

Curricular Renewal

at Bryn Mawr College

Curriculum Committee Proposal for Distribution Requirements

Curriculum Committee Proposal for Language Requirement

Curricular Renewal Work Group Recommendations for Writing at Bryn Mawr

- Summary Memorandum
- College Seminar Program
- Writing Intensive Courses
- Senior Capstone Experience

Other Initiatives of the Curricular Renewal Work Group

- Kaleidoscope Interdisciplinary Programs
- Advising
- Quantitative Literacy
- Globalization

Curricular Renewal Working Group

Steve Salkever (Co-Chair) Committee on Academic Priorities, Political Science
Radcliffe Edmonds (Co-Chair) Curriculum Committee, Classics
Ignacio Gallup Diaz, History
Rosi Song, Spanish
Kevin Robinson, Graduate School of Social Work & Social Research
Michael Rock, Economics
Linda Caruso-Haviland, Arts
Tamara Davis, Biology
Reggie Kukola, Student Representative
Kim Cassidy, Provost & Department of Psychology
Karen Tidmarsh, Dean of the Undergraduate College

Sub-Working Group on Languages

Penny Armstrong, French
Kaylea Mayer, Spanish
Darby Scott, Classics
Pauline Lin, East Asian Studies
Dan Davidson, Russian
Roberta Ricci, Italian
Ignacio Gallup-Diaz, History
Imke Meyer, German
Kim Cassidy, Provost

Sub-Working Group on Quantitative Literacy

Victor Donnay, Math
Kryn Lukacs, Chemistry
Michael Rock, Economics
Karen Tidmarsh, Dean of the Undergraduate
College

Sub-Working Group on Writing

Radcliffe Edmonds, Classics
Jane Hedley, English
Michelle Francl, Chemistry
Gail Hemmeter, English
Steve Salkever, Political Science
Linda Caruso-Haviland, Arts
Kim Cassidy, Provost
Karen Tidmarsh, Dean of the Undergraduate
College

Sub-Working Group on Globalization

Steve Salkever, Political Science
Cynthia Bisman, Graduate School of Social
Work & Social Research
Juan Arbona, Growth and Structure of Cities
Michael Rock, Economics
Peter Magee, Classical & Near Eastern
Archaeology
Pim Higginson, French
Bharath Vallabha, Philosophy
Jane McAuliffe, President

Sub-Working Group on Kaleidoscope

Marc Schulz, Psychology
Anne Dalke, English
Pim Higginson, French
Sandy Schram, Graduate School of Social Work
& Social Research
Peter Magee, Classical & Near Eastern
Archaeology
Gary McDonogh, Growth & Structure of Cities
Jennifer Spohrer, History
Carola Hein, Growth & Structure of Cities
Toba Kerson, Growth & Structure of Cities
Kim Cassidy, Provost

A New Proposal for Distributional Requirements

We believe it is central to our mission to expose students to a variety of approaches to inquiry and to promote the idea that liberal education must be more than a strong training in one discipline. We further believe that the College needs to do a better job of connecting this educational ideal to our general education requirements, and we are looking for ways in which we can renew and reinvigorate our curriculum. To this end, we propose replacing the current divisional requirement of six courses drawn from the three divisions with the requirement that each student must take at least one course in each of five modes of inquiry listed below. Under this new requirement, all appropriate courses at the College would be identified as providing an introductory experience in one or two of the five modes. Faculty should not only employ the relevant approach in their courses, but also thematize and articulate it, stressing the need for awareness of the process as well as mastery of the content.

Approaches to Inquiry:

1. Scientific Investigation (SI): the approach that aims to systematically explore and model the empirical world. Such investigations emphasize problem solving via hands-on manipulation of materials and exploratory experiences in order to gather, observe, and interpret data using inductive, deductive, and other systematic methods of hypothesis testing.
2. Imagination and Interpretation (II): the project of creating and interpreting meaningful texts, objects, and performances. This approach involves 'close-reading' of texts, whether literary texts, social documents, works of visual art or music, etc., as well as substantial reflection on the process of production and/or performance itself.
3. Cross-Cultural Analysis (CC): learning to see the world in the perspective of a culture different from one's own: the study of societal systems, patterns of behavior, literary and artistic traditions, and scientific perspectives across space.
4. Inquiry into the Past: (IP): learning to see the world from the perspective of temporal difference: the inquiry into the development and variety of human experiences over time.
5. Quantitative and Logical Reasoning (QL): analysis of conceptual and empirical problems via statistical inquiry or formal analysis (beyond the basic level of readiness in quantitative literacy). This mode draws attention to the analysis of problems and concepts employing quantitative methods and/or formal reasoning.

The Relation of the Approaches to the Current System of Divisional Requirements:

The first mode highlights approaches that characterize inquiry typical of the contemporary natural and physical sciences, but also of various social sciences. The second mode of inquiry is typical of the arts and humanities but also of certain of the social sciences as well. The third and fourth modes focus on ways liberal education should free us from the narrow-minded belief that our own time and place is the only significant time and place. Courses satisfying the requirement for these modes of inquiry would be drawn primarily from the arts, humanities, and social sciences, and such courses would be designed, in part, to call into question our all but inevitable human tendency to ethnocentrism and presentism. The fifth and final mode draws attention to the analysis of problems and concepts employing quantitative methods and/or formal reasoning. Courses satisfying this requirement will most likely be drawn from the natural and social sciences, but some courses from humanities departments (for example, logic and analytic philosophy) will also be appropriate.

