

- Philosophers and men dominated this conversation *but* should keep the focus on the big questions – esp how to live *meaningful, purposeful lives in community* (which writing, reasoning, and creativity contribute to but what about empowerment? Community? Relationship tools? Phys and financial health?)
- Don't drop the equivalent of global perspectives (MCG)
- FYS:
  - FYW *must be* a discrete course
  - Moving students as a cohort may be problematic – more flexibility
  - Staffing – please prepare a staffing model of FTE
  - How did the committee use assessment data to arrive at this model?
  - Students will not have a common experience, as much as we desire it and shape it. They bring experiences that shape their transition
- Writing in the major must be part of a requirement or we'll repeat problem of last curriculum
- So perhaps ethics could be like WRI now? 4 courses? Across the curriculum anywhere?
- Concerns about proposed GE:
  - This curriculum is big (assuming “double dipping” is not allowed) and would represent 50% of a 32-course graduation requirement
  - The curriculum proposed includes essentially 2 Religion courses. I think this is too many and students can make different courses.
- I disagree with argument that students *must* take an ethics course. “Values” are in the Religions Faith and Values requirement – should be added as an ILO, that's sufficient
- Agree with Danny M-H about history taking a bit of a narrow view
- Don't understand the creativity requirement at all
- Intrigued by Francesca's comment that art and music should count as experiential learning
- Agree with Irve that proposal is still too big
- Quant reasoning needs a little help, but am confident it will work out in the end
- I support the linked common courses in the first year seminar to build community and the ILOs. I think integration and synthesis has the potential to be developed here, but I'm not sure how it will be accomplished.
- I think choice is important. I'm not sure that SPM needs to be required. What about *wellness* more generally? I'd really like to see advising guidelines and wisdom shared in alignment with GE revision.
- Ideas about Reflection/Integration – prioritizing as an important skill
- When I think about Question 2, I also think about ethics, prioritizing or decision making, wellness, and financial literacy – reasoning with data especially
  - Question 1 → storytelling
- For Power, Inequity, and Race, I noted that those ILOs are about the USA, but I'm not sure why? Couldn't students learn about those topics in other contexts? Couldn't that be valuable?
- For Experiential Learning there seems like too much for *one* course to handle. The ILOs talk about global AND domestic engagement. It strikes me that *one* off-campus or one ACE won't be able to pull all of that
- Would love to see more connectivity between categories, and think certain areas like the arts and experiential learning need to be noted in most areas in the same way we need to see interaction between the natural sciences → space, power, environment, arts, etc.

- Where is the study of the Humanities in this curriculum? Philosophy, Lit, Art?
- Entire document misuses word “theology”
- Curriculum shifts entirely to MCD concerns. What global concerns?
- How can we mandate study of creativity but no study of content of the arts (drama, music, literature, art history, dance...?)
- 1 science without a lab???
- Gap between study of creativity without content of art, dance, lit, etc-anywhere in core.
- SRAP already gutted Humanities. Why did you? H2O2 here for “makers of a better world.”
- SPM courses need to stay as a GE requirement!!
- Experiential education
- Need for Ethics requirement
- Need for an Art/Literature requirement
- Need for integration - not just an assemblage of “skills”
- The history requirement is far too nominally specified
- Thank you so much for all the work you have put in this draft. I have a couple of observations:
  - The first 10 or 11 people to speak were tenured male faculty. I think this is very telling: certain people feel more comfortable or more empowered to speak publicly on these topics. I agree that this should be a full faculty discussion, but I think that this approach inadvertently favors a certain group of people. Pre-tenure/non-tenure-track faculty and students must be heard in these public meetings, without feeling that there may be reprisals from more established voices.
  - I would really like to hear more about the first-year seminar models. I really love this idea!
  - Someone mentioned that people may have difficulty envisaging interdisciplinary courses/opportunities. I agree, and think that a quick primer on what interdisciplinary truly is would be helpful and help allay some concerns.
  - Again, thank you for this draft! I think there is much more in it to celebrate and refine than to nitpick and condemn.
- Thank you for your hard work on this - it is helpful to see it all written down in order to continue productive discussions.
- I am very concerned to see that the natural sciences do not require a lab - that is where the “magic” happens and how a solid understanding of how science works occurs. We need a lab. Fits experiential learning.
- I am disappointed not to see something explicitly connecting students to the natural world. The challenge of this upcoming generation is climate change and global resources. We need students to connect to nature. (Could be ethics, religion, literature, environment studies, ecology, etc.)
- Creativity: Interesting idea, but I think needs to be split into 2 courses, one focused on ART - experiential/creating/doing.
- Ethics: we need ethics! More in today’s world than ever. I would like to see 1 less religion and add in 1 required ethics course.
- I’d like to see 1 less foreign language requirement, which could free up space for ethics. Students in collaboration from mentors can decide if they need more.

