sessions 4 days a week (MTWF) or 5 days a week during the 8:00, 9:00, and 10:00 a.m. block in order to provide frequent contact with students and to allow time for Peer MALT sessions and the possibility of common advising, linked course, and cohort-building sessions [Block C].
5. Partial credit courses (2 CU) meet on MW at 6:00 or 7:00 p.m. for 50 minutes (or one of those days for 100 minutes) or on TR at 11:00 a.m., 12:00 p.m., or 1:00 p.m. for 50 minutes (or one of those days for 100 minutes). Partial credit courses (2 CU) that meet for half a semester, will meet for 200-250 minutes per week during those blocks. [Block D]
6. 2-hour labs (110 minutes) and ART and T/D courses have daily options. [Block E]
7. The 4:00-6:00 p.m. block is reserved for touring music ensembles and laboratory courses (preferably only those labs that have multiple sections to choose from to alleviate conflicts with musicians). [Block F]
8. 3- (170 minutes) and 4- (230 minutes) hour labs have daily options. [Block G]
9. Sabbath break occurs on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 12:10-12:30 pm.
10. Common meeting time occurs on Wednesdays from 3:15-5:00 p.m. Additional common meeting time exists on Mondays and Fridays from 3:15-4:00 p.m.

11. By necessity, course offerings from some departments will not fit within this scheduling grid and will require standing exemptions from AOC (i.e., EDU, NUR, AT). AOC is discouraged from allowing additional exemptions beyond these.

Rationale

In creating this scheduling grid, the FTF was guided by two main priorities: 1) reducing the potential for course conflicts in order to address students' frustrations at scheduling difficulties; and 2) meeting the requirement of four contact hours per week for a 4-CU course in the transition to Carnegie Units.

This scheduling grid is designed to reduce situations in which two courses partially overlap, a situation which has been particularly common and frustrating for students in the past. This grid is also designed to increase clarity, consistency, and equity for faculty and students.

Coupled with the proposed academic calendar, this grid ensures that courses meeting two, three, or four/five days a week will have nearly the same number of hours of in-class instructional time over the semester even when accounting for holidays and other days when classes are canceled (i.e., Nobel Conference, Advising Day, etc.).

This proposal creates five options for courses that meet three days a week and six options for courses that meet two days a week. It creates four options for courses that meet either 4 or 5 days a week. This is fewer available options than in our current system, but we will also be reducing course offerings in the future. We currently underutilize classroom space on campus and so scheduling will be possible as long as departments and programs distribute courses evenly across the schedule.

This proposal builds in protections for FTS and music ensembles to help alleviate scheduling conflicts for students. This is important because of the large number of students who participate in music.

If adopted, department chairs and program directors would receive guidance from the Provost's Office to ensure that courses are distributed evenly across the schedule between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

Faculty would be encouraged to consider which model (4-5 days a week for 50 minutes, 3 days a week for 70 minutes, or 2 days a week for 105 minutes) is best suited for course level and content, pedagogical approach, and student learning experience.

This new model will increase teaching time for some faculty, however there are multiple reasons for this decision. First, it brings us into line with federal and HLC credit hours expectations, which we should have been doing more closely all along. Second, it creates more equity across the faculty. Currently, some faculty spend only 150 minutes per class per week in the classroom while others might spend 330 minutes per class per week. Third, in an age of increased AI and in a time when many students are less prepared for college-level work, the move to having students do more work (particularly writing work) in class is pedagogically helpful. Finally, it coheres with our in-person, residential model, which emphasizes the importance of the intellectual and academic life on campus and in our classrooms.

Faculty have multiple options for how to make use of the fourth hour they may gain. They might expand course content or use the additional in-class time to move activities that might otherwise have taken place outside of class (e.g., practice drills, homework activities, office hours, Q&A sessions) into the class period. Doing so would actually be pedagogically supportive in that students would get a jump start on their homework and be able to get questions answered quickly when the material is fresh in their mind, which would also possibly reduce faculty workload by reducing the likelihood of students asking questions via email, needing to schedule additional office hours, etc.

