

Faculty Votes and Clicker Polls on GE (as of 5/9/19)

Overview:

1. **Vote:** February 11, 2016, Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Committee – Resolution 15/16–08 Revisions to the Multicultural-Domestic (MCD) requirement. **Approved by 75%**
2. **Vote:** October 13, 2016, Faculty Meeting: Kent McWilliams moved and introduced Curriculum Committee [Resolution 16/17- 03](#) – Formation of a Task Force for General Education Curriculum Review **84% yes, 10% no, 6% abstain**
3. **Vote:** May 11, 2017, Faculty Meeting: Resolution [Resolution 16/17-18](#) – Continuation of the Task Force for General Education Review **93% yes, 6% no, 1% abstain**
4. August 31, 2017, Faculty Meeting: Discussion led by the GE Taskforce
5. December 7, 2017, Faculty Meeting: GE Task Force Update
6. April 12, 2018, Faculty Meeting: Faculty Discussion and Clicker Poll led by the GE Task Force
7. **Vote:** May 10, 2018, Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 17/18-22](#)– GE Task Force CC proposes continuation of the GE Task Force into the 2018-2019 academic year **91% yes, 7% no, 3% abstain**
8. **Vote:** October 4, 2018, Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Committee – [Resolution 18/19-02](#)– GE Guiding Principles **87% yes, 11% no, 2% abstain**
9. October 11, 2018, Special Faculty Meeting: Discussion (with members of the Board of Regents) and Clicker Polls on the Mission Statement for General Education
10. **Vote:** November 1, 2018, Faculty Meeting: Discussion and Vote on Motion to Require a Supermajority for GE votes **18% yes, 80% no, 2% abstain**
11. November 8, 2018, Special Faculty Meeting: Discussion led by the GE Task Force and Clicker Polls on ILOs for GE
12. **Vote:** December 6, 2018, Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 18/19-06](#) – OLE Questions for General Education **85% yes, 11% no, 4% abstain**
13. March 14, 2019, Faculty Meeting: Update from the GE Task Force on the revised timeline for a vote on the new GE requirements
14. March 21, 2019, Special Faculty Meeting, in which the GE Task Force plan for Discussion and Clicker Polls about the first draft of the proposed OLE Core was altered by a motion from the floor.
15. **Vote:** April 11, 2019, Faculty Meeting: Presentation by the GE Task Force and Vote on resolution to support the work and process of the GE Task Force. **78% yes, 11% no, 11% abstain**
16. April 18, 2019, Faculty/Staff Forum on the proposed OLE Core (3:45-5:30), streamed and archived on the GE Task Force website
17. April 25, 2019, Special Faculty Meeting: GE Task Force Discussion and Clicker Polls about size of the proposed OLE Core (draft revised and distributed April 17)
18. **Votes:** May 9 2019, Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 18/19-19](#) – General Education Task Force and [Resolution 18/19-20](#) – Maximum Size of the GE Curriculum

Minutes of Faculty Meetings, Resolutions, Summaries of Table Discussion, and Other Resources are available on the GE Task Force website: <https://wp.stolaf.edu/doc/general-education-task-force/>

Detailed Summaries:

1. February 11, 2016 Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Committee – Resolution 15/16–08 Revisions to the Multicultural-Domestic (MCD) requirement

After Professor Marsalek’s introduction of this resolution, there was a considerable amount of discussion. Three faculty members raised questions about the proposed ILOs and Course Guidelines: does the language in them suggest that MCD courses are not starting with puzzles to be investigated, but rather with a conclusion toward which students are to be directed? Is the tone too prescriptive and politically charged? Should it not be more celebratory and invite a variety of approaches? Does the emphasis, in three of the four ILOs, on race and ethnicity narrow the focus of the courses too much and downplay the importance of other issues (e.g., gender)? Would only sociologists be able to teach the courses? Jon Naito, who chaired the ad hoc committee on the MCD requirement, and several other faculty members responded, pointing out that the proposed language (with “must”) is in line with language used in other ILOs, explaining that the foregrounding of race and ethnicity was not intended to leave out other issues, and arguing that courses meeting the new MCD requirement would suit a variety of disciplines (e.g., art history, psychology) and could potentially have even more breadth in them. **The resolution was approved by electronic vote (75%).**

2. October 13, 2016 Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Committee [Resolution 16/17- 03](#) – Formation of a Task Force for General Education Curriculum Review

Kent McWilliams moved and introduced Curriculum Committee [Resolution 16/17- 03](#) – Formation of a Task Force for General Education Curriculum Review

Kent spoke to the motion, noting first that we haven’t had a check-up of curriculum for 25 years. The goal of this motion is to set up a task force with the charge to lead us down the pathway of General Education review. The membership of the Task Force would be partially elected (by votes within individual faculties to elect representatives of those faculties) and partially appointed by Associate Deans (to assure breadth of diversity of the Task Force).

There was some discussion of the motion. Donna McMillan proposed that the entire faculty vote for representatives for each sub-faculty, since what is at issue in the General Education reform is a college-wide concern. Kathryn Ananda-Owens moved an amendment to the original motion to that effect (viz., that elected members of the task force would be elected by the faculty as a whole instead of only by members of each individual sub-faculty). There was discussion of the amendment. Some felt individual faculties should choose their own representation. Others worried faculty-wide election could reduce diversity of views represented overall. Others noted that a large department within one sub-faculty could have undue influence on the vote for that sub-faculty. Some noted that GE attributes are not assigned to individual faculties and so the vote for representatives should not privilege individual faculties. The amendment to the motion passed (58% yes, 36% no, 6% abstain).

Discussion of the original motion continued. Kent noted that, as an *ex officio* member of the Task Force, the Provost would not have a vote. Others worried that “*ex officio*” did not necessarily mean “non-voting”. This was an emergency for a Classics scholar. Chris Brunelle stepped in to clarify that *ex officio* meant only “by virtue of holding the office of.” Tony Becker therefore moved an amendment to the motion clarifying that the Provost has non-voting membership of the Task Force. The amendment passed (91% yes, 3% no, 6% abstain).

The main motion to form the Task Force also passed (84% yes, 10% no, 6% abstain).

3. May 11, 2017 Faculty Meeting:

Resolution [Resolution 16/17-18](#) – **Continuation of the Task Force for General Education Review**
Matt Richey briefly spoke to the motion. Student, Don Williams has been added to the Task Force. The Task Force has an ambitious timeline: proposals on three GE models by Fall, 2017 and then the hope for agreement on a single model by end of AY2018-19. The motion was moved, seconded and then approved (93% yes; 6% no; 1% abstain). There was no discussion.

4. August 31, 2017 Faculty Meeting: Discussion led by the GE Taskforce

- Matt Richey, co-chair on the General Education (GE) taskforce, introduced the taskforce's faculty activities for this meeting.
- Donna McMillan gave a short quiz on GE curriculum requirements to get faculty thinking about GEs.
- Doug Casson gave a brief overview of the GE taskforce. The taskforce was created last fall by the Curriculum Committee and approved by faculty. Half of the members were elected by faculty, half were appointed by Associate Deans. Student membership appointed by student government. This summer, the taskforce undertook a four-day workshop to create three GE curriculum models (*course attribute, common curriculum, and reflective integrative*). The models will be rolled out to faculty for discussion in the coming year. This fall, four forums are planned for faculty discussion of GE curriculum reform. The first forum is scheduled for September 21 during Community Time in the Black and Gold Ballrooms.
- Matt Richey and Jennifer Kwon-Dobbs led a GE conversation starter by polling faculty about GE curriculum priorities. Faculty were asked to rank the importance of GE features. High-level features included integrative learning, student agency, metacognitive reflection, personal and social responsibility, intellectual and practical skills, and engagement with big questions. Structural features included experiential learning, a common first-year experience, a capstone experience, team-taught courses, and a smaller and simpler GE curriculum.
- Heather Klopchin tasked small group discussions at each table by asking faculty to consider two questions: 1) What do our students need to know and be able to do? and 2) What role can the GE curriculum play in meeting the broad goals of student learning? Approximately fifteen minutes were given for faculty discussion. **Notes were taken at each table and will be collated by the Provost's office for the GE taskforce.**
- David Booth provided a reminder that the changing world, new teaching pedagogies, and different student backgrounds make revisiting the GE curriculum a worthwhile endeavor. David stressed no single model (*course attribute, common curriculum, and reflective integrative*) proposed by the GE taskforce is necessarily the correct model. However, the models provide a way to begin to think outside the box for what GE requirements should encompass.
Departmental FTE consideration needs to be dismissed to facilitate unhindered discussions on the GE curriculum that will provide the greatest benefit to our students.