Certain of the elements of the current distributional system will be retained. Students must achieve a 2.0 or higher in the course in order to satisfy the requirement. Only one course within the major department may be used to satisfy both distributional requirements and the requirements of the major. Students will normally satisfy these requirements with courses taken while in residence at Bryn Mawr during the academic year, and students may still use credits transferred from other institutions to satisfy these requirements only with prior approval. Under the new system, however, AP credits could not be used to satisfy the distributional requirement, although they would allow a student to place in to a more advanced course representing the same Approach. As in the current system, all requirements must be fulfilled before the start of the senior year.

The Curriculum Committee requests that each department provide a list of all of the courses currently taught with a classification for each course into one of the new Approaches. Each faculty member should examine each course he or she teaches and designate an Approach that best describes the approach of the course. While it is possible to have more than one designation, the criterion for decision should be whether, **if this course should be the only course a student takes in that Approach, it would adequately give the student experience in this way of thinking (and doing)**. Thus, just as under the current system of divisional classification some courses may be classified under two divisions because they provide a sufficient experience of both those divisions' methodologies, so too in the new system a course may be classified with two Approaches labels. As under the current system, any given class can be used to satisfy one and only one divisional requirement. As courses offered each year are reclassified, the Curriculum Committee will review the listings and provide the Registrar with the new classificatory system. We recommend that these classifications be reviewed after three years to ensure that the new system is achieving the intended renewal of the curricular structure of the College. After three years, most of the courses regularly taught in the curriculum will have been introduced with the new classification, and faculty will have had the opportunity to adapt their courses to better meet the goals of the renewal process.

Revised Language Requirement Proposal

Internationalization of the curriculum has emerged as an important goal in the Curricular Renewal Process. The language departments play a critical role in the internationalization initiative both through the teaching of languages and in their more advanced offerings in literature, theory and culture. That Bryn Mawr offers more languages than virtually any other college of its size is a distinctive strength of the College, on which we should capitalize. We do not endorse cutting languages, even where national trends suggest lowering enrollments. Rather we see our breadth in the languages as well as our renewed commitment to making the languages a central contributor to the education of our students as global citizens as a strength that we should leverage. This proposal is therefore intended, not to reduce the importance of languages within Bryn Mawr's curriculum, but actually to further strengthen the languages, retaining the diversity of our language departments to create opportunities for greater interdisciplinarity and curricular innovation.

New Language Requirement for Bryn Mawr College:

All students will take two semesters of foreign language based courses. Students who come to Bryn Mawr with language proficiency may either place up (and take literature or culture courses within the language departments) or may begin a new language at the elementary level. Courses that fulfill this requirement must be taught in the foreign language; they cannot be taught in translation.

Language classes from the beginning level will approach the teaching of language from a cultural perspective as well as teaching the skills of the language, as recommended by MLA and as consistent with the way we **already teach** languages at Bryn Mawr. The aim of the requirement is to expose students to another culture in a way that allows them to achieve the cultural understanding one can only get by looking at the world, or thinking about the world, through another language. This exposure can serve as the basis for the development of linguistic proficiency.

Students may fulfill the requirement by completing two sequential semester-long courses in one language, either at the elementary level or, depending on the result of their language placement test, at the intermediate level. A student who is prepared for advanced work may complete the requirement instead with two advanced free-standing semester-long courses in the foreign language(s) in which she is proficient.

Curriculum Committee

Faculty Meeting 4.22.09

The Writing subgroup of the Curricular Renewal Work Group presented a proposal to the Curriculum Committee that has been approved; what follows is a brief summary of its key elements:

1. CSems:

– CSems can be either cross-disciplinary or disciplinary in content. If disciplinary, the CSem cannot be a survey course or a broad introduction to the discipline. It should instead focus on a topic of interest to the discipline that can be explored by entering first-year non-majors. Departments may decide to give major credit for a CSem, or may choose not to.

The Committee recommends that allocation of major credit be handled at a later moment in time – as a retrospective move in mapping the student’s academic path during major advising; first-semester freshmen would not be encouraged to take particular CSems in because it might count towards a major, nor would any preference be given to students in the selection lottery on the basis of hypothetical credit in a presumed major.

– CSem courses must be approved by the College Seminar Co-Directors in consultation with the Curriculum Committee.

– The College Seminar Co-Directors will be available to assist with course development.

– At the end of the Fall semester, a small team of faculty (including the CSem co-directors) will serve as a panel of readers for student work. Students will select one piece of CSem writing (from near the end of the semester) for assessment by this panel. From this assessment the faculty panel will make recommendations as to whether the student will be strongly encouraged to take an additional course on learning to write (English 125 Writing Workshop). This assessment of student writing may also be used to inform program revision and enhancement.

– Beginning in Fall 2009, Junior Faculty who teach two CSEM courses (cumulatively) while they are assistant professors will receive one course release as compensation. Senior faculty who teach three CSEM courses (cumulatively) will receive one course release as compensation.