Professor F teaches two sections of the same course and likes to offer them back to back. With the new scheduling grid, Professor F chooses to offer those courses on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays at 8:00 and 9:30. Because the 8:00 course ends at 9:10, Professor F has 20 minutes in between the two sections and he holds office hours so that he can catch students both after his first section and before his second section. Professor F offers his third course on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 2:00-3:10. This leaves plenty of time on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays for meetings with students and colleagues. Since he has reserved the last twenty minutes of each class period for student work sessions and he has the extra time between his first two sections, he doesn't spend as much time answering student emails and he has slightly reduced the number of office hours he holds. It also gives him flexibility on Tuesdays and Thursdays for research and course prep.

Student F is a first-year student who plans to study Physics, play in the orchestra, and join the swim team. Her FTS meets Mondays through Fridays from 9:00-9:50 am. She has Physics 190 from 10:00-10:50 am and the lab, 191, from 2:00-3:50 pm on Tuesdays (NTSCI). She takes Calculus 122 on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays from 12:30-1:40 pm (QUANT), and a USIDG course on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 12:00-1:45. The orchestra meets two nights a week from 4:00-6:00 pm. Student F is able to join the morning practice with the swim team since her first class doesn't start until 9 am. On Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, she has a lunch break between 10:50 and 12:30, when she can also fit in a bit of studying. She also has a break between 1:40 and 4:00 on those days, which she uses for some campus employment hours. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, Student F doesn't start class until noon (!) and she's done at 3:50 on Tuesday and 1:45 on Thursday. It's a humane schedule for a first-year student, especially one with as many activities as Student F.

Advising

Overview

The FTF recommends changes to advising procedures to improve the student experience and reduce faculty workload.

At Gustavus, the faculty advising model is designed to build meaningful relationships between students and faculty and to provide students with effective advice in course selection to prepare for post-graduate experiences (work and graduate school) while fulfilling graduation requirements within four years. A student's First Term Seminar professor serves as their academic advisor until they are ready to declare a major. After a student declares a major, they are advised by a faculty member from the department or program. Faculty advisors play an important role in student retention.

Faculty advisors are supported in their work by the Academic Support Center, the First Term Seminar program, and the Registrar's Office, which provide training, reminders, and resources throughout the year.

Goals

1. To simplify the process of declaring a major and minor for both students and faculty.
2. To create more time and support for effective advising and to enhance the culture of advising on campus.
3. To provide more equity in faculty advising loads.
4. To Increase retention of students.

Proposal

We propose the following changes be made to the advising and registration process:

1. Create a standardized major/minor declaration process housed on the Registrar's web page and coordinated by department/program Administrative Assistants using decision rules established by the department/program to assign new advisors.²⁶ This would not change majors that involve a competitive application process, but students could declare an "interest" in those majors, which would allow for those departments/programs to communicate more effectively with interested students. Students with a double major would continue to have advisors from each major.
2. Eliminate the requirement that minors have advisors. Students still use the online form to declare a minor but it does not need approval from an Administrative Assistant or faculty.²⁷ The department chair or program director would be listed on the website as a resource for students who have questions about the minor.

²⁶ This change does not require faculty approval and can be implemented by the Provost's Office. The Department Chair and Program Director Guide would be updated by the PO to reflect the change and approved by Department Chairs and Program Directors. The change also requires [amending the Academic Bulletin](#). Changing this part of the Academic Bulletin does not require faculty approval.

²⁷ [Minor Advisor Policy](#). This change should be recommended by the Curriculum Committee to the faculty for endorsement.

