

| Writing Requirement | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 18 | 12 | 4 | 6 | 40 |
| Support with modifications | 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 14 |
| Do not support | 7 | | 1 | 1 | 9 |
| Did not respond | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | 64 |
| Quantitative Thinking Requirement | | | | | |
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 15 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 28 |
| Support with modifications | 5 | 2 | | 2 | 9 |
| Do not support | 11 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 19 |
| Did not respond | 4 | 4 | | | 8 |
| | | | | | 64 |
| U.S. Multiculturalism Requirement | | | | | |
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 18 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 36 |
| Support with modifications | 6 | 3 | | 1 | 10 |
| Do not support | 9 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 15 |
| Did not respond | 2 | 1 | | | 3 |
| | | | | | 64 |
| Internationalism Requirement | | | | | |
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 14 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 28 |
| Support with modifications | 10 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 16 |
| Do not support | 8 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 13 |
| Did not respond | 3 | | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| | | | | | 64 |

| First-Year Course | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 19 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 35 |
| Support with modifications | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 17 |
| Do not support | 4 | 3 | | 2 | 9 |
| Did not respond | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| | | | | | 64 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Senior Capstone Experience | | | | | |
| | tenured | not tenured | not on tenure track | No response | Total |
| Support as defined | 23 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 43 |
| Support with modifications | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Do not support | 6 | 1 | | | 7 |
| Did not respond | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| | | | | | 64 |

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

Writing Requirement

currently stated learning objectives are really instructional goals; needs to have learning outcomes defined

Why create yet another committee? Can we implement the requirement without creating a committee to steer it?

I support the requirement, but weakly. See below.

1. This is not that demanding.
 2. I worry about equity across departments and divisions.
-

As long as there is a robust oversight committee for continually reviewing w designations. how will people know if the faculty member, for instance, never looks at drafts? or if their comments are helpful or extensive? it'd be easy to fill those general requirements above in a course description and then not deliver on the spirit of the description in any significant way. will faculty ever be required to turn in copies of their comments to a committee? receive training in writing instruction? will students get to send in special "W" evaluation forms to the oversight committee to see if the faculty member is actually doing the job sufficiently? This could very easily become a meaningless designation unless it is maintained with some rigor. I imagine departments competing for students will put pressure on this designation to make it as loose as possible. That way they can assign it to a number of their courses to increase their value and attractiveness, so to speak, for students trying to fill requirements (thereby increasing their enrollment and giving them more sway on campus). For instance, about half my courses would deserve such a designation if it was maintained seriously, but all could easily pass for it if the designation ended up being perceived as a loose or nonserious thing.

Much of this requirement seems to duplicate what is done in first year courses.

I'm not sure I support the notion that a first-year course could not serve to meet the writing requirements. My first-year course is VERY writing intensive. I can't imagine any course where students would get more careful feedback, opportunities to rewrite, learn editing techniques, work on both content and form. Also, writing intensive courses, when taught well, require a much greater time commitment from faculty. Would there be enrollment caps on such classes? Some kind of incentive for those who regularly teach W-designated courses?

The Steering Committee creates yet another faculty committee. The faculty worked hard to reduce the number of committees, in order to allow individuals more time to concentrate on their teaching and scholarship. I suggest that the Dean of Academic Programs be given the task of reviewing course proposals and making a recommendation to EPAG. The Dean, working with EPAG, should provide the assessment of this requirement. There should be faculty workshops each August for faculty teaching W courses. Faculty should be compensated for participating in these workshops.

Possibility to take into consideration some of the advanced foreign language courses that really train students to write. The rules for a good essay are the same.

I would like more emphasis on the final criterion, i.e. "the importance of clear writing and proper grammar, usage, and style in academic writing." a small but significant number of our students have severe problems in this area that are never suitably addressed. Perhaps we need something like Berkeley's Subject 1a or "Bonehead English" Requirement.

should there be more strict guidelines as to what defines a "w" in terms of how long a large research paper is/how many hours are necessary. I'm not sure how you will decide whether a course really can be a "w" unless this is only meant as a "guide", I also wonder if students are already subjected to "w" courses without having to define them. is it necessary to add the requirement. I wholeheartedly believe that writing should be an important component of a college class but do think it may already be there without having to demand it!

That the first year courses also be designated W, so that students have two intensive writing courses by the time they graduate/

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

Two comments:

first, there is no guarantee that the FYC will have competent or even existing writing instruction. I have been told, for example, of a technical theater course in which essentially no writing was done -- and this is hardly the only example. So: do not rely on the FYC for what it is _supposed_ to accomplish.

second, the MAX center is a really iffy place to get writing support, and its problems begin at the top.

Take out the word "academic" from the "requirement aims."

The "standard citation style" is not essential. This is something students can learn in their majors.

The above learning objectives should be those of the first-year course. As one who has students write a good deal, it would significantly improve the quality of work to have these consistently addressed early on--as they tend to be in colleges with first-year writing. I can't imagine teaching a W course in which some of the students have already met the objectives and some have not; the ones who have will be upset with the time spent on meeting the objectives (and I don't believe they will get met passively), and I will be wasting their time. What about students who take more than one W course? They will be doubly or triply put out. We shouldn't wait until the junior year to make sure these are met in any case.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

Writing Requirement

If we are really serious about the writing requirement it makes no sense to allow students to postpone it as late as the Junior year. It also seems to make little sense to not allow first year courses to count as writing courses.

I would propose that the writing requirement be met during the 1st year course

I don't find this requirement particularly inspiring. I don't think it will hurt if it passes; I just don't think it will make much of a difference, and it just adds another box that needs to be checked off. This will tend to isolate writing in particular courses rather than encouraging good teaching of writing throughout the curriculum. I'd rather see an institution-wide initiative to help all instructors improve their ability to incorporate effective writing instruction in their courses.

I'm not convinced that we really need to add this additional requirement. Many courses in the social sciences already require such writing assignments, and I'm nervous that adding the requirement will place a disproportionate burden on social science in terms of serving the entire college.

Not necessary.

While I appreciate the objectives and criteria, I am not sure that establishing a W course grad requirement is the best means to meet the objectives. There are two main reasons:

(1) If we have a "real" capstone requirement, most capstone projects will meet the objectives of the W requirement. That is, students will have to plan and organize an essay, using evidence to support a thesis statement, citing sources using an accepted disciplinary format. This material will be presented to a critical audience and will undergo feedback. Indeed, in a capstone seminar, peer feedback would seem to be intrinsic to the process of students learning what qualifies good writing.

(2) Having a W designation may make it more difficult for faculty to sell students a non-W designated writing intensive course. I have taught at other schools in which there is a W requirement. In courses in which I assigned significant amounts of writing but the course was not designated as W, students complained about having to write. While I am uncertain the extent to which the Macalester student culture would follow the student culture at these other schools, I do worry about the potential. Additionally, if we have a W designation, there might be decreased pressure on faculty to integrate writing instruction in non-W courses. Currently, I teach a little about writing in all of my courses, attempting to teach particular skills in particular courses, with the aim that students at various levels of courses will gain exposure to various aspects of the writing process and components of quality writing.

Summary: The essence of my first reason is that there is a better way to meet the requirement - through the capstone requirement. Such a means better solves inter-departmental equity issues, since no single department will bear the burden of teaching the W courses. Further, departments in such circumstances should structure their curricular offerings to prepare students for the capstone experience. Doing so would integrate writing into intermediate level courses so that students completing the capstone are well-prepared for the experience. To the extent that my second concern - a W could decrease the incentive for faculty to integrate writing into their courses if they are not designated W - also happens, the better, more organic means of teaching writing throughout the college career is further undermined.

I like the idea of a W course having three or more writing assignments during the semester. However, I do not approve of the phrase "or one larger research or term paper." Almost all courses at Mac have at least one paper (which you could call "larger" if you wanted, but I don't think a single assignment can give you the practice and experience that you need. I would strike that phrase from the criteria.

The responses I get from our graduate students upon their return to campus and after having begun graduate programs is that they are already better prepared to write than the vast majority of their graduate student colleagues. I do not understand the need for Macalester to institute an actual requirement.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

Writing Requirement

A BASIC writing course could only be taught as a writing course. I could modify any course I currently offer to this end but would have to sacrifice disciplinary needs to the purpose of writing instruction.

