General Education at Evergreen

The Historical Context, Current Experiments and Recommendations for Implementation

John McCann
January 2002

Introduction

About three months ago, our Provost, Enrique Riveros-Schäfer, asked me to write a piece on general education[1] for distribution to faculty and staff. As he imagined it, such a document would locate the general education debate of the past two years in the history of
the college and summarize the debate itself. The document would also describe experiments and works in progress regarding integration of the faculty-approved tenets on general education into the curriculum, and make some recommendations about how to encourage this increased breadth.

Pursuant to Enrique's charge I spent a month and a half interviewing 30 faculty and staff. Many of these colleagues provided me with syllabi, covenants and program descriptions incorporating best practices and ways of advising within programs. I asked for recommendations on how to support added breadth in the curriculum. I reviewed the literature on the college from the early years through the most recent reaccreditation report.

This work has been a great privilege. The interviews I conducted, the program materials I received and historical documents I read, reaffirm the extraordinary quality and dedication of Evergreen faculty and staff, past and present.

In the course of this work I've identified several themes that are explicated in the four sections that follow. These themes are:

1. The recent and ongoing debate about general education at Evergreen did not spring from nowhere. The issues of the debate are deeply rooted in the philosophical and pedagogical history of the college.

2. The debate was difficult, valuable and consonant with Evergreen's best thinking.

3. The tenets endorsed by the faculty (the six expectations and accompanying language) support our historical commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

4. Despite and because of the positions faculty took in the debate, they continued to teach and to innovate, and remained deeply committed to interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

---

[1] Many faculty and staff at Evergreen dislike the term "general education," and told me that we should call it something else, but nobody proposed a reasonable alternative. Since we've been using the term for over two years, I've retained it. As Gertrude Stein said, "general education is general education."

5. We will implement the tenets endorsed by the faculty in the same way we have other key aspects of college pedagogy and philosophy: incrementally and variously. Faculty experiments and works in progress on incorporating expectations, learning outcomes and advising within programs show great promise as we begin to implement the faculty-approved tenets on general education.

Section One of this paper describes key philosophical and pedagogical issues in Evergreen's history. It is impossible to understand the recently concluded debate on general education and the current attempt to implement the faculty-approved tenets on general education without also understanding the historical debates that shaped the nature and purpose of Evergreen. Many of these debates concerned requirements in general and general education in particular. They also addressed modes of learning and teaching, the problems associated with teaching the sciences (and arts) at Evergreen, and the very complex and often difficult means and processes of governance. Section One provides a sketch of pedagogical and philosophical issues and debates key to the college's development, showing that these debates are still with us and still important.

Section Two addresses the recently concluded debate on general education, locating that in the context of Evergreen's history.

Section Three describes experiments and works-in-progress currently in use by Evergreen programs. Most describe incorporation of the six expectations and advising in syllabi and programs.

Section Four presents twelve recommendations for increasing the breadth of Evergreen's curriculum in quantitative literacy, science, the arts and writing. These recommendations are based on our collective experience. Evergreen has never worked by administrative fiat, nor by faculty consensus, but by a reaching a kind of critical mass over time (via summer institutes, workshops, faculty retreats, etc.), through which faculty and staff eventually wind up doing more or less similar things together in a more or less common purpose.

Appendices include an early vision of the nature of the college by Rudy Martin and David Marr, the full original text of the five foci, goals of the Learning Resource Center, a comprehensive list of services available to students and faculty, and guidelines for small grants for Gen Ed implementation.

SECTION ONE
Historical Context: Debates on the Nature and Purpose of Evergreen

The recent and on-going debate about general education at Evergreen did not spring from nowhere. The issues of the debate are deeply rooted in the philosophical and pedagogical questions in the history of the college. What do we mean by interdisciplinary education? What do we mean by liberal studies? Should we have requirements? How do we understand our belief that students are responsible for their own education? How do we structure the curriculum? What are the roles of administrators and faculty? How do we best advise
students? How do we understand and maintain Evergreen's difference? What do we mean by faculty autonomy? How do we deal with external pressures? All of these questions and more surrounded our two-year discussion of general education. They were with us as our early leaders debated the nature and purpose of Evergreen. They have been with us in the past thirty years. This section summarizes those earlier debates from the founding period through the 1999 reaccreditation commission's recommendations.

"Decide what kind of an institution you want this to be."
—State Senator Gordon Sandison to Evergreen's first Board of Trustees[2]

Gordon Sandison, a state senator from Port Angeles, help craft the legislative mandate that created Evergreen. Commenting on the intent of the legislature to Evergreen's Board of Trustees, Sandison noted that "it was not the intent of the Legislature that this be just another four-year college." Rather, the new institution would be "a unique opportunity" to meet the needs of today's students. Planning of the new institution "would not be bound by any rigid structure of tradition" like the existing state colleges and universities. And the new college would not be shaped by any "overall state authority" as it would be in many states.[3]

The Board chose Charles McCann, then Dean of Faculty at Central Washington State College, as Evergreen's first president. McCann, in comments to the planning committee he convened to help chart the course of the new college, noted Senator Sandison's remarks and also quoted then-Governor Daniel Evans: "Governor Evans," said McCann, "has declared our need for a 'flexible and sophisticated educational instrument' as opposed to the 'vast and immobile establishment.' He sensed, too, the need to 'unshackle our educational thinking from traditional patterns.'"[4]

McCann went on to say:

> The need for the generalist becomes apparent. Society's rate of change calls for him, as indeed do the demands of citizenship. The generalist has specialized knowledge but has the ability to be flexible and adaptable to new situations. Put another way, he knows something well but is flexible because that something he knows well can be turned to many purposes. The

---

[2] *Daily Olympian,* 8/31/67, quoted in William Henry Stevens III, *The Philosophical and Political Origins of The Evergreen State College,* unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Washington, 1983, 182.
[3] Minutes, Board of Trustees, 8/30/67, quoted in Stevens, 182.
[4] Charles McCann to Members of the Planning Committee, 12/23/68, quoted in Stevens, 215.

> self-disciplines which he acquires … will give him confidence in his ability to master analogous but different situations.
>
> The machinery shouldn't dominate the student's life. The fact that he is going to end knowing something should be the sole dominant factor. To change the "system" we must do exactly that—we can't change part expecting to change the whole later, for the change of the part simply becomes the expensive little development for the few. The secret for radical change, while still meeting economic reality, is to avoid a plethora of courses and classes.
>
> Should any course be required? The Hampshire introductory seminars into the natural sciences, humanities, etc., have some compelling arguments in their favor, but what happens to required courses and to the attitudes of students required to take them and of instructors required to give them is an equally compelling argument against requiring them.[5]

McCann stressed that learning is life long, that college is not the total of learning, and that on-the-job experience is more important than vocational education:

> We discussed goals in view of the plight of undergraduate studies, the life of which has been squeezed out by the pressures of vocationalism on the one hand, and of the liberal arts [and] general education pressures on the other. Vocationalism has pretended that an undergraduate could be trained to enter professional or semi-professional work, but the undergraduate found that after he has the bachelor's degree (in some highly specific occupation), what he found on the job had little to do with what he did in college; the general educationalists or liberal artists, on the other hand, have claimed that no one is educated unless he has this and that, according to the myth which someone has put beautifully, that no one comes from high school knowing anything and everyone must know everything by the time he graduates, which of course must be no more or less than four years later.[6]
>
> Our climate needs loose organizational structure and instructional modes which in turn permit great flexibility in faculty effort; all this achieving equilibrium at the point of student needs and faculty competence.[7]

Shortly after hiring the first academic deans, Don Humphrey, Merv Cadwallader and Charlie Teske, McCann offered this summary of his goals for Evergreen. These would constitute, he said, "conditions of employment" for the planning faculty.

---

[5] Charles McCann to Members of the Planning Committee, 12/23/68, quoted in Stevens, 218.

[6] Charles J. McCann, "Vital Undergraduate Studies: What's the Right Climate?," an address to the WICHE Institute on Departmental and Institutional Development, Lake Arrowhead, California, 8/28/69, quoted in Stevens, 235.

[7] Ibid., 237.

[8] Charles J. McCann, "Introductory Remarks for Planning, Phase II," 2/8/70, The Evergreen State College Archives, quoted in Stevens, 275.

"Terms like 'breadth and depth requirements' will have no place here, since that assumes that the B.A. is, on one hand, the end of all education, or, in a few cases, not even the beginning, but simply prep school for 'real' learning later."[8]

The college's areas of inquiry would be the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities. "[U]nderstand," he said, "that this includes the idea of study in interdisciplinary problem areas, and that it excludes the strictly vocational."

There would be "only one college requirement for the B.A. degree: 36 units (each roughly equivalent to the level of reading and writing required for a stringent five-quarter credit), with the understanding that these units represent accomplishments, not accumulations of time."

"Modes of instruction would probably slant towards seminars."

"A student's program would be individual, developed with the advice (and consent) of a faculty advisor. A student should be able to progress on his own terms … Here much depends on the faculty member … whose status ought to be on the line with every approval."

"It must be possible to generate units by work-study; it's extremely important that we have an effective program. The question has been raised as to whether it can be effective if it's not a requirement. I feel very strongly that the absence of 'requirements' is an absolutely basic understanding of the place."

What did McCann mean by requirement?

> A student is faced when he begins his program with a series of hurdles to the B.A. degree in the form of particular discrete activities that he must go through. It is this sense of 'requirements' that has no place at Evergreen.[9]

Charles McCann, supported by the Board of Trustees and a legislative mandate that encouraged innovation, began by laying out basic principles for Evergreen:

- it would not be bound by any rigid structure of tradition
- it would unshackle our educational thinking from traditional patterns
- it would educate generalists
- it would give the student confidence and ability to master different situations
- it would be free of the machinery of the traditional college including rigid administrative reporting lines, departments and a plethora of courses
- it would not impose requirements
- it would equip the student for life-long learning
- it would focus on interdisciplinary study around themes and problems, on contracted study, and on internships
- it would employ the seminar method

[9] Charles J. McCann, "Introductory Remarks for Planning, Phase II," 2/8/70, The Evergreen State College Archives, quoted in Stevens, 276-77. In her critique of Section One of this paper, Barbara Smith noted that "Ironically, many of the terms in early McCann speeches sound like higher education reform advocates in the year 2000—the stress on student learning outcomes and accomplishments rather than time accumulated, the stress on close advising, the stress on individualized learning." She also noted "that Evergreen like other institutions is still struggling with assessing and reporting accomplishments in a way that the general public can understand."