2. Writing Intensive Courses

– Piloting the feasibility of a writing requirement to be satisfied by disciplinary courses designed to teach – among other things – writing in the discipline. Several departments (Art History, History, Cities, & French) have already expressed an interest in taking part in this pilot program in the coming year.

– Departments are invited to offer courses that would be designated as writing intensive on a voluntary basis, allowing for the identification of strengths, weaknesses and resource needs. Participants in the pilot program will have the opportunity to work with the Writing Center faculty to adapt existing courses and to invent new courses that could be designated as writing intensive.

– Individual faculty, departments, or discipline-based groups can propose a new writing intensive course or renovate an existing course to meet writing intensive criteria. Courses can be submitted to a WI faculty committee comprised of two members of the Curriculum Committee and the Director of the Writing Support Services.

3. Assisting Departments: Capstone Sequences.

– The nature of the capstone experience must be determined by the departments, according to the needs and conventions of the disciplines, as well as their existing departmental resources. The Writing Group has generated a number of questions that are intended to help the faculty produce and articulate a set of goals and guidelines that may be generally applicable, and might serve to assist departments in formulating the nature of their senior capstone experience.

4. Renaming the CSem Program

– The College Seminar External Review Committee did not like the “College Seminar” name or nickname (“CSEM”), and strongly recommended that it be changed. President McAuliffe suggests naming the program after a prestigious Bryn Mawr graduate or leader, for example, “The Emily Balch First Year Seminar Program.” This name could potentially create greater interest or appeal for the program in the admissions process, and might highlight for incoming and potential students a connection to our impressive alumnae. The Curriculum Committee will work with the Dean, Provost and President to explore the possibility of such a renaming.

THE COLLEGE SEMINAR*** PROGRAM

Goals of College Seminar Courses

1. To teach critical thinking about broad intellectual questions within and/or across disciplines through close reading, re-reading, and interpretation of substantial written, visual and material texts.
2. To give students instruction and practice in writing as a flexible tool of inquiry and interpretation; and to introduce students to college-level writing, moving them beyond the formulaic writing they learn in high school. To teach them
 - to respond thoughtfully in writing to course texts;
 - to construct clear, convincing written arguments based on non-obvious claims;
 - to develop these arguments through reasoning and evidence;
 - to communicate in clear, readable prose.
3. To make students conscious of writing as a process: to help them develop effective writing habits; to teach them to assess strengths and weaknesses of their writing in draft stage; to guide them to rethink and revise as a result of faculty and peer feedback; and to teach them copy-edit carefully.
4. To teach students to use written and visual sources fairly and effectively; to teach the logic and practice of citation and documentation; and to insure that students understand how to avoid misusing sources.
5. To model effective discussion strategies and to create a dynamic learning community, teaching students to participate effectively in small-group conversation.

Requirements for a Course to be Designated "CSEM"

1. Class size is limited to 14 students to promote active participation and to allow time for careful response to writing.
2. Classes are primarily conducted as discussions.
3. Appropriate readings for CSEM will be challenging, interpretable texts, those that encourage and reward deep reading and critical thinking. Visual, aural, material and performance texts may also be assigned. Texts should vary in type and length, but textbooks are not appropriate. Coverage of material is not a course goal; therefore, faculty should assign a reasonable number of pages per week – few enough so that students have time to reread and reflect on the reading.
4. CSEMs can be either cross-disciplinary or disciplinary in content. If disciplinary, the CSEM cannot be a survey course or a broad introduction to the discipline. It should instead focus on a topic of interest to the discipline that can be explored by entering first-year non-majors. Departments may decide to give major credit for a CSEM or may choose not to.
5. Students are expected to produce at least 25 pages of original writing in several assignments over the semester. Long assignments are not appropriate, and research papers should not be assigned.
6. Faculty must hold 20-minute conferences with each student every other week to discuss papers and reading. Graduate teaching assistants can be used to *supplement* faculty's work with students, but they may not substitute for faculty in conferencing or in responding to and grading written work.
7. Writing assignments should include opportunities to practice the writing process. These may include preliminary writing (response writing; informal proposals; mapping; outlining; etc.); draft development; and copyediting. Students should be given the opportunity to revise their work in response to feedback and

should be taught how to do so. Faculty should also show students how feedback may be applied to future writing assignments.

8. Some class time should be devoted to a discussion of writing strategies, for example, strategies for addressing audience, generating critical questions and claims, using sources fairly and effectively, and so forth.

9. Faculty are encouraged to provide opportunities for small-group work: small-group discussion of reading questions or sample essays; or peer writing workshops.

Processes Associated with the College Seminar Program

1. The Faculty has made or will make a commitment to this program. By virtue of approving it, they are making a commitment to support it by teaching in it. Having a first year seminar taught consistently and virtually completely by continuing faculty will be important to the success of the program and will give the College a relatively distinct profile in this regard. Going forward it is the expectation that all departments will contribute to the program regularly. At this time the WWG does not recommend a formal tithing system (although the External Review did), but this may become necessary if departmental support is not forthcoming.