I would definitely consider revising 2 other courses that I can think of to follow these guidelines and get this designation. This preparation for students is essential for their work as seniors on their capstone projects.

I think that History 379 (The Study of History) could fulfill this requirement. I will be teaching this course next semester and most likely, in the years to come.

Do departments outside the humanities offer many courses that could get a 'W' now? If so, the requirement has no downside. If not, will those departments develop many such courses? If so, will they need help, and who will help them? If not, is this really just a humanities requirement? I doubt this requirement will change our undergraduates' experience much, but I don't think it can hurt.

Actually, all six of my courses would fulfill the W requirement, as written, but there was no space to list Urban Politics in Latin America and Comparative Social Movements.

Do departments outside the humanities offer many courses that could get a 'W' now? If so, the requirement has no downside. If not, will those departments develop many such courses? If so, will they need help, and who will help them? If not, is this really just a humanities requirement? I doubt this requirement will change our undergraduates' experience much, but I don't think it can hurt.

I could pretty easily modify two of my other courses to fulfill this requirement.

Virtually all the courses I teach could qualify as "W" courses.

My courses are very writing intensive, but are taught in French. (Would courses count for W courses if the writing were not done in English?) If there were more support for teaching across the disciplines, I could certainly teach writing-intensive courses that focused on writing in English. I think team-teaching would be ideal for writing intensive courses: one professor, perhaps more trained in writing, paired with another professor. For example, Mark Mazullo and I could teach a historical survey "Text and Music" where he would focus on the musical theory and I would focus on the literary texts and student writing about both music and literature. We'd need institutional support to do something like that, but it strikes me as an ideal way to address college-level writing, in a setting that doesn't feel like a freshman comp course.

The relationship to the First Year courses still feels unclear to me. In my First Year courses I cover most if not all of these objectives. Nevertheless, I like the idea of this being additional to and not fulfillable by a First Year Course. How does this go beyond First Year courses?

all my courses would fit, with only minor changes. In fact they exceed the requirements.

I did not fill in the above course related questions because doing so would clearly identify me as a survey respondent. Is this information confidential? If so, this should be indicated up front.

This is such a basic requirement that I cannot believe it is really a step forward for the College. Currently, almost all courses offered by the PoliSci department meet (and most exceed) this requirement.

I like the new requirement, but am afraid that its true implementation may require more faculty time than may have been anticipated. I am not sure I will be able to provide continuous feedback on grammar and substance; it is rather a large undertaking for me!

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

I do not offer any courses in which I could institute a meaningful writing component without greatly sacrificing the present content.

The courses I teach at the advanced level also meet your criteria, but I want to reserve them primarily for majors, minors, and students with substantial background in related academic fields.

ALL my courses get good results in student writing, and are writing-intensive. I would never subject them to a college-wide committee for approval by people who have only random odds of knowing anything about teaching writing.

I am not going to complete the course inventory so that I can make my comments in a manner to preserve confidentiality.

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

Quantitative Thinking Requirement

I simply want to take this space to say that of all the reports, the Q report was by far the richest and best thought-out. I support it.

I think Q1-3 should be reversed so that the "total" adds up to 3. I think it should be clear that there are certain basics of what we intend the requirement to cover so that Q3 (or Q1) courses MUST ALL cover some common core of the goal (so that even if you're exposed to that 3 times, we're sure it's part of the critical aspects of QT).

I want to know more about the "faculty development" that "will be part of all "Q" courses." Does a faculty member have to participate in order for their course to 'count'? If so, this needs to be stated explicitly and voted upon by the faculty. Who will determine which courses count?

I wonder if we should drop the Q3 option. The Q3 courses are likely to be the hardest to monitor (in terms of course quality) and the least effective delivery system for student learning. I do like the idea of Q2, where a course can be substantially qualitative, with this as a major focus, but can include other approaches. I would also support a Q2 definition for all Q courses, and then just require that students take two.

Drop the *requirement* that faculty with Q courses attend the workshop, and make it recommended and supported instead.

I would propose merging the Q2 and Q3 classifications. It would be easier in terms of bookkeeping, advising, etc., and still retain the spirit of the requirement. Since natural science majors will automatically take three Q3 classes, there is no loss in cutting the requirement to two Q2 classes. Conversely, majors outside of the natural sciences and quantitative social sciences will most likely fulfill their requirement with a no-prerequisite Q1 class anyway. As a quantitative natural scientist, I also find it somewhat counterintuitive that my classes, which involve quantitative reasoning all semester, will likely be only Q3 courses under the proposed scheme, because they don't address a major of the QR goals. I am sympathetic to the breadth of goals. However, since even three Q3 classes in a typical natural science major plan won't meet the breadth of goals (and will nevertheless fulfill the QR requirement), why make the effort to differentiate Q2 and Q3?

1. In our lunch discussion of the Quant thinking requirement, it was reiterated that Intro to Stats and Principles of Econ are the two existing courses that come closest to the ideal of covering all five stated learning objectives (listed on the draft proposal). But at the meeting, it was also conceded that these two courses do not cover all five objectives. Therefore, it should be made clear that even a "Q1" course does not have to cover all five objectives (which would be difficult anyway in one semester).

2. I'm curious as to why the "Q1" courses should have no quantitative prerequisites. Why is this a stipulation for Q1 courses, but not for Q2 or Q3? What about a Q1 course that has a non-quantitative prerequisite, such as a disciplinary prereq? Is that acceptable? If the course covers the learning objectives, shouldn't it count as a Q1 level course, regardless of the existence of any prerequisites? I believe the point of the three levels of courses is to give students choice in how they fill the requirement, and to allow for a student to take three Q3 courses if they do not want to immerse themselves in a Q1 course. However, as it stands, it might be harder for a student to fulfill the requirement with three Q3 courses than with one Q1, simply because the Q3s might have prerequisites and it might be difficult to fit them all in. I feel like we should be consistent with the prereq limitation one way or the other, unless there is some justification for limiting the Q1 courses that I am not aware of.

I am somewhat indifferent to this requirement - I think it is important for students to have quantitative literacy, but wonder if this requirement is the best way to meet it. If divisions that teach more quantitative thinking (Natural and Social Sciences) courses would structure / limit courses to meet the distribution requirement to teach quantitative thinking, then there may not be a need for the requirement. On the other hand, it is nice to think that the quantitative thinking may be throughout the curriculum.

see above

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

Quantitative Thinking Requirement

Adopt a single-tier, one course requirement. Keep the criteria flexible.

It would overload students who do not have a proclivity for quantitative thinking.

I would vote for one course, but I can't see how multiple Q2 or Q3 courses make sense, since it may be that the same partial material would be taught in the two or three courses the student takes. I can't imagine what I would say to advisees who question this. If we're going to do it, let's bite the bullet and make them take one course that meets the requirement and figure out just what we need in new resources to do it.

Unless you can name a dozen courses in a choice of fields, this requirement is not yet a working proposal. No one agreed to two or three new courses per requirement last year in the voting. In fact, the deal was that to add an additional requirement one had to be dropped. This would be really hard for a student to plan a major around, hard for advisors to track, hard for departments in the Social Sciences to plan course offerings year by year.

I am not convinced of the need for a three-tier system. This seems burdensome, especially for students whose focus lies in areas further from QR-intensive fields. It appears that a student who doesn't want to take statistics might have to take two or three low-priority offerings in order to satisfy this requirement. Also, the notion that rhetoric or ethics courses might be 25% "quantitative" seems farfetched. I would prefer that a larger number of courses (including many currently in the Q2 list) be designated as fulfilling this requirement.

That the requirement be simplified, eliminating the three-course scheme in favor of one course.

I agree that students need some quantitative skills but how Q2 and Q3 are defined is too problematic. How many courses in the social sciences, humanities or interdisciplinary courses would fit? Or we not care. If the idea is that (non-science) students take these courses with the Stats dept and don't bother to apply it, then it's pointless anyway. I think it is ridiculous to create a requirement before knowing we can make it work. If humanities and social science students (e.g., anthropoglogy, international studies, history) have no chance of applying it, it's a waste of time.

I simply do not support this as a graduation requirement. I fear that it would draw away from present curricula and cause students to choose courses because of the requirement rather than their individual interests.