- it would enable the student to set an individual course of study closely advised by a faculty member

**The Four No's: "No Departments, No Ranks, No Requirements, No Grades"[10]
—Charles McCann**

The newly hired deans, all of whom came from experimental and innovative programs at other institutions, reached quick consensus on the characteristics they wanted in faculty. Faculty would plan and serve "in interdisciplinary (or multi-disciplinary) project groups … Each faculty person would generally be responsible for giving educational leadership to 18–20 students. The groups would be organized around … central themes … Advanced work would be primarily done through individual or group contracts." "In all cases … advanced work (upper division) in all areas should place as much responsibility on the individual student as possible for fulfillment of his educational program."[11]

In hiring the planning faculty, the deans and the provost, Dave Barry, would seek candidates with "demonstrated concerns and experience in pursuit of inter- (or multi-) disciplinary scholarship and teaching, experience in curriculum planning for inter-disciplinary programs, preferably team planning and teaching; [and] demonstrated interest in the rigorous,
demanding role of teacher with a definite respect and liking for this relationship with students, and counseling."[12]

The deans and provost hired eighteen planning faculty: Fred Young, Richard Alexander, Richard Brian, Beryl Crowe, Larry Eickstaedt, Will Humphreys, Richard Jones, Rudy Martin, Bob Sluss, Sid White, Dave Hitchins, Al Wiedemann, Byron Youtz, Bill Aldridge, Bob Barnard, Willi Unsoeld, Jack Webb and Fred Tabbutt. Thirteen of the original faculty came to Evergreen with experience at innovative colleges. Eight had experience with learning communities—curriculum structured around programs rather than courses.[13]

The debates began immediately. At a Board retreat Dean Merv Cadwallader presented his ideas about curricular organization at Evergreen, ideas based upon a resurrection of the design and format of the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin, later replicated at UC-Berkeley, San Jose State and SUNY-Old Westbury. Several of the founding faculty had been part of these experiments.[14] According to Cadwallader, Evergreen would be characterized by:

- organization by programs not by department
- coherent lower division curriculum organized around a central theme and related programs
- mathematics and foreign languages as integral parts of both programs
- an upper-division program in ecological and environmental studies designed,

---

[10] Charles J. McCann, "Academic Administration without Departments at The Evergreen State College," in *Alternatives to the Academic Department,* Dean McHenry, ed., San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1977.
[11] Conference Chairman to President McCann, quoted in Stevens, 279.
[12] Ibid., 281.
[13] Barbara Leigh Smith, critique of Section One of this document, fall 2001. For a view of the influence of minority and women faculty in Evergreen's early years, see Elizabeth Linn Diffendal, *Significant Differences: An Ethnographic Study of Women and Minority Faculty in the Development of an Innovative Liberal Arts College,* unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1986.
[14] Barbara Leigh Smith, critique of Section One of this document, fall 2001.

taught and evaluated by autonomous interdisciplinary teams
- an upper-division program in science that makes maximum use of the campus environs rather than expensive laboratory equipment
- qualitative evaluation of student work and progress culminating in a reproducible "portfolio" rather than a conventional transcript
- the steady enhancement of the art of teaching

The faculty accepted some of Cadwallader's ideas and rejected others, most notably the "two college" model of lower division and upper division programs, although Cadwallader continued to promote this notion. Cadwallader's most important contribution was his introduction to the faculty of Joseph Tussman's book *Experiment at Berkeley* and his championing of the ideas of Alexander Meiklejohn, which the faculty followed in their creation of coordinated studies programs.

Cadwallader recalled the adoption of coordinated studies at an early meeting.

> I described my previous coordinated studies program at San Jose, and I said I'd like to have an opportunity to do that with 100 of the 1,000 students we admitted. And then, as I recall, Don said, "if it's good for 100, it's good for 1,000 …" The moment Don said [that] … I was really appalled and shocked and scared. I started to backpedal and emphasize the difficulty of finding faculty who could teach cooperatively and across disciplinary lines in coordinated studies] … I was completely bowled over when in a matter of hours we found ourselves committed not to one coordinated studies [program] but to 12 on opening day.[15]

Fred Tabbutt, a chemist, questioned the viability of the proposed curricular structure. "As the forging of the curriculum nears the first deadline a number of tough problems emerge which would seem to be making the lot of the sciences not a very happy one … The President's directive that the only requirement for graduation should be 36 units implies a utopian freedom which, regrettably, cannot exist if our product is to be the 'liberated generalist.' …
I believe that it is imperative that the faculty face and answer the question whether liberal education is to be a requirement for graduation and if so, what that entails."[16]

Willi Unsoeld, the great mountain climber and advocate of wilderness education, recounted the faculty's distress with the lack of requirements:

> When we discussed requirements, and that's when Charlie stonewalled us to death, because we went in there loaded for bear, we had to have some requirements. Even the most liberal of our crew was relatively convinced of the fact that requirements were desirable. I remember being a prime spokesman, at that point, in favor of requirements and I remember my

[15] Sid White, Planning Deans, 1974, *Dreams and Goals: Early Visions of Evergreen* series, quoted in Barbara Leigh Smith, "Evergreen at Twenty-Five," in Barbara Leigh Smith and John McCann, eds., *Reinventing Ourselves: Interdisciplinary Education, Collaborative Learning, and Experimentation in Education,* Anker Publishing, Bolton, Massachusetts, 2001.

[16] Fred Tabbutt, "Memo to Planning Faculty re: A TECS Dilemma," 9/25/70, Willi Unsoeld's file "TESC Position Papers," quoted in Stevens, 310.

argument vividly because I knew where Charlie's Achilles' heel lay, and it lay in the pottery department. He was considering hiring a faculty member who did nothing but pottery, and he was agonizing over it, and in order to convince him I was willing to settle for a very small requirement, at least one coordinated studies program in a student's four years at Evergreen, and I wanted to head off at the pass that bunch of wild-eyed individualists who came to do nothing but individual contracts for four years, and so I said:

"Well, Charlie, how would you feel if one of our graduates stepped out of the college after four years, the proud possessor of an Evergreen diploma, and he had done nothing but throw pots? For four years! How would that make you feel?" And then Charlie said:

"I would be appalled, but there is only one thing that would appall me more and that is to tell him that he couldn't!"

The sly old dog, yep, but that was just rhetoric, and I was impressed but unconvinced. And then he proceeded to convince me, and he said:

"You see, the claim that we know what it is a student needs in the four years a student spends with us is based on assumptions that we cannot make good on … We don't know how every individual that comes to us is going to grow or can grow best. That's what we're saying, that a person may not be better for being forced to take one coordinated studies program. And I am not arguing statistics now because in general I totally agree with you. But, in this individual case before me—We just don't have that kind of expertise."

And then, you know, he says,"For example …"

And I don't know if this was his example—it's been mine ever since.

"How do we know if that individual who has done nothing but throw pots for four years, how do we know he doesn't step out at the end of four years of nothing but ceramics and say 'Now I am ready for atomic physics!'—We don't. There is nothing sacred about these four years, and people develop before them and after them, and for us to say that you have to develop OUR WAY is the point at which I draw the line."

---

[17] Interview with Willi Unsoeld, 10/23/77, quoted in Stevens, 310-11. Sam Schrager asked David Marr about requirements in Evergreen's early years: "According to David Marr (in an e-mail response to a question from me), after considerable controversy during the first year or two about the nature of requirements at Evergreen,"
Charlie McCann cleared it all up in one or two sentences. He said that though we didn't have departmental and divisional (etc.) requirements...we certainly must have requirements in the sense of individual faculty judgment (and of course faculty team judgment, where applicable). He explained: Either academic standards and quality are observed and upheld in face-to-face faculty-student relationships, or the new college will be worthless. Period.
Sam Schrager to Brian Price, e-mail, Subject: General Education DTF Web Crossing site and discussion, 1/9/00, Provost Office files.

> I was completely convinced. And I have argued that line ever since. Charlie was right—and that's very impressive.[17]

Byron Youtz' careful critique of curriculum planning raised issues which would reverberate through Evergreen's history to the present. Youtz, a physicist who would later serve as Evergreen's provost, said:

> We lack any sort of long-term advising mechanism which will encourage students to PLAN AHEAD or think out long-range educational objectives. Similarly, for those students who already know their objectives, we have no system for providing assistance or advice on how to get there. This problem is particularly great for the student in contracted studies as we have defined it thus far (although I agree that a similar problem exists for all our students). I am troubled by our inability to forecast in any fashion the needs or requests of students, the availability of specific faculty or fields at any one time, our resulting inability to advise … students in any sure and honest way when they ask whether or not they will be able to study specific things at specific times in their careers here. The whole thing has such a random, ad-hoc quality to it that I guess I really don't see how it is going to work. [Then there] is the … question of how far an individual faculty member can reasonably extend himself and still do an honest teaching job with each student. To what extent will faculty members be victimized by our loose and generous system? How wide a range of fields and topics can he truly offer to students at any one time? How many faculty in a particular disciplinary area can and should we afford in order to offer adequate coverage in that area?[18]

Richard Jones, a widely respected psychologist, summed up the first year of teaching at Evergreen:

> Evergreen's first year of experience was that of almost its entire faculty seeking to adapt their individual styles, habits, biases and preconceptions to conditions of collaboration which none but the small San Jose contingent have ever experienced, and which had never before been attempted on such a scale. For some, the experience was debilitating, for others it was exhilarating; for almost all, it was tantalizing. Teaching, we all had been taught, was by definition a strictly private enterprise and here we were all trying to do it together under each other's noses … The differences that had tended to divide us in the planning year—the mutual antipathy of the humanist education and great books champions, the chauvinism with which community internships were regarded by some, the suspicions held by others as to the place of wilderness experience in an academic community, the derision with which affective education was regarded by still

---

[18] Byron Youtz, "Contracted Study***Again," 12/3/70, Willi Unsoeld's files, quoted in Stevens, 313.

[19] Richard Jones, *Experiment at Evergreen,* Rochester, Vermont: Schenkman Books, 1981, 29, quoted in Stevens, 330.

others—became trivialities before the commonly felt excitement of having tried for a year to find out how groups of professors could teach effectively, for whatever purposes, together. It was an unforgettable experience in the life of the college …[19]

"The Evergreen State College is a survivor—one of the few major experiments in curricular innovation arising from the decade of the sixties which remains strong and growing …"[20]—Byron Youtz

The commitment to a curriculum composed primarily of coordinated studies with the somewhat secondary elements of individual contracted study and on-the-job experience was successful, but required close attention from faculty and students. The following set of exchanges illustrates the hard work and struggle involved in building a particular coordinated studies program. One group of students from the program "The Individual, the Citizen and the State," (ICS) issued a call they titled "The Charter of the Speckled Band."

> We are neither touchie-feelies nor aspiring academics; we are not particularly
> revolutionary nor particularly conservative. We are sometimes frivolous and are capable of discipline. We didn't come to Evergreen to join a commune or encounter group, and we didn't come here to re-create the roles called faculty, students, administrators. We didn't come here to Get Away From It All; we came here to Make Something of It. We came here to lead a good life. We came not quite knowing how. And we are a little worried about whether or not we're going to make it, collectively. We don't want to become just the fourth or fifth Washington State College, and neither do we want to become Esalen North.
>
> Our situation is a creative opportunity, and we want to come together in a spirit of hope, not negativism, to make a little more sense out of who we all are and what we're doing together … [21]

Other students responded by more closely criticizing aspects of the program.

> It is the purpose of this essay to bring to general attention the deplorable state of affairs that exists within the ICS coordinated studies program, and to explore both the cause of the malady and its ramifications, both for ICS and for the Evergreen community as a whole …
>
> We are in very real trouble, and the cause of that trouble can be easily traced to a general lack of challenging, intense and cogent intellectual enterprise on the part of the members of the program …

---

[20] Byron L. Youtz, "The Evergreen State College: An Experiment Maturing," in *Against the Current: Reform and Experimentation in Higher Education,* Richard M. Jones and Barbara Leigh Smith, eds., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1984. For an account of other innovative colleges of the period see Joy Rosenzweig Kliewer, "The Innovative Colleges and Universities of the 1960s and 1970s: Lessons from Six Alternative Institutions," in Barbara Leigh Smith and John McCann, eds., *Reinventing Ourselves: Interdisciplinary Education, Collaborative Learning, and Experimentation in Education,* Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing, 2001.

[21] "The Charter of the Speckled Band," David Marr's files, March 1972.

Generally speaking, students are coming to the seminars unprepared to rationally discuss the material under consideration (when they bother to come at all); there is no writing being shared by the seminar members; books are not being read; and the discussion invariably drifts from one topic to another without covering any of them thoroughly and comprehensively …

… [I]t seems wholly evident that Evergreen is failing, as a non-college it is succeeding brilliantly. Observation shows us that typical student behavior exhibits an undisciplined, hedonistic "life of the senses." The serious, academic [students] … are fast becoming a minority, subject to the tyranny of the anti-intellectual majority …

A plan for a little more academic endeavor seems in order … additional academic discipline and direction must be applied to oppose the counter-educational attitudes and activities prevalent here.[22]

Faculty, in this case Rudy Martin and David Marr, acknowledged and built on this criticism.