3. Create an Advising Day in each semester during which no classes will be held, and condense the registration process to one week. Registration will occur during late afternoon/evening hours (after 4:00 p.m.).²⁸
 - a. Proposed registration schedule: seniors and juniors register on Tuesday night, sophomores register on Wednesday night, and first-years register on Thursday night.
 - b. Planned activities during Advising Day:
 - i. Departments/Programs hold open houses based on a central schedule (this would replace the Major/Minor Fair).
 - ii. Academic Support Center offers advising-related workshops.
 - iii. Career Development offers career/internship-related workshops.
 - iv. Peer MALTs hold open advising hours in the dorms during registration week.
 - v. All tenured, tenure-track, and continuing faculty are expected to be on campus during these days and available for individual advising meetings with students and/or advising related activities organized by departments and programs. Visiting faculty are welcome to participate.
4. Increase the pool of faculty advisors by including distinguished endowed chairs and continuing faculty as eligible advisors.²⁹
5. Instruct the Provost's Office to help departments in which faculty have imbalanced advising loads develop mechanisms for distributing advisees more equitably.³⁰
6. Develop clearer expectations for advising by providing regular training for advisors (e.g., on Advising Day) and regularly assessing advising.³¹
7. Encourage students who have clear preferences for a major to declare their major in the second or third semester of enrollment. Students must declare a major by the registration period in the spring of their 2nd year (in anticipation of coursework in fall of junior year).³²

²⁸ This change requires faculty approval. AOC should bring the [motion to create Advising Day and cancel classes](#) to the faculty for endorsement [Note: the AOC has approved a modified version of this proposal, which is included in the faculty meeting packet for the August 31 meeting]. The Faculty Senate should bring the motion to [amend section 2.3.4 of the Faculty Manual](#) to the faculty for adoption to include information about expectations on Advising Day.

²⁹ his change does not require faculty approval and can be implemented by the Provost's Office.

³⁰ his change does not require faculty approval and can be implemented by the Provost's Office.

³¹ The Faculty Senate could propose changes to advising expectations through [amendments to section 2.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook](#) (Advising). The FTF has not proposed specific changes, but encourages the Faculty Senate to consult with the Academic Support Center in drafting this language.

³² Include this recommendation in [Academic Bulletin language about advising](#) and in [section 2.3.4 of the Faculty Handbook](#).

Rationale

The various aspects of this proposal are designed to simplify the process of declaring a major or minor, create time for effective advising, enhance our strong culture of advising on campus, and distribute the advising load more equitably.

Creating an online major declaration process administered by administrative assistants in conjunction with department chairs or program directors will simplify the process for students and faculty. Students will have a single system for declaring a major. Administrative assistants will ensure that the process moves forward in a timely manner. The Registrar's Office supports transitioning to an online process.

The current system requires students to find a faculty member to serve as an advisor to the minor. Minor advisors do not get a record of their minor advisees and do not have access to their records. Since students are not required to complete a minor, the current process creates extra work for both students and faculty. Under the new process, the responsibility for fulfilling the requirements of the minor falls to students. The student can use MyGustavus to guide their progress or consult with faculty from the relevant department/program when questions arise. Departments and programs will still have access to the email alias for students who have declared the minor.

Creation of an Advising Day benefits faculty, departments/programs, and students. It allows faculty time to meet with students without facing class conflicts and creates space for training and mentoring new advisors. It provides an opportunity for departments and programs to hold outreach events for students. Students will have time for advising appointments or to attend career-related workshops offered by Career Development or academic support workshops offered by the Academic Support Center. Some faculty will not be able to fit all advising meetings into a single day, but this day will still be helpful in alleviating scheduling conflicts overall.

Increasing the pool of faculty advisors and instructing the Provost's Office to work with departments with imbalanced advising loads will help distribute the advising load more equitably.

Developing clearer expectations and training for advising and regularly assessing advising will improve the quality of advising on campus.

Encouraging students who have a clear preference for a major to declare their major in the second or third semester and requiring students to declare a major by the registration period in the spring of their fourth semester will help to get students connected to a faculty advisor in their major earlier and will help to alleviate the advising burden of FTS faculty, creating more equity in faculty advising loads.