5. December 7, 2017 Faculty Meeting: GE Task Force Update

David Booth reminded faculty of the GE Task Force's work this past fall. The Task Force has hosted two forums since the last faculty meeting. The first was a joint forum with CILA on integrative and distributive approaches to general education identifying our current integrative and distributive methods and what we might do differently in the future. The second forum focused on goals for first year general education. The current FYW 111 and other first year courses as well as other broad GE goals were discussed in this forum. A series of informal conversations are planned for Thursday afternoons during interim on a series of topics to be announced.

Given all the insights from these forums and feedback from faculty, the Task Force has been thinking hard about their accepted charge from the Curriculum Committee last spring. The charge has three components: 1. Develop a guiding document that states governing philosophical commitments behind GE goals and make explicit intended learning outcomes for the GE curriculum; 2. Propose multiple working models designed to help faculty envision a variety of ways of addressing the goals of the guiding document; 3. Prepare a final slate of models for vote by the faculty in Spring 2018. The Task Force has been working at identifying intended learning outcomes of the GE curriculum. However, at this time, the Task Force is not ready to share with the faculty a list of intended learning outcomes or guiding principles. The Task Force has heard from faculty that it is hard to evaluate a GE model without knowing the outcomes that model would seek to achieve. The Task Force plans on fulfilling the first part of their charge from the Curriculum Committee. However, the Task Force is not certain future deliberations will provide a clear enough sense of the practical effects of any particular model or provide faculty confidence when voting for a particular model. The Task Force is working with the Curriculum Committee to reconsider the third part of the charge that calls for a vote on a slate of models this spring. The Task Force is disinclined to push until there is a clear sign of faculty readiness.

Donna McMillan introduced four particular reasons to pursue GE curriculum reform.

- To create a more inclusive curriculum with more explicit attention to race and intersectionality.
- To make the GE curriculum more comprehensible and meaningful by simplifying the requirements.
- To increase intentional integration and self-reflection.
- To build in flexibility for addressing emerging, current, and/or unforeseen issues.

Paul Jackson asked about the meaning of intentional integration and whether that referred to individual students integrating what they learn or if it referred to integration through the curriculum. Donna indicated that both integration schemes that Paul mentioned were viable and that the reasons given above were meant to be flexible. Anton Armstrong asked what is meant by intersectionality. Jennifer Kwon-Dobbs explained that intersectionality is interlocking systems of power with axes of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and religion that we use to define ourselves. These axes also serve as sites of resistance and critique.

Notecards were given to each faculty member at each table. Faculty were asked to provide comments on each of the above reasons as well as rank importance of each of the four reasons if they so wished on a one (strongly disagree) to five (strongly agree) scale. Small group discussions lasted at each table for approximately thirteen minutes. Cards were collected by the Task Force after the meeting and will be used to inform GE activities during interim and the spring semester.

Sarah Freyermuth '19 (student member of the GE Task Force) gave an overview on student perspectives of GE curriculum reform. Student feedback on GE educational requirements was gathered in a survey that went out to students last year, GE forums, and personal feedback to the GE Task Force. The biggest

reason students want to see GE curriculum reform is the first bulleted point above. Student desire to have more attention given to race and intersectionality has been present prior to the events from last spring. Some students feel that some of the current courses that address race and intersectionality can be skirted around by other students and that these courses should be mandatory so that all students have to engage in these issues. Additionally, since many students see the GE requirements as a “box checking” exercise, the second bulleted reason above seeking to make GE requirements more comprehensive and meaningful is very important. Students would also like to see a reduced GE curriculum. Simplifying GE requirements would also give students more agency overall. Finally, students feel the fourth bulleted reason above is important. It has been approximately twenty-five years since the GE curriculum was last visited and students would like to see a GE curriculum that can adapt to stay healthy and relevant to today’s issues. Sarah finished by encouraging faculty to talk with students about what students would like to see in the GE curriculum.

6. April 12, 2018 Faculty Meeting: Faculty Discussion and Clicker Poll led by the GE Task Force

Matt Richey acknowledged a significant amount of work is still required on GE reform. The GE Task Force is still in the process of gathering information. On April 26 a GE forum will be held. The topic of the forum will be decided during the GE Task Force meeting on April 13.

Matt Richey solicited input from faculty using a “clickers” survey to obtain a general sense of faculty feelings regarding **aspirational general education** reform.

1. The GE curriculum should increase students’ ability to name and characterize the significance of the liberal arts and their own learning across multiple GE courses over time. 44% Strongly Agree, 36% Agree, 14% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 3% Disagree, 4% Strongly Disagree
2. The GE curriculum should be smaller than it is now. 32% Strongly Agree, 24% Agree, 24% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 13% Disagree, 6% Strongly Disagree
3. The GE curriculum should emphasize broad skills that can be experienced in many disciplines. 57% Strongly Agree, 34% Agree, 6% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 1% Disagree, 2% Strongly Disagree
4. The GE curriculum should ensure that all students have opportunities to apply knowledge and skills across disciplines and to new settings and complex problems. 60% Strongly Agree, 28% Agree, 8% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 0% Disagree, 3% Strongly Disagree
5. The GE curriculum should ensure that all students have opportunities for experiential learning. 42% Strongly Agree, 23% Agree, 12% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 12% Disagree, 11% Strongly Disagree
6. The GE curriculum should ensure that all students have equal access to institutional knowledge that enables success and enhances familiarity with the values of the liberal arts. 46% Strongly Agree, 20% Agree, 27% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2% Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree
7. The GE curriculum should include an integrative first-year seminar. 32% Strongly Agree, 26% Agree, 21% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 14% Disagree, 7% Strongly Disagree
8. The GE curriculum should include a culminating capstone experience. 14% Strongly Agree, 14% Agree, 30% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 26% Disagree, 17% Strongly Disagree

Matt then asked the faculty to consider the same set of questions while reflecting on our current GE requirements.

1. The GE curriculum increases students' ability to name and characterize the significance of the liberal arts and their own learning across multiple GE courses over time. 8% Strongly Agree, 28% Agree, 29% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 26% Disagree, 9% Strongly Disagree
2. The GE curriculum is right-sized. 9% Strongly Agree, 20% Agree, 16% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 36% Disagree, 20% Strongly Disagree
3. The GE curriculum emphasizes broad skills that can be experienced in many disciplines. 19% Strongly Agree, 40% Agree, 22% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 13% Disagree, 6% Strongly Disagree
4. The GE curriculum ensures that all students have opportunities to apply knowledge and skills across disciplines and to new settings and complex problems. 5% Strongly Agree, 33% Agree, 32% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 21% Disagree, 9% Strongly Disagree
5. The GE curriculum ensures that all students have opportunities for experiential learning. 2% Strongly Agree, 14% Agree, 17% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 41% Disagree, 25% Strongly Disagree
6. The GE curriculum ensures that all students have equal access to institutional knowledge that enables success and enhances familiarity with the values of the liberal arts. 6% Strongly Agree, 15% Agree, 37% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 31% Disagree, 12% Strongly Disagree
7. The GE curriculum includes an integrative first-year sequence. 7% Strongly Agree, 13% Agree, 13% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 28% Disagree, 39% Strongly Disagree
8. The GE curriculum includes a culminating capstone experience. 1% Strongly Agree, 2% Agree, 7% Neither Agree nor Disagree, 19% Disagree, 72% Strongly Disagree

Matt Richey remarked that general education is complicated and this exercise was designed to identify aspirational general education reform while considering the current state of general education at St. Olaf College.

The floor was opened for questions and comments.