It's impossible to spend much time on the Evergreen campus without coming into contact with or hearing about "the problem." Administrators, faculty and staff walk around up-tight, students wander around spaced-out, and there seems to be a general sense of uneasiness all over the place. Some programs, some students and faculty, some projects and internships are going along splendidly. Some people seem to have a firm sense of who they are, and they are forging ahead. But there seems to a pervasive malaise, a funk, or a depression hanging in the very air we breath instead of the excitement and vitality a lot of us are looking for. Some of our Coordinated Studies Programs are hardly "coordinated," (others are "studies" by only the greatest stretch of the imagination) … students complain that they aren't learning anything, long-faced faculty members trudge on grimly, fearing the next frustrating encounter with Woodstock Nation anti-intellectualism … This is only a partial listing of the ills Evergreeners agonize over and spend hours rapping about, but it gets at what seems to be the "problem."

First, our desire for community ends up as a phantasm or a bugaboo. What many people seem to be looking for is mobbism, not community, which is a group of unique individuals with shared goals and interests . . . We've got so much "community" we're ready to bust, but so far it's a community of misery and frustration. Rather than building community, we need to take advantage of the community we have and direct it in more creative ways, i.e., toward learning.

---

[22] Gregory J. Renault and Andrew Daly, "Evergreen Autopsy, A Report from the Trenches, or 'Would you buy a used college from this...?,'" David Marr's files, March 1972.

A second implication of the "problem" is that the rampant insecurity about the identity of this institution keeps everyone perpetually on edge … Everyone seems so afraid of doing something that Evergreen is not, that they don't do some of the things that Evergreen thinks (or says it thinks) it is.

A third tendency implied in the "problem" is the tendency toward dissolution, the most pernicious and dangerous of the three mentioned here. This one leads … to extreme do-your-own-thingism (witness the pressure towards a curriculum based mainly on individual and/or group contracts). It leads away from interdisciplinary coordinated study and ever more toward courses in this and departments of that. The point here is not that … coordinated studies should be the only acceptable mode of learning here, but rather that we should avoid the processes of fragmentation and factionalization that this culture has built into us all.[23]

Marr and Martin then provided a pointed critique of the institution: "These," they said, "seem to be some of things at the root of our troubles":

The obscure nature of the institution and its Goals. Until folks both on and off campus know just what this college is in clear, concrete terms, none of us will be able to do his job or to tell when someone else, regardless of his title, is doing his.

Ambiguous and unclear catalogue and campus rhetoric. The vagueness of our language in crucial places, which makes it possible, indeed common, for folks to understand what they choose rather than what we mean about the curriculum, the educational process, the campus administration, and other campus matters, seems to be a direct contributor to the confusion and lack of morale all over the campus.

The failure of the academic leadership by the people responsible for it. There has been too little effort expended by faculty and administrators in trying to define, clarify and perform the functions for which we were hired. Too many people have been too afraid of charges of "authoritarianism … "

The suggestion that "community" means representative or participatory democracy in guiding college affairs has led people to believe that the real decision-making power around here is vested somewhere other than where
it is, i.e., in the hands … of the board of trustees and the college's administrative staff.

The most crippling aspect of the "Woodstock" culture: the superficial, paranoid, anti-intellectualism of students and faculty.[24]

---

[23] Rudy Martin and David Marr, "The M 'n M Manifesto: My Snowman's Burning Down," David Marr's files, 3/9/72 - 3/15/72.

[24] Ibid. According to David Marr, student and faculty attributions of "anti-intellectualism" were pointed references to two or three programs.

Marr and Martin then reminded students and faculty of the "real expectations" that students and faculty should have of each other:

- Program covenants which "clearly specify the individual and mutual activities and responsibilities of the people involved."
- Critical and constructive student self-evaluations and faculty evaluations of each other and students.
- Subject-matter oriented seminars.
- Lectures, "despite faddish arguments to the contrary."
- Writing. "Students at Evergreen are expected to write regularly as a part of their education."
- Skill Development.
- Faculty Group Seminars.
- Individual Motivation and Group Dynamics. "Students are expected to develop both independent initiative and the ability to work together in groups."
- Curricular Design and Schedule. "Faculty are expected to inform the community, especially their students, of the over-all design of their programs or contracts as much in advance … as possible. They are also expected to publish a weekly schedule of program or contract activities."[25]

For the first five years of the college, program planning for the next year of study occurred one year in advance, and few programs were repeated. By the second year, after "operating in this frenetic manner," the faculty met at Lake Quinault to address the difficulties they had encountered in the first year of study.[26]

Byron Youtz summarized the problems faculty and administrators had identified: "there was no way to serve part-time students; foreign languages, mathematics, dance and some other subjects did not lend themselves well to … our mode of study; skills development, especially reading and writing … were not being handled well; the artists on the faculty felt overshadowed and under-represented; the institutional commitment to education for minority students was strongly questioned."[27]

To meet the needs of working adults and students who desired more access to particular subjects, Evergreen established a part-time studies program. To address skills development, the college established a Learning Resource Center. More arts faculty and additional minority faculty would be hired. The college would include "Third World concerns in all parts of the curriculum." The results of the Lake Quinault Conference, Youtz reported, "were regarded with considerable suspicion and some hostility by various groups of students

---

[25] Rudy Martin and David Marr, "The M 'n M Manifesto: My Snowman's Burning Down," David Marr's files, 3/9/72–3/15/72. Also see Rudy Martin and David Marr, "M & M II: The Current Crisis," David Marr's files, November 1975. Appendix One quotes a portion of this document.

[26] Byron L. Youtz, "The Evergreen State College: An Experiment Maturing," in *Against the Current: Reform and Experimentation in Higher Education,* Richard M. Jones and Barbara Leigh Smith, eds., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1984, 100.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., pgs. 100-101 For a brief explanation of two other critical events (the 1974 accreditation and a 1976 Evergreen Trustees' review panel) see Barbara Leigh Smith, "Evergreen at Twenty-Five," in Barbara Smith and John McCann, eds., *Reinventing Ourselves: Interdisciplinary Education, Collaborative Learning, and Experimentation in Higher Education,* Bolton, Massachusetts: Anker Publishing, 2001, 72-74.

and faculty who wished to preserve the purity of the initial curriculum."[28]

By 1975, concerns about under-enrollment in the state, faculty exhaustion at Evergreen, and "student complaints about the unpredictability of the curriculum … came to a crisis," and the college engaged in a three-day "Campus Forum" to discuss how to proceed. Students, faculty and staff agreed to charge three DTFs: on college governance, on the short-term curriculum, and on the long-range curriculum. The results of this six-month study reaffirmed the college's "faith in the importance of interdisciplinary study, in the methods for delivering that type of study, in the central importance of helping students learn how to learn, and in the value of having students take charge of … their own curricular paths."[29]

The primary recommendations of this Long Range Curriculum DTF were to establish Specialty Areas within the college encompassing major fields of study. The Specialty Areas would enable faculty to plan the curriculum two years in advance. The faculty established these areas: Environmental Studies; European and American Studies; Expressive Arts; Health and Human Development; Management and the Public Interest; Marine Sciences and Crafts; Northwest Native American Studies; Political Economy; and Scientific Knowledge and Inquiry.[30]

Richard Jones commented:

> [A]s we find ourselves, today [1980], scrambling to solve an under-enrollment crisis by way of reinventing traditional forms under futuristic names ("specialty areas" and "specialty area convenors" for departments and department heads; "career tracks" for majors, "modules" for courses; "embedded modules" for part-time courses) we find the college's second president, former Washington Governor Dan Evans writing to the faculty as follows:
>
> "I believe that the recommendations adopted so far … will make Evergreen more understandable to both students and the outside community. I believe most strongly, however, that we should and must retain the core of Evergreen's unique education: Comprehensive and interdisciplinary coordinated studies, a collaborative rather than competitive education … "
>
> Evans may never have heard of Meiklejohn or Tussman … But he is a states-

[29] Byron L. Youtz, "The Evergreen State College: An Experiment Maturing," in *Against the Current: Reform and Experimentation in Higher Education,* Richard M. Jones and Barbara Leigh Smith, eds., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1984, 101.

[30] A second review of specialty areas took place in 1982. "After five years, the 1976 plan was reviewed by a second major Long Range Curriculum DTF. It was a time of serious and conflicting political pressures. Declining enrollments threatened to give major leverage to those legislators with long-simmering discontents with Evergreen. A series of skirmishes forestalled drastic legislative action, but not without great internal strain and anxiety. The first report of the 1982 Long Range Curriculum DTF, which dramatically redefined the specialty areas, was shelved in the face of strong faculty opposition. The faculty then adopted a proposal which did not change the subject matter of the areas significantly but which tried to formalize and tighten specialty areas and make them more responsive to perceived student need for clear routes to post-college work." From *Constancy and Change: A Self-Study Report Prepared by The Evergreen State College for the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges,* August 1989, 23.

[31] Richard Jones, *Experiment at Evergreen,* Rochester, Vermont: Schenkman Publishing, 1981, 30.

man, a nimble politician, an intelligent and honest man and a thoughtful citizen; and I interpret this reminder to the Evergreen faculty as his response to a generative educational concept which, although it has taken sixty years for it to barely survive in this country, is of significant societal value. That value, as I have come to perceive it, lies in its recognition that the liberal mind needs exercise in collective as well as private enterprise.[31]

Given that Evergreen's original faculty and staff had all but taken oaths in blood[32] against establishing departments, the debate on specialty areas was particularly charged, intense and acrimonious. However, as Youtz pointed out, the specialty areas had "no budgetary base and no assigned faculty lines." Dean Charlie Teske warned, "Some internal specialization was needed for efficient planning, the use of resources and continuity. But having proliferated these growths, we must be vigilant and continually examine them to make sure that they are benign."[33]

By 1984, Youtz could report that "we are still surprisingly faithful and true to our original ideals. We remain a bastion of interdisciplinary studies among U.S. colleges." But Youtz also took note of the internal strife that accompanied change. "Some faculty feel that we have become too career oriented, that we have lost our innovative spirit, that we are no longer committed to experimentation. Many feel that we are slipping ever closer to departmentalization, though our protective structures are still intact. Others feel that we have sold out to the public relations demands of the legislature and our continuing critics."[34]

Charlie Teske commented, "I submit that our principles are still remarkably intact. We should stand and fight for them."[35]

The Five Foci of Evergreen Education

The Five Foci first appeared in Evergreen's 1989 self-study for reaccreditation, *Constancy and Change.* In formulating them, Matt Smith and his colleagues on the reaccreditation DTF performed an extraordinary service to the college. For the first time we had a cogent, even elegant, expression of our philosophy of education. The Five Foci defined Evergreen's approach to teaching and learning positively in a manner that could be understood both internally and externally. "What we were" had previously been very difficult to describe even to ourselves. The "Four No's," importantly, defined what we were not, but the Five Foci spoke eloquently to our central values about pedagogy and philosophy. The full text from the 1989 self-study appears in Appendix One. The short version is below.

- Interdisciplinary Study

---

[32] Richard Jones, "About the only thing we have not done to preclude the emergence of departmentalization at Evergreen is to take oaths in blood." quoted in Stevens, 328.

[33] Teske response to Jones in Jones, 102.

[34] Byron L. Youtz, "The Evergreen State College: An Experiment Maturing," in *Against the Current: Reform and Experimentation in Higher Education,* Richard M. Jones and Barbara Leigh Smith, eds., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing, 1984, 106-07.

[35] Teske response to Youtz, in Youtz, 106.

[36] *Constancy and Change,* 13-18. The Five Foci first appeared in an embryonic form in "Final Report of the Values and Aspirations Committee for Strategic Planning," May 1986, 5-6.

