

Updated Report and Recommendations: General Education at the University of Minnesota (October 29, 2019)

Abstract

This updated report is the result of a two-year, often intense and simultaneously collaborative, effort of the Liberal Education Redesign Committee (LERC) to update and redefine the core undergraduate curriculum of the University of Minnesota. It retains much of the work and all of the fresh elements of the September 2019 report. These include a redesigned review process for new courses, redefinitions of course categories in the General Education curriculum, and a new Fundamentals category that will create overlay of Ethics and Quantitative Reasoning and Mathematics in a model that echoes Writing Intensive courses. After determining that key elements of the current curriculum remain essential, the LERC reconsidered every aspect of that curriculum and thought creatively about issues raised in the 2017 Liberal Education (LE) Pre-Planning faculty forums including double-certification of courses and the certification process. Throughout the process the LERC remained sensitive to the issue of credit hours.

Initially, the LERC committee, reflecting concerns expressed at earlier all-faculty forums, viewed double-certification between Themes and Disciplines as a key problem of the current LE model. After much discussion of various frameworks, members agreed that the LE redesign should endorse courses that are either a Theme or a Discipline, not both. Courses with a single focus would then have greater depth, encourage themes toward more interdisciplinarity, encourage students to choose courses they are most interested in, and reduce pressure on faculty to create courses that fulfill more than one requirement at the expense of courses they really want to teach. The original Plans A, B, and C were designed with those concerns in mind. Concerns about limiting the overall credit hours, resulted in a series of plans (A, B, and C) that reduced Thematic Inquiry and/or Disciplinary Inquiry requirements.

After public distribution of the report through an online forum and other meetings, Plan A emerged as the preference among the three plans because it retained six Disciplinary Inquiry courses. Some committee members, reluctantly accepting the limit thus required in the number of Thematic Inquiry courses, recommended that students select one course in each of two broad categories, one reflecting national or global diversity and the other issues of science and technology. At the same time, other committee members persisted in thinking that the cost of fewer Thematic Inquiry courses was too steep and preferred retaining the option of double-certification between Disciplinary and Thematic Inquiry courses. Plan D retains the six Disciplinary Inquiry and the four Thematic Inquiry course requirements. Plan D allows for dual-though not triple-certified courses.

Both plans endorse a new General Education Committee that relies on new processes of course review for Disciplinary Inquiry and Fundamental courses and the establishment of Faculty Learning Communities to review and support instructors teaching Thematic Inquiry courses. This updated report presents [Plan A](#) and [Plan D](#). Visuals for each plan are attached.

Background

Based on feedback from the University of Minnesota Strategic Plan, in Fall 2015 the Office of the Provost created a Liberal Education Pre-Planning Committee to determine if changes in the current requirements, established in 2008, should be considered. This committee hosted three campus-wide listening sessions and, based on these and additional feedback from the University community, determined that there was support for considering a redesign of the required curriculum for University of Minnesota undergraduates. The Liberal Education Redesign Committee (LERC), with twenty faculty (Appendix B) representing all undergraduate colleges, was appointed in fall 2017 by Provost Hanson. It began its deliberations by thinking creatively about what basic educational experiences were essential for a college graduate in the decade of the 2020s. Members looked closely at newly revised General Education and required curriculum at similar institutions and then gathered considerable data for U of M students including: patterns of course selection, demographics (e.g. by college, student admit type), and prior credit (e.g. AP, PSEO, and transfer credit). The LERC solicited comments from all undergraduate colleges, and the chair of the committee met in Spring 2019 with the Advising Steering Committee of staff advisors, the Vice Provost's Undergraduate Advisory Board, the Minnesota Student Association, the Faculty Consultative Committee, and others on request.

Members generally approved of the elements in the current LE curriculum and found them similar to those in other universities. At the same time, committee members identified some problematic aspects and agreed it would be useful to review all the requirements, reevaluate and update definitions, and discuss overall frameworks and requirements. The range of opinions was wide, from an advocate for a "genuine" liberal education required of all students to another advocate who recommended allowing individual faculty to determine course eligibility, a model that would allow most courses to meet a GE requirement. Most committee members, however, preferred a model that built on and improved many of the current LE requirements.