- It was pointed out that question seven in the aspirational GE survey above used “first-year seminar” while question seven in the second GE survey used “first-year sequence”. Matt replied this was an editing error.
- A question was asked about the meaning of institutional knowledge. Matt explained institutional knowledge is knowledge about how St. Olaf works apart from the curriculum. It can include knowledge about institutional resources, advising, support services, the norms of the college, and the role of student-faculty relations. First-generation students often lack this knowledge when coming to St. Olaf. The college has a goal of increasing institutional knowledge among the incoming class.
- Dan Dressen asked if the survey results will be available. Matt replied he would make the results available to faculty and also include them in the GE Task Force report.
- Chuck Huff asked about the fate of the wisdom gleaned from previous forums. Matt said that video and audio transcripts of the forums are available on the GE Task Force website. The GE Task Force plans on distilling down what was learned at the forums and including that material in the GE Task Force report.
- Matt Rohn pointed out a recommendation from a Regents meeting that faculty need to stop using “liberal arts” or potentially offend parents of prospective students. Matt Richey assured Matt Rohn that the phrase “liberal arts” will not be removed from general education discussion. Karen Cherewatuk, Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents, added that we should be able to describe the value of the education we offer without using the phrase “liberal arts”. Not everyone understands our intra-college meaning of “liberal arts” and it will be important in the future for us

to explain what we do differently than larger universities. Matt Richey added that the GE Task Force has searched for a better over-arching phrase to replace “general education” so that we can better project its intent to incoming students.

- Jo Beld asked two questions about the conversations the GE Task Force has been conducting. A) Are there compelling examples or innovations at other colleges that could fit our general education aspirations at St. Olaf? B) Has the GE Task Force identified topics that are better suited to other vehicles rather than general education? Matt replied that the GE Task Force has looked at numerous curricula and processes leading to change at other schools. From Matt’s perspective, the trend has been a more focused general education curriculum with a more discernible flavor which might be beneficial for us to think about. Matt also replied that the GE Task Force is aware of the boundary of general education and is trying to identify where general education should end.
- Mary Carlsen and faculty thanked the GE Task Force for the enormous commitment this past year. Mary Carlsen pointed that Ripon College did a general education reform in a year and asked what factors at St. Olaf are keeping St. Olaf from a speedier reform. Matt replied that faculty diversity of well-founded views is holding back general education reform. The richness, passion, and variety of opinions that faculty have for general education makes the general education puzzle harder to solve. Matt says there is no reason to rush. Donna McMillan also pointed out that some issues will require conflict and we must have the courage to move forward on these points. Matt Rohn remarked that we should identify what we want out of general education rather than what we want out of general education relative to what we currently have.
- Carlo Veltri asked about how we can prepare students for changing cultural capital in general education. Matt replied that the GE Task Force recognizes the different cultural capital each student brings.
- Seth Peabody asked if the new general education curriculum will have a term limit before it is revamped again. Matt replied that the GE Task Force has not considered a general education term limit before reconsideration.
- Karen Cherewatuk commented that it has been hard to take on major general education reform with SRAP commitments as well.

7. May 10, 2018 Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 17/18-22](#)– *GE Task Force*

CC proposes continuation of the GE Task Force into the 2018-2019 academic year. The GE Task Force will be tasked with proposing a general education curriculum by the Spring of 2019 consistent with a guiding document detailing the overall goals of the GE Curriculum at St. Olaf College. A summer 2018 transition team will be formed. The 2017-2018 GE Task Force will share their reviews and recommendations in the coming weeks. **The Resolution passed with a 91% Yes, 7% No, 3% Abstain vote.**

In closing, Katie stated CC is seeking self-nominations for serving on the GE Task Force summer transition team and the 2018-2019 GE Task Force.

8. October 4, 2018 Faculty Meeting: Curriculum Committee – [Resolution 18/19-02](#)– *GE Guiding Principles*

Jon Naito provided context on Resolution 18/19-02. Kelsey Thompson crafted Resolution 18/19-02 by synthesizing the GE Guiding Principles from the September 20, 2018 special faculty meeting with faculty discussion feedback at that meeting as well as faculty comments submitted via the GE Task Force email alias. On September 26, the GE Task Force and Curriculum Committee met to discuss the draft of the resolution. The final draft of the resolution incorporated changes suggested by the Curriculum Committee. The resolution was then approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Guiding Principles were designed to be independent of specific academic subjects and were solely intended as helpful points of reference for faculty deliberations and expectations of our work at the college. Jon reminded faculty that this is one of many faculty votes on GE reform this year as stated in the GE syllabus.

- Kathryn Ananda-Owens sought clarification if faculty were voting for the Guiding Principles or if the faculty were also voting for what these Guiding Principles might suggest or their potential possibilities listed on the document circulated at the September 20 meeting. Jon stated faculty were voting only on the Guiding Principles.
- Jeanine Grenberg asked if faculty were voting to approve the Guiding Principles or the rationale as well. Jon Naito said that the rationale was not binding but merely meant as clarification to the Principles. Jeanine also asked if these resolutions can pass with a 51% majority. Jon replied in the affirmative. Jeanine raised a concern that key votes on GE reform during the year could hinge on very narrow votes and that would not represent the goals faculty want their community to realize.
- President Anderson sought confirmation that the rationale was part of the motion faculty were voting on. Jon Naito confirmed that the motion did contain the rationale, but was open to correction by faculty if this was not normal operating procedure.
- David Booth's understanding was the motion itself was separate from the rationale and the rationale was presented only to guide interpretation of the motion. David noted the rationale included the paragraph in Resolution 18/19-02 titled "Rationale", but also the sections "Several General Points to Keep in Mind" and "Points of Clarification Concerning the Guiding Principles". President Anderson agreed.
- Matt Rohn felt the rationale is generally not what faculty approve in a motion under normal operating procedure.
- Doug Casson asked about the process of responding to faculty input for this resolution and coming resolutions. Jon Naito responded that both the Curriculum Committee and the GE Task Force discussed how to incorporate the various comments and critiques of this resolution. However, it would have been too time consuming to reach out to all faculty that spoke at the September 20 meeting. Jon noted that much of the faculty feedback from September 20 was additions to the Guiding Principles that could restrict interpretation of the Guiding Principles and potentially define content of the GE curriculum.
- Tony Lott commented that the Guiding Principles fulfilled their promise in the September 20 meeting by fostering faculty discussion of potential GE ILOs and curricula.
- Shelly Dickinson noted that feedback on notecards from September 20 was informative. Only five emails from faculty after the September 20 meeting followed. On October 11, the faculty will meet to discuss the GE Mission Statement which reflects many of the comments from the September 20 meeting and emails from faculty.
- David Booth asked about the relation between the business of the special faculty meetings and the business of the regular faculty meetings. While the September 20 special faculty meeting generated rich discussion on GE reform, Resolution 18/19-02 is almost verbatim to the draft of

the Guiding Principles given to faculty on September 20. David noted the September 20 meeting was not a deliberative meeting where faculty could make motions to amend the Guiding Principles. Instead, the regular faculty meetings seem the place where motions could be offered to amend the substance of the resolutions put forth by the Curriculum Committee. David asked if it would be appropriate to amend the Guiding Principles or any future resolutions only at the regular faculty meetings? Jon Natio responded the GE Task Force syllabus lays out a plan of action and aims to move through the Guiding Principles rather quickly so that more time can be dedicated to other time-intensive areas such as GE ILOs. All motions to amend resolutions and binding votes should occur during regular faculty meetings. Jon felt this will not diminish the importance of the special faculty meetings since faculty feedback from these meetings will help craft future resolutions. Kathryn Ananda-Owens stated that the faculty manual makes no distinction between special and regular faculty meetings. Therefore, faculty are empowered to make amendments, vote, and call the question in any faculty meeting. President Anderson clarified that the Administration suggested, not requested, the faculty organizing the special faculty meetings limit voting, making motions, etc. to the regular faculty meetings. Jon Naito added that a major goal of the special meetings was simply to get faculty together to discuss GE reform.