- Personal Engagement in Learning
- Linking Theoretical Perspectives with Practice
- Collaborative/Cooperative Work
- Teaching Across Significant Differences[36]

1989 Reaccreditation Report and Recommendations

Generally, the reaccreditation team praised Evergreen's accomplishments:

> We commend the Evergreen faculty staff, students, administration and trustees for their dedication to the founding principles and institutional challenges of the college. Through their joint and complementary efforts and extraordinary labors, they have implemented, refined and sustained curriculum and pedagogy that effectively embodies these principles.
>
> We congratulate Evergreen for fostering a spirit of cultural diversity and note the extraordinary success in recruiting and retaining people of color and women on the faculty. Few comparable colleges can measure up to having one in five faculty members from a minority background.
>
> We celebrate the widespread self-scrutiny which is an integral part of Evergreen.
>
> We admit the academic "climate" is a subjective insubstantial criterion for assessment. Yet we venture to judge the climate at Evergreen to be very good—indeed remarkable—equaled in a very few places we know. The commitment to community, to openness and free inquiry, penetrates the style of the classrooms and spills out into the stairways and plazas and play areas. One of the team members remarks that "if you sit down anywhere
> and ask a student a question, you not only get an answer, you get an articulate answer!"

Nonetheless, the report criticized the college for its programs' inadequate attention to natural science and the arts:

> Nothing in our observation of the core programs would lead us to disagree with the judgment in the self-study report that in recent years "the quality of core programs and their status in the college have risen significantly," and that students in the core "gain a first-rate introduction to the liberal arts and sciences, acquiring the academic skills and prerequisite knowledge … for intermediate and advanced work …" While the aggregate core programs do indeed provide a generous and sufficient range of liberal arts and sciences, by the very nature of the case few individual programs can do the same. Furthermore, even by the most generous interpretation, such key areas

---

[37] Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges, "A confidential report prepared for the Commission on Colleges that represents the views of the Evaluation Committee," October 23-25, 1989, 16.

as natural science and fine arts are not represented at all in half or more of the current programs.[37]

Perhaps more tellingly in terms of the current debate, the commission pointedly criticized Evergreen for "the possibility for almost complete science and mathematics avoidance in some students' college experience, which runs contrary to the Commission's standards related to general education. Roughly half the core programs, which might be expected to carry a large burden of general education, have little or no science/mathematics content … [S]cience/mathematics avoidance is easily engineered, whether by conscious design or not. Current planning to at least inject a meaningful math-across-the-curriculum component into the Evergreen experience deserves strong encouragement and rapid implementation."[38]

Then-Provost Patrick Hill commented on the Commission's report:

> The report is correct to be worried about our students' disciplinary exposure. The report is not correct to suggest that we have not studied the problem or that we lack adequate information about it. In September 1987, we studied a random sample of 324 recent Evergreen graduates. The study did, indeed, confirm that there was a low exposure to the natural sciences. Our alumni survey of 1988 confirmed this. It was in response to both of these studies that the college defined and is now moving on the concept of math across the curriculum. We are not satisfied with the low exposure of our students to mathematics and the natural sciences.[39]

Also prefiguring the current debate, Hill said, "Additionally, our concern about the quality of our advising system—something which the accreditation team took less seriously than we—
is in large part motivated by our concern to effect a wider pattern of distribution in our students' courses of study. We expect the improved advising system to be very helpful in broadening, where needed, the paths of study at Evergreen."[40]

The college half-heartedly implemented math across the curriculum, and went some way in addressing Hill's concerns about advising. In his 1994 "Interim Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation," Academic Dean John Cushing noted that a "math coordinator" position "was created to strengthen mathematics in the curriculum, especially in Core." The coordinator was responsible for math tutoring, Core faculty support, assessment and collecting best practices for use by Evergreen faculty. According to Cushing:

> The appointment of the math coordinator represented the one concerted effort to make the college's pledge of "math across the curriculum" real, especially for 1st-year students in Core programs. Quite frankly, however,

[38] Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges, "A confidential report prepared for the Commission on Colleges that represents the views of the Evaluation Committee," October 23-25, 1989, 18. Jin Darney notes that the Commission lumped arts into the humanities, and so did not consider student exposure to the arts separately—in the sense that they considered student exposure to the sciences. Jin Darney, critique of a draft of this document, 1/10/02.

[39] Memo, Patrick Hill to Mas Jones, re: Accreditation Response, 11/20/89, Provost Office files.

[40] Ibid.

[41] John Cushing, "The Evergreen State College Interim Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation," 10/3/94, Provost Office files, 26-27.

either the concept of the math coordinator itself was flawed or the incumbent was the wrong person for the position. The incumbent resigned in August of 1993, and the position has since remained unfilled due to budget constraints and uncertainty about how best to approach the problem of math across the curriculum. During the 1993–94 academic year only the tutoring services remained—supervised by a faculty member teaching physics.[41]

Noting the Commission's report that " … student and alumni surveys continually point to academic advising as one of the least satisfactory parts of the Evergreen experience," the college made various changes that resulted in "increasing staffing available for academic advising," and expanded the number of workshops available to faculty and students.
Most significantly, academic advising staff established the "core connector" program, which assigned individual staff to "connect with the faculty and students in … Core program(s)." Overall, academic advisors reported "a significant increase in the number of student contacts."[42]

1994-96 Long Range Curriculum DTF

In the most recent effort to rationalize what David Marr calls "the curricular economy,"[43] the faculty, after 18 months of exhaustive and exhausting effort on the part of the DTF, approved a major restructuring of how the curriculum was organized and planned. The debate on the DTF's recommendations reflected all the values and positions of previous debates on the nature of Evergreen. The DTF recommended four structural changes, which the faculty adopted. Five planning units replaced eleven specialty areas. The planning units consisted of "faculty affiliated with Culture, Text and Language, Expressive Arts, Social Science, Environmental Studies, and Science and Mathematics." These planning units would offer curriculum through "four major modes of study":

- Planning Area Programs
- Inter-Area Programs
- Programs for First-Year Students
- Individual and Student-Originated Study

Jin Darney noted, "We created five planning units to help stop the fragmentation of the curriculum with faculty isolated in specialty areas of three people, for example, who weren't talking to other faculty about curriculum. And to be sure that all faculty associated with
one planning unit—[that there were] no 'unaffiliated faculty.' The creation of an expectation of teaching in Core and inter-area programs has made a huge difference to the curriculum."[44]

~~The DTF recommended faculty~~ distribution of a "minimum of 20 percent serving first-year

[42] John Cushing, "The Evergreen State College Interim Report for Reaffirmation of Accreditation," 10/3/94, Provost Office files, 37-39.
[43] Author interview with David Marr, fall 2001.
[44] Jin Darney, critique of a draft of the document, 1/10/02.
[45] Jeannie Hahn to Jane Jervis, "Transmittal of Final Report, Long Range Curriculum DTF," 2/26/96. In her memo, Hahn noted that "With the transmittal of this document, the Long-Range Curriculum DTF has, at last, disappeared."

students; a maximum of 60 percent in planning area programs including Individual and Student-Originated study; and a minimum of 20 percent in inter-area programs." Finally, the DTF recommended that the college create "a coherent, degree-oriented Part-time Studies Curriculum, consistent with Evergreen's philosophy and values."[45]

The debate on whether the planning units represent creeping departmentalism is still open. As Byron Youtz noted earlier in his comments on specialty areas, the planning units have no budgetary authority or assigned faculty lines. As Charlie Teske noted earlier, "having
proliferated these growths, we must be vigilant and continually examine them to make sure that they are benign."

Changes in the External Environment

The 1990s saw extensive changes in the external environment for higher education in Washington State. Reaccreditation became a much more serious and innovative enterprise, focusing on assessment and student learning. Washington became one of the leading states
in both assessment and accountability, adopting statewide student learning outcomes in information technology literacy, writing, quantitative and symbolic reasoning and critical thinking. Evergreen, with the other state universities and four-year colleges, continues to participate in developing assessment methods in these areas.[46]

1998 Reaccreditation Report and Recommendations

The 1998 reaccreditation team once again praised Evergreen and once again criticized the college's approach to general education:

> The mission for which The Evergreen State College was founded is fulfilled by an institution-wide climate of engagement, improvement and intellectual curiousity. We find these achievements to be almost unparalleled anywhere in higher education.

> The committee commends Evergreen for its imaginative, dedicated and innovative faculty. The faculty give selflessly of their time to students …

> The Evergreen State College is commended for its programs of long-standing support of students of color. The success of minority students on the campus reflects the creation and maintenance of a nurturing, friendly, caring,
> supportive and academically responsive environment …

---

[46] Conversation with Laura Coghlan, Research Associate, Evergreen Office of Institutional Research, winter 2001; Most of this section is paraphrased from Barbara Smith, critique of Section One of this document, fall 2001.
[47] Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges Commission on Colleges, "The Evergreen State College, Full-Scale Evaluation," 10/18-10/21/98, 44-45.

We commend The Evergreen State College for the beauty of the campus and the care of its facilities. Despite significant budget cuts over the years, the limited number of physical plant staff are doing an exceptional job of addressing facilities needs on campus … [47]

Regarding general education, the reaccreditation committee recommended "… that The Evergreen State College insure that all of its students acquire the competencies appropriate to general education, especially but not exclusively in mathematics. This is called for by the college's own goals as well as by Standard 2C. Whatever the means taken, given a situation in which there are no required courses/programs, and in which student choices are largely unconstrained, there is nonetheless an institutional responsibility to achieve its stated liberal and general education goals."[48]

SECTION TWO
The General Education Debate

"We're at the point where the very term 'Gen Ed' pisses people off." [49]
—DTF chair Brian Price

Introduction

The recent two-year debate on general education was difficult and frustrating, but valuable and consonant with Evergreen's best thinking. In interviewing faculty and staff on the subject, and reviewing the mass of documents pertaining to it, I was struck by the principled honesty, frankness and very hard work of Evergreen faculty and staff. Early in the process of research I decided that we did not need just a booklet of experiments or best practices, still less a cheerleader-like account, but also a brief history of the debate that closely accounted for major issues and points of view. I also decided that it was crucial to acknowledge opinions and feelings about the debate itself. What follows is my attempt to honestly, and fairly objectively, present the essence of the argument, thereby, I hope, helping lay it to rest.

The Charge to the DTF

When Provost Barbara Leigh Smith charged the General Education DTF in June 1999, she asked its members to address the reaccreditation commission's recommendation noted above and to keep in mind anticipated requirements on student learning outcomes coming from the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) in 2003. The HECB-mandated learning outcomes would focus on quantitative skills and technological literacy and possibly later on writing. Smith suggested that the two problems (the commission's recommendations and the anticipated HECB learning outcomes requirement) be addressed concurrently by the DTF. Smith saw "the learning outcome discussion as integrally related

---

[49] Author interviews with Brian Price, fall 2001.

[50] Barbara Leigh Smith to General Education/Evergreen Learning Outcomes DTF, 6/8/99.

[51] Commenting on this survey, David Marr noted, "We have actually been asked to take seriously...the alleged complaint by alumni who regret not having studied mathematics while at Evergreen. Who made their educational decisions for them? Who forgot to tell them to take their mitties?" David Marr, "For Evergreen: Against GenEd," undated, Provost office files.

to the general education issues raised by the Commission on Colleges." She said, "It seems to me that the best way to discuss general education is in terms of the learning outcomes we expect our graduates to achieve." Smith hoped "that Evergreen can produce a thoughtful and innovative approach to this challenge." "It seems to me," she said, "that this college, more than most others, tries to educate its graduates with skills, values and competencies that far surpass traditional distribution requirements."[50]

Smith noted a 1996 survey of a sample group of graduates that revealed the graduates reported no credits received in these areas: Art (39% did not receive credit in art), Science (33%), Math (30%), Social Science (8%), and Humanities (7%).[51] She further noted that "common expectations for general education is a minimum of 10 credits in the broad divisional areas (though usually art and humanities are combined) and a modest four credits in math." According to these criteria, the survey revealed that the following proportions of graduates did meet these standards: Art (69% met the "common expectations" for general education mentioned above), Science (52%), Math (36%), Social Science (21%), and Humanities (22%).