Committee discussions were set against ongoing commentary about what various observers viewed as problematic within the current system. Quite early, members pointed out that the process of selecting and developing courses to meet requirements too often seems complex, confusing, and burdensome to students and faculty. For undergraduate students, the apparent "matrix" appeared to produce a check-list mentality as they try to match Designated Theme and Diversified Core courses in order to satisfy both categories (double counted courses). Committee members were concerned that that often unnecessary search for efficiency distracts students from thinking more broadly about the possibilities in curriculum and identifying courses and topics that particularly interest them. Some committee members also commented that the current system establishes incentives for departments and faculty to design courses that satisfy both a Designated Theme and Diversified Core in order to attract a large number of students into a select number of courses. At the end of these debates, some LERC concluded that the best response to these issues was a GE system where Disciplinary and Thematic Inquiry courses have a strong, singular focus without an incentive system that pushes toward dual identity. Other members of the LERC believe that given the credit unit constraints,

the only way to ensure that students have access to all the Disciplinary and Thematic Inquiry courses is to allow to the dual certification of courses in these two categories.

There were additional issues raised: was the current configuration among arts, humanities, and literature the right one; what was the best way to incorporate quantitative thinking and mathematics; how might ethics be integrated throughout the four years and perhaps within the major; and what is needed to rethink the descriptions of required courses and, at the core of making final decisions about the framework, what is the right balance and number of credits if each course were to meet just one requirement? Some committee members also argued for more opportunities to teach collaborative courses across units, especially on issues of justice across geographical scales and engagement with diverse ways of knowing. Through often intense conversations, committee members reiterated their confidence in the strength of our faculty and the discernment of our students. They recommend a system that will allow and even encourage undergraduates to explore and learn about the multiple ways that knowledge is generated, disseminated, and critiqued. At the same time, the committee also sought to identify several key issues that the coming generation of students will need to address and that require informed analysis and critical thinking. The LERC wrestled with how to balance these elements and possibilities. The initial report was the product of negotiation and compromise among the dedicated and diverse group of faculty named in Appendix B. It also reflected the ongoing tension about the total number of course credits in the required curriculum, given the constraints of some majors. As a result, the committee set 30 credits as a ceiling for meeting the requirements. Some of those would likely overlap with major requirements while, at the same time, students might elect to take more courses in that curriculum.

Goals of the Proposed General Education Curriculum

The LERC faculty have been aspirational in hoping that the new curriculum will provide renewed attention to the goals of collegiate education. Renewal seems important in reconsidering a curriculum that has been largely in place for twenty-five years. The committee members observed that many of their concerns about essential elements in a university education are articulated in the Learning Outcomes, including the ability to identify and analyze complex issues, engage in problem solving, enhance communication skills, prepare for civic engagement, understand the ethical dimensions of their actions, and participate in conversations about the factors that frame their identities and those around them. Moreover, many of the descriptions also incorporate pedagogical goals as emphasized by faculty representing those disciplinary clusters.

The core curriculum is intended as an introduction to the work of the disciplines and the classic and current scholarship produced at this university and elsewhere. Such scholarship reaches into history to explore the information and decisions that have shaped the society in which we engage. It also opens up into critical issues that require attention in contemporary society. The Report identifies three categories of requirements:

1. Fundamentals: writing, quantitative reasoning and mathematical thinking, and ethical thinking

2. Disciplinary Inquiry: an understanding of the importance of disciplinary “ways of knowing” or, expressed another way, “how we know what we know”
3. Thematic Inquiry: investigation of themes that address critical issues that have shaped society and will shape the future both locally and globally.

Overview of the Proposed Curricular Plans

An important goal of both Plans A and D is to provide a more clear, flexible, and straightforward set of requirements that invites exploration across the curriculum and focused attention to the central elements in each course. The recommended General Education curriculum both identifies the importance of breadth in university studies and highlights issues that often transcend disciplinary investigation. Thematic Inquiry courses, with the support of Faculty Learning Communities (see page 4), will be encouraged to use interdisciplinary materials and contacts. In thinking about fundamentals, the committee believed that in addition to our current writing requirement that allows students to grapple with writing in deeply contextualized courses, that students would benefit similarly from a quantitative reasoning and ethics requirement that could also be taught contextually in courses that fall either within or beyond their major departments.

In order to provide undergraduates with an opportunity to engage with a required curriculum that takes full advantage of the extensive and rich offerings on campus, the courses will be taught by University of Minnesota faculty (including established academic instructional staff). In rare cases, exceptions may be granted when (1) the need is clearly justified and (2) an effective plan is in place for oversight by an appropriate member of the academic and instructional staff who will ensure the goals and spirit of a General Education course are met.