Although I think a math requirement is a good idea, as presently worded this is a proposal only a lawyer could like. I hope your kidding because this proposal is patently unworkable and it's a bad idea to turn graduation requirements into a subject of humor.

In reading through the entire QT report and having heard the requirement discussed I continue to be impressed with the emphasis on approaching quantitative reasoning in a social context for civic purposes. This I strongly support. However, I don't see this emphasis reflected in the statement of the description of the requirement or in the learning objectives which seems like a significant missed opportunity. I am also very concerned about the Q levels. Intelligent and ethical use of quantitative reasoning regarding important social issues presents complex scholarly and pedagogical challenges. As a valued graduation requirement for our talented, thoughtful and civic-minded students, I am convinced that this merits a full, carefully developed course.

The Q3 category seems pretty vague to me. I can easily imagine a set of 3 Q3 courses that do not enable students to attain the learning objectives listed above. I recommend that the Q3 option be deleted, so that the requirement is 1 Q1 or 2 Q2.

I think that the criteria are unduly complicated. I don't think that you need three levels of Q course. That gives the Q-designation committee much too much to think about. I would simply say, take a Q1 course. Alternatively, I might be willing to consider Q1 and Q2, where Q1 are courses that teach extensively about quantitative thinking and Q2 are courses that extensively use quantitative thinking.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

This requirement is too complicated (Q1, Q2 and Q3 - way too many choices and accounting needed). What does it mean if a student takes 2 Q2 or 3 Q3 courses but still hasn't been exposed to all of the learning objectives set forth? I suggest we just required a single "Q1" course.

There is also a LOT of overhead in this requirement. A new faculty committee is set forth and there is continual review of courses. How will this be staffed? If we go this route, the college should reinstitute the position of Academic Dean and have this person responsible for overseeing this requirement, in conjunction with EPAG.

Only one course requirements should be approved, and make many more selections available under this category. Many of my students will not do well in Stats or Econ and should not have to take 2 or 3 times the coursework to meet this requirement. They won't be able to finish their majors or take more than one elective. In addition its an advising nightmare. Which sections count when in what year?

Too complex.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

Quantitative Thinking Requirement

Courses I teach require a great amount of musically quantitative and qualitative thinking, reasoning and application, but would in no way satisfy the suggested socially oriented topics.

Will the courses with which humanities and fine arts majors commonly fulfill their science requirements (e.g. women's health and reproduction; dinosaurs) fulfill the quantitative requirement? If not, can we add enough courses to allow humanities and fine arts majors to do so, or are we making those majors take courses meant primarily as intro-level courses for science majors? How will the science majors, or the science departments, feel about the additional demand thus created?

By quantitative do you mean "mathematical" or more broadly scientific? From the web discussions posted it seems you mean mathematical, but here it is not clear. If you do primarily mean courses teaching mathematical skills, surely we should also include requirements in which students are exposed to the analytical methods from the sciences, arts, humanities and social sciences? They currently are if the distribution requirements remain the same, but I gather from the discussion we are thinking of dropping these? If so, I must object. A liberal arts education should expose students to as many ways of problem solving as possible. I would also respectfully submit my support for continuing a strong language requirement; something that has been brought up in the discussions but is not mentioned here.

I find the notes on Q1, Q2, Q3 confusing. Where would, say, Differential Equations fit in. It clearly includes all aspects of what makes a course Q1, except that it has a quantitative prerequisite. So I guess it is not Q1 under the current definition. What about an advanced course in statistics that has a calculus prereq or a stats prereq. I saw an earlier draft that said that a major in math would be deemed to satisfy the requirement independent of Q designations.

It just seems difficult for me to understand how Q1, Q2, Q3 are to apply to courses that are purely quantitative and also study applications. For example, linear algebra: this has a prereq, so as written above, it cannot be a Q1. But calculus could be a Q1. This all seems a little illogical.

Will the courses with which humanities and fine arts majors commonly fulfill their science requirements (e.g. women's health and reproduction; dinosaurs) fulfill the quantitative requirement? If not, can we add enough courses to allow humanities and fine arts majors to do so, or are we making those majors take courses meant primarily as intro-level courses for science majors? How will the science majors, or the science departments, feel about the additional demand thus created?

I think all the requirements of this kind are earnest of bureaucratic disaster, if anyone tries to implement them at all. And I object to this one on the same intellectual grounds as the former.

This is a well articulated and VERY/VERY sensible requirement. I strongly endorse it as configured.

This is unnecessarily complex.

This should have never gotten out of committee. Faculty voted for no extra requirements and here is a proposal for two and three extra.

The details on the implementation of this appear to me to be quite difficult to deal with; I am not clear on who will determine whether a particular course is Q1 or Q2 or whatever. What if the instructor changes for a particular course and there is a change in focus or quantitative content; then that would seem to me to pose difficulties for the students and the faculty.

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

U.S. Multiculturalism Requirement

I attended the faculty lunch discussion of this requirement, and was intrigued by the suggestion to eliminate the list of areas covered under the first objective. Does the list make this inclusive or exclusive? This is worth considering. Also, should 'social group' in the objectives be defined again in the way it is in the wording of the requirement?

Please, please, please be judicious in your decisions on which courses will meet these requirements. The requirement is great but if we follow what happened in the past, we will end up with 160 courses that satisfy this requirement, including things like "Witches, Seers, and Saints", "Jazz", "Topics in Linguistic Anthropology" and "Regional Geography of North America." Please keep it to courses that really focus entirely on issues of race, class, gender, sexuality.

It does seem odd to make it parallel (if that is the right word) with the Internationalism requirement, since we are talking about roughly 80 million people in one country vs. 6 billion in 194.

1. That as discussed at the EPAG lunch meeting, the qualifiers 'creative, cultural, literary, economic, environmental, historical, political and/or social' be removed from learning objective #1. Listing these qualifiers serves to restrict the types of 'experiences and contributions of social groups' that faculty might consider 'either remove these adjectives, or make sure the list is absolutely comprehensive (which would be difficult to do).
2. Be clear about the focus of the requirement 'is it a multiculturalism requirement in terms of understanding experiences and contributions of different groups? Is it a requirement in terms of promoting equity and social justice among these groups? Or does a course have to do both in equal amounts in order to be considered? I can think of many courses that weigh more heavily one way or the other (e.g. focusing on the history of a group and not on the present time).
3. I am concerned about the phrase 'hierarchically defined groups' under Proposed Criteria and Thoughts on the Course Approval Process (p. 3). Are all social groups (as broadly defined in the first section as 'e.g. based on race, religion, class, gender, sexuality, language, national origin') necessarily hierarchically defined? I realize the requirement also discusses power and privilege, but that phrase struck me as different from the original inclusive definition of social groupings.

I will support this requirement only if it replaces, rather than existing on top of, the current domestic diversity requirement.

I support this in theory, but there needs to be a much more clear mechanism for fulfilling this than has been in place for Domestic Diversity. It was virtually impossible to find an open domestic diversity course for my first-year students this fall.

I do not understand what is meant by "Attend to efforts to promote equity and social justice among groups within the U.S." Does this require that students engage in real-world activism beyond academic inquiry? If so, I would recommend that this learning objective be deleted from the list. If not, it needs clarification.

my courses tend to focus less on particular groups and more on vectors (in my case, sacred text) that groups use to articulate themselves, their difference, their resistance to dominance and so on. i worry that my courses will fall through the crack of the multi-culturalism requirement as it is worded. i also notice the lack of the word religion in the list under learning objectives.

I strongly urge you to include the category religion in the first criterion listed above as it is a major factor in the construction of difference, ethnic and racial identity, gender identity, etc. I suspect that you may have just meant to include it under "cultural," but then why list creative and literary separately? Think about what it means to talk about African American or African immigrant identity as if religion were simply incidentally part of culture.

This proposal has both an "incentive" (FTR or stipends) and a "tax" (faculty should be expected to teach X courses over a period of X years to fulfill general education requirements). The working groups should be careful when suggesting FTR or stipends for faculty teaching courses. Why should those participating in the M/I requirement courses receive extra FTR or stipend while those doing quantitative or writing NOT receive extra compensation? If there are SUMMER workshops to work on curricular project, compensate faculty, otherwise this is part of our jobs.