- David Booth encouraged faculty to vote for the Guiding Principles. GE is the hallmark of a liberal arts education. David hoped that the specific Guiding Principles “supports the college mission” and “owned and supported by the faculty” help faculty recognize that GE should be deeply inspiring to our teaching and foster the best collaborations between faculty.
- Linda Mokdad called the question of whether or not to cease debate. Faculty approved to close debate with a 80% Yes, 18% No, and 3% Abstain vote (passed with a two-thirds vote).
- President Anderson asked Jon Naito to clarify if this motion included voting for the rationale as well as the Guiding Principles. Jon felt that the vote should be for the Guiding Principles, not the rationale. The rationale should simply inform the Guiding Principles.
- **Resolution 18/19-02 passed with a 87% Yes, 11% No, and 2% Abstain vote.**

9. October 11, 2018 Special Faculty Meeting: Discussion (with members of the Board of Regents) and Clicker Polls on the Mission Statement for General Education

Clicker Straw Poll 1: Faculty participated in the poll, indicating their agreement (from 1 to 5) with the statement, “I am prepared to support a Mission Statement for general education with content comparable to the proposed draft.” Results of the poll were (144 respondents)

- **1 = Strongly agree 32%**
- **2 = Agree 41%**
- **3 = Neither agree nor disagree 14%**
- **4 = Disagree 8%**
- **5 = Strongly disagree 6%**

Discussion: Professor Dickinson invited faculty, who were seated at tables of eight, with one member of the Board of Regents at each table, to have a 40-minute discussion, responding to the prompt, “Discuss your thoughts about the proposed Mission Statement for general education:

- How might it help us to better explain the purposes of liberal arts education to our students and empower our students to make more of their St. Olaf education?
- How might it support our advising and inspire our advisees to embrace general education as an endeavor beyond checking boxes?
- What suggestions do you have for the Task Force regarding the content of the Mission Statement for general education?
- What suggestions do you have for the Task Force about the rationale that will accompany the Mission Statement for general education in the Curriculum Committee resolution?

Clicker Straw Poll 2: Faculty participated in a second poll, indicating their agreement (from 1 to 5) with the statement, “I am prepared to support a Mission Statement for general education with content comparable to the proposed draft.” Results of the poll were (144 respondents)

- 1 = Strongly agree 24%
- 2 = Agree 20%
- 3 = Neither agree nor disagree 19%
- 4 = Disagree 22%
- 5 = Strongly disagree 15%

10. November 1, 2018 Faculty Meeting: Discussion and Vote on Motion to Require a Supermajority for GE votes

Approval of the [October 4, 2018 Faculty Meeting Minutes](#)

Approval of the [October 11, 2018 Special Faculty Meeting Minutes](#) was moved, seconded, and then approved by unanimous voice vote.

Approval of the minutes was moved and seconded. Jon Naito moved to amend the minutes. In the first paragraph of the Curriculum Committee report on New Business, the role of Kelsey Thompson needed to be clarified. The paragraph from the October 4, 2018 minutes read:

Jon Naito provided context on Resolution 18/19-02. Kelsey Thompson crafted Resolution 18/19-02 by synthesizing the GE Guiding Principles from the September 20, 2018 special faculty meeting with faculty discussion feedback at that meeting as well as faculty comments submitted via the GE Task Force email alias. On September 26, the GE Task Force and Curriculum Committee met to discuss the draft of the resolution. The final draft of the resolution incorporated changes suggested by the Curriculum Committee. The resolution was then approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Guiding Principles were designed to be independent of specific academic subjects and were solely intended as helpful points of reference for faculty deliberations and expectations of our work at the college. Jon reminded faculty that this is one of many faculty votes on GE reform this year as stated in the GE syllabus.

Jon’s proposed changing that paragraph to:

Jon Naito provided context on Resolution 18/19-02. Following the September 20 faculty meeting, which focused on the draft of the GE Guiding Principles, Kelsey Thompson summarized written notes about the table discussions. The CC Resolution 18/19-02 was crafted by the GE Task Force and the Curriculum Committee, taking into consideration email and spoken comments from individual faculty members as

well as the notes from the September 20 table discussions. The Guiding Principles were designed to be independent of specific academic subjects and were solely intended as helpful points of reference for faculty deliberations and expectations of our work at the college. Jon reminded faculty that this is one of many faculty votes on GE reform this year as stated in the GE syllabus.

The motion to amend the minutes was seconded and approved by unanimous voice vote. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Curriculum Committee Report:

Jon invited Shelly Dickinson (GE Task Force Reporter) to the podium. Shelly reminded faculty that according to the GE syllabus faculty were to vote on a GE mission statement today. At the October 11 meeting, faculty were given two straw polls, one before and one after small group discussion of the mission statement. Approval of the GE mission statement waned after group discussion. In addition, small group discussion provided copious notes and ideas on implementation of a GE mission statement. The GE Task Force felt it was impossible to craft a GE mission statement for a vote given the immense feedback from the October 11 meeting. The GE Task Force is currently deciding on how best to use the faculty feedback. Shelly reminded faculty that on November 8 another faculty meeting on GE reform will be held that will focus on GE Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs).

Jon returned to the podium to comment on the Curriculum Committee's deliberations of Jeanine Grenberg's supermajority motion. The Curriculum Committee did not take a position on the motion, but compiled a list of comments to share with faculty.

- The Curriculum Committee felt setting a high voting threshold (two-thirds supermajority) will make adoption of GE proposals very difficult.
- The Curriculum Committee worried what precedent this motion would set for curricular change in general.
- A supermajority vote suggests a lack of trust in the GE revision process, the GE Task Force, and the Curriculum Committee.
- The supermajority motion disregards the role of the Curriculum Committee in overseeing the GE Task Force and GE revision process. The Curriculum Committee has the power to slow down the GE revision process if the Curriculum Committee feels resolutions will pass by the slimmest of margins.
- The supermajority motion will make it more difficult for the faculty to reconsider and make changes to items related to the GE curriculum once a vote has been taken on those items.

Supermajority Motion – Jeanine Grenberg

Jeanine Grenberg introduced and moved the supermajority motion. The motion was seconded. Jeanine insisted that her motives for the motion were to affirm the community and shared aspirations of GE reform. Jeanine concluded that choices that have a pervasive effect on identity often rely on a supermajority vote in a democracy.

- Ryan Sheppard pointed out that faculty must reckon with the negative consequences of supermajority voting systems. Regardless of the intention to promote broader consensus, supermajority systems easily result in rule by the minority. We can promote consensus without tying ourselves to a supermajority system. It is both desirable and possible to achieve majorities

of 70%, 80%, or even 90% on our votes, but should the majority be overruled when it is 65%, 60%, or 55%?

- Chris Chapp posited that if the faculty were to break into two coalitions regarding GE reform, the smaller coalition would have extra bargaining power because of veto power and the power to slow down the process. If there are not just two coalitions, the problem of an unstable majority may arise where it becomes difficult to achieve supermajority consistently.
- Charles Wilson asked who would want to teach in a curriculum that could not muster two-thirds faculty approval?
- Jamie Schillinger asked if this was an issue in the last GE reform. Jeanine answered that the current GE curriculum passed by seventy percent faculty approval.
- Steve McKelvey asked if the supermajority motion required two-thirds majority to pass. The answer was affirmative.
- DeAne Lagerquist pointed out that we will not all agree on every aspect of the new GE curriculum, but a simple majority vote would provide us the opportunity to go along with the process and hopefully be excited about the aspects of the new GE curriculum that impact us personally.
- Irve Dell remarked that he has confidence in the faculty community to arrive at a new GE curriculum without the added mechanism of a supermajority vote.
- **The motion did not pass with an 18% Yes, 80% No, and 2% Abstain vote.**
- Jeanine thanked the faculty community for considering her motion.