Disciplinary Inquiry courses should be part of the regular curriculum and should have no prerequisites (except in rare and clearly justified cases). Fundamentals may overlay with Disciplinary, Thematic or other regular courses. Neither plan allows a course to fulfill more than two requirements.

Distinctions between Plan A and Plan D

Plan A emphasizes that courses in both Disciplinary Inquiry and Thematic Inquiry will be singly focused on their particular content and intention and deeply emphasize the new definitions in the General Education Curriculum. Plan A requires that students take six Disciplinary Inquiry courses across the six areas of study. Students will also be required to take just one course in each of two Thematic Inquiry areas: 1) Diversity, Power, and Justice in the United States OR Global Perspective and 2) Environment and Sustainability OR Technology and Social Transformations. The Thematic Inquiry courses will not be linked to any disciplinary affiliation although they will likely be taught by faculty whose expertise is also in a discipline. The intention is to provide for a single, deep focus on these critical issues and the expectation is that many faculty will be able to take advantage of appropriate cross disciplinary content and methods, a capacity facilitated by Faculty Learning Communities.

Plan D requires that students take six Disciplinary Inquiry courses across six areas of study and complete four Thematic Inquiry courses across the four topical areas. This model is premised on the idea that students should complete the entire curriculum. This model presents Thematic Inquiry courses as among the most important courses that the University offers, in that they deal with critical issues and are places where many members of our faculty have considerable expertise. All four are central to creating informed future citizens. In order to develop a plan that is comprehensive and credit neutral for students in majors with high in-major credit requirements, Plan D allows for dual-certified though not triple-certified courses and acknowledges that many of our faculty currently teach very successful dual-certified courses.

In both plans the new review process, especially the Faculty Learning Communities, will ensure that faculty teaching Thematic Inquiry courses receive the same types of support as faculty teaching Disciplinary Inquiry courses do in their departments, by creating an intentional space for faculty support and collaboration. Both of the newly proposed models of course review will ensure that courses in all three areas -- Disciplinary Inquiry, Thematic Inquiry, and Fundamentals -- will be evaluated by experienced faculty in these areas as outlined below in Evaluation and Oversight.

Domains of Inquiry and Attainment

Disciplinary Inquiry

The committee, initially coordinating through subcommittees, systematically worked to revise and update the descriptions for Disciplinary Inquiry courses. The intention is to eliminate what seemed to become a detailed checklist of requirements and to move toward evaluations that are attuned to the course content and methods in ways that capture the intended spirit of the disciplinary category without being overly prescriptive. These courses generally highlight “ways of knowing” or, perhaps, “how we know what we know,” using insights and tools from a range of academic fields. Having a comprehensive description that foregrounds the methods as well as content is intended to encourage more faculty to identify their courses as part of the General Education curriculum.

The committee proposes to retain from our current LE model, six required Core, now Disciplinary Inquiry, courses to offer breadth:

1. Arts/Humanities
2. Biological Sciences
3. History
4. Literature
5. Physical Sciences
6. Social Sciences

These categories are identified but with a recognition that there is now considerable overlap and interdisciplinarity within and among the disciplinary divisions. While departments are often identified with particular required categories, the intention of the descriptions is to allow courses in contiguous areas that meet the criteria to be eligible. All faculty teaching these courses will be asked to provide statements that explicitly indicate how their course content

and assignments meet the intentions of the descriptions found in Appendix A. The intention is to avoid having a bullet-point list of categories and instead to have groups of faculty with some related expertise evaluate whether each course proposed meets the intention of the specific breadth category. It is essential that the courses are clearly intended for General Education and that they capture the spirit of the description provided.