I support the inclusion of the "Deans" in oversight of these requirements ONLY if there are administrators involved in the oversight of other requirements (e.g. Dean of Academic Programs in Writing and First Year Courses and a "new" Academic Dean for Quantitative and Capstone requirement).

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

U.S. Multiculturalism Requirement

Using the term "social groups" is much too vague. I can't think of a single course about the U.S. that would NOT touch on social groups. Why isn't this requirement actually about race? There is a huge body of scholarship about race and ethnicity in the US that students at Mac should be familiar with and I don't understand why this requirement isn't more specific about that very thing. If one studies this type of requirement at other institutions, one would find that they are quite clear that "multiculturalism" is about race and that it is OK to have students take one course in four years that helps them understand and analyze race theory, race relations, and/or racial literatures and fictions in the US. Furthermore, Mac has among its faculty folks who are experts in this area. (Just as it has folks who are experts in quantitative methods and theories or folks who are experts in globalization and international relations). It seems misguided to have very clear and specific guidelines for the other requirements and to make this one so fuzzy.

I believe the last phrase: "including analysis of the forces that create, contest, or maintain power, identity, and difference" should be deleted. While analysis of these forces is crucial, I don't believe the college can mandate a particular approach.

Too much of theory in it: "power, privilege, identity, difference." It's removed too much from the experiences of individual groups. An important goal of having this as a requirement is that all students should become familiar with some group that is unfamiliar to them; that they should see that such differences are normal and not something to be suspicious of, that legitimate social norms vary from group to group. This does not need to be about "power."

The criteria are an unwieldy mix. It would seem that no course could really achieve all four criteria. If this is the case, I think we're setting ourselves up for a requirement that can not be met, so that we end up with no real standards for determining courses that meet the requirement.

We should take a step back and consider why it is important to have a US Multiculturalism / Domestic Diversity requirement: to have students gain an understanding that the experience of non-dominant groups frequently differs substantially from "mainstream" experiences. This understanding can help students ask new or different questions. The new additions dilute this aspect of the requirement.

In the larger proposal, I also wonder: how does course development for the content of the course work? I understand workshops on skills-based objectives (writing, info fluency, and the like), but here we are talking about integration of diversity — not a skill that we teach the student, but course content (readings, lectures, and the like) that need to be true to the discipline in which the course is taught.

I believe that the language of this proposal is too broad, and that the multiculturalism requirement should focus on people of other-than European descent. I believe that the breadth of this requirement makes it meaningless in terms of its original intent, which was to make the curriculum less Eurocentric. It is distressing to me that this requirement is being watered down at precisely the time when (as Katrina demonstrates) we need to renew our commitment to making non-Europeans more visible in our curriculum.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

October 10, 2005

Comments on the Preliminary Report on the U.S. Multiculturalism Requirement

I support a multiculturalism requirement that provides for specific knowledge about the complexity of multiculturalism abroad, in the U.S., and in the rich campus and local communities in which Macalester participates. All social groups of course have culture, and as such any course that deals with any component of the American population should in principle be eligible for inclusion in this requirement. An excellent rationale for the requirement is found on page 1: "In learning about other cultures and groups one dislodges presuppositions about others and crucially, about one's individual and collective self." I suggest that this sentence introduce the rationale for the requirement, rather than be buried deep in that paragraph.

I have strong reservations however about one that requires the inclusion of analyses of the forces that create, contest, or maintain power, identity, and difference, for the following reasons.

(1) No intellectual justification is given for this provision. Why is analysis of these forces privileged rather than, for example, the historical processes that created these groups in the first place? Why not require that courses contain analyses of the agency of individuals, that is, their ability to act autonomously of cultural, social and other structures and to assert control over their lives?

(2) A concern with systems of power and privilege is an integral aspect of social science approaches and from the perspective of social science is redundant. The social sciences are concerned among other things with forms of social stratification, the distribution of power in societies, and the ideologies that underpin them (much of current theorizing in the social sciences however is concerned not with issues of structure but of agency; in that respect also, this provision is outdated). This requirement is analogous to a natural science requirement that mandates that only those courses predicated on an evolutionary paradigm are acceptable. This provision does nothing to explain or justify why the multicultural requirement is necessary.

(3) The effect of this provision is to represent certain social groups in this country as being victims of systems of power and privilege that help create and maintain hierarchical relations among peoples and would serve only to reinscribe antiquated stereotypes. Some years ago during President McPherson's tenure a proposal to modify the diversity requirement in a manner similar to this one was brought before the faculty and was voted down. On that occasion two African-American members of the faculty, Professor Roy Kay (who has since left) and Dean Samatar, spoke out strongly against it, and among other arguments, cited the one I have mentioned above. That argument still holds true.

(4) Individual faculty members are always free to teach courses that focus on power, privilege and their impact on identity and difference. Other faculty should be free to contribute to the multiculturalism requirement by exploring other intellectual avenues and forms of analysis that examine the inter-connectedness of multiculturalism and internationalism, and thus challenge our preconceptions of our neighbors both at home and abroad which is the fundamental purpose of both the multicultural and international requirement. Why is an emphasis on power and privilege the only way or even the principal way these interconnections can be explored or stereotypes challenged?

(5) The primary effect of this provision appears to be to function as a litmus test for which courses will be acceptable and which not. A concern with unequal power and privilege is listed as one of the four learning objectives on page 2 and the section on how a course would be evaluated indicates that the instructor is expected to meet all of those objectives. This provision is underscored in the following sentence that appears on p. 3: "In addition, instructors will affirm that the course in question provides a meaningful engagement with the issues articulated in the requirement, which we define as a devotion of two-thirds or more of the course . . . to the study of . . . hierarchically defined groups in the U.S."

(6) There is no reason to increase the paperwork necessary to administer this requirement. A faculty committee ought to be able to tell from the syllabus or bibliography and the course description whether it meets the requirements or not, and in the event this is not possible, it can ask for clarification. Most faculty and department chairs have inordinately busy lives where time is at a premium, and it is both unreasonable and unnecessary to generate more paperwork than is minimally necessary.

(7) To require that every one of the learning objectives listed for either multiculturalism or internationalism be met is unreasonable. The requirement should be that one or more of them should be met and the committee entrusted with the task of evaluating the courses for their suitability should have the discretion and the good judgment to decide. If you put up too many hurdles, some faculty may simply decide not to concern themselves with the requirement, especially in those departments whose courses are already oversubscribed. This would result in an impoverishment of the courses available to our students to fulfill this requirement.

The draft is marred by this litmus test. There is no justification for its presence in the document. Were it to be removed I am referring to the second clause in the initial description of U.S. Multiculturalism and the derivative sentences scattered throughout the subsequent text, including the third learning objective this would be a perfectly acceptable proposal and one I would support. I will not support it in its present form.

Arjun Guneratne
Associate Professor and Chair
Department of Anthropology

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

The criteria should be broadened. As is, the criteria impose a political agenda.

This requirement is badly stated. Is it about power and oppressed groups in general? Is it limited to only certain groups? Which ones? And what is the rationale for that? Or is this about learning to live with with difference? That would suggest very different sorts of courses. We need this requirement, but it needs to be clear what we are doing.

This requirment has all hallmarks of a pork barrel congressional appropriations bill: a bridge here, a post office there, new roads for some, farm subsidies for others. There is no guiding principle at work here that permits us to make choices about what's in or out. Let me suggest a definition: " a course primarily devoted to the study of one or more racial/ethnic minorities in the United States, or primarily devoted to the study one or more gender/sexual identities." Simple, concise. Gets at what who we really want to include in the curriculum. And, it can't just be anyone who feels like a minority for whatever reason. We have to make some choices, set priorities.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

U.S. Multiculturalism Requirement

The courses I identify above were denied a Domestic Diversity designation several years back by EPAG. My students and I were outraged, as our class discussions centered around issues of race and class in American musical culture of the mid-twentieth century. It was my fault: the syllabus did not reflect this emphasis strongly enough: it was a first-time offering. At the same time, I felt that the wording of the requirement at the time was vague. I would like to see this course fulfill the requirement when it is offered again, with a revised syllabus.

How is this not simply a tightening of criteria for our current domestic diversity requirement? (Maybe that's all we need to do?)

I'm a little concerned about the 2/3 coverage designation and how that will be determined

Can someone explain what "attend to efforts..." means.