11. November 8, 2018 Special Faculty Meeting: Discussion led by GE Task Force and Clicker Polls on ILOs for GE

Clicker Straw Poll 1: Faculty used the clickers to indicate their years of service at St. Olaf (1=0-6, 2=7-15, 3=16-24, 4=25+). Results of the poll were: 120 responses

- 1 = 0-6 30%
- 2 = 7-15 18%
- 3 = 16-24 28%
- 4 = 25+ 23%
- **Note: the first attempt on clicker poll did not work. These results were gathered at the end of the meeting.**

Discussion: Beginning at 11:43 am, Professor Dickinson invited faculty to have a forty minute discussion about the proposed intended learning areas and outcomes for general education, responding to the prompt[s]:

- “How might these enduring questions engage students?”
- “What are the strengths of this draft?”
- “What do you think could make it stronger?”

At 12:17 am Professor Dickinson noted that discussion seemed strong and asked for participants to come up to microphones and give some thoughts.

Reporting back: Faculty were invited to come forward to microphones to share their table's response to the prompts.

Dave Walmsley in Mathematics, Statistics and Computer Science asked for clarification regarding the first question in the GE ILO document, potentially adding the phrase "and my identity in it" to the end of the first question. Dave's table felt that the bullet points did not speak to "living meaningfully in community". Dave recommended adding in something specific to vocation. Dave also felt that the third bullet-point in question two was "marrying us to a current GE attribute."

Jeanine Grenberg in Philosophy noted the discussion at her table about the word "Christian" not appearing in the document. She felt that we should have an ILO that includes Christianity and other religious contexts. She also felt it was too experiential, with not enough in the skills area emphasizing the need to study 'normative' versus 'evaluative' religious points of view..

Arthur Cunningham in Philosophy gave a big picture basic breakdown of the document: knowledge, skills, and engagement. He noted that question three "smuggled in" additional knowledge about ethics, so perhaps it should be moved elsewhere. Arthur also felt that question three might make more sense with less determinant content attached to it.

Kathy Tegtmeyer Pak – Asian Studies/Political Science noted that questions one and two on the document feel fairly familiar to many liberal arts colleges, but question three shows what is unique about St Olaf.

David Booth in Religion reported from his table that they felt that questions were valuable, but bullets could be redistributed anywhere among the three. David argued for not letting the questions categorize too stringently so that the bullet points flow across the top-level questions. – David's table felt that the third bullet point in question one is of a different order of magnitude than the first two. The third bullet point is more specific in character and more involved in addressing a pressing challenge — critical self-reflection.. His table was surprised that the idea of "embodied learning" had dropped out of learning goals.

Hilary Boussein in Classics followed on what David had to say. She noted that their table felt there was another bullet point missing related to meta-cognitive issues . Specifically, how do these areas of knowledge fit together? Question one, third bullet point could serve to direct student experiences with the GE curriculum.

Ulises Jovel Orantes and Myrto Neamonitaki both thanked the faculty for allowing them to speak. Ulises noted that he is looking forward to helping others engage with St Olaf in the future in meaningful ways; Myrto was also happy with the questions as she felt they helped students think about St Olaf moving forward inclusively.

Clicker Straw Poll 2: Faculty used the clickers to respond to the question:

● "I support the idea of using enduring questions to engage students in general education." Rate from 1 to 5 (1=SA, 5 =SD). Results of the poll were: 120 responses

- **1 = SA 33%**
- **2 = A 47%**
- **3 = Neutral 15%**
- **4 = D 2%**
- **5 = SD 2%**

12. December 6, 2018 Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 18/19-06](#) – *OLE Questions for General Education*

Approval of the [November 8, 2018 Minutes of the Special Faculty Meeting](#)

[Resolution 18/19-06](#) – *OLE Questions for General Education*

Jon Naito spoke to Resolution 18/19-06 and moved the faculty adopt the Open, Linked, and Enduring (OLE) questions in Resolution 18/19-06 as parameters for the revised GE curriculum. The OLE questions were:

Q1. In what ways can I understand the world and my role in it?

Q2. What skills do I need to live a meaningful and purposeful life in community?

Q3. How can I live responsibly and prepare for challenges in a dynamic, global society?

Jeanine Grenberg asked for clarification of how faculty would use the OLE questions since there was nothing in the proposal that identified what faculty would be doing with these questions. Jon Naito responded that the Resolution was part of a process and not a final product. Shelly Dickinson pointed out that the questions were for prospective students as they ask what they will gain from the GE curriculum. The questions were designed to be open enough so that the ad hoc groups and faculty could flesh out what would go into addressing each OLE question. Jeanine asked if the questions serve as an internal guiding document for faculty deliberation and also to inform an external audience. Jon Naito replied in the affirmative. Jeanine asked if the questions would be edited during faculty deliberations before revealing to an external audience. Jon Naito replied that a vote to accept these OLE questions would mean that they would not be edited in the future. The rationale describes how these questions provide a framework for internal use among faculty and external use with prospective students and families. Jon acknowledged that the faculty vote would be for the proposal itself, but could not imagine the Curriculum Committee betraying the rationale in the future.

Rika Ito asked Jeanine what her contributions would be to make the resolution more acceptable. Jeanine responded that she felt the OLE questions were good for internal deliberations, but not for external use. Jeanine suggested adding a phrase, such as “St. Olaf is a liberal arts college nourished in the Lutheran tradition whose students in the general education study will look at these questions.”

Chris Chiappari suggested he was ready to call the question and asked if this meeting was the place to spend valuable time editing the resolution.

DeAne Lagerquist felt that these questions were a starting point and what is important is how we address the questions. DeAne was confident we will interpret the OLE questions in light of the College Mission Statement and Resolution rationale.

- **Resolution 18/19-06 passed with a 85% Yes, 11% No, and 4% Abstain vote.**

13. March 14, 2019 Faculty Meeting: Update from the GE Task Force on the revised timeline for a vote on the new GE requirements

Shelly Dickinson to give an update on the GE Task Force. The GE Task Force has been reviewing feedback from the February 28 Special Faculty Meeting and preparing a draft of new GE requirements. The draft will come to faculty next week for discussion at the March 21 Special Faculty Meeting. Faculty will also take time on April 11 in the regular faculty meeting to deliberate on the new GE requirements. The GE Task Force is updating the GE syllabus to provide opportunities for faculty feedback and votes this spring and early next fall. These changes will ensure a plan is in place to communicate more fully with the Board of Regents about the shape of the new requirements. A faculty vote on the proposed core requirements will occur at the Special Faculty Meeting on April 25. The GE Task Force will meet with the Board of Regents on May 2-3. A faculty vote at the May 9 Faculty Meeting will be on a resolution to continue the work of the GE Task Force over the summer in preparation for a final faculty vote in the fall. GE Task Force summer work will include 1) drafting a new mission statement for the new GE curriculum, 2) finalizing the GE requirements based on input from the faculty and the Board of Regents, and 3) creating a structure and timeline for implementation. At the September faculty meeting, faculty will vote on the entire GE package including guiding principles, Ole questions, core requirements, and GE mission statement in preparation for bringing the GE package to the Board of Regents Meeting on October 10 for the Board's review and endorsement.

Shelly invited President Anderson to provide more information on GE revision and the Board's interest. President Anderson acknowledged that we all want the best GE curriculum for our students and the college with maximum support from students, faculty, and the Board. Since the Board only meets three times a year, the Board has had fewer opportunities than faculty or students to think collectively about GE reform. To maximize the Board's support of the new GE curriculum, the optimum strategy would be for the Board to have meaningful input into the process and this is something they desire. At the last Board meeting, the Board members expressed vigilant trepidation on the new GE requirements not quite knowing what these new requirements would entail. The Board expressed that it was not their interest to craft curricula, but to have some oversight in the process to have confidence in the outcome. Another view from the Board parallels tenure and promotion recommendations. Over the past thirteen years, no recommendation from the faculty, Provost, and President for tenure and promotion has been denied by the Board because the Provost provides extensive detail on the entire decision making process. President Anderson maintained it is prudent to give the Board input into the GE revision process when the Task Force meets with the Board in May. The Board has trust in faculty, but they do want the new GE requirements to support the mission of the College. President Anderson respects and affirms the process.

Matt Rohn asked what would happen if the Board did not endorse the new GE requirements. President Anderson responded the college by-laws state that the Board has a role in the process of curriculum reform, so including the Board in the shared responsibility of the revision process is required. President Anderson felt confident in the process of GE reform, but if it were to be denied by the Board, the faculty would have to return to the process of GE reform.