Thematic Inquiry

Thematic Inquiry courses address contemporary issues deemed critical for students to understand as global citizens in the twenty-first century. These courses complement Disciplinary Inquiry courses by encouraging students to identify and investigate critical concerns in contemporary society. Very often these issues require engaging multiple perspectives and, whether taught by more than one faculty member or not, will likely be interdisciplinary. Because these topics are deeply embedded in social concerns, they will address the ethical issues raised by behaviors and policies. All of the Thematic Inquiry categories are important. Four themes are identified but with distinctive configurations in the two plans:

1. Diversity, Power, and Justice in the United States
2. Environment and Sustainability
3. Global Perspectives
4. Technology and Social Transformations

Fundamentals

Following the model of Writing Intensive courses, the LERC hopes that the creation of the Fundamentals category will encourage departments to engage with Ethics in a sustained way through courses within and beyond their major and will encourage the creation of more Quantitative Reasoning courses across the curriculum in order to allow students to wrestle with math, logic, and symbolic language in various contexts of the courses they are taking. The LERC also imagines that the Departments that have traditionally offered courses in Ethics and Quantitative Reasoning will continue to do so. Three Fundamentals are required in both plans:

1. Ethics
2. Quantitative Reasoning
3. Writing Intensive

Evaluation and Oversight

Appendix C describes the issue of oversight and evaluation of proposed courses in detail, noting that there are distinct procedures for Fundamental, Disciplinary Inquiry and Thematic Inquiry courses. To be a course of record for General Education in any category, the teaching faculty must present a paragraph explaining how the course meets the description. There must also be a proposed syllabus with a statement for students pointing out how the course contributes to their General Education.

A newly constituted General Education Committee will be appointed with attention to areas of expertise and experience of members to allow proposed courses in the Disciplinary Inquiry and Fundamentals areas (both Q and E) to be reviewed by small teams of faculty members. Each

team should have at least two members from the appropriate disciplinary or fundamentals area. If issues arise, one of those faculty members should serve as liaison to talk with the course proposer. After further discussion, if required, the team's recommendation is then sent to the full committee.

Thematic Inquiry courses will be evaluated by faculty peers who have taught or intend to teach a particular theme. All faculty teaching thematic inquiry courses will participate in at least one discussion forum with others planning to teach that theme, albeit often from quite different perspectives. The purpose is to share syllabi, discuss sources and approaches to the material, and identify colleagues in order to create communities of scholars (Faculty Learning Communities) with similar teaching and perhaps research interests across the campus.

Significant Changes from the Current Curriculum

- The addition of a new Fundamentals category (Ethics, Quantitative Reasoning, and Writing)
- Redefining six Disciplinary Inquiry courses
- Redefining four Thematic Inquiry courses
- Requiring students to complete courses in all of the three domains (Disciplinary, Fundamentals, Thematic)
- Adopting category descriptions that capture the spirit of their intent without being overly prescriptive.
- Creating systems of faculty oversight that assumes that faculty working within their Disciplines are best situated to determine which courses fulfill the Disciplinary Inquiry requirements
- Investing in Faculty Learning Communities that both ensure that faculty with expertise within the Thematic Inquiry areas are supporting faculty teaching in these areas and creating real and sustained opportunities for crossdisciplinary faculty collaboration across these critical thematic areas of study

APPENDIX A: REQUIREMENT DESCRIPTIONS

These descriptions are not to be used as a checklist of requirements, but rather represent an inventory of attributes that collectively characterize the category. Generally, courses are expected to engage most, if not all, the attributes described, but may emphasize some over others, so long as the spirit of the core, theme, or fundamental is met.

Fundamentals

Writing

The University of Minnesota's writing requirement has two components: First-Year Writing and Writing Intensive courses.

- **First-Year Writing:** All students continue to be expected to complete the first-year writing requirement (WRIT 1301, 1401, or equivalent) within their first two semesters of enrollment. First-year writing gives incoming students the fundamental writing skills demanded in university study. The Department of Writing Studies' purpose is to help emerging adults undertake university-level study of writing and develop the habits of mind and skills that will make them independent learners. Carefully designed experiences in reading and writing allow students to reflect seriously on the ways advanced literacy skills lead to success in college and in the many professions that accomplish much of their work through writing.
- **Writing Intensive:** In addition to the first-year writing requirement, students continue to be expected to complete four Writing Intensive (WI) courses. These courses help students understand what it means to write in various disciplines and the teaching faculty present evidence of the ways in which writing is incorporated into individual areas of investigation. Two of the four courses must be completed at the upper-division (3xxx or higher) level, and one of the two upper-division (3xxx or higher) courses must be within a student's major field of study.