The committee will have to think hard about how narrowly they wish to define 'social groups.' A narrow definition may lead to a limited set of courses that only focus on some aspects of multiculturalism (e.g., historical, cultural) and ignore others (e.g., environmental).

Adding layers of extra fuss to requirements, especially one as empty of content as this one is at Macalester, is a bad idea. It also skews the likely distribution of resources for departmental intellectual development, and contributes to the distinctly anti-historical bias at this college. The socially acceptable definition of this kind of concept becomes a cause for social or ethical embarrassment and looks old-fashioned within just a few years, as Mac's history has already demonstrated. And once again it takes students away from liberal arts.

How is this not simply a tightening of criteria for our current domestic diversity requirement? (Maybe that's all we need to do?)

Make clear how this requirement will be administered and enforced. The current practice is to make this the required PC course on campus and as just it is genuinely resented by its victims.

The designation of these courses does not seem to be consistent. As an advisor, I often can't understand why certain courses fulfill this requirement while others do not. Among other things, it seems that instructors must submit their courses for EPAG decision on this matter, and some instructors don't do this, or some decisions are made too late to be useful for students.

I'm a little uncertain about the definition. Some courses could very well fit the description, even though, for instance, they would not be considered appropriate for women's and gender studies or American studies here at Macalester. Is this description purposefully loose so that things not traditionally considered part of "multicultural studies" can be included? I see no special emphasis, for instance, on minority social groups. What about a course focusing exclusively on white Christian fundamentalists? Or say a course on Marxist theory focusing only on class? What about a course that focused on power relations, the US, and globalization, but talked specifically about identity (race, gender, etc.) only in a secondary way? Would they count? It seems they would by this definition.

I wish there were some way to register what role class/race/ethnicity/gender/sexuality analysis within the U.S. in courses that don't devote 2/3 of the content to these issues. All my courses approach religion with the analysis of the significance of difference at the heart, but the content in most cases is only roughly 1/3, partly because I focus on how the local and the global intersect. For example, "Work and Ethics across Traditions" is international and comparative in scope, but 1/3 of it is focused on multicultural dynamics in the U.S.

Make sure faculty members are aware that these Multicultural courses do not only describe power differences and conflicts. They seem to require a section that will present solutions to power differentials.

How could I tell which courses might fit?

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

I accept this because it is only 1 course and students will be able to use it in all aspects of their life (e.g., when they graduate and work with minorities, etc.)

—

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

Internationalism Requirement

I am concerned that the learning objective "Explore ways in which individual and collective identities are shaped by their position within larger national, transnational or global contexts" would mean that some courses, for example, International Economics, which currently fulfill the International requirement, would do so no longer. Because of this, and because this requirement seems substantially more discipline-specific than the others on the list, I recommend that it be deleted.

Based on the lunch discussion of this requirement, it is worth considering whether the list of adjectives should be eliminated from the first learning objective (that is, creative....social).

it seems to me we should encourage internationalism courses in languages other than english and the study of language(s) other than english to a level of competence that allows learning in (not just about) the chosen language(s) precisely for all the reasons an internationalism requirement is desirable for our students.

See my comments above. As I said there, the idea of this requirement is great and I fully support it, but it ends up getting watered down to the point of worthlessness because we are afraid to say no when someone requests International Diversity designation. Would you believe that right now 155 courses count toward the ID requirement! One of my favorites is "Japanimation and Manga"--I guess someone thought that studying Japanese cartoons might help us understand the world around us! Also, there are many courses like "Tudor and Stuart England", Tsarist Russia, and Ancient Greece. These are not really ID courses but History courses. They might help us to understand the world as it was, but they do not focus on the important issues (environmental, economic, religious) facing the world today. Finally, I have my doubts about narrow International courses like "Introduction to Spanish Language Literary Analysis" This is a fine course for learning that topic, but it is so narrow in its focus that I would be hard pressed to call it a ID course. Please please please be tough in your approval of ID courses. I would think that 20-30 would be a good number to shoot for.

I support it, tho somewhere it must be recognized that this one is very easy to complete, and tons of students willingly do so, while Domestic has fewer courses and lower interest.

Again the category of religion is noticeable for its absence. This is remarkable, given the roles of Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Christianity in shaping world events today.

I support this only if it replace our current international diversity requirement, rather than existing on top of it, as it seems clearly intended to do. Also, "develop a comparative and/or historical perspective on... access to power or privilege" is fine if construed broadly (so that a Shakespeare course would count) but questionable if construed so narrowly as to virtually require either a comparative-historical-broad-brush course, or a course focused on contemporary topics.

I am comfortable with this requirement but understand that for some it may appear to lean too heavily toward the social sciences. As long as it is clear that some courses would emphasize the first phrase of the description and the first learning objective, treating the other aspects with less intensity, I think the current description is fine, definitely better than the very limited guidance provided currently. On the other hand, I would also support changing the word 'including' to 'and/or' and asking that courses address 2-3 of the learning objectives but not all.

Clarify the criteria for approval of courses and set up a credible mechanism for their application. At present this requirement is innocuous but if it is "strengthened" simply to expand the power of a single individual it will not be an improvement.

I don't think every course should have to fulfill every learning objective. It seems that even one (of the 4) could be sufficient to fulfill the goals of the internationalism requirement

again, i notice an allergy to religion, yet a desire to explore interconnectednesses. how to account for this, and for diaspora, without accounting for religion?

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

1. That as discussed at the EPAG lunch meeting, the qualifiers "creative, cultural, literary, economic, environmental, historical, political and/or social" be removed from learning objective #1. Listing these qualifiers serves to restrict the types of "experiences and contributions of peoples or societies" that faculty might consider "either remove these adjectives, or make sure the list is absolutely comprehensive (which would be difficult to do).

2. Be clear about the focus of the requirement "is it an international requirement in terms of understanding experiences and contributions of different peoples or societies? Is it a requirement in terms of developing a perspective on unequal power and privilege and an awareness of current inequities? Or does a course have to do both in equal amounts in order to be considered? I can think of many courses that weigh more heavily one way or the other (e.g. focusing on the history of a society and not on the present time).

—

As currently defined, it is difficult for many courses offered by departments in the science division to contribute to this requirement.

—

The way the requirement description is worded implies that the courses that would fulfill this category should cover periods after which the categories of "nationalism" and "nation" can be accurately applied. Is this what the committee/college means? IF the college/committee also wishes to include courses that deal with this issue in the more distant past (something I favor) then the wording could be a little more clear. If the committee/college does not intend to include pre-modern topics within this requirement, then I would have to say that this attitude is short-sighted and encourages our students to adopt a very truncated and skewed vision of cultural exchange, conflict, etc.

—

see above

—

There is no reason any given course meet all of the learning objectives. A course should meet one or more of the objectives and the committee appointed to evaluate the course should have the discretion and the good judgment to make their decision based on their understanding of the criteria of the requirement.

—

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

Internationalism Requirement

Eliminate the requirement that courses must include issues of globalization.

I think it is too broad curricularly, and is abused the inclusion of many Euro-centric courses. I think the requirement should center upon international topics beyond the Euro-American base. I also believe strongly that a study-abroad experience in a non European/American/Canadian/Australian/NewZealand setting should itself be equal to the Internationalism requirement, regardless of the curricular undertakings.

The criteria should be broadened. Again, a political agenda is being imposed.

I am writing to put forward some concerns about the text of the internationalism proposal. I do so in this form so that these concerns (shared by at least some others) are clear from the outset and because I can't make the open forum that has been scheduled.

The internationalism statement reads as if internationalism is a second multiculturalism requirement, but, in this case, international multiculturalism. This is more than problematic.

1. the distinction between international and domestic multiculturalism is quite blurred in any case. It is only in the construction of this document and in our practices at the College that we so carefully police this boundary.

2. This construction of the international is so narrow that it appears to wash out of the requirement much of what is done at the College that is international, transnational or global.

a). the first clause of the description sets the parameters of the requirement as "peoples and systems in regions outside of the US." Processes and forces in the second clause are subordinated to this. The international is also about forces, processes and structures that are international/transnational/global that cross into the US, that are not simply outside, and should not be thought of as about peoples and systems outside of the US.

b). to put it differently, the learning objectives are a bit better, though they aren't adequate (see point 3). But, reading backwards to the description from the learning objectives in the document, it seems that the third point makes no sense except to the extent the global processes emphasize identity and difference. Though I have just published a book on international relations and difference, it is misguided to read the international or global simply thru the lense of difference or identity. This would exclude much that is valuable that is done in and around the international/transnational/global at the College. None of this is to say that identities and difference are not important to those who work and teach in this area, but that it seems inappropriate to turn internationalism into international multiculturalism alone.