Anne Walter pointed out the Board's intense interest in GE reform. Anne stated the Board asked good questions about the process and reflected deeply on the answers. Anne felt confident that there would be a good discussion with the Board in May when the Task Force meets with the Board.

Joan Hepburn asked if summer GE Task Force members would receive a stipend. Shelly responded that she did not know if they would receive a stipend or even if the Task Force membership would remain the same over the summer. Jon Naito responded that remaining work over the summer would be limited and might not warrant a stipend.

Maggie Odell extended gratitude for moving the final vote to September 2019 since the process has begun to feel rushed and more deliberation was needed. Maggie was not clear if the Board has asked or expects to vote on the new GE requirements or whether we are being asked to share our procedure and we are asking them to vote and endorse the new GE requirements. President Anderson felt the shared governance model would involve the Board voting on a resolution for GE reform. In May, the Board will be presented with the current GE reform model and the thought process behind its crafting to give an opportunity for the Board to provide input on the process.

14. March 21, 2019: Special Faculty Meeting, in which the GE Task Force plan for Discussion and Clicker Polls about the proposed OLE Core was altered by a motion from the floor.

Shelly began by describing the plan to use clicker slides to gather feedback and focus the table discussions. She gave a very brief overview of the process and work so far, noting the years of work here at St. Olaf, national GE revision trends, and our goal to develop a core curriculum that prepares students for the 21st century. She noted the input from multiple sources and groups, as well as peer institutions. She reminded the faculty that today was not about implementation; rather, faculty would be focusing on OLE Core requirements themselves.

After Shelly outlined the plan for the meeting (to start with clicker polls, and follow up with two focused discussions at tables), Mike Fuerstein (Philosophy) moved that faculty not follow the plan developed by the GE Task Force but instead have an open, whole-faculty discussion, foregoing table discussions. The motion was seconded. Charles Taliaferro spoke about ethics not being included in the proposal. DeAne Lagerquist called the question. President David Anderson advised that a two-thirds vote was required to call the question. A hand vote showed more than two-thirds of faculty were in favor of calling the question. As the faculty prepared to consider the motion not to hold table discussions, Shelly clarified that she (on behalf of the GE Task Force) still wanted to use the clicker polls to gather whole-faculty responses. The new motion, to replace table discussions with a large-group discussion, was passed by a show of hands.

- The first clicker question asked faculty to respond to the statement, “I support the goals of the OLE Core Curriculum. It was unclear what goals the faculty were voting on. Shelly decided to move on and faculty response to this statement was not recorded.
- The second clicker question asked faculty to choose a response to complete the sentence, “The OLE Core requirements proposed in this draft...” Results of that poll were (131 total votes): Need minimal revision 15%, Are fine in principle, need clarification 32%, need significant modification 45%, are the wrong direction 8%
- Faculty were asked to respond to the next prepared clicker question, which provided the prompt, “The FY Seminar proposed in this draft...” Results of that poll were (129 total votes): Need minimal revision 22%, Are fine in principle, need clarification 51%, need significant modification 19%, are the wrong direction 8%
- Shelly asked faculty to provide data for two more clicker questions, both intended to gauge the level of faculty-wide interest in discussing each of the proposed requirements. The first of those clicker polls asked about five areas associated with Q1, “Which area are you most interested in discussing today?” Results of that poll were (111 total votes): Religions, Faith, and Values, 36%,

Power, Inequity, and Race 29%, Historical Perspectives 7%, Natural Sciences 23%, Social Sciences 5%. The other clicker question about faculty-wide interest asked about five areas associated with Q2 and Q3, “Which area are you most interested in discussing today?” Results of that poll were (109 total votes): Writing in Context 13%, Quantitative Reasoning 10%, World Languages and Cultures 11%, Creativity 33%, Experiential Learning in Context 33%

OPEN DISCUSSION:

Mike Fuerstein (Philosophy): Expressed strong concern about the lack of an ethics requirement in the proposed curriculum. He read examples of ethics course topics and questions and asked how the three OLE questions could be understood without ethical reasoning and ethics as required elements of the curriculum.

Paul Jackson (Chemistry and Environmental Studies): Moved that the faculty allow the students from the Curriculum Committee and the GE Task Force who were present to speak. The motion was seconded. Arthur Cunningham (Philosophy) spoke against the motion to allow students to speak, on the grounds that the faculty needed to have the time to speak. Donna McMillan (Psychology) asked that all present listen as well as speak to present their own views. A hand count showed that the motion was defeated.

Matt Rohn (Art and Art History): Asked if the Task Force is planning on bringing more GE requirements to the faculty. Jon Naito (English and Curriculum Committee) said that the Task Force was interested in bringing ideas for consideration. Not everything is done yet, such as reflective thinking by students.

Anthony Rudd (Philosophy): Asked for clarification of the answer to Matt’s question about whether these were the only proposed GE requirements. Jon clarified that this is the vision of GE courses and core curriculum, but that elements such as the actual, final ILOs are not yet fully developed.

David Booth (Religion): Stated that faculty input must help shape the new GE curriculum. David said that he had written to the Task Force and wanted to share part of those comments with faculty so they become part of the public deliberation: 1) David was surprised not to see art and literature included in the first OLE question; 2) David was surprised that the science requirement does not explicitly note the social context for science; 3) other explicit modes for student reflection need to be developed to enable students to tell their own story about reflections on their learning experiences. Shelly added that a portfolio is intended to be part of the plan but is not yet developed.

Justin Merritt (Music): Agreed with the goal of reducing the overall size of the GE curriculum, as Music has done with its major, but was concerned about the elimination of the current SPM. Students have physical and mental health needs that are addressed by SPM. Justin also asked what is going to be cut in a new GE curriculum.

Irve Dell (Art and Art History): The lack of experience in the physical world is a problem for students, as is the nature deficit. He was not excited by the GE proposal; it’s not bold or innovative or inspiring and is just a slightly modified version of what we currently have. He is concerned about the Power, Inequity, and Race component, which appears as only one required course. It should be included in all parts of the core curriculum.

Danny Muñoz-Hutchinson (Philosophy): The lack of a physical education requirement is a concern because students are increasingly not physically able to do somersaults in his judo interim class. Moving one's body through space is an important part of education. In Historical Perspectives, diversity and race issues are important but the rationale suggests that the only approach allowed is a history of race and power.

Pete Gittins (Chemistry): The draft presents the curriculum as a series of courses that need to be checked off. The science course requirement would seem to require an additional course to teach about science in a social context. He asked how a whole course in science could do what the proposed GE ILOs require. Shelly replied that the Task Force has considered a module approach, but how would we count modules or know how these ideas are being addressed in different courses so that they sum to a meaningful experience?

Diane LeBlanc (Writing Program): Noted that the conversation was taking a productive turn. The draft was relevant to both ways of knowing and distribution models. Some faculty were speaking to one issue and others were focusing on the other. It would be helpful to consider what is possible. Ways of knowing components have the potential to be fulfilled through a range of courses.

Brian Borovsky (Physics): Offered a statement he had written about a different possible second Natural Sciences ILO about social and political issues: 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.

Jeanine Grenberg (Philosophy): Focusing on the writing requirement, she asserted that rigorous training in writing is more important than ever. Cutting the requirements in this area is not the right direction. Adding more of some kind of writing should be seriously considered. Jon Naito added that the Task Force has considered where parts of the current GE could be delivered through the majors. The OLE Core proposes two writing semesters in the FY Seminar, one course in Writing in Context, and encourages an additional writing-focused course in the major. Writing within the major was one of the objectives of the current GE curriculum that was not fully implemented. Shelly noted that students in different majors need to learn to write in different ways.

Francesca Anderegg (Music): Wondered about what is required versus what is possible. She warned that future interpretations of the GE document would be literal and therefore we should be as concrete as possible when framing the GE document. She said that Experiential Learning in Context seems to focus on non-academic experiences, but then added that ACE and off-campus courses are academic courses. She said that music and art are embodied and experiential learning, too, and she was sad not to see music explicitly included in the Experiential Learning section.