Smith suggested that Evergreen might approach general education through these "multiple avenues" for students to fulfill distribution expectations:

- doing a better job of infusing these throughout the curriculum
- building modules as avenues to satisfy distribution expectations
- testing out through competency based assessments
- developing stated expectations which guide advising
- clarifying current credit equivalencies on transcripts
- making better use of summer school offerings

Smith summarized the DTF's task as follows:

1. Develop a clear policy statement about general education at Evergreen, recognizing that general education is an issue for the whole curriculum, not just Core, and that it must include the large number of transfer students as well as native four-year Evergreen students. I am hopeful that we can gain a leadership position in thinking about general education in a way that is distinctive and provocative for higher education.
2. Consider how the achievement of general education will be measured. While this may practically involve the metrics of counting credit hours, I encourage you to be conceptual, creative and imaginative about this. Perhaps the metrics themselves have the potential to be highly innovative.
3. Consider how academic advising needs to be organized to support the new approaches to general education.
4. Revisit the role of the Learning Resource Center and the job description of the Writing Center Coordinator.[52]

Retrospective Comments on the Debate

---

[52] Barbara Leigh Smith to General Education/Evergreen Learning Outcomes DTF, 6/8/99.

Many faculty and staff involved in the general education debate, and especially many of those who served on the DTF, looked back on their experience with something akin to horror. One faculty member who participated regularly in faculty meetings on the subject said, "Gen Ed was a poisonous debate. It was uncomfortable here for two years." "We wasted two years on Gen Ed," said a DTF member. Another DTF veteran said, "I learned a new word in the process, 'veleity.' This is a wish unaccompanied by any effort to make it come true." The same person added, "The DTF was too big. We were barely together. Members of the DTF wouldn't even support its conclusions. The DTF never crystallized. We had the wrong chair. It was all about turf, autonomy and control. It got to a point where people said, 'Oh, fuck it—I quit.'" A widely respected veteran of Evergreen, also a DTF member said, "The Gen Ed DTF was my time in hell. It was awful. It was badly charged. It was not well governed. People were so far apart." A faculty member who was relatively new to the college observed, "I was so fed up with the whole thing I thought seriously about leaving." A staff person who served on the DTF said, "It was one of the worst experiences I've had at the college. It was all about
posturing, renaming old problems, and resurrecting old antagonisms." "We're at the point," said DTF chair Brian Price, "where the very term 'Gen Ed' pisses people off."[53]

Some criticized Provost Barbara Smith. In terms reminiscent of earlier criticism of Provost Patrick Hill regarding the 1988 reaccreditation, one faculty member said, "We should have said 'no' to the Commission and negotiated with them about Gen Ed." A DTF member said, "people thought that the Commission didn't have any right to tell us what to do." "Barbara jammed this down our throats," said another faculty member. "She should have supported us."[54]

Others questioned the basis for the Commission's recommendation and critiqued the approach of the DTF. One faculty member said, "The issues should have been more narrowly defined." "The Commission didn't find out what we were really doing. I don't trust their measures. I don't trust the bias of the whole quantitative reasoning argument," said one faculty member. "Quantitative reasoning is an ideological project," said another. The same person commented, "The politics of Gen Ed is disingenuous in the extreme on the part of its advocates … Education is not about consumer choices … There's not the same kind of fretting about the arts as about quantitative reasoning and math. The political side is not about science students studying more poetry … We bumbled into this by writing the self study the way we did."[55]

Although some DTF members supported the idea of general education, and some finally were pleased with the measures the faculty adopted, most of those interviewed had nothing good to say about the process.[56]

The DTF's Work: Year One

"Instead of solving the math problem, we set out to reconceive the whole curriculum."[57] —DTF member Matt Smith

---

[53] Author interviews with faculty and staff, fall 2001.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid.
[56] I interviewed ten of the twenty-four faculty and staff members of the DTF in fall 2001.
[57] Author interview with Matt Smith, fall 2001.

The DTF began by trying to interpret their charge. They read fairly extensively on the subject of general education and decided to begin their work by addressing the questions of expectations and learning outcomes. Rather quickly, they decided to ask, "What are the attributes of the ideal Evergreen graduate?" Concurrently, the DTF considered curricular changes thought necessary to achieve these expectation and outcomes.

The first discussions about curricular change were wide open, ranging from "narrow, multiple general education requirements on the model of the distribution requirements normal at other schools," to "broad requirements," fulfilled by taking interdisciplinary programs designed "to meet basic general education requirements." And, the DTF considered a model proposing no requirements, in which faculty would be "required to create large numbers of cross-divisional coordinated studies programs containing quantitative and other content [thus] making the avoidance of such content much more difficult for students …" An early proposal on academic advising proposed that "All students would be required to write an academic advising plan explaining how they will demonstrate breadth and depth of
education, and what skills they will learn and demonstrate as they gain both depth and breadth … "[58]

The DTF presented its work on expectations at a January 2000 faculty meeting. The DTF said that, "We were clear from the outset that we would NOT simply replicate other colleges' approach to general education … The centrality of students' choice-making (not among pre-determined options) and interdisciplinary studies have been the hallmarks of an Evergreen education. The intent of this DTF is to support both of these practices."[59] The DTF presented the following expectations to the faculty, noting, "If these are the right expectations, the DTF will identify outcomes for each expectation, and then identify ways in which students might demonstrate the outcomes."

- the graduating student should be able to participate responsibly in our democratic society
- the graduating student should demonstrate independent, critical thinking in the interpretation of written works, oral presentations and argument, works of art, or observations of natural phenomena
- the graduating student should demonstrate awareness of multiple modes of inquiry and successfully bring appropriate approaches to knowledge to bear on practical problems
- the graduating student should recognize the value of accurate information; formulate questions based on needs for information; develop successful search strategies and access varied sources of information including computer-based technologies; evaluate information, integrate it into existing knowledge and

---

[58] "Some examples of possible curricular revisions to provide a framework for discussion," 11/16/99, Provost office files. The document notes that "examples are provided for the sake of discussion only."
[59] "General Education and Learning Outcomes DTF to Faculty Colleagues," 1/10/00, Provost office files.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Faculty Meeting Minutes, 1/12/00, Provost office files.

> use it in problem-solving
> - the graduating student should be able to evaluate, interpret and use quantitative information
> - working individually and collaboratively, the graduating student should be able to prepare and present both written and oral work to a public audience
> - the graduating student should demonstrate depth of learning and the ability to reflect in writing on the personal and social significance of that learning[60]

Faculty response was mixed. The expectations were "weak on cultural difference," and "too problem-solving centered." They were "not clear enough on writing skills," "weak on quantitative skills." One person asked, "Why should quantitative skills be more important than art?" Another urged, "Don't overemphasize quantitative reasoning." "The expectations should be more inclusive." "The realm of imagination and how to foster it is not listed." "The case is not yet made that students really lack needed breadth."[61] The DTF went back to work, forming itself into three sub-committees: one to compose a "vision statement of general education at TESC," one to define the role of the Learning Resource Center in implementation of general education, and one to "look at structural changes in terms of curriculum, advising and support" for general education.[62]

In April 2000, the DTF asked the faculty for comment on three possible structural changes to the curriculum, and on a revised list of expectations and learning outcomes. The expectations were reduced to five with accompanying sample learning outcomes:

1. Graduates will be prepared to participate responsibly in our diverse society.
2. Graduates will demonstrate independent, critical thinking.
3. Graduates will demonstrate awareness of multiple modes of inquiry (both qualitative and quantitative) and successfully apply appropriate knowledge to practical and theoretical problems.
4. Working individually and collaboratively, graduates will prepare and present both written and oral work to a public audience.
5. As a culmination of their education, graduates will demonstrate depth, breadth and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect in writing on the personal and social significance of that learning.[63]

The DTF presented three curricular structures. The "Spring Festival" model proposed that each year forty percent of the faculty "will move away from 16-credit three-quarter programs to 16-credit two-quarter programs. Spring quarter will become a "Festival of Learning," which provides students with the opportunity to study 'a little science, a little math or a little art.'" The "Cross-Divisional" model would "identify a number of programs that are guaranteed to offer a broad mix of the expectations as well as a particular set of content areas—and require students to earn credit in at least two quarters of such a program." The "12-4" option would establish "twelve-credit programs as the norm for Co-ordinated Studies programs," and generate "numerous and attractive four-credit modules as supplements to the 12-credit offerings."[64]

---

[62] Faculty Meeting Minutes, 1/12/00, Provost office files.

[63] "Progress Report from the General Education DTF - April 5 Faculty Meeting," Provost office files.

[64] Ibid.

[65] General Education DTF, "Summary of Recommendations," submitted for discussion at 5/17/00 faculty meeting, Provost office files.

Faculty response to the curricular models and expectations was such that the DTF withdrew all of them, and went back to work on a final report that they submitted for faculty discussion the following month. The new "Summary of Recommendations" contained two very broadly stated expectations, a set of learning outcomes that essentially repeated the five foci, and a brief list of skills expected of a graduate. The new curricular model required students to take a team-taught interdisciplinary program for two consecutive quarters, and also required student participation in a quarter-long "quantitative-intensive" program and in a quarter-long "writing-intensive" program. Finally, the DTF recommended "a required Academic Plan, with supporting documents and substantive faculty advising." Each faculty would "be required to advise 20–25 student during special Academic Plan days in each spring quarter."[65]

The DTF was divided on its own recommendations with the exception of the advising plan, which most supported (by a vote of 15 for, 2 against, 2 abstaining). On the question of requiring two quarters of a cross-divisional program, they voted 11 for, 5 against, 3 abstaining; on requiring one quarter of a "writing-intensive" program, 10 for, 8 against, 1 abstaining; on requiring one quarter of a quantitative reasoning program, they voted 9 for, 9 against,
1 abstaining.[66]

Faculty response reflected the lack of consensus on the DTF. President Jane Jervis spoke in favor of the DTF's recommendations. She said the proposal "honors and insists upon Evergreen's commitment to broad interdisciplinary study, to connectedness, to embeddedness, and to student responsibility for learning." Faculty questioned the evidence for the Commission's conclusions. DTF chair Brian Price (again) recited the evidence based on the college's own surveys and on self-studies for the 1998 reaccreditation. "What are the implications for faculty hiring?" asked one person. "Why are we emphasizing writing?" asked another. "The conversation about quantitative skills is deceptive." "Students should choose their own advisors … Advising conferences shouldn't become meaningless rituals." "The term 'quantitative skills' is a very broad category and often students don't know it is a skill or field they need. Requirements would help them . . ." "There shouldn't be requirements . . .
The problem is holding students to their own commitments." "We should call them 'standards,' not 'requirements.'" One person stated, "I am opposed to requirements, especially those imposed indirectly upon faculty." Another said, "I am in favor of requirements to improve quality."[67]

After this inconclusive discussion it was obvious that the DTF proposal would not pass a faculty vote, and the DTF did not ask for one. Instead, they used the last faculty meeting of 2000 to poll the faculty on how to proceed in the coming year. A straw poll taken at this meeting indicated that all elements of the DTF's recommendations (required programs, an advising plan, and expectations) would have been soundly defeated if the faculty had

[66] "Summary of the General Education DTF discussion of the four proposals," 5/17/00, Provost office files.
[67] Quotes are paraphrased from Faculty Meeting Minutes of 5/17/00, Provost office files.
[68] Straw Poll, 5/24/00 Faculty meeting, Provost office files.
[69] Attachment to Minutes of Faculty Meeting, 10/18/00, Provost office files.
[70] Attachment to Minutes of Faculty Meeting, 11/15/00, Provost office files.
[71] According to Jin Darney, the learning outcomes were "suggested." She thinks the faculty mistook these suggestions for requirements, and so rejected them. Jin Darney, critique of a draft of this document, 1/10/02.

formally voted.[68]

The DTF's Work: Year Two

At an October faculty meeting, the DTF gave out a packet containing a revised set of expectations and learning outcomes, a page of suggestions from faculty who had attended the previous summer's institutes on general education, and a mind-boggling nine "ideas for curricular options."[69] The options included the DTF's spring 2000 proposal to the faculty, the "Spring Festival" proposal, and others from Lee Lyttle, Bill Arney, Rob Knapp, Ruth Hayes, Stephanie Kozick, Patrick Hill and Peter Pessiki.