3. The central point is that internationalism needs to have a definition that grows out of an understanding of the international/transnational/global as a domain in and of itself. It should not be the residual remaining after you subtract out the "domestic" in multiculturalism. We might begin with language like this: Internationalism includes:

- (a) an understanding of non-US peoples and cultures in comparative perspective;
- (b) an understanding of the historical dynamics and contemporary structures that condition life at the transnational/international/global levels or scales: and
- (c) an understanding of the ethical dimensions of international/transnational/global life.

Courses should do at least one of these well. It would be heroic to do all well at the same time, though some courses may move across two or three of these dimensions. And no one of the three is reducible to the other two.

It isn't that I didn't say something like this before. My name is on the list of those consulted.

David

See critique of multiculturalism requirement.

Here's a try: One course primarily devoted to the study of peoples or regions outside the US and/or the study of any subject from a transcultural, transnational or global perspective.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

The proposed definition seems unduly focused on understanding different "identities" and learning about other cultures (in other words, it is a very quaint and somewhat old-fashioned diversity requirement, rather than an "internationalism" requirement properly understood). While the focus on "difference" and "identity" is necessary, it is clearly not sufficient. Students also need to understand the historical dynamics and structures through which global social/political life is structured (or, to put it slightly differently, to understand the structures and practices that both constitute actors and condition their (inter)actions at the global level). Absent this, all we have is a requirement that mandates comparative politics, literature/language programs, and area studies without placing them in the necessary context of broader transnational, international and global phenomena (ie. world order structures/dynamics - which unquestionably exceed phenomena such "diaspora" or "globalization", which the current proposal mentions). Some of this is vaguely implicit in the proposal, but I think it really needs to be clearly articulated and foregrounded.

Bottom line: Internationalism is NOT simply a global multiculturalism requirement. Properly understood (as I know many people counseled the summer working group), it comprises the following three elements:

(a) an understanding of non-US peoples and cultures in comparative perspective (a kind of multiculturalism/diversity requirement);

(b) an understanding of the historical dynamics and contemporary structures that condition life at the transnational/international/global level: and

(c) an understanding of the ethical dimensions of international/transnational/global life.

These are all irreducible to one another. To meet the requirement, a course should do at least two of these.

While I categorically endorse the necessity of an internationalism requirement (how can one speak of a liberal arts education in the 21st century without such a requirement?), I cannot in good conscience support the proposed requirement on the grounds that it actually moves us BACKWARDS. We need to strengthen the internationalism requirement, NOT weaken it (as this proposal does).

The following is unclear: "[...] meaningful engagement with the study of peoples and systems in regions outside the U.S., including analysis of issues underlying international, transnational, and global phenomena." At least two-thirds of the course must be devoted to this material." To what does "this material" refer? To "analysis of issues underlying international, transnational, and global phenomena"? Or to the two components--attention to "people and systems...outside the U.S." AND "international, transnational, and global phenomena." And the requirement that every course designated "Internationalism" address both the particular and the global will surely rule out (or force an unnecessary deformation of) many fine courses that exist now or could exist in the future that focus entirely on the absolutely worthy goal of "meaningful engagement with the study of peoples and systems in regions outside the U.S."

While I appreciate the greater attention to international / global processes in the requirement, it veers a bit too much toward reducing internationalism to identity.

The criteria also have the same problem as the US Multiculturalism criteria - there are too many and too diverse, so that I do not think any course could really meet the criteria.

Why do we have an internationalism requirement? Presumably to internationalize our students, or at least give them a more internationalized perspective on the world. As formulated, the requirement is inimical to this logic: it mandates that "internationalism" operate with a paradigm that has been generated by our own western system, whereby I am not arguing that power, etc. are crucial categories. To be internationalized, students need to be exposed to difference, to see things from a pov where their "own" understanding is relativized. Until now, for example, a class where students read literature in the "target" language would count as an internationalizing experience; the student would encounter the expression of another system on its own terms, experience her own "outsiderness" from that system, her own deficiencies and non-mastery. As the requirement is stated, this course would no longer count, unless the instructor had the "right" approach. This is the "wrong" approach to internationalism.

integrate the U.S. multiculturalism requirement with the internationalism requirement. The artificial separation of IS/MC is intellectually unsound.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

Internationalism Requirement

As written, I see a stress on cultural production and history, which makes the above courses natural fits (perhaps with some slight changes) for this designation. However, if the stress is *really* on non-European cultures and/or social-political-economic inequities, the courses would not fit. I would like to be sure that the ordering of the learning objectives in the above bullet points truly represents the goals of the requirement. I've encountered some confusion and frustration over this requirement and the domestic diversity requirement in the past for similar reasons. . . .

There is an ongoing serious debate in academe about whether internationalism and globalization are the same thing. This requirement privileges one side of the debate--not surprisingly, the side of the debate that the current Dean of International Studies is on. Graduation requirements need to be seen as something in which the whole faculty can participate. They should not be used for the aggrandisement of one or another faction.

Same objections as to the multiculturalism requirement. Furthermore it adds to the problem that Macalester seems to be uninterested in actually being a liberal-arts college, and wants rather to be a Baby Think Tank on international affairs. It's got a long way to go, just to get serious as a liberal arts college of any depth.

The objectives are coherent and intelligent.

The question was raised during the faculty lunch discussion of this topic whether a course must focus upon or address the modern world in order to count for this requirement. I would like to argue against this, but either way it should be clarified before a committee is asked to approve courses. In favor of a broader historical perspective, I would argue first that the distant past is a wonderful practice ground for discussing difficult topics. We often get students in our department who are tentative about charged topics in courses about the contemporary world; they end up working on the issues of identity, social hierarchy and power, but in a more neutral setting. This is highly beneficial for them, and they take these skills to other courses and other parts of life. In addition, the past is just as complex as the present, containing many similar problems, but also different ones. The past is thus very useful in seeing the familiar in a new light and learning how to approach the unfamiliar. Since we in the class are always part of the modern world, a class about the ancient world cannot exist in the past exclusively, but is always in dialogue with the present, whether that is an explicit goal of the course or not. Finally, particularly in the context of globalization, I think it is very powerful for students to study a society which existed before the European colonization and enslavement of Africa. Certainly the Greeks and Romans and Hebrews had their own means of categorizing people and creating social hierarchies, but they were dramatically different from those we live with today, and race was constructed entirely differently. Learning about this helps students perceive how such categories are socially constructed, and I feel makes it possible to believe that the world can be changed, because it already has.

My Comparative Social Movements class would likely fulfill this requirement too.

Same comment as in US Multiculturalism section, above

The courses we offer which focus on writings (and paintings and music) by people from outside the United States ought to count for this requirement, even if those people have been dead for a long time. Contemporary scholarly methods will inevitably bring ideas about internationalism (e.g. the flow of Romantic musical styles from Germany to Russia) and unequal access and privilege (Russian late-Romantic music actually makes a good example there too) into these courses, along with their traditional formal topics. This requirement should not be construed as restricted to contemporary, nor to non-Western, topics.

1. I believe most of my language-department colleagues would (heartily) disagree with me, but I do not think that fourth-semester language courses which fulfill the language requirement should also fulfill the Internationalism requirement.

2. The wording of the requirement is a bit unclear as to the role of history in the Internationalism requirement. This is, admittedly, my own intellectual bias, but I believe Mac students are so steeped in the process of looking horizontally (contemporary politics of every region of the globe) that they have very little sense of the vertical, that is, looking back, tracing peoples through time, rather than through space. Does Roman history fulfill the Internationalism requirement? What about eighteenth-century French literature? The wording seems to privilege courses rooted in the present.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

The courses we offer which focus on writings (and paintings and music) by people from outside the United States ought to count for this requirement, even if those people have been dead for a long time. Contemporary scholarly methods will inevitably bring ideas about internationalism (e.g. the flow of Romantic musical styles from Germany to Russia) and unequal access and privilege (Russian late-Romantic music actually makes a good example there too) into these courses, along with their traditional formal topics. This requirement should not be construed as restricted to contemporary, nor to non-Western, topics.