Corliss Swain (Philosophy): The OLE Questions that we came up with are the spirit of a liberal arts education. However, a "meaningful and purposeful life" and the other OLE Questions seem not to be guiding the proposed curriculum. Shelly observed that she thinks the questions are in fact guiding the draft.

Irve Dell (Art and Art History): Wondered how big or important is the GE core relative to everything else we do. Some of the elements should be done in our majors. We might want to think about key fundamental questions, not focus so much on disciplines and current GEs.

Paul Jackson (Chemistry and Environmental Studies): Focusing on a disciplinary perspective is limiting when thinking about possibilities for different kinds of general education curriculum. Students are excited about these possibilities. Paul was disappointed that students' voices were not allowed to be part of the discussion.

Karil Kucera (Art and Art History/Asian Studies): The organization of the OLE Questions and courses is somewhat arbitrary. Any course could be put under any question. A reorganization listing the questions followed by all the courses would emphasize how the questions are embodied in all the courses.

Arthur Cunningham (Philosophy): Science should be science-in-context, but the requirements are narrow and disciplinary and seem to say nothing about investigating the ways of knowing. There are no critical reflections on the nature of science in the draft. We should remain true to the broad interdisciplinary aims. By contrast, the humanities get no broad mention. Only history and languages and writing represent humanities in the draft.

Tony Becker (Economics): A proposed GE requirement refers to "inequity" but no place that mentions where students will learn about "equity". The study of equity would require studying ethics. The discussion about analyzing social systems from a perspective of power and privilege is not the only way to analyze systems. Students need to be aware of other frameworks or we risk setting them outside a number of mainstream ways of analyzing social systems. The proposed Social Sciences requirement creates a very narrow view of the social sciences. Use of data and empirical techniques is not explicitly noted.

Lisa Moore (Social Work and Family Studies): This is the first time we have had a draft to work with. The level of detail that some faculty are reading into the draft are not evident to all faculty. She would like to have heard more from students, including at this meeting. Shelly said that the GE Task Force students are going to take the drafts to students to gather their feedback.

Louis Epstein (Music): He thought that some faculty were reading the document too literally and ungenerously. For example, Historical Perspectives does not state that there is only one way to teach these courses. We will all be able to teach fully, as we do now.

DeAne Lagerquist (Religion): Would like the GE curriculum to articulate the aspirations of our students, not just what is wrong with the world. She referenced the late faculty member Jim Farrell, who sought to enable students to contribute to a better world. She thinks that we should state this aspiration firmly and directly.

Provost Sortor called for a close to the meeting. Shelly closed with reminders and requests. The GE Task Force wants feedback from faculty. The faculty meetings on April 11 and 25 will include time to discuss the evolving OLE Core. The GE Task Force will keep everyone apprised of progress on the GE Task Force website as we move forward.

15. April 11, 2019 Faculty Meeting: Presentation by the GE Task Force and Vote on resolution to support the work and process of the GE Task Force.

Resolution: Mary Carlsen offered a motion for the faculty body to support the work of the GE Task Force going forward. The motion was seconded. Peter Nelson asked for clarity on the motion. Mary Carlsen replied she does not want to see the process devolve into GE reform by petition or email. Mary recognized this process might take another year or two, but she would like to keep GE reform momentum moving forward with continued conversations rather than stopping the process and starting over. Mary has confidence in the GE Task Force. A clicker slide was created for faculty vote on the motion. While faculty waited, Doug Casson pointed out that he would support the motion if it meant supporting the hard work of the Task Force, but could not support the motion if it meant halting any criticism of the proposed GE curriculum or challenging each other to improve the proposed GE curriculum. Mary clarified that the vote would be either for or against support of the GE Task Force moving the process forward. In the event that faculty vote down any proposed GE reforms, Mary felt that not supporting the process would entail disbanding the GE Task Force followed by reconstitution and beginning the process over again. Jon Naito said the GE Task Force does not want to have faculty feel any reform is rushed, so the process will remain open and feedback will be solicited. The question was called. A total of 102 faculty voted on calling the question and the motion passed with a 78% yes, 20% no, 2% abstain vote. **A total of 104 faculty voted on Mary's motion and the motion passed with a 78% yes, 11% no, 11% abstain vote.**

16. April 18, 2019 Faculty/Staff Forum on the proposed OLE Core (3:45-5:30), streamed and archived on the GE Task Force website

17. April 25, 2019 Special Faculty Meeting: GE Task Force Discussion and Clicker Polls about the size of the proposed OLE Core (draft revised and distributed April 17)

Minutes of the St. Olaf Special Faculty Meeting – April 25, 2019

OPENING REMARKS – President Anderson

President Anderson outlined the meeting. The Task Force would use the first 25 minutes to discuss GE curriculum reform and to take clicker polls. The remainder of the meeting would be dedicated to faculty discussion. President Anderson let faculty know that students were present and that a motion was necessary to allow them to speak at the meeting. Allowing students to speak at the meeting was moved, seconded and passed with unanimous voice vote.

Dana Gross and Shelly Dickinson were invited to the podium by President Anderson. Shelly let faculty know that new documents were available on the GE Task Force website. These documents were designed to let faculty know how we got to where we currently are in the GE reform process.

- Faculty Votes and Straw Polls on GEs. This document contains a timeline of all the things that have happened in the GE reform process since we began in 2016.
- Annotated Bibliography. This document contains a list of resources the Task Force has read.

- Selected Reading List. This document contains a list of resources given to all ad hoc working groups in December 2018.

Shelly outlined some next steps in the process.

- There will be a community ad hoc workshop during Community Time on May 2nd. This workshop will be an opportunity for sustained idea incubation and recommendations for the Core.
- We need to renew the charge for GE revision in 2019-2020.
- The GE Task Force strongly urges that we find time devoted to GE discussion during Week Zero.

Shelly outlined what the GE Task Force envisions for a 21st century OLE Core curriculum.

- The Task Force wants the GE Core to welcome all students, foster belonging, support learning, and foster collaboration, integration, and collaborative problem solving.
- The Task Force believes the GE curriculum should be smaller and more flexible to open space for exploration, action, reflection, and interaction with faculty.

Shelly reminded faculty of the Guiding Principles voted on by faculty in the fall:

An acceptable revised general education curriculum is one that

- Has **breadth** that complements depth in a major
- Supports the **college mission**
- Is owned and supported by the **faculty**
- Is **forward-looking**
- Is **inclusive, accessible**, and supports **equity**
- Is **resource-sensitive**
- Promotes **student agency**

Shelly announced that a new document (Guiding Principles linked to OLE Core) linking the guiding principles to the OLE Core is now available on the GE Task Force website.

Shelly and the GE Task Force feel the proposed OLE Core provides opportunities for students through:

- Learning communities for all students
- Experiential learning
- Creative problem-solving
- More flexibility
- Integrative learning
- 21st century literacies in digital and visual data literacies and speaking and writing
- Reflection on the OLE questions

Myrto Neamonitaki '20 and Ulises Jovel '20 informed the faculty that the SGA passed a resolution supporting the OLE Core proposal, the work of the Task Force, and the revision process. SGA will operate with the understanding that students will be involved and be able to provide input in the process.

Dana Gross discussed the size of the OLE Core.

- The original ad hoc group of Steve McKelvey, Seth Binder, Doug Casson, Laura Maki, and Kent McWilliams attended the AAC&U Institute on General Education and Assessment in 2016. Their report concluded the St. Olaf GE curriculum was too complex with too many attributes and ILOs which led to problems in assessment and difficulty explaining it to students, new faculty, staff or other stakeholders. The room for meaningful reflection was not apparent in the current GE curriculum and students could not articulate the benefits and reasons for the GE requirements. There was also a lack of faculty ownership given the age of the GE curriculum.
- In May 2018, a report from the previous Task Force concluded that too many students did not see the value or meaning of the GE curriculum which has led to some student resentment of the GE curriculum.
- There is significant variability in the length of the GE path for students due to AP/IB credit, college knowledge, majors that offer multiple GEs, and transfer students/transfer credit.
- The question is do we want a smaller and integrative GE Core or larger and more prescriptive Core? The GE Task Force feels a smaller curriculum will improve retention, improve equity and access, and increase student agency.