2. The English department will continue with its current level of commitment to the CSem program, as their current level of faculty FTE is based on their enhanced contribution to the CSem program.

3. New CSem faculty must attend program orientation workshops. Continuing CSem faculty are encouraged to do so. If graduate-level course assistants are assigned to support faculty teaching CSem courses, they must attend training workshops in writing pedagogy. This additional training will be valuable professional development for the graduate students as well.

4. CSem courses must be approved by the College Seminar Co-Directors in consultation with the Curriculum Committee.

5. The College Seminar Co-Directors will be available to assist with course development.

6. At the end of the Fall semester, a team of faculty (including the CSem co-directors) will be assembled to serve as a panel of readers for student work. Students will be asked to select one piece of CSem writing for assessment by this panel. Rather than relying solely on CSem instructor identification, from this assessment the faculty panel will make recommendations as to which students will be strongly encouraged to take an additional course on learning to write.

7. Beginning in Fall 2009, Junior Faculty who teach two CSEM courses (cumulatively) while they are assistant professors will receive one course release as compensation. Senior faculty who teach three CSEM courses (cumulatively) will receive one course release as compensation.

***The College Seminar External Review Committee did not like the "College Seminar" name or nickname ("CSEM"). They highly recommended that it be changed. Separately, President McAuliffe suggested that the program be renamed for a variety of different reasons. First, a renaming would signal to the faculty that the program has changed. The WWG noticed that Faculty have many misconceptions about CSEM based on old models. Often they use these unfounded objections to refuse to participate. A name change might facilitate efforts to educate faculty that the program has changed. Second, a renaming would signal to the outside world that this is a new/importantly revised program. Change or evolution is appealing to alumnae and donors. So this change would be helpful to President McAuliffe in her messaging and in concretely showing how the curricular renewal process has produced substantial re-envisioning. President McAuliffe suggests naming the program after a prestigious Bryn Mawr graduate or leader, for example, "The Emily Balch First Year Seminar Program." This type of name could potentially create greater interest or appeal for the program in the admissions process. It would also highlight for incoming and potential students a connection to our highly impressive alums. The WWG strongly recommends that the Curriculum Committee work with the Dean, Provost and President to explore the possibility of a renaming.

WRITING INTENSIVE/INSTRUCTIVE COURSES

While maintaining and strengthening the integrity of the CSEM program, we would like to position it as the first step that Bryn Mawr students will take towards becoming effective communicators in the contemporary world. The second step would be a mid-level Writing-Instructive/Writing-Intensive course, located in the majors, concentrations or the disciplines, that would orient students to both the scholarly and writerly practices in the field. A third step would consist of a capstone senior paper or project that would represent the final stage of the Writing Program within the curriculum.

As the middle step in the Writing Program in the Bryn Mawr Curriculum, one such WI course would be required for every major or concentration as a way to orient the students to the discipline and to prepare them for the capstone senior project. The writing in discipline-based courses should not be viewed as stand-alone assignments to improve writing, nor should faculty feel that writing instruction need consume significant amounts of class time. The discipline specific Writing Intensive course should serve as an opportunity for our faculty, who are qualified by virtue of their disciplinary expertise, to orient their students to the standards of the discipline, to acquaint students with the norms and idioms in current practice, and to learn to write in the modes specific to the discipline. The critical thinking and writing in these courses can be seen as a way to help students better understand the scholarship done in the discipline, the methods as well as the conventions of expression. The writing assignments should obviously be integral to the content of the course, helping the students think about the materials covered in the class and deepening their engagement with them.

Students in majors or concentrations that expect performances, compositions, or other artworks to comprise the capstone senior experience should still be expected to demonstrate their ability to clearly and critically write about their field. Departments or programs must institute some method in which students demonstrate this capacity. This might range from a portfolio of writing to a research paper, with a minimum of 20 pages and with the expectation that the writing will undergo the same review and revision from faculty as in other classes.

WRITING INTENSIVE COURSES

Goals of a Writing Intensive Course:

1. To give students instruction and practice in writing as a tool of inquiry and critical thinking. Students will further develop their ability to use writing to create and represent knowledge, to explore and build upon ideas and concepts, to express thought and perspective.
2. To continue to teach students to write substantive, convincing arguments by generating critical questions, making claims, structuring arguments through reasoning and evidence, and generating a finished product that is appropriate to the writing's purpose and audience.
3. To orient students to the practices of research and writing in their own discipline through discipline based content and writing. These courses should help students:
 - to recognize the purposes, the assumptions, the questions posed, and the evidence considered persuasive by the disciplines they study;
 - to learn, when appropriate, discipline-based research;
 - to become familiar with the genres, structures, and language of writing characteristic of the discipline
4. To offer students various process models for writing that they can adapt to their own habits and modes of learning:
 - to teach students that good writing rarely is the product of a single draft produced in one sitting; rather that writing occurs in stages over time
 - to give students practice in typical process stages such as preliminary writing (note-taking, informal writing, outlining, mapping, etc.), drafting, revising, copy-editing;
 - to offer strategies for learning to assess the strengths and weaknesses of drafts
 - to effectively use faculty and peer feedback

Criteria for inclusion as a Writing Intensive Course:

1) Class or section size

While a class of 15 students should be considered the ideal, no class should have more than 20 students, even if this restriction requires that only majors be permitted to enroll. Classes in the upper end of the range should be provided with peer tutors or writing assistants.