Professor G averages about 35 advisees each year since he teaches FTS nearly every year. It takes a lot of time to meet with all of those students in time for registration. It is also challenging because most of his advisees are undeclared and they have a lot of different academic interests that are well outside of his area of expertise. He doesn't always know enough about other majors to be able to effectively advise students and he spends a lot of time reaching out to colleagues in other departments to gather information he needs.

Under the new system, Professor G has a full day to schedule advising meetings. Even though he won't be able to fit all of them into one day, it relieves a lot of pressure on his schedule to have a day when both he and his advisees are available. Since departments and programs across campus are holding special events on Advising Day, he asks his advisees to visit several different departments to ask questions and learn more about their majors and minors, which saves him quite a bit of time and effort. He also knows that the ASC staff holds this day for phone calls and Google chats about questions that come up in advising meetings. This semester, his new TT colleague is going to sit in on a few of his advising appointments (with permission of the students, of course!) to see how he approaches advising. That colleague is also going to shadow her faculty mentor for a few advising meetings and is going to help out with the department's open house in the morning.

Student G is a sophomore and ready to declare a major. Under the current system, Student G and her FTS advisor have to use the Gustavus website to figure out if Student G's new major department is one where students ask a faculty member to be an advisor or if students send an email to an administrative assistant to be assigned an advisor (or "some other way of doing it I don't even know about" the FTS advisor says, a little too audibly). Student G finds out that their department is an "ask the faculty member department" (or at least the absence of any other instruction from that department on the website makes that seem like the answer). Student G prints out a declaration of major form, sets up a time to meet with the new advisor, gets a signature, and then turns in the paper form at the Registrar's Office. All told, Student G had to visit three different buildings on campus to declare a major.

Under the new system, Student G visits the Registrar's Office webpage where they fill out a short form online. Student G knew to do that because her FTS advisor told students—correctly—that the first step of the process is the same for all students. The major Student G is declaring gives students some choice in selecting their advisor, so they are asked to identify up to three potential faculty advisors on the form. Behind the scenes, the form is processed and Student G is assigned an advisor through a process that the department controls. Both Student G and the new advisor get an email confirming that they have successfully declared the major and introducing their new advisor. Student G is bemused by stories from upper-level students about doing web searches to figure out how to declare a major and trekking across campus with a piece of paper for signatures.

Appendix A: Other Related Changes

In addition to the proposed changes described above, the Provost's Office is also working on additional changes that will not require faculty approval but which are relevant to the work of the FTF and have been discussed by the group.

These changes include: the baseline faculty numbers for departments/programs, low course enrollment policy, faculty presence on campus policy, and a student academic complaint process.

Baseline Numbers for Departments

The Provost's Office is developing a number range for the baseline faculty in departments, along with some recommendations about a timeline for moving departments closer to the baseline range. The Deans will be communicating this information individually and directly with department chairs in September. The FTF is not privy to the baseline data, but the Provost's Office has confirmed that the proposals described above are compatible with the baseline faculty numbers in combination with the new proposed guidelines for low enrollment courses.

Guidelines for Low Enrollment Courses (Fall and Spring Terms)

The Provost's Office is developing a comprehensive [policy for establishing minimum enrollment for courses and guidelines for courses that fail to meet the minimum enrollment](#). This proposal is still being refined, but the FTF has used these enrollment minimums to model the savings generated by the new general education requirements and caps on the size of majors.

Faculty Expectations for Time on Campus

The Provost's Office is developing a [policy detailing expectations for faculty time on-campus](#). As a student-centered, residential liberal arts college, Gustavus values faculty-student interaction, a robust intellectual life on campus, shared governance, and faculty engagement in scholarship and teaching. The College's expectations for faculty presence on campus reflect the College's values and commitments and respond to faculty requests for clarity about time on campus, mode of instruction, and expectations of availability. This proposed language makes these expectations clear for what faculty can expect for themselves and one another about availability.