- Natural sciences: coming back to this, I believe our attempt to understand how we work, how the world works, how non-humans work, the scientific method base is foundational. We need to see scientific method as an ILO for natural sciences.
- Lack of ethics in curriculum as central
- Ethics - where in curriculum/GE? Optional = embedded in several other requirements. Ethical reasoning skills in Rel, Faith, Values; Power, Inequity, Race; Exp Learning
- PE - embodiment - nature very important for integrative education as experiential education.
- History - only to serve race/power other modes of historical investigations
- Question: Can we name how we'll prioritize who speaks before beginning?
- Physical health, wellness, activity - make this a requirement - tactile, kinesthetic knowing.
- Need to include computing somewhere (in 2019)!
- I don't think we need a physical education requirement.
- Incorporating ethics is a sound idea, assuming it's integrated into the currently articulated "Religions, Faith & Values" section, i.e. not adding a course.
- The reorientation of writing sounds really good!
- I agree with Kari that we can move the questions to the "top" of the document, rather than limiting the "answer" to each question. Moving them to the top might also help the fighting about which course goes where, or who is left out of each section.
- NICE WORK!!!
- Concern with ethics.
  - Q1. Place for ethics?
  - Scope for requirements?
  - Might be others?
- Concern for Art/Lit? (Place in the curriculum)
- Concern of social context of science
- Student reflection - space in curriculum
- Concern for cut of SPM (mental & physical health)
- Not bold/not innovative
- Power inequity race in one place
- Lack of SPM, importance of being embodied
- Historical perspectives too much P|R|I
- Natural Science a whole course? Can Nat Science do this?
- Writing distribution/ways of knowing what's possible?
- Broader natural sciences
- Writing - mistake to cut the writing requirement
- Required vs Possible. Strive to be literal/concrete. Mistake to put experiential learning in its own context (e.g music, art)
- Questions are meaningful yet how do they guide the discussion?
- How big is the core? What should happen in the major as opposed to the core?
- Risk not taking disciplinary options
- Expediency in organizing the questions.
- Comments about Nat Science requirement Social Science issues with Humanities.
- Question about inequity with no course on equity.

- Power as the only way to understanding social systems
  - Social Science requirements e.g data & empiricism
- Need to hear from students
- Ungenerous readings?
- Aspirations - what do our students hope for? Liberal Artisans
- Ethics requirement, based in mission statement. Shouldn't Q1 include arts and literature?
- I'm concerned about the ILOs for the first-year seminar, specifically ILO 3. ILO 3 is the only one of the four proposed ILOs that deals with the content of the seminar rather than a method or skills. It comes uncomfortably close to dictating to professors what they ought to be teaching in their courses.
  - I also very much agree with Danny Muñoz-Hutchinson that histories of power, race, and inequity are not the only histories, nor, necessarily, the most important histories. Not every history course should be required to focus on this. Again, it comes uncomfortably close to dictating what should be taught (and what should not) in individual classrooms.
- On the whole, this document seems to privilege the social sciences over other ways of knowing. E.g. why are natural sciences an "intellectual pursuit" which "come to be appreciated" while it's social sciences that grant "the ability to apply methods and content across disciplines"? Don't the natural sciences and humanities and fine arts also grant this ability?
- "Power, Inequity, and Race" I wonder why race is privileged here. The ILOs mention "other forms of structured inequity such as gender, religion, sexual orientation, and social class." Why put race in a different category than these others? Does this tie us to a way of thinking that may not age well as we prepare for the future? Would it make more sense to have a broader category - "Distributions of Power"?
- What's missing?
  - Ethics - Normative enquiry.
  - Reflective - critical reflection.
  - Learn how to reflect meaningfully
  - Integration. Tell the story of what they learned.
- What's left to do
  - Drilling down ILOs
  - portfolio
  - This is the core curriculum?
  - Art & Lit – Question 1
- What's out and why?
  - What is the vision for General Education?
  - Distribution requirements
  - Not bold, not innovative, not inspiring (Irve) I agree
  - Check off approach. 1 course - 1 requirement
  - Content more distributed. Peter's (Modular approach)
  - Diane LeBlanc - Ways of Knowing Distribution – Creativity, Physical Activity.
    - What's required?/ What's possible? Not sure what this means
- Interdisciplinary - where?
  - Generation of knowledge
  - Nature and limits