2) Who Teaches

a) Faculty: As these are courses that will fulfill major/divisional requirements, they should be taught by our academic faculty: senior and junior faculty and continuing faculty appointments.

b) Assistants or Fellows: Assistance in early stages of assignments should be consistently available through peer tutors, writing assistants, TAs. These assistants could be used to supplement-- not replace-- faculty work with student writers in providing feedback, conferring individually with students, and so forth. Peer or graduate writing assistants must undergo training in writing pedagogy and conferencing techniques, and they should meet regularly with the faculty instructor to discuss writing goals and strategies. This additional training will be valuable professional development for the graduate students.

3) Amount of writing

These courses will require a minimum of 30 pages of writing, distributed over several assignments of varying length, one of which should be considered substantial. The assignments should include some introduction to and support of research methods. Some flexibility in this requirement should be maintained to allow for disciplinary differences in writing expectations. Types of writing may vary among the disciplines, and faculty are encouraged to design assignments that complement work within the discipline. Writing might include, for example, argumentative essays; critical reviews of the scientific literature or policy; reports of laboratory work/mathematical work that include a significant component which analyzes and discusses the results; critiques of objects, events, performances, or research papers.

4) Writing Instruction

As these courses are designed to assist students in improving their critical thinking and writing skills as they immerse themselves in their major studies, it is crucial that part of class discussion involve conversations and instruction on writing as a process and on the elements of disciplinary-based writing. In developing the syllabus for the course, faculty should plan assignments that assist students and give them support for the steps involved in disciplinary writing (e.g., assembling appropriate reference materials, creating outlines, describing data).

5) Feedback/Revision

Detailed faculty feedback is desirable at all stages of the writing process, but is required at least once for each discrete assignment. The faculty instructor is required to conference with the student at least twice during the semester to discuss writing in process. Revising writing should be included as part of the instructional content of the course. At least one assignment should undergo revision that includes meaningful faculty feedback throughout the process, rather than only at the end. Faculty are encouraged to utilize other feedback techniques: in-class peer writing workshops, utilizing writing assistants to review and discuss drafts with students, etc.

6) Integration with course content

The assignments in "WI" courses should not be viewed as writing exercises divorced from course content; nor should writing instruction consume all of class time. The discipline specific Writing Intensive course should serve as an opportunity for our faculty, who are qualified by virtue of their

disciplinary expertise, to orient their students to the standards of the discipline, to acquaint students with the norms and idioms in current practice, and to learn to write in the modes specific to the discipline. The critical thinking and writing in these courses can be seen as a way to help students better understand the scholarship done in the discipline, the methods as well as the conventions of expression.

7) Studio or Performance based courses

Students in majors or concentrations that expect performances, compositions, or other artworks to comprise some of the major work of a course, should still be expected to demonstrate their ability to clearly and critically write about their field. Departments or programs must institute some method in which students demonstrate this capacity. This might range from a portfolio of writing to a research paper, with a minimum of 20 pages and with the expectation that the writing will undergo the same review and revision from faculty as in other classes.

Faculty/Program Support

The College should be prepared to support interested faculty on several levels:

- maintaining an upper limit of 20 students in writing intensive course
- offering programs to train and support writing assistants and to continue the work of the Writing Center
- --offering introductory and ongoing faculty workshops
- providing opportunities for additional faculty or departmental mentoring in integrating writing into major or disciplinary courses.
- developing pedagogical materials, handbook, resource area (physical space or virtual)

Designating a course as a WI course

Individual faculty, departments, or discipline-based groups can propose a new WI course or renovate an existing course to meet WI criteria. Courses can be submitted to a WI faculty committee comprised of two members of the Curriculum Committee and the Director of the Writing Support Services. It also should be noted that while some courses do not lend themselves to be “WI” courses, publishing goals for disciplinary writing courses and guidelines for the teaching of writing may increase the focus on writing in all discipline based courses.

SENIOR CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE

The third tier of writing instruction should be the capstone experience for students within their majors. Even more than for the WI courses, the nature of the capstone experience must be determined by the departments according to the needs and conventions of the disciplines, as well as their existing departmental resources. The Writing Group has generated a number of questions that are intended to help the faculty produce and articulate a set of goals and guidelines that may be generally applicable and serve to assist departments in formulating the nature of their senior capstone experience.

- 1) What is the role of writing in the capstone experience?
- 2) What preparations should we expect departments or programs to render with reference to the capstone?
 - --models
 - --discipline specific training
 - --peer feedback
 - --faculty feedback
- 3) What writing competency should we expect from our graduating seniors and how do we assess this?
- 4) Should we also expect some competency in oral or non-written presentations?
- 5) What demonstration of writing competency should we expect from student who do a capstone that does not have expository writing as a key component?

Kaleidoscope Program
November 15, 2009

Situated within the tradition of interdisciplinary work already being done at Bryn Mawr, the proposed Kaleidoscope program is a new arrangement of interdisciplinary and interactive educational experiences for students and faculty. The Kaleidoscope program connects courses together through common problems, themes, and experiences that bring faculty and students outside the traditional classroom walls for the purposes of research and scholarship.