Work done at the faculty retreat enabled the DTF to present four "hybrid" curricular models at a November faculty meeting, together with a set of expectations. In a straw vote, the faculty approved the expectations by a good margin.[70] After exhaustively debating the expectations and their attached learning outcomes over several meetings, the faculty overwhelmingly approved the expectations, but rejected the outcomes.[71] This is what they adopted:

Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate

1. Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work.
2. Participate collaboratively and responsibly in our diverse society.
3. Communicate creatively and effectively.
4. Demonstrate integrative, independent, and critical thinking.
5. Apply quantitative, qualitative, and creative modes of inquiry appropriately to practical and theoretical problems across disciplines.
6. As a culmination of your education, demonstrate depth, breadth, and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning.[72]

By February, the DTF was ready to ask for a faculty vote on a proposal for curricular reform. They called this the "Cross-Divisional and Spring Festival Model." It had four components:

1. Two- to three-quarter-long cross-divisional core programs, taught by 20% of the faculty.
2. One-quarter-long cross-divisional or intensive all level programs that may repeat, taught by 10% of the faculty.
3. Two- to three-quarter-long cross-divisional programs (non-core), taught by 10% of the faculty.
4. Spring Festival programs, taught by 40% of the faculty.

Sixty-percent of the faculty would teach in planning unit curriculum, with some participation in Spring Festival programs.[73] The DTF assumed that the programs noted above "would provide access to the expectations."

---

[72] Minutes of Faculty Meeting, 1/17/01, Provost office files.
[73] "General Education DTF 2-14 Proposal: Curricular Model and Advising System," attachment to AC/DC for 2/14/01 faculty meeting, Provost office files.
[74] Matt Smith, "To My Colleagues, re: General Education," undated, Provost office files.

The faculty debated this plan over two meetings, with a vote scheduled for the February 21st meeting. Just prior to this meeting, in a move that surprised the DTF, Matt Smith presented a counter-proposal. Smith said, "I offer this at this late date with deep apologies to my colleagues on the DTF and with great trepidation. I put this forward because I believe that the structure as proposed will do significant harm to the quality of the education and the experience of teaching and learning at the college." Smith severely criticized the DTF's plan, saying:

- the plan proposed by the DTF fails to respond to the full range of issues raised by the DTF's work
- the plan is political, not pedagogical, and misdefines the problem
- the plan privileges the superficial and the segmental
- the plan costs opportunities to do serious interdivisional work at all levels
- the "solution" mistakes the problem and damages our capacity to be a leader in undergraduate education
- the plan fails to respond coherently to issues of retention and spring quarter contract enrollment[74]

In the end, Smith's proposal was tabled, but so, effectively, was the DTF's. "The faculty," said Brian Price, "spent the whole time talking about Matt's proposal, and said very little about the DTF's."[75] The faculty voted to reject the DTF's proposal on curricular restructuring by a vote of 44 opposed, 37 in favor and 10 abstaining.[76]

The advising portion of the DTF's recommendation originally called for a mandatory annual advising conference between the individual student and a faculty member. If the student did not fulfill this requirement, he or she would not be allowed to register in the following year until the conference took place. Summative self-evaluations would be required of students as a condition of graduation. Credit would be awarded for work involved in the annual advising conferences and for the summative self-evaluation.[77]

The faculty stripped this language of requirements, and voted against awarding credit. Now, students would be "encouraged" to write a summative self-evaluation. The faculty adopted the following commitment to advising:

1. All faculty will hold advising conferences with their students each year based on a self-reflective piece written by the student.
2. Faculty, aided by the Advising Office, will be responsible for appropriate instruction to their students on how to prepare for this meeting.

---

[75] Author interview with Brian Price, fall 2001.
[76] Minutes of the Faculty Meeting, 2/21/01, Provost office files.
[77] "General Education DTF 2-14 Proposal: Curricular Model and Advising System," attachment to AC/DC for 2/14/01 faculty meeting, Provost office files.
[78] General Education DTF, "Document for April 11th and April 18th Faculty Meetings," Lee Lyttle's files.
[79] According to Jin Darney, "At the Core workshops in summer 2000, it became very clear that faculty assumed that 'other programs' were teaching writing and quantitative reasoning—and when they discussed their program plans for the 2000-01 academic year, they were startled to recognize that NO ONE was doing it. That moment helped faculty to see the issue of breadth and curricular coherence." Jin Darney, critique of first draft of this document, fall 2001.

   3.   Students will document this conference in their own portfolio.[78]

Finally, the faculty voted on issues relating to the role of the Learning Resource Center in general education and on an initiative for curriculum reform. They approved special faculty status for a director of a quantitative reasoning center, and for a director of the writing center. And they approved the following language on curricular reform:

1. Core: Dean and faculty experiment with alternatives that provide greater access to QR, science and art.
   Support: More paid planning time for Core faculty, summer institutes, extra fall faculty retreat day for forming Core teams and discussing Core experiments, and spring planning retreat. Increased staff support, especially to the LRC and Academic Advising, to assist faculty in facilitating student access to arts, sciences, writing, quantitative reasoning and advising.[79]

2. Cross-divisional programs: The faculty work to create more cross-divisional all-level and sophomore-and-above programs in order to increase access by students to more quantitative reasoning (QR), arts, and science options taught in an interdisciplinary context.
   Support: More faculty hires (QR), summer institutes, extra fall faculty retreat day, and spring planning retreat. Increased staff support, especially to the LRC and Academic Advising, to assist faculty in facilitating student access to arts, sciences, writing, quantitative reasoning and advising.

3. Planning unit discussions: The planning units design access to the Expectations, sciences, arts and quantitative reasoning for transfer and sophomore and above students into the "majors," sharing and coordinating their ideas across planning units.

4. Reduce spring quarter prerequisites. Reduce the number of spring quarter programs with prerequisites that deny access to lower division students.

5. Program team downsizing. While teams teaching three-quarter-long programs should experiment with ways of retaining their students and facilitating new student entry, especially in spring quarter, they should also plan to downsize in light of possible under-enrollment. Faculty leaving programs due to under-enrollment would create additional programs for spring quarter.
   Support: By planning to downsize and create new programs from the start
   of their planning negotiations, teams retain control over the content of their programs, decide when and how best to use their team members' skills, and relieve themselves of last minute deanly pressure to downsize. The deans create a "downsizers' list" that will be shared across planning units so that faculty exiting programs can discuss creating spring quarter offerings together. Additional planning time will be made available during the academic year for those on the list.

6. Assessment: Actions in all of the above five areas will be documented, assessed and reported annually to the faculty for five years. Achievement by students of the college's expectations will be the criteria for assessment.

No prerequisites or requirements appear in any aspect of the plan the faculty endorsed. No learning outcomes accompanied the six expectations endorsed by the faculty. No penalties were exacted for not conducting an annual academic advising conference. A summative self-evaluation would not be required as a condition of graduation. The curriculum would be planned in the same way we have always planned it, but with much increased attention to providing student access to quantitative reasoning, writing, science and the arts.

According to DTF chair Brian Price:

> The DTF, acknowledging that faculty would not buy off on a specific model for curricular change, saw as their task, on the one hand, to acknowledge the faculty's feeling, and, on the other, to figure out how, in the absence of one model, access to math, science and art could still be made available. The curriculum reform principles empower the dean of first-year studies and the faculty to rethink how access is provided to first-year students in one part of the curriculum. The principle of developing more cross-divisional programs is also vital. It means that across the curriculum, but particularly in Core, all-level and inter-area programs, cross-divisionality should be the primary way to involve students in math, science and art. That means rethinking the ways in which we think about, develop and articulate program themes, with the curriculum and first-year dean and PUCs playing a strong role in advising faculty proposing programs as to ways they could effectively build in work in math, science and art. Our faculty have the imagination and the skills to make access to these areas of knowledge available in rich, complex and easily workable cross-divisional programs.
>
> Principle five is vital to student access to the curriculum in two ways: First, it means more program choices for students who leave ongoing programs. Second, it obliges faculty to respond to students voting with their feet by the creation of new programs. (In a recent spring quarter, for example, over 1,000 students engaged in individual learning contracts.)
>
> Principle four tells faculty to "stop denying so many students access to your programs." Principle three says planning units have to figure out how to provide access to quantitative reasoning, art and science within their more advanced specialized curriculum, due to the large number of transfer students who miss out on Core programs.
>
> These principles as voted upon by the faculty legislate significant change in how the curriculum is planned and carried out and in how the content of the curriculum is configured. I would argue that if the five principles

---

[80] Brian Price, December 2001 e-mail to the author.

were fully enacted, the outcome would be more profound than any single model for curricular reform that the faculty rejected.[80]

General Education Assessment

In December 2001, the provost charged an Assessment Study Group to develop assessment methods for Gen Ed implementation. The work of this group will include three areas:

1. To evaluate strategies that will provide us feedback on how well we are implementing the general education recommendations adopted by the faculty last spring.
2. To prepare a data set and format for ongoing evaluation that we can use for our next self-study and reaccreditation visit in 2003–04.
3. To set benchmark goals and then use multiple approaches for systematically monitoring those goals.

The work of the Assessment Study Group will be crucial to our understanding of the effectiveness of implementation of the general education tenets adopted by the faculty, and will form an integral part of our next reaccreditation report. Part of the work of the study group will involve working closely with selected programs to develop and test assessment methods; working with program faculty to identify, describe and analyze best practices; annually publishing best practices, analysis and recommendations; and conducting a summer institute or workshop on how to effectively incorporate assessment principles and practices into programs.

Conclusion

The General Education DTF did its work under enormous pressure: from within itself, from faculty and staff, from the provost and from the reaccreditation commission. The DTF never reached consensus or substantial agreement on most of its proposals. Faculty and staff positions, like those of DTF members, ran the gamut from advocating substantial requirements to rejection of the very idea of general education. The provost applied intense pressure on the DTF and the faculty to reach agreement on what general education would mean at the college. The reaccreditation commission made it clear that Evergreen had to respond to its recommendations concerning student access to quantitative reasoning and science. Ignoring the commission's recommendation was not an option.

Historical precedents shaped the debate, most often in ways that were unacknowledged. "It was like," said one DTF member, "we had a historical problem we worked to solve ahistorically."[81] Partly because the debate itself was ahistorical, partly because of the pressures to reach agreement on general education, the process of framing the issues sometimes became unnecessarily acrimonious. Many faculty opposed iterations of the DTF's proposals; most, if not all, of this opposition was principled, based on cornerstones of Evergreen's history. But the principles involved were largely assumed and unexplicated, to the point that one person deeply involved in the debate said, "I could go so far as to argue that our claims of support for students' freedom of education are really a veil that hides the real in-

---

[81] Author interview with staff member, fall 2001.
[82] Critique of a draft of the document, fall 2001.
[83] Critique of a draft of this document, December 2001.

terest of many faculty in getting paid to talk with each other regardless of student interest in the conversation."[82] Too often, principled opposition to the DTF's proposals was interpreted as arbitrary, obstructionist or self-interested.

Paradoxically, despite the ahistorical nature of the debate, the two long years of work on general education and the commission's recommendation ended in a way that was largely consonant with the philosophical and pedagogical history of the college. Faculty listened to the claims for general education emanating from the commission, the provost, and the DTF. After extensive debate faculty guardedly endorsed these claims, adopting broadly framed, general expectations that allowed great flexibility in application. They committed themselves to more careful attention to student advising. They rejected all requirements. They rejected major restructuring of the curriculum. The tenets endorsed by the faculty (the six expectations and accompanying language) complemented Evergreen's historical debates on the nature of interdisciplinary teaching and learning.

Views of the debate on general education ranged widely. Some endorsed the faculty-approved tenets.