Quantitative Reasoning and Mathematics

This requirement involves students in systematic formal reasoning through coursework including mathematics, statistics, computing, argumentation and related fields. These courses possess three key elements. First, they involve facility with a formal, symbolic language designed for logical discourse. Students use symbolic languages (beyond mere arithmetic computation) to propose verifiable arguments and explanations. Second, courses in quantitative literacy demonstrate the applicability of formal and mathematical reasoning in particular academic contexts. Many problems that arise in the everyday world can be modeled using formal symbolic reasoning. These elegant solutions to applied problems are necessary for a deeper understanding of the forces that continuously transform our world. Third, quantitative literacy courses engage students in communicating their formal reasoning processes. Communicating quantitative reasoning helps students form their ideas, and once they have developed confidence and consensus around their ideas, communication allows students to take action through quantitative reasoning. Courses in quantitative literacy may attend to these three principles in varying proportions, but all courses should expose students to quantitative literacy as a creative endeavor and should develop students' confidence in using formal reasoning as a life skill.

Ethics

Understanding the fundamental importance of ethics is essential as students continually shape their personal and professional identities and character in relationship to their communities. Civic life and public engagement are not simply political activities; they inevitably encompass the everyday actions that individuals take in their personal, professional, and public lives. Ethics involves acquisition of insight into experiences that help us to make decisions about what is good or bad, right or wrong, just or unjust—and to recognize the ambiguity inherent in many public problems. There are fundamental philosophical underpinnings to ethics as well as the practical ways in which ethics are part of decisions that affect the general population in their daily lives. Integrating ethics into academic majors (and anticipating future professions) will make the necessarily abstract discussions of ethics directly related to public responsibility and engagement in managing contemporary challenges and opportunities. Where appropriate, students may use a fully focused ethics course in philosophy or another department that has developed a course relating to that subject and encompassing the considerations above.

Disciplinary Inquiry

Arts

The arts foster original, imaginative ways of perceiving, reconceiving, and sensing the world around us. Arts courses bring together practical training, the creative production of new work, and critical insight into artistic production (for example, in considering issues of representation, memory, power, embodiment, and cultural aesthetics). Artistic pursuits raise rather than answer questions, discover rather than solve problems, and explore paradox, contradiction, and the unspeakable. Artistic works are implicitly directed toward an audience, evoking beauty, perplexity, outrage, wonder, empathy, and other aesthetic experiences. These courses work with the rich ambiguities of motion, sound, poetic connotation, space, and color rather than fixed systems of denotation, syntax, and definition. Among the specific capacities fostered in such courses are flexibility, intuitive experimentation, thoughtful critique, ingenuity in problem solving, and working in the midst of complexity and conceptual paradox. All this aims to initiate a lasting connection to the arts for students as critically attuned creators, viewers, and participants.

Humanities

Humanities reflect on the common and familiar human condition – human limitations and failures together with distinctive human capacities and achievements. Courses in the humanities analyze and contemplate on works that invite or compel critical thought. They focus on ways to explore and articulate human experiences with particular emphasis on modes of communication, aesthetic qualities, and the complexity of private lives and engaged human interactions. Studies of language, meaning, context, and influence of written and media expressions enrich our lives and enable us to be more thoughtful and perceptive members of our communities. Humanities courses explore and articulate human experiences with particular emphasis on modes of communication, aesthetic qualities, and/or the complexity of private lives and engaged human interactions.

Literature

Literature enlarges understanding of the human experience, transforms thinking and lives, and helps to articulate through language new imagined possibilities for individuals, societies and the world. Focusing on analysis of written works of literature, these courses will address the form and meaning of writings that may include fiction, creative nonfiction, poetry or essays. Students will explore the choices authors make when constructing a work, including genre, style, character, word choice, meter or the use of symbolism and other devices -- all of which combine to create literature's ability to powerfully evoke a reader's response. Students will also engage in analysis of written works of literature and examine the social and historical contexts of the literary work. Courses in literature are found in a variety of departments and units throughout the university

Biological Sciences

Biological Sciences courses study the processes of living organisms, individually and as they constantly interact with other organisms and the environment. The courses guide students through the process of acquiring knowledge using the tools of the discipline, present the limitations of current research, convey the message that questions of the future will continuously require new ways of gathering information, and emphasize that new knowledge often requires substantial revision of our current thinking. Courses will provide evidence of how we know what we know about the living world. The aim is not to capture simply a snapshot of what we currently know in a given field but to develop skills that allow for a critical analysis of information pertaining to biological sciences. Courses will include the opportunity for collection and analysis of scientific data in a laboratory or field setting.