What is a Kaleidoscope?

A Kaleidoscope is a collection of courses that possesses four characteristics:

1. It offers an **interdisciplinary** experience for students and faculty.

--Reflecting the fact that some of the most interesting knowledge generation is occurring at the edges or intersections of fields, the program emphasizes interdisciplinary coursework. Kaleidoscope defines interdisciplinarity broadly, allowing each cluster to develop its own explicit definition of interdisciplinary study. A Kaleidoscope offering could be 2 faculty members across divisions, across departments within a division, even 2 faculty members of the same department with VERY different subfields. What is central is that they engage problems using different approaches, theories, prior data and methods and be explicit about it.

--These faculty will work with students to draw different disciplinary perspectives together in a meaningful way. Rather than a “parade” of faculty from different disciplines talking to the students from their own perspectives only, we intend for the various perspectives to engage with and have an impact on one another.

-A Kaleidoscope will be one in a continuum of interdisciplinary programs that the College already offers:

**Sustaining an intellectual focus on a single topic across several courses, Kaleidoscopes will offer intellectual engagement deeper than that of a single interdisciplinary course.

**Organized around a particular problem or research question, with student experience occurring over a few months, Kaleidoscopes will be more focused in time and topic than interdisciplinary Concentrations.

** Forming and reforming in different configurations around a single set of issues, Kaleidoscopes do not constitute fields like Middle Eastern Studies or Peace and Conflict Studies.

2. Kaleidoscopes are unified by a focused **theme or research question**.

—These can be topics like “poverty,” a particular space or time like “Vienna at the turn of the 20th century”, or a research question, such as the impact of Hurricane Katrina in the city of New Orleans.

3. Kaleidoscopes **engage students and faculty** in active and interactive ways in a **non-traditional classroom experience**. Essential to the program is a component beyond traditional classroom walls. This could occur through

- “data gathering” trips
- praxis-like community based partnership/learning
- extra-intensive laboratory activity.

4. Kaleidoscopes will encourage students and faculty to draw together these different perspectives in **reflective and explicit ways**.

Over their course of study, students often informally put together a set of related courses. In a Kaleidoscope, these connections are made explicit, shaped by collaboration among faculty members, and explored reflectively among faculty and fellow students.

What is the goal of a Kaleidoscope program for Bryn Mawr?

1. To provide additional and different kinds of learning opportunities for our faculty and students [undergraduate and graduate].
2. To provide opportunities for faculty to take their scholarship in new directions.
3. To reinvigorate or enrich opportunities for collaborative teaching.
4. To provide a “signature program” that helps us recruit and retain the best students. Even students not participating may be attracted to an institution that has unique interdisciplinary programs.

Who are the targets for a Kaleidoscope experience?

-Because Kaleidoscopes will allow students to experience the shifting and questioning of frames that sometimes comes from interdisciplinary work with faculty, most will be targeted for “advanced” sophomores and juniors.

-Kaleidoscopes could also lead to individualized advanced interdisciplinary work in the senior year.

Why Kaleidoscopes will be sustainable, and not place a significant strain on existing resources (in terms both of money and faculty energy):

- Our initial goal is to offer two Kaleidoscopes a year.
- Kaleidoscopes will be taught by standing members of the faculty.
- They will be made up of existing types of courses (so do not require changing the curricular rules).
- At least some of the courses will count toward the major.
- They may feed senior thesis or capstone work.

-- Individual Kaleidoscopes will be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee as they are proposed, to assure that they fit the goals of the program.

Possible forms for the Kaleidoscopes

Kaleidoscopes may take a range of configurations to realize the scholarly and pedagogical goals of the program. Forms may vary in terms of the number of courses involved, whether they meet separately or together, whether the students' only coursework is within the Kaleidoscope, and whether all of the coursework takes place within the typical confines of the semester.

Below are a few examples of how these variables might translate into Kaleidoscopes:

Example 1:

-Students would take all 4 courses in the Kaleidoscope, and only Kaleidoscope students are enrolled in these 4 courses.

-For example, a Kaleidoscope might be composed of 2 "content" courses, one method course (taught by all faculty involved in the Kaleidoscope), and one independent research credit. Or 3 content courses might be combined with one unit of independent research.

- 2-3 Faculty would be involved, and would only teach in the Kaleidoscope that semester.

-This arrangement would permit students and faculty either to be "portable" to engage in an intensive activity (in the lab, for instance) during large chunks of the semester.

Specific Example: "Borders"

Courses:

Archaeology: Borders and Boundaries in Greece/Athens

Cities: Edges of the Modern City/ Paris and Hamburg

Geology: Edges: Urban Development and Geology

403: Independent Research

Experience: Three week research trip to Athens, Hamburg and Paris three quarters of the way through the semester.

Example 2:

-Students would take at least 2 core courses for the Kaleidoscope, in combination with other courses that are not part of the program. Some of the other courses could be affiliated with the Kaleidoscope but they would involve some students and faculty who are not in the Kaleidoscope.