I refuse to offer music theory as an internationalism course.

Every course in the International Relations stream of the PoliSci department would meet or exceed the internationalism standard I have defined above. Almost none of these courses would meet the proposed internationalism standard. This is clearly ridiculous (what kind of internationalism requirement would not be met by any of the International Relations courses offered by the PS Department? (especially given that PoliSci currently has over 100 majors, approximately 70% of which are in International Relations -- this is more majors than in IS or any other "international" major).

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

First Year Course

I would like to know more about the speaker series before we require it. Currently there is no obvious time that all students could attend, and I worry that we might not come up with 4 really great speakers every year. I don't oppose this idea, but with the current time demands on both faculty and students, another series of required meetings seems questionable. Maybe a single speaker (perhaps at the opening convo) could set the tone for the FYCs.

First, how are we going to compensate faculty for the very substantial extra work for this course? Second, I can easily see that we try to stuff too much into one little course, and the course collapses as a result. Lastly, the item about hearing a speaker on how his/her discipline contributes to the liberal arts strikes me as unclear and even a bit bizarre. What does it mean?

There should be a summer workshop for first year instructors dealing with BOTH writing and "ways of knowing."

We need very good planning to make sure that the extra sessions are not a complete waste of time for students and faculty. The idea that these can be well integrated into a vast array of courses is mis-guided. Better to made them stand alone in value.

I found it difficult to spend time in class discussing the "healthy living" part of the objectives. I would suggest that "good study skills, time management skills, and well-balanced living habits" be addressed by special meetings organized by the MAX Center, similar to the way that library instruction program is handled.

The Student Learning Outcomes seem somewhat unreasonable for all courses. I'm not sure every class could or should address "Well-balanced living habits" and the philosophy of a liberal arts college -- at least not in any significantly measurable way. I'm teaching a first-year course for the first time this semester, and I am finding it a challenge because the students chose the course for its topic, but I find myself spending equal time off the topic, and on subjects such as writing, studying, and so on. I don't want to complain: I love teaching writing. I'm just worried that the more we add to these courses, the more students are going to resent having to jump through all these extra hoops in the class, at the expense of the course material . . . In any event, these are concerns that I am facing right now.

The speaker series seems like an organizational nightmare. Everything else looks good (and not that different from what we do now).

The library dimension would be better handled as part of orientation. The Speaker series will be a disaster.

I'm not sure it would be necessary, or a good idea, to meet up to 4 times during the fall semester as a group. Perhaps twice would be better. The disruption of more than this might exceed the benefits of such group meetings.

Only meet as a group twice.

They should all be writing courses and all include the learning objectives of the W course. If we have enough faculty who are trained or could be trained to do the W course, we have enough for the first year course. We owe it to our students to make sure they can begin to write as well as they think by the end of their first semester.

Learning Objectives are more like instructional goals. It would be nice to have desired learning outcomes explicitly stated.

If freshmen are to participate in the speaker series, then it is imperative that the faculty who are teaching freshmen seminars, or thinking about teaching one, know well in advance what the series is about in order to give them a chance to develop their course around it. Otherwise the series and the accompanying reading becomes tangential to the course and not obviously useful to the students or the course. Overall I do not strongly support this particular requirement at all.

If the FYC workshop is no longer than 1 day or a couple of afternoons during the school year this requirement is fine, otherwise it becomes an unnecessary burden on the faculty and tends toward repetition.

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

I think recommending that faculty participate in an FYC workshop prior to teaching one is enough. I don't think it has to be listed as a "Criteria for Designation."

I believe extra time should be devoted to what you call 'experience using the library resources'. Our goal should be stated more forcefully that students should obtain information fluency and be aware of issues such as copyright and fair use and plagiarism. A short lab exercise with librarians (1-2 hours for the whole semester) will not be enough here- extra time for students to really learn how to use library indexes and research topics, write annotated bibliographies, and properly cite evidence in their arguments is needed. They need to learn to use a program like write-n-cite by being given instruction in it.

Scratch the last learning requirement -- the faculty is not in loco parentis to the students.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

First Year Course

The common experience element will require actual buy-in by the faculty teaching these courses. If there are events truly common to all courses meetings, then we are imposing an additional time burden on faculty teaching these courses. Or, if faculty do not attend, these are simply disconnected from the course and the goal of serving as a common experience is not met. I fear that buy-in is not really possible.

Further, I doubt the feasibility of the topical relevance of the speaker series. The FY courses this year include Problems of Race in the US, Book Arts, Foundations in International Relations, Ecology, General Chem, Natural History of National Parks, Discrete Math and From Magic to Witchcraft (to name 8). What are the topics that will bridge these courses?

If the topics do not bridge the courses and we require instructors to assign additional material to students, we trade off more with the content of these courses (which are supposed to be part of the regular curricular offerings of departments).

Are there ways to meet the goal of "common experience" in a more decentralized manner than can lead to greater / easier buy-in by faculty? What if there were series of events in common with OTHER first year courses y perhaps more integrated into the substantive course content - that might draw together 2 - 5 FY Seminars? I am not certain that this will overcome all of the issues, but if there are some mild inducements (food?) that might be sufficient to make it work. We certainly could try this on a pilot basis without changing the requirements.

Also, in the second criterion (set aside class time for...), there are really only two must-do items. The "ideally" section means that one would not have to include it. I would urge more consistency between headings and supporting language. (If we require it, require it. If we recommend it, put it elsewhere.)

In general, I like the current FY course set up. Let's try new things out within the current requirements before adding new requirements that we have not tested.

The primary goal of a first-year course should be to put a student into a small group environment where they can feel comfortable during a difficult transitional period, and to give students close contact with an advisor who will keep careful track of them. Throwing everything --- writing, library, modes of inquiry --- into the first-year seminar will reduce the number of instructors who will be willing to teach them. Removing the possibility that first-year seminars can be introductions to the major (as this requirement would in many fields).

I do like the idea of requiring every FYC instructor to get some training.

the fyc lacks, to me, an intellectual reason for being. there are social reasons for a first year course, but as it is configured, i notice that besides research skills there is little intellectual ligature offered here. other schools offer great books or humanities courses, which are always political and problematic, but at least they address the issue of what it means to engage in a study of the liberal arts. why don't we? it also seems to generate a great deal more work that if we collaborated on a common syllabus and taught discussion sections. this could be thematic (one year, for example, the topic would be revolution and scientists could talk about scientific revolution; historitans about historical revolutions, philosophers about conceptual apparatus re: revolution, and so on). there are quite a few good working models of humanities courses that include science and international humanities approaches. to teach this class at level of departments has a feel of hit and miss and general avoidance of what it is we commonly do here, something i think mac students are entitled to and that faculty should model but do not. the fyc shows that, by stressing social adjustment and individual departmental preference.

Some faculty members may not want to participate in this program.

I know there is no hope of this kind of change, but I'll throw it out anyway. I have seen how interdisciplinary freshmen seminars at other colleges are often the highlight of a student's college years. The department-based model, while it works well for advising, strikes me as a poor substitute for the kind of big idea/critical thinking courses that could really be a space of critical inquiry and collective learning. When I was a freshman, I took an honors seminar called "On Being Humanm" team taught by three professors from biology, organizational behavior, and philosophy. I just don't see how a section of Econ 101 could achieve similar intellectual goals. I know that Mac faculty seem fairly happy with the first-year program as it is, but since you asked my opinion...

I really like the first year courses in their current form. What is the value of adding the speaker series? How will students 'fully participate'? With so many students involved in these sessions, won't they simply look and feel like big lectures? Why has this additional component been added?

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

I am skeptical about the speaker series, as currently described, though I suppose "participate fully" is open to interpretation.

Cut that added fuss of guest speakers speaking about their discipline and the liberal arts. The school might actually be bold and decide just to put some serious resources and cultural value on the teaching and learning of the liberal arts: now that would be an exciting move.

If this requirement is passed, I would either not teach First-year courses anymore, or advise my students not to attend such lectures.

Who would guarantee the intellectual quality of the speakers? Who would guarantee that they could address freshmen? I don't hand those teaching decisions over to other people, much less to a committee.