- No critical reflection!!! (again) just disciplinary course. Distribution model.
- This proposal seems to me to throw the history and tradition and mission of the college under the bus. It replaces Biblical studies, Christian theology and Ethics with loose study of comparative religions and theologies. It replaces two courses in Western culture with a single course in any history. It is full of left wing progressive jargon about power, inequity etc.
- Clarification on nature of FYS (which disciplines are represented)
- Agree that ethics are important for living meaningful/responsible life
- Agree that Art & Literature should be included
- If no lab component is required, students should learn about scientific method and structure of scientific inquiry.
- I like the matrix approach to GE introduced by Ad Hoc Group 1
- Writing requirements should be more rigorous → ability to communicate coherently distinguishes liberal arts students from students graduating from other types of institutions.
  - Can you require students to take 1 writing course in their general field of study.
- Agree that GE should be constructive and contain reflection pieces so that students feel empowered to go out into the world and create and improve our world.
- Ethics should be part of “Religions, Faith, and Values.” It fits neatly in there. Just takes a minor edit. There are already ILOs that speak to ethics - let’s adopt them.
- Art & Literature should be a way to answer Question 1. But maybe students choose 5 of 7 courses not in their home major(s) to answer that question.
- Can we still add ILOs within existing distribution categories? What is fixed, and what is revisable?
- The second ILO for the Natural Sciences course is too narrow, as it limits the application of Natural Sciences to Social Science and some fields within the humanities. I feel that exploring connections between Fine Arts and science
- No ethics → unacceptable.
- No Christian content in the religion requirements - Need bible
- Reduction of History
- Reduction of Science education and lab requirement.
- Need specific arts/music. Creativity too vague
- Confusing use of “Theology”
  - Needs 50% Christian Theology
  - Needs *not* to be applied to traditions where the category is foreign.
- Need a literature requirement
- Global concerns need a cognitive/theoretical unit.
- I feel strongly that the religion requirement include a specific Christian element along with interfaith elements
- I believe that the proposed science requirement is watered down. There should be a required lab.
- There is an imbalance between the writing (too large) and quantitative (too small) requirement
- There is an overweight in the proposed Core to issue of power and privilege.
- I believe the omission of an explicit Ethics and philosophy course is odd/not good

- I am concerned about the one – and only one – course required for question #3. Not only should there be a class/requirement that explicitly helps students reflect on responsible living – *and* service, but also a “capstone” like requirement – perhaps in the major – bookending their St. Olaf experience. FY : Capstone bookends = high impact learning
- This is a minimalist GE, and thus far it isn’t at all clear that the majority of students or faculty desire a minimalist approach. And why the choice of the attribute model? There hasn’t been an explanation for that choice, and the faculty ought to have an answer to that.
- There must be some version of an EIN course – general education ethics course
- Race and inequity course begs important questions that ought to be left open for liberal arts inquiry. For example, class is as important as race to consider. Moreover, some see racism as an expression of something deeper – e.g., the general lust to dominate others. A course might be about freedom and oppression (racism might be one instance of the latter). There are other theories and foci. And there are other major issues other than race.
- As WRI was described, it would still result in 2 fewer experiences with intensive writing
- This doesn’t seem like a liberal arts education; it seems like an indoctrination in left wing secular orthodoxy. We’re already an institution of mostly liberal progressives, do we really want to take a sharp turn even further to the left?