An academic dean, responding to an earlier draft of this document, said, "The current discussion was not about redesigning the curriculum to fit Gen Ed, but rather about the ways we might consider students' learning needs rather than faculty teaching desires, and about how to make these two coincide."[83] "Gen Ed makes faculty think about what's important. The six expectations speak to Evergreen and explain what we're about … The expectations are particularly useful in advising … If you have a curriculum that requires students to make their own decisions, good advising is essential." "The benefit of the general education debate has been thinking in a different way about how we design programs … The debate has shaken things up and increased interdisciplinarity."[84] These comments reflected agreement with the reaccreditation commission's view that students were not well served in science and quantitative reasoning by the current curriculum, and approval of the faculty's resolutions.

One faculty member welcomed the discussion generated by the debate. "People at Evergreen guard their time so closely that there's not much room for change and thinking about how to do it … Everyone needs time to think and process through issues. The DTF couldn't do that for us. We had to do it ourselves. I hunger for conversations about teaching and learning. That's what the general education debate did for me. It made conversations about what we do in the classroom legitimate."[85]

Another member of the faculty commented on the role of the reaccreditation commission and what it means to call ourselves a liberal arts college. "It's a legitimate thing for society to ask what we're doing given that we're a [public] liberal arts college. Places should be what they claim to be … We haven't been paying attention to general education. When we began paying attention, it looked difficult and scary … The six expectations are weak

---

[84] Author interview with faculty member, fall 2001.
[85] Author interview with faculty member, fall 2001.
[85] Author interview with faculty member, fall 2001.
[86] Author interview with faculty member, fall 2001.
[87] Author interview with faculty member, fall 2001.

enough that implementation might be slow and hard to track … Our questions should be: Is it working? Do they get it? It's legitimate for us to say that we have to have a curriculum that meets these expectations … The debate on general education has raised consciousness … We have a danger at Evergreen of becoming insular and excessively self-referential."

One faculty member, speaking in favor of quantitative reasoning throughout the curriculum, said, "Faculty bitch about students coming to Evergreen without skills, but it seems to be acceptable for students to leave without skills."[86] A long-time advocate of mathematics education at the college said, "We need to do more developmental math here. What we're doing now regarding math across the curriculum is borderline scandalous. Faculty who want to do their own thing have predominated." The same person criticized the faculty-approved general education measures as inadequate. The attitude was, he said, "we're going to ram something through even if it doesn't mean anything."[87]

Another questioned the need for quantitative reasoning throughout the curriculum.

> If we do decide that we actually need to able to show results about quantitative reasoning, for the accreditation visit or the HECB learning outcomes project . . . I think we should start with a prioritized list of the actual things we think are required for literate citizenship. I don't mean a set of general pieties, but a list of concrete tasks that the student should be able to do, like "Look at graphs with one or more of the following list of four deceptive features and point out what's misleading about them." Then we could see if our students can actually do these things (since they are all supposed to have learned them by the 10th grade to pass the WASL[88]). If they actually can't, then we could worry about how to teach it to them."[89]

One faculty member, (previously quoted), who advocated requirements and prerequisites regarded the faculty-adopted tenets as so watered down that she saw the work of the DTF as a "waste" of two years.

Others reiterated their opposition to the six expectations, to the way in which the DTF framed the general education debate, and to the need for general education. According to one faculty member:

> The list of expectations … has been voted in by a landslide. Since then, I've heard faculty say confidently that, in their program, students are easily meeting all, or most, of the expectations. This is a sign that the expectations are about minimum thresholds. Their vagueness is painfully apparent when compared to Jane Jervis' "top-of-my-head" suggestions for requirements in her memo to the faculty of 26 May 2000. Her first "nominee": "The ability to read, understand and criticize texts in the major academic areas—literary, artistic, scientific, historical, sociological, economic." Her second, "The ability to take a position on a major issue of public policy and

---

[88] The Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) is administered in the fourth, seventh and tenth grades to measure students' capabilities across the public school curriculum.
[89] Critique of draft of this document, December 2001.
[90] Sam Schrager, "Gen Ed and Me: Five-Year Retrospective and Prospective," January 2001.
[91] Author conversation with faculty member, January 2002.

to defend it in writing and in oral debate." And so on. Jane's proposals at least had bite. The list we've adopted is a set of faux standards.

When I've asked Gen Ed supporters, "Why must there be a set of shared expectations for all Evergreen students?" they've squirmed a bit. Someone explained to me that we must try to reach a consensus about expectations. The implication was that we might decide, in the end, that we can't reach a consensus and let the thing go. Not having some new set of expectations, however, was never recognized as a choice by the DTF, which assumed that we must have them to satisfy external pressures. The only question has been whether there should be requirements. The politics of consensus often operates this way in organizations. By limiting the initial question, the debate gets focused on means, not ends … The move towards expectations was fueled by the specter of requirements, which made expectations seem like a reasonable compromise.[90]

This faculty member criticized the move to adopt general education as "a movement towards management of the faculty and the curriculum." It showed, he said, a lack of confidence in ourselves—in faculty and students.[91] He continued:

Gen Ed can … be understood (however else it's understood) as the latest battle, perhaps a decisive turning-point, in a long-running battle to manage the faculty, occurring at a juncture when many of the older faculty who could have argued trenchantly against it are gone, and younger faculty are being "socialized" into a more administratively driven way of making academic decisions.

Gen Ed has been driven by the administration's decision that it would not, or could not, defend Evergreen, as it is, against external pressures to define our standards and justify our awarding of degrees. I believe that Evergreen is eminently defensible. This is not to say that Evergreen can't or shouldn't improve in a number of areas. It is to say that we ought to consider changes only on the basis of careful argument and evidence.[92]

This member of the faculty noted that the college's concentration over the past two years on general education detracted from more important aspects of Evergreen. "The expectations can easily be reductive … We shouldn't impose them on the broader, more valuable aspects of the college." "I fear that we are moving in the direction of a consumer-driven model of education." "The faculty vote was a concession to the DTF so they wouldn't feel they'd accomplished nothing."[93]

Another faculty member said, "I have no respect for what's called general education. It's not intellectually or academically respectable … Gen Ed is a management strategy for controlling an unruly academic world … Once policies like this come into existence, it's like

---

[92] Sam Schrager, "Gen Ed and Me: Five-Year Retrospective and Prospective," January 2001.
[93] Author conversation with faculty member, January 2002.
[94] Author interview with faculty member, December 2001.
[95] Author interview with faculty member, December 2001.
[96] Author interview with faculty member, December 2001.

SECTION THREE:
A Continuum of Experiments and Works in Progress

Introduction

Many faculty I interviewed worried that using the six expectations and associated learning outcomes in their syllabi would somehow trivialize or standardize teaching and learning at Evergreen. Nobody wanted a "checklist" to follow in program design or to include in syllabi. Nobody believed that quantitative reasoning should be "forced" into every program. Several people were suspicious about the possibility of the Provost imposing a standard template for general education. Many saw general education as a threat to faculty freedom.[97] None of these fears has materialized. There is no reason to regard general education as a sort of campus-wide lock-step. In fact, quite the contrary. Despite the positions faculty took in the debate, they continued to teach, to innovate, and remained deeply committed to interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Although they did not endorse college-wide learning outcomes, many faculty employed them and the six expectations in their programs. Following are some examples of experiments that employ a range of methods from use of learning outcomes in program planning, to complete integration of outcomes, student self-assessment, activities tied to the outcomes, advising and evaluation.

EXAMPLE ONE

Chuck Pailthorp, Arun Chandra and José Gomez used this set of learning outcomes to help them conceptualize, discuss and plan their program, "How Can You Tell an American?" They used these educational goals to help guide students' thinking about the themes and content of their program.

"How Can You Tell an American?"
Educational goals of this program
September 25, 2000

I.   The purpose of a liberal arts education is to foster:

1.   Curiosity, intellectual honesty, fairness, civility, and openness to new and challenging ideas;

2.   Critical, independent thinking;

3.   The integration of knowledge across disciplines;

4.   The ability to function effectively in a society undergoing rapid and often unpredictable change;

5.   An understanding of the importance of studying the past and present;

6.   A responsive understanding of the literary, performing and fine arts as elements of human culture;

---

[97] Author interviews with faculty and staff, fall 2001.

7. An active life as an informed, responsible, democratically-minded citizen and member of the global community;

8. Learning as a personal and a collaborative process exercised over a lifetime.

II. Goals of a liberal education:

1. **Write and speak effectively**—Students develop language skills necessary to function in their own culture and the larger world.

2. **Comprehend, evaluate and critique quantitative information; learn to acquire, process and present quantitative information.**—Students gain the ability to select and use effectively the most appropriate technologies for gathering, analyzing and manipulating, transmitting, storing and presenting information.

3. **Reason critically, both individually and collaboratively, draw sound conclusions from information, ideas, and interpretations gathered from various sources and disciplines, and apply those conclusions to one's life and society.—Students learn to reason critically, to distinguish among forms of argumentation, and to derive justified conclusions.**

4. **Understand the personal and social importance of ethical reflection and moral reasoning.—Students develop their capacity for ethical sensitivity, insight and critical thought in understanding important social issues that confront our society and the larger world.**

5. **Comprehend mathematical concepts and reason mathematically in both abstract and applied contexts.—Students develop a fundamental understanding and competency in the use and interpretation of mathematics for problem-solving and decision-making.**

6. **Understand the scientific method; forming and testing hypotheses as well as evaluating results.—Students understand how data are gathered and organized, how models, theories and laws are constructed and evaluated, and what are the purposes, values and limits of scientific investigation. Students learn to critically evaluate scientific problems and assertions.**

7. **Critique the evolving interrelationships among science, technology and society.**—Students understand the impact and changes in society that take place as scientific knowledge deepens and new technologies are developed.

8. **Respond critically and sensitively to artistic expression in its multiple forms and contexts.—Students develop insight into works of art from a variety of artistic media, how various elements combine to create a whole work; students develop and learn to trust their own authority in responding to artistic works and assessing their significance.**

9. **Realize one's abilities to live and act creatively.—Students develop their capac-**

ity for creative work through mastery of technique and the integrity of thought, feeling, expression and act.

10. **Understand the relationships between physical, mental, emotional and spiritual well-being and the quality of life of the individual, the family and the community.—Students recognize the interdependent nature of the individual, family and society in shaping human behavior and the quality of life. They understand that mental, physical, emotional and spiritual well-being are interconnected, and how to apply this knowledge to their own well-being and that of others.**

11. **Understand the development of cultures and organizations of human societies and their changing interrelationships.—Students comprehend how, over time, various societies have approached the common problems of human existence. They learn that the form of those problems and the solutions to them vary because of tradition, geography, philosophy, religion, economic development, technological change and political organization.**

12. **Evaluate the impact of theories, events and institutions of the social, economic, legal and political aspects of society.—Students develop knowledge of the socio-economic organization, the legal systems, and forms of government that comprise society. They understand how these institutions have functioned, how they have interacted with each other, and how they have evolved in our own society and others.**

13. **Acknowledge and comprehend the development of diversity in America in all its forms.—Students comprehend the historical and political development of the United States—the ideals, rights and institutions associated with this nation and the resulting dynamics of tension, contradiction and change. In this context, students recognize the diverse characteristics of the populations that comprise American society, and the impact these differences have had in our social and political lives. Diversity includes but is not limited to the characteristics of race, social and economic class, religion, gender, ethnicity, age, disability, sexual orientation and political identity.**

14. **Understand and value the natural environment and the processes that shape it.—Students demonstrate knowledge of the characteristics, processes and laws that define natural environments. They learn to evaluate the impact of political and social change within these environments.**

15. **Comprehend the development of justice and equality in American life.— Students comprehend the difficult and conflicting demands of realizing a social and cultural order that lives up to the ideals of justice and equality for all.**

III. Goals this program will address:

As the faculty anticipate our work, students in "How Can You Tell an American?" will have an excellent opportunity to address some of these goals directly and consistently throughout the year. We will not address at all other

goals from among this set of fifteen. For another group, students will have some opportunity to develop these elements of their education—perhaps extensively if the student emphasizes this in her or his own work—but the curriculum will lead toward these goals only in a limited way.