Doug Casson felt that critiques of the current GE model were warranted, but clicker polls might be biased today after priming faculty with the GE Task Force presentation. Doug argued that the faculty should discuss GE reform first before taking the clicker polls. President Anderson suggested the faculty vote on whether to take the clicker polls first or discuss first. Doug Casson moved that faculty have a discussion before taking the clicker polls. The motion was seconded. Shelly mentioned that the clicker polls were meant to initiate conversation and she would prefer to gather data on the poll questions first. Donna McMillan mentioned some faculty routinely speak at faculty meetings while the majority of faculty do not. Clicker polls have the advantage of giving the other faculty input. Dan Hofrenning asked if faculty could see the poll questions first. Shelly displayed the three questions to the faculty:

1. The maximum number of courses in the OLE Core should be 16. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)
2. We should vote on a maximum size of the Core at the May 9, 2019 faculty meeting. (Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree)
3. In general, I think the number of Core/GE courses should be

0-4

5-8

9-12

13-16

17+

Hilary Boussein asked if faculty could do a clicker poll, have a discussion, and follow that with another round of clicker polls. Shelly replied in the affirmative. Jeanine Grenberg felt the clicker poll data would be more reflective if faculty discussed reasons against a smaller GE to contrast with what the GE Task Force presented earlier. Corliss Swain asked if the clicker polls were meant to begin or end a conversation. Shelly responded they were meant to initiate the conversation and represented a baseline for the conversation.

The question was called to stop discussion about Doug's motion to have a faculty discussion of the GE Core prior to the clicker polls. Faculty agreed to stop discussion of the motion with a 94% Yes/5% No vote (122 respondents). The motion to have a discussion prior to the clicker polls did not pass (23% Yes/75% No with 130 respondents).

Seth Peabody introduced a motion to have clicker polls before and after a round of discussion. The motion was seconded. The motion passed by voice vote.

Olaf Hall-Holt pointed out the poll questions were stated in terms of courses, but the current GE format is attributes that can be attached to courses. Jon Naito responded the questions were crafted in terms of courses since it was more natural to think in terms of total courses. Olaf asked about the typical number of GE courses a student must take. Shelly responded the maximum number of courses students take to fulfill the GE requirement is twenty-six courses while the average is approximately sixteen courses.

Round one poll results:

Jon Naito provided context to the first clicker poll question which sets a maximum number of OLE Core courses to sixteen for a student that comes to St. Olaf without any AP or transfer credits. Tony Becker pointed out the first question was misleading since a Strongly Disagree vote could include voters who feel significantly more or significantly less than sixteen GE courses should be required. Peter Gittins asked for clarification that if a voter agreed with the first clicker poll statement, that voter was in support of no more than sixteen courses for the GE requirement. Jon Naito confirmed this.

1. The maximum number of courses in the OLE Core should be 16. (130 respondents)
2. Strongly agree – 30%
3. Agree – 32%
4. Disagree – 23%
5. Strongly disagree – 15%

1. We should vote on a maximum size of the Core at the May 9, 2019 faculty meeting. (128 respondents)
2. Strongly agree – 34%
3. Agree – 27%
4. Disagree – 18%
5. Strongly disagree – 20%

John Giannini pointed out in the third poll question that it was hard to determine the number of courses for the GE Core without having a feel yet for what that number should be. President Anderson said that if there was uncertainty in a voter's mind, that voter would have to think how to respond or not to respond at all. Paul Jackson put the question in context by reminding faculty that the total number of credits required for graduation is thirty-five. Paul asked faculty to consider what fraction of that total should be dedicated to GE. Meredith Holgerson asked if faculty could consider a single course counting for multiple GE requirements. Shelly said that is open to discussion, but the Task Force is hoping that does not happen in the new GE curriculum. Jon Naito said that some GE courses could be counted towards majors.

1. In general, I think the number of Core/GE courses should be (123 respondents)

0-4	– 5%
5-8	– 8%
9-12	– 33%
13-16	– 30%
17+	– 24%

The meeting was opened for faculty discussion on the GE Core.

- Jeanine Grenberg asked if the Task Force weighed arguments against a smaller GE curriculum. Dana responded faculty do not speak very clearly to students about the size of the GE curriculum. Dana felt faculty have not made a case for such a large GE requirement. The compelling argument is for a coherent curriculum that we can explain and students can understand and value the experience. Ulises added that a smaller GE requirement will help alleviate student frustration about being limited to only a few electives. Jeanine offered two arguments to balance the arguments for a smaller GE requirement: 1) A larger GE requirement maintains the identity of St. Olaf as a liberal arts college and 2) maintains the identity of the college specifically through the GE curriculum.
- Jamie Schillinger recalls from a survey administered through Ryan Sheppard’s and Tom Williamson’s SOAN courses that students do not want a smaller GE curriculum. Jamie also said that agency should not be equated with choice.
- Matt Rohn pointed out the small GE requirement of Grinnell College which is also a liberal arts college.
- Ryan Sheppard, in response to Jamie Schillinger’s comment, said the student data was qualitative and comes from only a few students.
- Jon Naito pointed out we don’t perceive the challenges students face in navigating the GE curriculum. Jon indicated in the Fall semester of their senior year, the Class of 2014 had a majority of students that had not fulfilled the WRI GE requirement. More than 33% of the class had completed two or fewer WRI GE courses. This indicated the WRI component has become a senior year requirement for a significant number of students. Jon does not feel this was intended when the current GE model was implemented.
- DeAne Lagerquist admitted that she is undecided on the size of the GE curriculum, but is willing to consider a small reduction from its current size. She felt that other faculty were in a similar position being undecided on the size of the GE curriculum.
- Donna McMillan agrees that agency is not the same as choice. Students must take ownership in the decisions they make when pursuing their education at St. Olaf.
- Doug Casson mentioned that most political science students take their WRI requirements during their senior year in the political science seminars. Doug mentioned he would hate to see a WRI requirement reduced as part of GE reduction. Instead, writing should be placed within the OLE Core intentionally and repeatedly.
- Rika Ito suggested we can think of the GE requirement as one minimum requirement for a liberal arts education. Therefore, we can think about teaching courses beyond the GE curriculum that include a writing component.
- Karen Cherewatuk suggested the clicker polls have a neutral or “can’t decide” option.
- Jon Naito reminded faculty that we deliver a liberal arts education in the GE curriculum, in majors and in meetings with advisees. Jon agreed with Rika that the GE curriculum is a minimum

set of expectations for a liberal arts education and he hopes students will go above and beyond the requirements. Jon mentioned anecdotally of an advisee that dropped Great Conversation and is now struggling to fit in all the GE requirements in four years.

- Ulises concluded that a new GE curriculum offers the possibility for students to see themselves in the courses they are taking.
- Shelly encouraged everyone to attend the community ad hoc workshop on May 2nd during Community Time.

Round two poll results:

1. The maximum number of courses in the OLE Core should be 16. (126 respondents)
2. Strongly agree – 44%
3. Agree – 21%
4. Disagree – 17%
5. Strongly disagree – 19%

1. We should vote on a maximum size of the Core at the May 9, 2019 faculty meeting. (128 respondents)
2. Strongly agree – 41%
3. Agree – 24%
4. Disagree – 16%
5. Strongly disagree – 20%

1. In general, I think the number of Core/GE courses should be (124 respondents)

0-4	– 6%
5-8	– 9%
9-12	– 35%
13-16	– 32%
17+	– 17%

Shelly reminded faculty that all GE Task Force documents were available on the GE Task Force website.

18. Votes: May 9 2019, Faculty Meeting: [Resolution 18/19-19](#) – Continuation of the Task Force For General Education Curriculum Revision Faculty vote: **71% yes, 22% no, 7% abstain**, and [Resolution 18/19-20](#) – Maximum Size of GE Curriculum Faculty vote: **74% yes, 22% no, 4% abstain**