-Because the Kaleidoscope core courses will involve an intensive non-traditional classroom experience, they may begin partway through the semester, as long as they are roughly equivalent, in total, of a typical one semester course.

-Core courses might begin with a common set of meetings in which methods are reviewed; then meet apart for awhile; then return for some integrated meetings before they begin their experience

outside the classroom. Alternatively, the core courses could meet separately, but would be coordinated and synergistic in their topics and readings.

-Students would have an active experience, of at least two weeks in duration, outside the boundaries of the semester (in January or May).

-Students would finish the course with a project when they return.

-Faculty from affiliated courses could go on the trip, if it occurs outside of the semester.

Specific Example: “Borders”

Core Courses:

Archaeology: Borders and Boundaries in Greece/Athens

Cities: Edges of the Modern City/Hamburg and Paris

Affiliated Courses:

Geology: Edges: Urban Development and Geology

East Asian Studies: Edges in Chinese Cities

Psychology: Edges of Identity

Chemistry: The Stuff of the City

Experience: 14 day trip to Athens, Hamburg and Paris at the end of the semester. Students write up their final projects when they return (over the first 2 weeks of the summer, or winter break).

Under these arrangements, students would take the core courses and choose from several affiliated courses in which they would interact with other students. Students would bring perspectives from these affiliated courses to the core courses, and vice versa. Affiliated faculty would be invited to participate in the field trip experience. The core courses could begin meeting partway through the semester to compensate for the time needed at the end for the field trip or similar component.

The core courses could meet together for the first few weeks to cover methods, then meet separately for several weeks and then return to joint meetings for integration in preparation for the field experience. They may also choose to meet separately the entire time but be coordinated and synergistic in their content and work.

Other forms:

We imagine that there may also be student generated Kaleidoscopes, in which students find common themes or issues across courses and draw this coursework together through an Independent Study with a willing faculty member(s). The Kaleidoscope Steering Committee is continuing to consider a model for student generated Kaleidoscopes and may bring this idea forward at a later time.

In addition, the goals of the Kaleidoscope program perhaps could be met by a single, team taught course offering, in which the active experience occurs during the Fall or Spring Break. To achieve the depth of intellectual engagement that defines a Kaleidoscope, this course would have a more focused topic than is typical of some of our regular interdisciplinary courses (such as “Evolution”)

Unanswered Questions:

What will constitute adequate faculty “compensation” to develop and offer courses?

What administrative support will be needed, both “clerical” and in developing and sustaining the program?

How do we best resource the program in ways that do not make the program overly burdensome on faculty or administrative assistants?

What funding will be available for students if the experience involves a trip? Will we offer financial aid?

Is there a way to tie this to alumnae programming (and in so doing get financial support)?

Is there a way to use graduate students and/or a way that graduate students can benefit from this program? [For example: Graduate students could be TAs in a Kaleidoscope, leading discussion sessions, or overseeing specific assignments geared towards interdisciplinary research. Such an interdisciplinary teaching and research experience for them could transform their own disciplinary and educational approach.] Also A G-Sem on a topic related to Kaleidoscope courses (i.e. Borders) could help prepare and test the theoretical and methodological foundations and help train a graduate student who could then TA in a Kaleidoscope,

Can we get grant/foundation funding to subsidize the program? We have already begun the process of looking for foundation support.

Launching a Pilot of the Kaleidoscope Program to begin in AY 2010-2011

We are looking at exploring the feasibility of a Kaleidoscope program by trying a pilot phase during the academic years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.

1. In November, Kaleidoscope will be explored with CAP and Curriculum Committee to get the committee’s input and will be revised accordingly.
2. In December, this Kaleidoscope document will be circulated to the faculty and will be discussed at the meeting for further faculty input.
3. If there continues to be faculty support and enthusiasm, during the early part of the spring semester, groups who are interested in pursuing a Kaleidoscope will meet to explore their interest and the feasibility of participating in this program. Up to \$300 per group will be available for meals or refreshments as the faculty groups meet to do their planning. These groups are strongly encouraged to include student input or consultation in their planning.
4. By **February 15th, 2010**, Kaleidoscope groups who decide that their idea both interests the faculty and is feasible in its implementation will submit a more detailed 2-4 pp. proposal to the Kaleidoscope Steering Committee. The proposal will contain more detail about the courses involved, the scholarly/research focus of those courses, the nature of the “field or lab” experience, and an explanation of how the logistics of the Kaleidoscope might work.

4. From these proposals, 6 proposals will be chosen to go into a formal course development phase. Groups chosen will receive small stipends to support materials, refreshments and travel for the remainder of **spring semester 2010**. If at the end of the spring semester the Kaleidoscope continues to seem viable, each faculty member involved in the groups going forward will receive a \$5,000 summer stipend or research fund to support the summer or summer/early fall work of completing the course development. Again, student input and consultation is encouraged.
5. The goal would be to offer two Kaleidoscopes in AY 2010-11, and two in AY 2011-12. Ideally it would mean one each semester, but the start could be delayed to spring 2011.

The program will be started with innovation seed money. During this planning phase, we will be actively seeking grant support.

During the pilot phase the program will be assessed to determine if and how it will continue beyond the pilot phase.