Historical Perspectives

Historical Perspectives courses encourage students to think critically and in an informed manner about their own and others' assumptions and assertions about the human past. They investigate how historical knowledge is produced from material, oral, visual and written primary sources. By discerning between "the past" as that which happened and "historical knowledge" as what we know about the past, these courses self-consciously examine the methods and sources used to produce historical knowledge. A central question in any Historical Perspectives course concerns both the value and the limitations of certain sources. The incomplete and partial nature of the sources, and the distinctive perspective any given individual brings to them, leads inevitably to multiple and conflicting interpretations of the past. And yet not all historical analyses and arguments are equally persuasive. These courses equip students to evaluate the reliability of sources and historical arguments and thus develop their own historical perspectives.

Physical Sciences

Physical Sciences courses explore the natural world, as elucidated via the scientific method. They provide basic knowledge of modern scientific thought about nonliving systems and demonstrate how predictive models are developed and refined in the face of ever-present uncertainties. Students learn to appreciate the role of creativity and empirical observation in

driving scientific breakthroughs and that the scientific endeavor is an evolving process. Through required laboratory or field work, they will experience how scientific knowledge is acquired and assimilated into a broader framework for understanding the world around them.

Social Sciences

Social Sciences courses study human behavior through systematic investigation at the level of the individual, group, or society. Relevant areas of inquiry include the study of society and societies, of government and commerce, of the spatial interactions between humans and their environment, of how they communicate, and of the determinants of individual behavior. Courses that fulfill this requirement engage students in identifying the evidence and methods used by social scientists to reach conclusions significant in understanding human dynamics.

Thematic Inquiry

Diversity, Power, and Justice in the United States

The United States is a diverse nation that embraces its internal diversity as a defining feature as much as it struggles to live up to the ideals embedded in that claim. Courses that fulfill this requirement wrestle explicitly with the complex relationship between diversity, power and justice in the United States. Students will explore one or more forms of diversity through a multi-layered analysis of power, privilege, and justice. Such courses promote historical and contemporary understanding of how race, ethnicity, class, gender, religion, sexual orientation, and disability have shaped social, economic, political, and cross-cultural relationships within the United States. The differential treatment of particular groups and the unequal distribution of power have generated inequality and new ideas about the meaning of justice. Thus, students examine how the contested nature of diversity, power, and justice impacts social dynamics, democratic practices, and institutional stratification. In order to get at these issues, these courses engage with current scholarship and critical theoretical approaches that respond to epistemological gaps in information and perspective.

Environment and Sustainability

Human interaction with the environment is complex. Responding to environmental issues raised by that interaction requires students do the following: understand the origin and nature of the issue; vigorously debate solutions with attention to costs, benefits and tradeoffs; navigate an information culture that can pose significant challenges to concepts of scientific consensus and uncertainty; and learn to become involved, informed, and constructive citizens. Issues such as sustainability and the ethics of intergenerational equity must be weighed against meeting current demands and shifting community needs. Courses that fulfill this theme provide students opportunities to take on the complex issues of the environment in an academic setting involving a broad array of disciplines, from physical, biological, and social sciences, to the arts and humanities. Science based approaches and engagement with ethics and societal values should be integral to proposed solutions.

Global Perspectives

In a complex, rapidly changing world that is increasingly interdependent yet fraught with conflicts and disparities, courses with this theme engage students with some significant

discussion about the world beyond U.S. borders, and the opportunity to consider the implications of this knowledge for the international community and their own lives. Global perspectives courses might include contemporary popular culture; nationalism; globalization; human rights; comparative politics, economics, or cultures; historical studies; different modes of material and political life; regional, ethnic, or religious conflict; artistic and literary responses to colonialism or the colonial legacy, and the role of governments, corporations, or international organizations. These courses may engage in a concentrated study of a particular country, culture, or region, be part of an in-depth focus on a particular global issue with reference to two or more parts of the world, or cultivate a broader global awareness by a comparative method as students learn the importance of the particularities of place, time, and culture to understanding our world.

Technology and Social Transformations

Technology and Social Transformations theme courses consider the impact of technology on society and the impact of society on technology. Students will investigate how advances in science and engineering can produce profound impact on society, shaping not only the way people live but how they interact and construct possibilities. Courses will provide examples of how new technologies are developed, the ways in which they are adopted and implemented, and the conditions and assumptions governing their use. The course will help students develop a foundation for evaluating the range of costs -- economic and well as broader human costs -- and the personal and social benefits of existing technologies as well as those likely to emerge in the future. When appropriate, students should explore underlying science, design, or engineering to understand the technology's social implications.

