Key points and ideas that emerged from table discussion (bulleted list of 5-10 points with a couple sentences of description for each):

Question 1: Beyond disciplinary competency, what are the most important attributes that should characterize U of M graduates and be addressed in Liberal education curriculum?

- Critical Thinking
  - Great group consensus around the importance of fostering opportunities for students to think critically about local and global topics.

- Technical Skills
  - Examples ranging from wider communications skills to C++ and coding, the group felt strongly that students want these skills to acquire jobs and the university has a responsibility to provide these skills for students but are currently coming up short; classes that are available are only upper level, non-exploratory, or fill too rapidly. Technology and Society as a theme often has students learning about technology but not how that technology works.
  - A balance needs to be made between societal pressures to be ready for a career and the altruistic ideals of mind broadening through liberal education requirements.
  - Consensus was not made on whether or not the best way to tackle the lack of technical skills acquired is best tackled through liberal education requirements or through some other method.

- Writing
  - All students, no matter their AP or PSEO status, should require freshman writing. Recognizing that high school and college writing is different; learning to write at a collegiate level early in college is tied to success. It is a disservice to students if they do not have to write a long (10 plus pages) paper in their college career.

- Responsible Citizenship
  - The group did not have time to discuss this, but was brought up as an important aspect that should be added to LE Requirements.

Question 2: How should the curriculum be designed in order to help students cultivate these ideas?

- Double Dipping
  - Double dipping courses may make the requirements feel more manageable, but do we need more applied skills courses that are different. Courses that use different methods of thinking and inquiry and may not be considered a lib ed course.
High achieving students that come in with a lot of credit often only need two or three diversified core classes. Is this equitable? Are those students truly ready for upper division course work?

**Interest and Perception**
- Students do not want to take certain themes or diversified courses
- Students’ perception that LE requirements are done in your freshman year needs to be defeated. Creating more interdepartmental courses would be necessary.
- Are we trying to address variety in LE requirements and requirement courses or exploration?

**Not Universal**
- Some degree programs, specifically, or colleges, generally, provide diverse classes that cover most of the requirements while others do not. Begging the question if students are expanding beyond their choice of study or double dipping within major requirements.
- Writing intensives are often the first thing to be shredded by students but great that its built into some programs, it lets us know where they should be developing those writing skills. Some departments have responded to that by building within their own departments while others are more difficult to acquire

**Writing Intensive**
- What writing intensive means needs to be clear. What do those classes look like for students? Is this universal? No.

Summary of discussion (300 to 500 words):
Participants at table 14 had a wide range of experience and contact with students and LE requirements. Specifically, one participant worked with honors students and another participant worked with students of color, first generation college students and English Language Learning students. Unconsciously, the conversation addressed the second question, followed by the first question. Everyone involved focused on students’ experience and preparedness both in their time at the University of Minnesota and beyond.

Within the first few minutes of discussing LE requirements the question of whether or not students felt the current requirements were unwieldy or overbearing was brought up several times. There was not consensus on whether or not students felt this way, and a call from one participant to engage students in this discussion was made. All participants expressed the importance and societal pressures of students being able to graduate on time and find a job after graduation. Beyond graduation and job acquisition, are students equipped with the skills necessary not just to succeed in a job but as adults that analyze and think critically about the world around them. To that end, the current LE requirements are falling short through a lack of diversified academic experiences that fit LE requirements. It was debated whether or not this was a disservice to students. The group recognized that by taking LE requirements within one’s area of study it makes it easier for the student to graduate on time and be sure to “check the boxes” necessary to graduate. However, if the goal of LE requirements is to broaden the students’ interests or understanding of different topics, the LE requirements fall short.

Discussing the design and purpose of the current LE requirements brought us back around to the first topic for discussion; what are the most important attributes that should characterize U of M graduates and be addressed in a new liberal education curriculum? With the table mostly consisting of those who worked within the College of Liberal Arts, the discussion
focused on acquiring hard skills that are easily transferable to a resume and employment. Recognizing the face paced technology world we live in, the group addressed the importance of technology skills across colleges and majors. There was no consensus if this set of skill acquisition would best be obtained through LE requirements or through a broadening of opportunities for students to gain these skills. Examples included C++, HTML, but also database management, extensive excel understanding, and professional social media use. The group acknowledged that some of these classes were already offered at the U of M, but these classes often fill up quickly, or require prerequisites that may deter non major students. Regardless of where or how such skills are acquired in the university setting, it was agreed that there was an obligation to students to provide opportunities for concrete skills.

The last point discussed was the raise of college credit that students come to the university with through AP or PSEO high school experiences. All participants noted that while those students may have already completed most of their LE requirements, their maturity, cognitive, and life experiences may mean they are not ready to engage in the content. The concern was that these students may be ‘checking the boxes’ but not making connections across the boxes. This lead to the final unanswered questions of the group; if students are achieving these requirements in high school, what is our responsibility once they are here? Are we bridging high school to college so that they could participate at a higher level?

Additional context (characterize level of consensus/lack of consensus, tone and tenor of conversation, other notable aspects of the discussion):

Generally there was a lot of consensus amongst the group. Even with participants working with different demographics of students, the participants chose to focus on the similarities within the groups. For example, everyone has seen a raise in students coming with AP and PSEO credits. People were positive. The group seemed to pose more questions than answered them.