Kaleidoscope Steering Committee: Marc Schulz, Jennifer Spohrer, Anne Dalke, Carola Hein, Sandy Schram, Gary McDonogh, Peter Magee, Pim Higginson, Toba Kerson, Kim Cassidy

WORK IN PROGRESS

Advising

Our new distributional requirement would be implemented using a revision to our current advising system. Because another goal of the new requirements is for students to have a deeper understanding of the goals, purposes and meanings of a liberal education, faculty will become more directly involved with student advising to help students navigate the general education requirement. In the new system students would be required to write reflectively about their educational experiences and goals during their first and second year to document their intellectual pathway through the curriculum. The CRWG is still exploring the form of this writing, but one promising avenue seems to be responses to a series of probe questions. These questions would then be discussed with their pre-major faculty advisor during their first and second year. These meetings would help students make sense of the breadth of the distributional requirements, the significance of the approaches to inquiry and their own strengths and interests. This more intentional charting of an intellectual journey is a particularly fitting process at Bryn Mawr, insofar as it is a natural expression of the Bryn Mawr woman's characteristically purposeful vision of her life and insofar as it instills appreciation of the meaning and importance of liberal education, something fundamental to the mission and goals of the College.

Quantitative Literacy:

Bryn Mawr prides itself on its success in graduating a high percentage of women who major in math and who go on to quantitatively demanding careers, yet at many of our faculty discussions, faculty members who teach courses that require quantitative skills or quantitative literacy expressed frustration at how unprepared some students are for their classes. These faculty members are forced to either push on (knowing that some students will be left behind, or even fail) or spend an inordinate amount of time teaching basic quantitative literacy skills. The concern that some proportion of our students struggle with quantitative literacy is supported by data from both the COFHE Senior Survey and the NSSE 2008 data and by the Deans, who report that many students get into academic trouble because they lack the quantitative skills their coursework requires.

Ensuring basic quantitative literacy would better prepare all students to take advantage of other academic offerings at the College, particularly in areas such as economics, psychology, sociology, chemistry and geology. In addition, educating students for civic responsibility necessitates a certain amount of quantitative facility that not all of our students appear to be getting. The CRWG is investigating how best to support and develop students who enter the College with poor quantitative literacy skills. The CRWG is looking for effective ways to identify these students early on in their careers and provide them with the education that they need via coursework. To this end, the CRWG is meeting with science and social science department to develop an inventory of commonly needed basic quantitative skills. We are trying to use this inventory to develop a diagnostic test that would be administered to entering freshman. Those that demonstrate that they are not well prepared would be required to take a quantitative literacy course. If these quantitative literacy courses are successful students can then avail themselves of all avenues in the curriculum and will emerge from the College ready to be informed participants in a society that increasingly relies on quantitative information.

Globalization

Our mission statement emphasizes the importance of preparing students to be global citizens. Indeed, global citizenship there comes forward as a key outcome of a liberal education in general, and a Bryn Mawr education in particular. The CRWG has done a significant amount of work on how we might better achieve this goal.

First, the CRWG took stock of what we already provide to students in this regard. We offer training in 11 foreign languages on our own campus and Japanese and Arabic in conjunction with our Bi-College and Tri-College partners. We have a Center for International Studies that provides co-curricular programming, internship opportunities and research funds for work relating to international studies. We offer a minor in International Studies. We have area studies minors or concentrations in Africana Studies, the Middle East, and Latin American and Latino Studies, and a Bi-College department in East Asian Studies. All social science and humanities departments exhibit scholarly and curricular expertise beyond the United States, and many faculty members study non-Western areas. Many collaborate with research partners in other regions of the world as well.

The CRWG spent significant time, with broad faculty input, reworking the College's general mission statement about achieving global citizenship or internationalization of the curriculum, so that our future plans can best be directed toward fulfilling those goals. To that end the CRWG defined three elements of globalization that the College will target moving forward:

1. The study of other cultures, especially non-Western cultures.
2. Action-oriented, experiential learning about unfamiliar cultures, in this country and abroad.
3. The study of globalization proper, by which we mean the cumulative processes of a worldwide expansion of trade and production, commodity and financial markets, fashions, the media and computer programs, news and communications networks, transportation systems and the flow of migrations, the risks generated by large-scale technology, environmental damage and epidemics as well as organized crime and terrorism. Educating women for a global world will mean helping to understand these processes and the ways in which they have and will transcend traditional boundaries of nationhood and what we have traditionally understood as “belonging to one place or another.”

During the 2009-10 academic year, the sub-working group on curricular globalization, led by the President, will be exploring a host of ways to increase globalization of the curriculum toward these three elements. They plan to explore:

- the representation of cultural studies and globalization in the curriculum,
- possibilities for student and faculty exchanges in other regions of the world,
- the incorporation of international experiences in coursework, either by telepresence in course partnerships with non-US universities or by shorter travel experiences as part of the coursework, and
- the creation of other summer and semester-break internships that allow students to get practical experience working in another country.

The sub-working group may also explore the possibility of creating a more formal partnership in a particular region of the world, or with a particular university in another part of the world, to investigate the idea of opening a satellite campus, or a dual-degree program.