APPENDIX B: MEMBERS OF THE LIBERAL EDUCATION REDESIGN COMMITTEE

Name	College	Role	Term
Sally Gregory Kohlstedt	CSE	Chair	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Daniel Bond	CBS	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Gayla Lindt	CDes	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Rashne Jehangir	CEHD	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Sue Staats	CEHD	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Jay Bell	CFANS	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Jonathan Gewirtz	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Gayle Golden	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Malinda Lindquist	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Peter Mercer-Taylor	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Richa Nagar	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Chris Phelan	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Matthew Rahaim	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
JB Shank	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
John Watkins	CLA	Member	Fall 2017 - Spring 2018
Randal Barnes	CSE	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Ken Leopold	CSE	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Justin Revenaugh	CSE	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Liliya Williams	CSE	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Mary Benner	CSOM	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Vlad Griskevicius	CSOM	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
William Durfee	CSE	Member	Spring 2019 – Fall 2019
Ruby Nguyen	SPH	Member	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Julie Tonneson	Budget Office	Ex officio	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Robert McMaster	OUE	Ex officio	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019
Jennifer Reckner	OUE	Ex officio	Spring 2019
Kathrine Russell	OUE	Staff	Fall 2017 - Fall 2019

APPENDIX C: IMPLEMENTATION AND OVERSIGHT

The General Education curriculum comprises three basic types of courses: Disciplinary Inquiry, Thematic Inquiry, and Fundamentals. Disciplinary Inquiry courses (Arts/Humanities, Biological Sciences, Literature, Historical Perspectives, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences) introduce students to the various ways of knowing and modes of inquiry that scholars have developed to understand the world. Thematic Inquiry courses (Diversity, Power, and Justice in the United States; Environment and Sustainability; Global Perspectives; and Technology and Social Transformations) focus on four critical issues and questions of our time. Fundamentals courses build insight and expertise in writing, quantitative thinking, and ethical thinking.

Disciplinary Inquiry Courses

A General Education Committee will have oversight of the curriculum. Its charge will be to affirm that every proposed course meets the spirit and definition of the disciplinary area and to assist, where appropriate, in that process. To ensure this outcome, the GEC members will include the range of fields represented in the Disciplinary and Fundamentals areas (with the Writing Intensive course oversight remaining with the Writing Board). Individual members will serve on subcommittees or teams in which at least two members represent the field or area under discussion. In addition to a written report if a course is not approved, a member of the team will be available to serve as liaison and to meet with the faculty member proposing a course to answer questions or make suggestions. The reviewing teams will make a final recommendation to the full GEC. The intention is to encourage courses by developing them with peer support.

Thematic Inquiry Courses

The very nature of the Thematic Inquiry (TI) courses invite and will be used to foster integrative cross-disciplinary and intercollegiate collaborations that generate a curricula that builds on the best of our current offerings. This new approach emphasizes and supports exploration among both students and the faculty. The critical questions embedded in these Thematic Inquiry courses are often best investigated using more than one discipline, thus the formation of Faculty Learning Communities will create a space for cross disciplinary conversations. These courses place a new emphasis on learning together in ways that will deepen our understanding of these issues, create new systems and structures that support and encourage new faculty collaborations, and encourage students to think boldly beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries.

The Thematic Inquiry courses will therefore be governed through Faculty Learning Communities (FLCs), a structure that will encourage collaboration, initiative and communication among the wide range of disciplines at the university. All University of Minnesota faculty teaching Thematic Inquiry courses will participate in Faculty Learning Communities at some level as they develop their courses or serve as mentors to those who seek collaborative learning.

Minimally, these FLCs will bring faculty planning to teach and/or already teaching TI courses together in discussion forums in the semester(s) before they teach their course. The purpose

will be to share syllabi, discuss sources and approaches to the material, and identify potential colleagues with whom to interact during the semester in and beyond the individual courses. Each faculty member will be encouraged to continue meeting with others in the cohort teaching in the theme, perhaps visiting the classes of colleagues, providing a guest lecture, or otherwise helping students to see the value of integrative cross-disciplinary engagement in tackling the issues of that thematic investigation.