You expect too much out of a single course and from one professor. The first-year course needs fine tuning--like getting all professors who teach the course to focus more on research, writing, and speaking skills--not an overhaul. You are loading it up too heavily and expecting it (and us) to do too much. Why don't you do more of the reflection work (on learning how to learn and what liberal arts is all about) during a meatier, more extended orientation that works out of academic affairs and doesn't involve all of us. I love to teach first-year seminars and do so with no small success. If I had to meet the requirements/criteria you list formally, I simply would no longer teach first-year seminars. Until this semester, no one else would teach them from my department. I think you are putting a successful but fragile program at risk here.

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

First Year Course

Except for the invited speaker component, every FYC offered by the PoliSci department would meet (indeed, exceed) these requirements.

I am in strong support of the extra hour for FY courses, not all of which (or none of which, if desired), must be used by the instructor (but instead could be used for library time, common lectures, discussions of transition to college with staff people, etc.)

I offer first-year courses on a rotating basis.

I have no curricular space in my load to develop a course- I have taught first-year seminars in that past- they were successful, but they did not cover the writing requirements that I do support.

In general, my opinion is that this requirement is on the verge of being over-managed. The more overt the apparatus, the more chances there are for the student to miss the forest for all the trees . . .

I urge you to rethink what you are doing here. You are asking too much.

Faculty Feedback: I support...but with modifications (Section I)

Senior Capstone Experience

I support this but have concerns about the peer-review process. I see the positive side of this, however, there will be great variability in peer-reviewing, even with training. I would support this if there is a way to evaluate or grade the peer-reviewing. Ideally, faculty should be providing the final feed-back and approval of the completed capstone.

Does the presentation have to be to the Macalester community? In psychology, for example, students must do a public presentation at the Minnesota Undergraduate Psychology Conference...

For students who do double majors, require the capstone in only one of the majors. We're getting overload of faculty effort and of student effort.

We need to start doing an honest assessment of the time that individual faculty put into the capstone and crediting them with this. It's a bit uneven to have a course count in some departments while other departments are doing stand-alone projects.

Ideally, there should be some sort of senior week where all these many projects can be publicly celebrated.

How is this different from what we do now?

I worry about the time burden of this requirement. It may work for a department that graduates 5 or 15 majors a year. Try to add this on when the number is 45 or 50.

These guidelines do not seem to be much different from what we have: "Departments will also designate the appropriate means for completion of the senior capstone requirement within each major" (2005 y 2006 Catalog: 37). There seems to be a little more here y the language in the current policy suggests that the purpose of the capstone could be to get "experience with reading original research literature" (37).

Let's get it a bit more serious - require senior theses or at least require a senior seminar. There's just too much flexibility in the criteria, meaning that there is really no requirement.

I think that space should be created for creative written and visual (as well as performative) work if that is what the student's career goals or major allow. By "creative" in this context I mean projects that might (should) require a great deal of research and mastery yet whose primary function is not necessarily to present and analyze that information in a "scholarly" / "academic" way. Examples: websites, computer games, painting, sculpture, drawing, poetry, fiction, drama. I suggest that students should register early in the process whether they are doing an "academic" capstone or a creative one and then assemble an appropriate committee.

Faculty Feedback: I do not support and suggest the following... (Section I)

Senior Capstone Experience

We in International Studies had 34 senior graduates last year. How are we going to have 34 public presentations? There is gross unevenness of workload here: Japanese and Russian and WGS and Theater and others have very little work here, while Econ, Poli, Psych and others will get killed.

Also, a tiny point: do not hyphenate "departmentally-based," or in any situation following an ___ly word, since adverbs modify, rather than combine with, the adjectives which follow.

—

The notion that the product of the capstone be made available to the Macalester community through public presentations etc is unworkable. This may work for departments with only a handful of graduates, but how do you suppose understaffed departments with large numbers of majors are going to find either the time or the inclination to organize this? Much of the rest of this proposal is already implemented in anthropology.

—

With growing numbers of majors and stagnant growth in FTE, I'm concerned that faculty have insufficient resources to adequately supervise these projects. For example, in a department with 30-40 graduating seniors and 6-7 FTE, each faculty member will be responsible for supervising approximately 5-6 projects a year. As someone who supervised 4 honors / independent study projects in a previous semester, I'm very concerned about the burden this requirement would create, at least for some of the more highly subscribed majors on campus. Giving departments more flexibility is key.

—

I have not had enough time to think about this requirement. I am concerned that the peer review process might be too costly in terms of time and coordination.

—

This requirement still seems unclear to me and the emphasis on public presentation and performance, while exciting, may in practice be challenging. The public presentations of every senior will be in competition for time and resources. The notion of peer-review is intriguing, but its implementation also seems difficult to conceive. Not only will seniors have to prepare their own piece of original work or Honors Project, and present it publicly, but they will also have to somehow review (prior to presentation?) the projects of other students. This will be extremely onerous for students doing double majors. If the capstone is to be the other end of the FYC, there should be more discussion about the type of capstone program the college wants to set up. At most school, the capstone is a "capstone course" and a "capstone experience" is a pass/fail credit bearing experience, like an internship. A "capstone project" is yet another animal, that is sometimes collaborative. We have not discussed curriculum design (new course designations and credit allocation) to support any particular version of the capstone.

—

I suggest that you require a capstone and then leave it to the discretion of the department as to how to design it. I teach our capstone course. I would not teach it according to the criteria you list, and therefore, simply would not teach it in the future. You are once again needlessly loading up and already overworked faculty.

—

There is still too much variation in how this requirement is met. For some students they will receive credit and have no additional workload if this is part of a "regular" course. Other students will have additional workload and little or no credit given.

—

Faculty Feedback: General comments on each requirement (Section III)

Senior Capstone Experience

Music department has a senior recital as the capstone.

um, this is my last space to respond here, but two tiny items:

1. the programming of this HTML form meant that any inadvertent hitting of Enter submitted the form. So I accidentally submitted this once or twice before when my responses were still fragmentary.
2. Um, whatever happened to the urban or civic engagement thing. I know the faculty voted down a requirement this past spring, but is there anything in the works now that we can comment on?

Thank you for your heavy and serious labors!!!

I think this is still a little vague.

I have a much broader comment that deals with the requirements as whole (and you have not left a box for these types of comments). Given the internationalism and multiculturalism requirements (which essentially deal with human systems), I find it interesting that you have no requirements that deal with the biophysical world. Many schools have an environmental literacy requirement.

In principle, this is a very good requirement (indeed, the Poli Sci Dep't already meets this standard for a substantial subset of our graduating majors). In practice, the PoliSci department (with over 100 majors and only about 8 FTE) would need an additional 2-4 FTE to make it work for all our graduating majors. EPAG needs to take into account the PRACTICAL dimensions of the proposed requirement (especially the resource requirements). Simply requiring that a department offer this type of (very good) capstone without providing the resources to do it well is a recipe for mediocrity (and directly at cross-purposes to the College's commitment to academic excellence).

For all reqs, learning objective language should be closest to the W language, or language of "should" rather than "will"

THERE WAS NO WHERE TO COMMENT ON THE URBAN EXPERIENCE SUGGESTIONS - WHY NOT?

Overall: I appreciate what you've done!

These are general comments in relation to all your proposals. I appreciate greatly the hard work you have put into your proposals. They are clearly thoughtful and rigorous. My chief concern is time. I think the first-year seminar works as is and that you should leave it alone; I think capstones are best designed entirely by the departments/disciplines who teach. There are other more material problems as well, for those of us who teach both, and for that matter, anyone who teaches either, you are placing undo new work with no relief in other areas, even if you support new development monetarily in the summer. I need time. Where does it come from? Do I resign from the elected committees I regularly serve on? The ad hoc committees I serve on? Give up all reading and research (to which I have now very little time to devote at all--only summers)? Give up any kind of life outside work? Until you can give me time, you can throw all the money you want at course development and it's just not going to help. As it stands, were the new criteria to go into effect, I would withdraw from teaching both the first-year seminar and the capstone. I just can't do it all.

This already exists as an option for students who wish to do it. The resources to implement it are impossible: a department the size of mine, for example (English), would not be able to manage unless we doubled the size of the faculty.