Student Academic Complaint Process

The Provost's Office is developing a [policy for student academic complaints](#) about a faculty member's classroom practices, policies, or behaviors not covered by other institutional or federal policies such as Title IX (related to sexual harassment and assault), Non-discrimination, Harassment, and Other Unwanted Conduct, Sexual Harassment and Sexual Misconduct, and Grade Change Policies. Student academic complaints might include, among others, concerns about how often a faculty member cancels class, lack of regular feedback on assignments, faculty expertise in the subject area, and treatment (other than harassment and bias) of students in class.

Appendix B: Additional Policy Document Updates

The following sections of the *Faculty Handbook* will need updating if these changes are adopted:

- 2.2.1.1 Course Approval Policy-Regular Courses
- Appendix E: Internships and Experiential Learning

The following sections of the *Academic Bulletin* will need updating if these changes are adopted:

- Career Development (Academic Internships and Career Explorations)
- 4-1-4 Calendar Year
- Core Requirements
- Writing Program
- Academic Advising
- Special Academic Opportunities
- Credit Transfer Guide
- Overload Guidelines
- Academic Schedule Conflicts
- Independent Study
- Internship Program
- International and Domestic Study Away Programs
- January Interim
- Summer Session
- Final Exams

The following sections of the *Department Chair and Program Director Guide* will need updating if these changes are adopted:

- Academic Calendar - 1:6
- The Role of the Department Chair - 2:1
- January Term Experience Fee Policy - 4:7
- Academic Calendar and the Common Meeting Time - 10:4
- Supporting J-Term Only Faculty/Staff - 10:5
- Calendar of Tasks for Department Chairs - 10:7

Appendix C: Recommended Timeline

Fall 2023

Main Tasks:

- Adoption of FTF Proposal
- PO shares baseline faculty numbers with departments/programs
- Departments/Programs begin planning conversations for anticipated changes

Key Dates:

- August 31: Faculty Retreat: FTF presents the proposal, time for committee deliberation and faculty discussion
- September 8: Senate & Academic Operations Committee meetings
- September 15: Curriculum Committee & Personnel Committee meetings
- September 20: Deadline for any committee changes to the proposal
- September 22: Faculty Colloquium
- September 25: Final Proposal submitted to faculty meeting packet
- October 6: Faculty Meeting - Vote on FTF Proposal
- November 3 : Full day of faculty work time (no class) - [Proposed Department/Program discussion guidelines](#)
- November 7, 2023: Pilot Advising Day

Spring 2024

Main Tasks:

- Finalize changes to general education course designations and numbering (prior to fall registration)
- First batch of changes to majors reviewed by Curriculum Committee

Key Dates:

- TBD: Department/Program Work Day
- February 9: Faculty Colloquium
- April 16: Advising Day

Fall 2024

Main Tasks:

- First year of the new academic calendar (no January term).
- First year of revised general education curriculum.
- Transition to Carnegie Units for all classes
- Transition to new scheduling grid
- Second batch of changes to majors reviewed by Curriculum Committee.

Spring 2025

Main Tasks:

- Finalize policies and procedures for Signature Experience.
- Develop Signature Experience bootcamp curricula.

Fall 2025

Main Tasks:

- First round of boot camps for summer Signature Experience students (research, internships, study away)

Spring 2026

Main Tasks:

- Full implementation of Signature Experience

Appendix D: Campus Consultations

In addition to receiving feedback through open sessions and surveys from a broad range of faculty, staff, and administrators, members of the Faculty Task Force met specifically with representatives from the following departments, programs, committees, and offices during the process of developing the FTF Proposal:

Administrative Offices

- Academic Support Center (Tom McHugh)
- Admission Office (Kim Frisch, Teresa Naumann, David Kogler, and Kirk Carlson)
- Advancement (Angela Erickson)
- Athletics
- Career Development (Tom Vecchione)
- Center for International and Cultural Education (Matthew Hirman)
- Chaplain's Office (Grady St. Dennis)
- Dining Services (Steve Kjellgren)
- Financial Aid Office (Jesus Hernandez Mejia, Kirk Carlson)
- President Bergman
- Registrar's Office
- Residential Life
- Physical Plant (Travis Jordan)

