Key points and ideas from table discussion:

- There should be a course that addresses the role of political life
- How should curriculum be designed: it is about enrollment management, and students follow the LE - that drives behavior. Students don't necessarily look at electives, topics courses, etc. because they don't have LE designators. We should look at a mechanism that could drive people to non LE courses.
- In some majors, such as physics or math, the students don't a lot of flexibility to add more classes - once they take major courses and LE courses. There are no times for students to take areas of other interest.
- There should be a courses for students to learn some foundation of computer science.
- In health sciences, the question is how to develop the breadth of knowledge to work in the complex health care environment. Students take courses that will get them into medical school, etc. The grand challenge courses challenge students to think more deeply and widely.
- What are the pros and cons of a core curriculum?
- Pros: what we currently see, we are under a lot of enrollment pressure, can we get a course in English that fills an "x" requirement - in other words, it would be a powerful disincentive to be thinking about how to drive enrollment, get students in their departments vs another department
- Maybe make some connections between grand challenge and lib ed.
- Chicago has a core curriculum - there's some sense that faculty and students felt it was too restrictive. Perhaps we should limit the number of options on the core and themes. Or maybe the themes and core aren't labeled properly - maybe they should be named more specifically.
- What are the assumptions that are built into the lib ed requirements we have? In other words, the system is built perfect to give us what we get.
- Assumption: Students want a depth of knowledge in an area.....
- Maybe we need to have a course that says "this is what we're doing here". Example from health sciences, students know *why* they need to have an understanding of politics or the environment in health.
- We understand how/why students want a depth of knowledge in an area, but that's not a liberal education - educated to be liberated
- The assumption about current status - student needs to understand that there are seven distinct ways of knowing. is that true? is that right?
- Another assumption is that students need to know all of those seven ways of knowing? How is knowledge produced?
- Perhaps we could urge completion of these courses in the first couple years. We should think about this developmentally - different stages of their four years.
- How can we change how students think about these courses? To have knowledge about the things we think are important for them rather than having students "getting these
courses out of the way”.

- One approach is to figure out a way to have grand challenges courses, with grand challenges faculty - these are the core things/themes built in (work in groups, evaluate facts, etc.) - a few interdisciplinary courses.
- Also think about how students are being taught in high school.
- What flexibility can be built in to accommodate very good students who do not have any interest in certain areas?
- Student could test out of a course - e.g., language
- If we have a math class, then students should take a math class, not talk about math. Why don't students all take calc 1? However, that would be based on the notion that all students start from the same place - and they don't.
- Students don't care about the difference necessarily between a core and a theme. Or a triple dip - a core, a theme, and WI - fills a slot.
- What we lose if we moved away from courses that introduce certain ways of knowing/thinking?
- You could go broad and never go deep. You could lose the depth if care isn't taken to avoid that.
- One challenge - the timing - it would be nice to have a system that was able to be more responsive to current events. For example, it would be great to be able to respond to refugee/immigrant quickly, but figure out a way not to have 20 classes offered on the subject.
- Question/suggestion: for the biological science and physical sciences, both have lab requirements. Is this really necessary? In other words, could chemistry be offered with dry labs? Or could we have a requirement for a courses with only one lab requirement?
- There are both technical and adaptive problems associated with reviewing the LE requirements.