#### Comments written directly on draft curriculum/ILOs sheets

- Historical perspectives ILO: this is only one perspective. What about gender? Technology?
- SPM needs to remain as a core requirement. Call it something else if need to change name for a fresh start. It is experiential learning.
- Can ethics be woven into courses throughout? Ethics here? [in Religions, Faith, and Values]
- Can experiential learning incorporate reflection piece? Permeates the curriculum – distributed!!! Like writing within the major
- [Question mark by ILOs under World Languages and Cultures] empathy/intercultural competence
- I believe there needs to be more attention given to ethics and philosophy
- Creativity: People who teach art and lit are wondering – does this include the critical study of art and literature – (aesthetic)
- Social Sciences: Isn’t the Power course going to overlap here?
- World Languages and Cultures: Why does FOL get ¼ of new GE? This is too much. Reduce by at least 1 course
- [Question mark by Creativity]
- First-Year Seminar: Why 2 semesters? I’m having trouble imagining enough content plus students at other schools I’ve talked to have not been impressed by such seminars. Religions, Faith, and Values: Here too, why 2 semesters?
- Historical Perspectives: Why perspectives? Trying to figure out how you imagine this.
- Writing in Context: Seems like not enough writing to only require one class
- Question 3: global society – How will internships do this for students? Why not a global course?
- I too was disappointed by what seems mostly like a modernized list of requirements that cuts some and emphasizes others. I was really hoping for a skill-based core – media literacy, writing, research, etc.

- Add “Art and Literature” under Question 1
- GE ≠ curriculum
- This is the proposal for courses, but is there room for adding ILOs to match current practice
- There needs to be consistent numbers of ILOs across requirements
- Question 1:
  - Study of literature as primary means that we have done this for centuries. Narrative, story telling
  - Literature is also the means we have of understanding the world empathetically rather than simply analytically
- World Languages and Cultures: But no course that emphasizes the study of the English language? Doesn't serve our increasing pool of international students. Closely examining language is essential tool for understanding the world and role in it.
- Philosophy/ethics
- ILOs: Nearly 50% of our students take courses or have experiences in the arts – a critical way of understanding the world and one's self. The fine arts should be represented under question 1.
- Question 1 ILOs: Arts?
- Writing in Context ILOs: How does this/can this materialize in other areas vs. being siloed/sequestered
- ILOs: Experiential – how is this nested throughout?
- Social Sciences: What if we do this for all – SS, NS, HUM, FA, and ID exp.
- Power, Inequity, and Race ILOs: Across the curriculum?
- Natural Sciences ILOs: ability to use a variety of disciplinary perspectives in addition to NS to other areas of interest
- Critical reflection
- Natural Sciences ILOs: Require social context!
- Social Sciences ILOs: These are highly bent toward sociology, rather than a broader social science perspective. Principles of economics would not fit these and for principles of econ to not count for a “social science” credit is a political statement. There should be a consensus among social science faculty about what constitutes SS.
  - “Cultural production” – not in econ. Other important things are central to econ that I would not impose on a sociology course.
  - “Self-knowledge” – what does this mean in this context?
  - “Historical....contexts” – covered under Historical Perspectives and not always central to every social science
  - “Content across disciplines” – trying to do everything
- Experiential Learning ILOs: I worry greatly about making internships part of GE, if they require faculty supervision
  - 1) Equity issues . . . students who can't afford this during summer
  - 2) Faculty burden during summers . . . research?
- I strongly support the inclusion of an ethics component. It doesn't need the Christian component it has now, but it is central.
- The first-year sequence is an amazing opportunity for collaboration between faculty . . . I would like students to see more collaboration and disagreement between faculty.

