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

1. Beyond disciplinary competency, what are the important attributes (knowledge, perspectives, and skills) that should characterize U of M graduates and be addressed in a new liberal education curriculum?
   - Students should be given the ability and choice to challenge themselves
     - Be able to take diversified classes without worrying about the outcome
     - For example, transcripts can note the inherent difficult of a class the student is taking
     - Increase number of classes with satisfactory/ non-satisfactory grading
   - Students should be able to satisfy their curiosity
     - Should be able to take the courses they want to take without worry about graduating on time
     - Should be able to take courses that they are interested in
     - There should not be a mentality of “getting rid” of requirements
   - Students should be able to make their own choices
     - Should be able to pursue their interests without being micromanaged by the system
     - Should not be forced into a box
       ✤ Although, some students may like the rigidity of the system since they do not have a set framework of what they want to do when they enter college, others may want more freedom with choosing their learning

2. How should the curriculum be designed in order to help students cultivate these attributes?
   - Remove the theme requirements and reduce the core requirements
     - There is more opportunity for depth into a certain discipline
     - More opportunity for students to develop skills in areas they have curiosity in
   - Redesign the theme/core certification process
     - Highly bureaucratic process which is a disaster for faculty
     - Some faculty are unable to get the proper certification for their courses since they do not have time, or do not use the right vocabulary in their applications

3. Reflecting on the current liberal education curriculum: Are there components that should be retained? Is there anything that is overemphasized? Is there anything that is missing?
   - The curriculum reflects a distrust of faculty and students
     - Faculty are required to get their courses certified so they can qualify for the theme/core, despite themselves being an expert in that field
✧ Ex. A Shakespeare course does not satisfy the literature core even though it is taught by an English professor

● Departments are pitted against each other
  ➢ They are fighting with each other to enroll more students in their courses for budgetary reasons
  ➢ Anybody on campus can offer a course that meets any of the themes/cores as long as the language they use on the application matches what the certification committee is looking for. This undermines other colleges where the lib-ed courses are areas of expertise of the faculty.
  ✧ Not necessarily a cross-discipline challenge since the actual department of the discipline is not acknowledged
  ➢ Students are not given a choice

● Can keep the cores and remove the themes

● Process for certification of courses is a disaster
  ➢ Difficult for faculty to get certification for their courses
  ➢ Many faculty in STEM disciplines do not have the incentive to get certification for the courses they teach since the students have to take the classes. They do not have the incentive for budget pushing them.

Summary of discussion (300 to 500 words):

In general, the table seemed to agree that the current Liberal Education system needed to go through a serious revision. One of the main points of revision that was talked about was the current certification system. There was a general consensus that the current system to get a course certified in a core/theme was a “disaster for faculty”, because of the highly bureaucratic process. Many people argued that it didn’t make sense that a course taught by a faculty specializing in that particular core discipline had to be certified for students to fulfill the core/theme requirements. Additionally, the application requires a lot of time to be filled out, and the faculty must use certain phrases to meet the requirements and get their courses certified.

Depending on the department, some faculty have no incentive to even get their courses certified. For example, many instructors of STEM disciplines do not apply for certification since the courses they teach are required for students of the disciplines. There is no budgetary incentive that pushes them, so there are many STEM students that have to take the “technology and society” theme courses in other colleges.

Furthermore, the current system pits different colleges and departments against each other. Since having a higher student enrollment leads to higher budgets, many faculty from departments not related to the core/theme are offering certified courses to the students. This makes it very hard for the original departments to attract students, especially if they do not offer courses with certifications, and undermines the expertise of the faculty.

The current system is not beneficial for students as well. Students who do not have much space in their schedule are forced to take classes that they are not interested in to fulfill the requirements for graduation. They are not given a choice and are not able to satisfy their curiosity without risk of a delayed graduation time.
Finally, the faculty at the table thought that it would be better for this issue of revision to go to the faculty senate.

Additional context (characterize level of consensus/lack of consensus, tone and tenor of conversation, other notable aspects of the discussion):
Most people seemed to be in consensus regarding the ideas. The overall tone was quite negative towards the liberal education, but many good ideas were discussed.