Academic Departments, Programs, and Committees

- Academic Operations Committee
- Challenge Seminar (Laura Burrack)
- Curriculum Committee
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee
- Education Department chair
- Faculty Personnel Committee
- Faculty Senate
- First Term Seminar (Lauren Hecht and Hayley Russell)
- Library (Michelle Twait and Anna Hulseberg)
- Mathematics, Computer Science, and Statistics faculty
- Modern Languages, Literatures, and Cultures past/present chairs (Carlos Mejía Suárez and Ana Adams) and survey of language faculty
- Writing Program (Nissa Parmar, Becky Fremo)

Note: The offices/ departments/ individuals mentioned above are not meant to indicate their endorsement of the proposal, but simply to reflect the fact that we consulted with these offices/ departments during the process.

Members of the FTF and Provost's Office also reflected the perspectives of their affiliated departments, programs, and current and recent committee affiliations during the process of crafting this proposal:

- Accreditation Committee (Sarah)
- Art and Art History (Betsy)
- Arts Entrepreneurship (Betsy, Dave)
- Chemistry (Dwight)

- Communication Studies (Pam)
- Elementary and Secondary Education (Valerie)
- Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies (Yurie, Kate)
- Greek, Latin, and Classical Studies (Yurie)
- Music (Dave)
- Political Science (Kate)
- Psychological Science (Kyle)
- Religion (Sarah)
- Faculty Admission Liaisons (Kate, Dwight, Pam)
- Kendall Center for Engaged Learning (Pam, Dave)
- Faculty Senate (Yurie, Brenda)
- Curriculum Committee (Dwight, Sarah, Yurie, Kate)
- Academic Operations Committee (Kyle, Dave)
- Faculty Personnel Committee (Valerie, Brenda)
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (Pam)
- Student Experience Committee of the Board of Trustees (Kate)
- President's Environmental Sustainability Council (Betsy)
- Committee on Academic Standing (Sarah)
- Assessment Committee (Sarah)
- Department Chairs and Program Directors list (Betsy, Dwight, Pam, Kyle, Kate, Dave, Yurie)

Previous Retreat Topics

Faculty Retreats are normally scheduled each fall. Below is a list of meeting topics.

- 2022, [Innovative Teaching Ideas](#)
- 2020, [Teaching and Learning in Unprecedented Times](#)
- 2019, [Taking Some Challenge Out of the Challenge Curriculum](#)
- 2018, [Implementing the Challenge Curriculum](#)
- 2017, [Gustavus Acts Strategic Plan](#)
- 2016, [Designing a New General Education Curriculum](#)
- 2015, [Curricular Innovation](#)
- 2014, [The Value of a Gustavus Liberal Arts Education](#)
- 2013, [Community and Global Engagement at Gustavus: What, So What, Now What?](#)
- 2012, [Beyond the Classroom: Faculty Responsibilities for the College's Finances](#)
- 2011, [Accreditation for Today and Tomorrow](#)
- 2010, [Liberal Arts Education at Gustavus: The Real and the Ideal](#)
- 2009, [After Gustavus: Faculty Roles in Preparing Students](#)
- 2007, [Internationalization of the Gustavus Campus](#)
- 2006, [Academic Planning](#)
- 2005, [Faculty Governance](#)
- 2004, [Intellectual Climate at Gustavus Adolphus College](#)
- 2003, [NCA Report and "Community Conversation"](#)
- 2002, ["Blue Ribbon" Report on the Curriculum](#)
- 2001, [Institutional Mission](#)
- 2000, [Vision for the Future](#)
- 1999, [Faculty Development - Bush Grant Planning](#)
- 1998, [General Education Proposal](#)
- 1997, [General Education Curriculum](#)