Beyond that initial meeting, members of a FLC will have responsibility for the overall TI curriculum. The FLC will be responsible for vetting course proposals and determining whether they meet the spirit of the TI course requirements. When the FLC agrees that a course fits the description and stated intention of its particular theme, it will be forwarded to the General Education Board for its official designation as a TI course. In the event that an FLC cannot make a determination about a specific course, they will engage a similarly-themed FLC to help them work through and resolve any issues or disagreements.

The LERC believes that these FLCs will create new, exciting, and innovative pedagogical and research opportunities for our faculty and students. UMN has recently invested in Grand Challenges that foster integrative cross-disciplinary and intercollegiate opportunities for faculty and students who focus on such specific issues as water, equitable communities, health, and climate change. Building on some of the best practices embedded in the Grand Challenges model, the LERC recognizes that establishing, coordinating, and sustaining vibrant FLCs will involve a commitment and significant financial investments from the University.

Thriving FLCs will require compensated faculty leadership and administrative support from the University to establish and sustain these collaborative efforts. The LERC recommends at least four identified and compensated faculty coordinators will organize the four FLCs with administrative support. Each FLC will be composed of an interdisciplinary set of faculty who will meet in smaller cohorts of six to ten members and have the opportunity to engage with each other both before, during and after the semester they teach. FLCs will share best teaching and collaborative practices as well as new teaching, collaborative and research opportunities that develop through their FLC participation. To encourage these collaborative efforts, FLCs should hold annual (or possibly semester-end) symposia for each theme area featuring speakers from inside and outside the University, which will be open to students and faculty. Such activity will bring substantial benefit to the University community; in turn, the faculty leadership of each FLC will require significant individual compensation and a budget to sustain symposia, recruit faculty, and support pedagogical and the new research agendas that grow out of these FLCs. The four faculty TI leads will also require sustained administrative support to organize the meetings that would involve not only large symposia, but, more importantly, smaller cross-disciplinary and intercollegiate cohorts (of six 6 to 10 teaching members). The result of these activities and investments should create Faculty Learning Communities with shared expertise and mutual engagement.

The LERC believes it will take some period of time to successfully integrate all UMN-faculty into Faculty Learning Communities. While faculty have indicated eagerness to collaborate in

integrated cross-disciplinary ways on topics of critical importance and in ways that are supported and recognized by the University, the LERC understands that this is a major pedagogical shift and that some faculty may need time to adjust to the requirements of an FLC. In order to support the successful development of FLC's, the LERC suggests that faculty who join a FLC within the first four years of the implementation of the new system be offered incentives (in the form of funds for pedagogical and research innovations that develop out of their participation in the FLC as well as small stipends for participating in the pre-semester boot camps and annual symposia). Within five years of the implementation of this plan, all faculty teaching TI courses will be a part of these established Faculty Learning Communities.

Faculty Learning Communities will also provide a way for faculty to ease out of the initial community requirements as well as refresh their involvement, and their courses, after several semesters. Faculty teaching a new course or one converted from the previous LE system will be required to participate in a FLC when that course is first offered (if a new course) or within the first four years of the adoption of the FLC model (if a converted course). Once a faculty member has participated in a FLC, that member is welcome to continue to participate in that FLC while teaching their TI courses but is not required to do so. However, once a faculty member has taught a TI course for six semesters, the member will be required to return to a FLC to share what the member has learned, mentor new TI faculty, and connect with new and old faculty teaching TI courses in ways that support pedagogical and research innovation.

Acknowledging the importance of the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum, faculty teaching throughout the MNSCU system are encouraged to collaborate with the University of Minnesota to build their own Faculty Learning Communities.

APPENDIX D: RELATED CONVERSATIONS ABOUT POSSIBLE FUTURE EDUCATIONAL INITIATIVES

Over nearly two years of deliberation, the LERC considered a range of ideas relating to the content of the required curriculum as well as the ways in which it might be designed to take additional advantage of faculty initiatives and skills. Among the ideas that emerged from consideration of recently revised curriculum at other universities was that of having a small, self-selective “liberal education college” designed by a group of faculty that creatively restructured the overall set of requirements. One model was that of the New College at the University of Virginia which built a distinctive framework of common experiences for a relatively small set of self-selected students that collectively meet the goals of liberal education. As a complement to the currently proposed General Education, the LERC recommends that such a possibility be made available and that the administration seriously consider any proposal from a core group of faculty interested in designing such a curriculum.

DRAFT