- The woman at the end got it . . . we need to teach to build, not just tear down.
- Love the Ole Core name
- Religions, Faith, and Values ILOs: Something about human flourishing, skills in ethical reasoning
- Power, Inequity, and Race ILOs: Skills in active listening and respectful discussion
  - Integrate everywhere
- Historical Perspectives ILOs: Maybe add another so not only re: equity and race
- Experiential Learning ILOs: with active reflection
- A wellness requirement?
- Question 1 ILOs: Add a role for ethical reasoning here
- I agree with David Booth that art and literature merit inclusion
- Power, Inequity, and Race ILOs: too much focus on power and privilege
- Historical Perspectives ILOs: Broaden. There is more to history than this.
- Natural Sciences ILO 2: Excellent, but too narrow. Better to broaden this. “Students will gain the ability to use a variety of disciplinary perspectives, within or in addition to the natural sciences, to understand an issue or topic.”
- I long for a GE that fosters an ideal and aspiration, not only analysis of what is wrong.
- First-Year Seminar: I suspect that there will be huge logistical staffing issues
  - My questions are largely about logistics and implementation. In all cases, questions continue about who will determine how these are fleshed out.
- Power, Inequity, and Race ILOs: Will this have some global focus?
- Experiential Learning: Needs a second course that is constructive. It might be specifically an ethics course, but perhaps not the same as the current EIN.
- I’m hearing the ghost of Jim Farrell – how do we foster liberal artisans – makers of constructive meaning. So much depends on the actual courses. I am eager to consider how this gives me opportunities to develop revised and new courses.
- First-Year Seminar: Great idea – would be nice to have the first instructor be the faculty advisor
- Natural Sciences: If the course does not have a laboratory it should have a significant activity emphasis in class.
- Experiential Learning: This is great
- Would be nice to see how this is implemented so it’s not just “old GE 2.0”
- Religions, Faith, and Values: Basically seems like BTS-B,T rephrased. Unless these things are incorporated into other courses.
  - Should not be primarily in Religion department. Want to think more open about how this is accomplished.
  - Add “Ethics” to Critical Understanding of Religions, Faith, and Values course
- Natural Sciences/Social Sciences: “NS/SS tools” → meaning? Rather have an ILO guide the requirements
- Only have a seminar each year? Progressively addressing various things people want to see, but linked (and not old GE model). That could be all that’s truly required, giving various specific (inter)disciplinary options.
  - Or, course clusters (2 paired things, etc.) that have a common theme, but can individually have their own “topic” or discipline.
- I still like the 3 questions very much.



- Surreal to leave out ethics
- First-Year Seminar: Bad idea. I hope this is furniture? *Really* hard to be the 2<sup>nd</sup> prof
- Religions, Faith, and Values: “Typically offered through the Religion Department” – This is inappropriate as “house”/policy. No one department should monopolize a GE in this framework.
- Power, Inequity, and Race: No longer sensible with elimination of MCG. Parochial. Our students are supposed to develop global perspectives
- Historical Perspectives: “hierarchies of power, identities, traditions” – I agree with what Danny said. History has more, broader questions that should not be silenced.
- Hang in there you all!
- Religions, Faith, and Values ILOs: We are giving away our ability to discuss ethics – secular as equivalent to ethics – religious through this titling
  - Word “Religions” and “theological” puts Abrahamic religions in dominant position for all time.
- Power, Inequity, and Race ILOs: Out of line with mission commitment to global perspectives. Parochial. If we eliminate MCG – should not keep MCD. Power, Inequity, and Race are transnational and transcultural.
- Religions, Faith, and Values: Need to be embedded in all areas. Part of our mission (even though it is NOT explicitly addressed in it)
  - Liberal artisans; makers of a better world → Jim Farrell
- Could all faculty train in EIN so that we can all incorporate into our courses?
- Power, Inequity, and Race: Equity? And agency.
- All of these [3 questions] should intersect, overlap, inform, rather than compartmentalize the different areas
- Creativity: This could be enhanced
- Experiential Learning: Rather than a course, a series of experiences and tie to the rest of the curriculum
- Modules – I would prefer this (although it would be messier)
- Appreciated/second Diane LeBlanc’s comment
  - Ways of knowing vs. distributions
  - What’s required? And what’s possible? I would like to take a chance on this model. How might we imagine this – echoing Paul Jackson’s point
- Here, here! Brian Borowski’s revised ILO of applying sciences to other areas
- Not only learning, awareness but could we add DOING – is this the reflection piece??