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

- **Current LE structure**
  - **Advantages**
    - The current LE model is flexible across colleges, which is less of a hinderance to transfer students than a ‘siloed’ approach
    - LE requirements are useful to undecided students
    - There are lot of choices for core and theme courses
    - Compared to other countries, our high school students do not get the chance to explore education across a broad range of topics. College gives American students the opportunity to explore, especially with University wide LE; a collegiate unit LE model would inhibit curiosity
  - **Disadvantages**
    - The current funding model hinders cross-disciplinary thinking. LE requirements are used by departments to grab enrollment and disregard expertise from other departments, (ie: Carlson offering ‘Spanish for business’ instead of sending students to CLA for Spanish classes). Competition for enrollment drives the LE structure, not thoughtful curriculum building.
    - It is extremely burdensome for faculty to get courses approved. Some departments find themselves making prefilled ‘template’ applications for faculty, so that answers are framed to increase chances of approval. After receiving certification, classes are not assessed to ensure that the LE requirement is actually being taught; accountability is syllabus rather than classroom focused and reapproval only occurs every 5 years.
    - These courses should teach students a way of knowing rather than being introductory or prerequisite-type courses for specific departments. A lot of departments don’t change their teaching methodology to accommodate students across disciplines.
    - Courses are mostly taught by adjunct faculty
    - The international student population struggles with LE the most. One participant grades for errors of organization, argument, and evidence only, rather than errors related to exposure to English (marking but not grading for spelling and grammar). She now uses this double grading system for all her students. Are there collegiate or University-wide measures to address this issue?
    - There is no vetting process for AP courses, yet incoming students use them to opt out of classes quite easily. They theoretically satisfy a requirement, but don’t prepare students for future levels of coursework. AP is based on a multiple choice test and therefore relates to rote learning rather than deep thinking. PSEO is different because students gain University experience, and IB also includes a slightly more in-depth assessment than AP.
Students benefit from interdisciplinary work, but LE certification is more labor intensive than MOU.

It is difficult to certify a course for LE if it has prerequisites. Many courses are lower division and do not delve deep; students check them off in their first few semesters at the University.

An advisor mentioned that many of her students want more online LE courses. They are driven by what fits within their schedule rather than what interests them/ Are they really gaining LE perspectives?

Saint Paul has many opportunities to offer, but it is difficult to bring students to campus. Travel time eats at least 2 class periods. The bikeway and transitway help, but even more improvement is required. It is important for students to experience expertise from faculty in STP fields.

### Important LE components
- **Writing**: should be taught to a high degree with upper division courses. The current requirement is separate from LE core and themes, but works.
- **Computer science**: students engage in unethical behavior with technology; they need to learn rules of privacy and engagement.
- **Grand challenges** address topics that are important and relevant to the world we live in. But it is difficult for transfer students to engage with GCC courses.
- **Core and theme topics** are important and incorporate ‘real world’ skills. Pushback from another participant: the courses are surface level, they do not fully engage students in critical thinking practices.

### Hypothetical LE scenarios
- More flexibility for students and faculty: faculty could be given the opportunity to integrate lib eds into all their courses. Pushback: some faculty prefer stay exclusively within their disciplinary lanes.
- LE could provide general guidelines rather than specific course requirements, such as: a student must take a particular number of credits outside of their designated college.
- Go back to individual college LE requirements instead of University-wide.
- Broaden the perspective of where themes apply; they work in any department.
- What has changed in the last 10 years? The digital ecosystem. All students don’t need to program, but digital proficiency could be integrated across the curriculum similarly to the writing requirement.
- The current template is created with a general student in mind. A different approach: to create requirements for specific fields of study that are offered by outside departments/colleges or are co-taught between departments (ie: writing for computer science, taught in the writing department).

### Cross-disciplinary model
- LE requirements should incentivize interdisciplinary, intercultural work: in fact, these themes should be imbedded in the LE model as a whole.
- An advisor noted that students love taking interdisciplinary courses. They find real value in unexpected conversations across disciplines, and ‘double-dipping’ lightens their course loads; many study abroad courses already include these components.
- As it stands, Arts & Humanities and Literature are the only classes that a CFANS student needs to take outside of the college. Different course structures, perhaps co-taught with enrollment money split between departments, could encourage cross-
Summary of discussion (300 to 500 words):

The discussion group included directors, advisors, and professors in Computer Science, Classical and Near Eastern Studies, International Programs, and CFANS including Horticultural Science. The Provost’s introduction was different than at the previous forum, and as a result the conversation veered towards the topics of budget, previous LE models, and the MN transfer curriculum more-so than uninhibited brainstorming. The participants focused mostly on the pros and cons of collegiate unit versus university-wide LE models; concluding that the current University-wide system could do more to incentivize both interdisciplinary LE coursework between fields, and in-depth LE exploration within fields. A participant noted the merits of interdisciplinary coursework, citing that writing is shortchanged in computer science but written and verbal communication skills are integral to successful post-graduation experiences. Another hoped for increased student immersion in complex subject matter. Two models were proposed: (A) Imbed LE requirements in college or department curriculum with cross-disciplinary courses (B) Continue with University-wide requirements. The first would keep money and students in departments with particular specialties, and the second would encourage students to take classes from different departments and colleges. One participant noted that uprooting a system entirely is a huge transition for students and is disruptive to learning for several years. He asserted that the current system is not broken, it needs to be tweaked; the rest of the table seemed to agree. They also agreed upon the idea that the breadth of knowledge provided by liberal education is an immense strength which leads to innovation in many fields. However, changes to the model are required to allow faculty greater flexibility, and encourage heightened curiosity in students. Currently students are provided surface-level primer courses which they struggle to fit into their schedules. The group was concerned about students engaging in LE curriculum in its entirety, asking, ‘how many students test out of liberal education requirements?’

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

Several of the group-members were critical of administrative functions at the university. Throughout the conversation they tried to interpret the purpose of LE and budgetary structures. A few participants were skeptical of the results of previous, current, and future LE models. While the table expressed consensus about most topics, the conversation had points of tension.