

Most comments from faculty focused on concerns over what seems to be left out of the draft curriculum:

- Many were concerned about the lack of an ethics requirement. This could fit within the Religions, Faith, and Values requirement, or, as some argued, should be woven throughout the entire curriculum.
- Many noted that while an MCD equivalent remains within the Power, Inequity, and Race requirement, there is no longer a clear MCG counterpart. Faculty expressed concern that this leaves us falling short of our mission to educate global citizens.
 - Several faculty also thought that the Historical Perspectives focus was too narrow, and that the primary lenses of race and power for both this and the Power, Inequity, and Race requirements leave out other important issues and perspectives.
- An explicit reference to the study of art and literature also seems to be missing. Several felt that the Creativity requirement does not capture this, and that these areas of study should also appear under Question 1.
- Several faculty thought that the writing requirement was reduced too much.
 - Some want writing within the major to be required.
- Some faculty repeated concerns raised within the poster session comments that the Natural Sciences requirement does not require a lab.
 - A few also thought that the ILOs here (and for Social Sciences) are too narrow.
- Some questioned the lack of an SPM equivalent and thought that a mental/physical health and wellness requirement was necessary.
- A few faculty thought that there was not enough reflection built into the curriculum. Some noted that this is especially critical for the Experiential Learning component, and thought that this component should require an actual course in addition to an experiential piece.
- Some worried about staffing and resources for the First-Year Seminar and Experiential Learning components.

Some faculty thought that the draft Core Curriculum was too similar to the current distribution/attribute model and should do more than simply create “GE 2.0.”

- A few suggested keeping the OLE questions at a higher level rather than using them to categorize parts of the curriculum. They should be answered by the curriculum as a whole, not a selection of requirements.

Still, many expressed gratitude to the GE Task Force for their hard work this year and specifically in crafting this draft.

- Some cautioned, however, that attention must be paid in the future to hearing feedback from all faculty; they felt that the conversation at the faculty meeting was dominated by tenured, male faculty.