Directly	In a limited way	Not at all
1, 3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15	2, 7, 9, 10	5, 6, 14

We have developed this statement of the "goals of a liberal education" by modifying a statement adopted by the faculty at Youngstown State University for the "goals of a general education." That statement can be found at http://www.cc.ysu.edu/ger/genedg.html.

We have used the YSU statement simply as a beginning point, and assume nothing about whether or not the faculty of that institution understand their statement in the way we understand ours. We welcome any suggestions for clarifying or improving this version, which we are using in "How Can You Tell an American?"

EXAMPLE TWO

The following messages from Russ Fox and Susan Preciso describe an innovative series of forums designed for the Part-Time Studies programs.

A Message from Russ Fox:

Dear Part-Time Studies Faculty,

Thanks to Susan Preciso's initiative and a "pilot" forum this quarter, planned by Sarah, Char, Marla and Marcella for their Saturday students in the "Revolutions at Work" and "The Authentic Self" programs, the Part-Time Studies Planning Unit has decided to institute a quarterly "Liberal Arts" forum for all students in 8-credit programs. Faculty and students in 4-credit courses may choose to join also, but we think we will reach most of our part-time students by including all the half-time programs. I am very excited about and supportive of this initiative for several reasons (these are some of the ideas generated from our initial discussions):

It is a creative strategy to enable all of us in Part-Time Studies to respond to the recommendations of the "General Education DTF" policies adopted by the Evergreen Faculty last spring.

Students will have an opportunity to examine how their specific academic interests/programs relate to broader liberal arts goals and to fulfilling the six "Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate" adopted as part of the GenEd plan.

Students will be able to meet and interact with faculty teaching in other subject areas within Part-Time Studies.

It provides a potential mechanism for fulfilling the requirement that we include an academic advising conversation with each of our students during winter quarter.

It provides an opportunity to create a stronger sense of identity and community among part-time studies students and faculty.

Students will be able to meet and interact with other students also pursuing their degree through Part-Time Studies.

Faculty will have opportunities to engage in more unit-wide, collaborative intellectual work.

It could become a quarterly "tradition" of collaboration across programs within Part-Time Studies.

It is flexible in structure and has the potential of being a mechanism enabling us to pursue other goals as well.

Each quarter's format for the Forum might be different—faculty panel, special keynote speaker, mixed program seminars with a common reading, common workshop activity such as how to create an academic plan, seminar skills, thinking quantitatively, a joint community-service project, etc.

Occasionally, the Forum events/activities could be off campus, with broader community invitation.

The message below outlines our proposal for a winter 2001 Forum during Week 4 of winter quarter. In the next day or so you will also receive an e-mail launching our Web-Crossing conversation on Issues and Activities of Part-Time Studies. Joe Tougas and Hirsh Diamant have taken the leadership in setting this up for us. Two Discussion Folders already created are "Meaning of Liberal Arts" and "Issues for Part-Time Studies." We hope that the ideas presented in this e-mail will generate lively discussion on both of these topics.

First, though, read our proposal as written by Susan Preciso, include the dates indicated in your winter quarter syllabus planning, and be ready to join the discussions.

From Susan Preciso to the Part-Time Studies Faculty

A group of interested faculty met on October 3 to further plans for a forum on liberal education—a meeting of students in half-time programs, and certainly for any student taking a course as well. From the beginning, we saw this as an opportunity for faculty to talk to each other about an idea, and for students to engage in good conversation and reflection around a common theme as well. So—here is our plan.

The format for the forums will be as follows. Students will have read William Cronon's essay, "Only Connect: The Goals of a Liberal Education," prior to the forum. With Joe Tougas as our Master of Ceremonies (thanks, Joe) students and faculty from several programs will meet together. Faculty will engage in a fishbowl seminar about the liberal arts and how we see them, ourselves, the wider community of college and beyond. Students will listen to us talk for maybe half an hour. Then, students will join seminar groups (across programs), organized by Sarah Ryan (thanks Sarah), with faculty facilitators to talk about Cronon's essay and to share experiences from their programs with each other. They'll have a set of guiding questions (composed by faculty together—work we will do on line at the new PT Studies Web X-ing site) to keep the focus on the main ideas. Individual work will follow as students will also have a format for reflecting on their own work and future academic plans. They will bring that worksheet/reflection/plan to their winter evaluation conference. This will fulfill our need to provide good advising as detailed in our new General Education policy.

When will this all happen? Week 4 of winter quarter. There will be a forum on Tuesday, Jan 29, 2002, on Wednesday, Jan 30, 2002, and on Saturday, February 2 (time to be determined by weekend programs). Faculty from programs that normally meet on those days will bring their students and will participate in the fishbowl and seminar facilitation. We also really want to encourage faculty who teach in courses to join us, even if you can't give up the meeting time for your students to attend. Some of you have already been a part of the planning (thanks Hirsh and Joli). Since one reason we are doing this is to give ourselves, as a faculty, the time and place to engage in a good seminar together, we hope as many of us as possible will be a part of the conversation.

I've requested CAB 110, 108 and the Faculty Staff Lounge area, but haven't heard back yet. It seems like a good space. More planning will happen online, so watch for an e-mail about the Web X-ing site and discussion groups already talking … huge thank you to Joe Tougas and Hirsh Diamant.

EXAMPLE THREE

David Paulsen, Carrie Margolin and Stu Matz specifically related activities in their program, "Science of Mind," to the six expectations. They were very explicit in describing program activities and content. They employed an intake form and exit form standard in the Scientific Inquiry planning unit, and asked students to complete a self-assessment questionnaire (or self-directed learning plan), which faculty used in short fifth-week advising conferences.

Syllabus
"Science of Mind"
FWS 2001–2002

"Science of Mind" is a broadly interdisciplinary program that provides intermediate undergraduate work in science (neurobiology), social science (psychology) and the humanities (philosophy of science and mind). It contributes to Evergreen's General Education goals by offering students with academic goals in one of these areas an opportunity to do work in the others. In addition, it provides significant work involving quantitative reasoning in the statistics and research methods portions of the program.

The program contributes to the newly adopted expectations of an Evergreen Graduate in the following ways:

Expectation	Aspect of program focused on expectation	Degree of emphasis
1. Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work	Projects, seminar papers and other written work, active participation in seminars, workshops and labs	high
2. Participate collaboratively and responsibly in our diverse society	Projects, workshops and labs	medium
3. Communicate creatively and effectively	Seminars, project posters, oral presentations, final research article	high
4. Demonstrate integrative, independent and critical thinking	Projects, seminar papers	high
5. Apply qualitative, quantitative and creative modes of inquiry appropriately to practical and theoretical problems across disciplines	Quantitative work in the statistics, research methods, neurobiology, and methods components, projects, poster composition	high
6. As a culmination of your education, demonstrate depth, breadth and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning	Project, possible summative evaluation	medium

The "Science of Mind" program will examine the scope and limits of recent attempts to develop a new "science" of cognition.

It will explore these broad questions:
- What is involved in studying the mind scientifically?
- What questions can be answered scientifically?
- What questions can't?
- Is the mind nothing but the brain?

It will consider the following major topics:
- the nature and scope of contemporary research efforts in cognitive science
- specific consideration of neurobiological, psychological and computational issues in attention, memory, automatic processing, reasoning, language and consciousness
- the analytic tools involved in empirical research design, data collection and analysis suited to the study of mind
- the relationship between the contemporary research in cognitive science and its historical antecedents

The program is especially suited for students interested in psychology (especially though not exclusively, cognitive psychology), neurobiology, philosophy, computer science and teaching. Students can earn upper division science credit for up to 45 of the 48 quarter hours offered through the program.

Program Intake and Exit Questionnaires

"Science of Mind" uses intake and exit questionnaires that are standard in the Scientific Inquiry planning unit. These questionnaires assess students' levels of experience and competency in math and the sciences as they enter programs, and ask students about what they learned and about their future plans as they leave programs.

Self-Directed Learning Plan for "Science of Mind"

Very soon you will have a progress meeting with your faculty during fall quarter. During that brief meeting, your faculty will want to get to know you and your needs better. A tool to help you self-assess your educational goals is this "self-directed learning plan." The learning plan will also assist you and your faculty to write your evaluation each quarter. Now is a good time to draft a learning plan for yourself. Please bring a typed draft, with copies for you and your faculty, to your first meeting with your faculty.

The following is intended to be a guide to help you write a learning contract. You may personalize the style and content to fit your goals. However, the form suggested below seems to work well. We suggest you write your background or skill level plus goals and a plan for improvement in the following areas: written communication, oral communication, quantitative skills, critical thinking skills, collaborative process skills, general college skills and time management. A brief and easy-to-follow format is to write this in outline form. To give you a better idea of what should be included, the following is an example (for a fictional student):

I.   Written Communication

  A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
   1. I know how to type. I can write a thesis paper from an outline and communicate ideas clearly. I have problems with spelling and apostrophes. I write boring opening paragraphs.

  B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
   1. 1 need to learn how to use a spell-checker. I will work on opening paragraphs,   sentences and paragraph structure by going to the Writing Center once a week.

II. Oral Communication

  A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
   1. I am afraid to speak in seminar.

  B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
   1. 1 will work with a seminar partner, being sure to speak about the readings. I will ask my faculty to use small-group format frequently.

III. Quantitative Skills

  A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
   1. I have always avoided anything to do with math.

  B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
   1. I will seek out help in the program's statistics help sessions. I will go to the Math Center for help in interpreting graphs.

IV. Critical Thinking Skills

  A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
   1. I have trouble recognizing an author's crucial premises and assumptions in his or her arguments.

  B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
   1. I will try to state the author's arguments in my own words, and distinguish his or her ideas from my own opinions.

V. Collaborative Process Skills

  A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
   1. I work well with others but I tend to dominate group process in small groups.

  B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
   1. I will monitor the number of times I speak and how often I am silent. I will speak only 3 times per group meeting this quarter.

VI. General College Skills (Includes seminar, reading, studying)

    A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
       1. I need to learn how to enter into a seminar discussion.
       2. I don't always understand what I read and don't feel prepared for seminar.

    B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
       1. I will talk to my classmates to get their suggestions on speaking up in seminar.
       2. I will go to the Learning Resource Center to learn how to pre-read texts and how to highlight and take notes effectively.

VII. Time Management

    A. Current Skills (Strengths and Weaknesses)
       1. I procrastinate and underestimate the time I need to complete work, especially with reading texts.

    B. Goals and Plan for Improvement
       1. I will see how many pages need to be read each week and divide that number by 7, to set a daily page limit for reading.
       2. I will write a weekly schedule that includes class and study time, social time, personal time and enough sleep each night.

EXAMPLE FOUR

In "Culture, Context and Human Rights," Greg Mullins and Steve Niva explicitly relate program activities to the six expectations, and use the expectations to structure a sixth-week advising conference with their students. Greg prefers to call this a "work in progress," and offers a brief reflection on the program's first quarter.

<div align="center">

"Culture, Context and Human Rights"
Fall and Winter, 2001–2002
The Evergreen State College
Greg Mullins (literature) and Steve Niva (political science)

</div>

Program Description:

This coordinated studies program is designed both for students planning to work as professional or volunteer human rights activists and for students who want to study human rights for a wide range of other reasons. It is also designed to deepen your ability to analyze literature and to appreciate the contributions literature can make to the study of justice and injustice.

Over the course of fall and winter we will study selected human rights topics. We will also study philosophical and theoretical problems that must be addressed if we are to understand why and how human rights work has become such an important mode of struggle for justice, both in the United States and around the world.

Our program title—"Culture, Context and Human Rights"—condenses the

following goals:

1. To study the ways that different cultures define human rights, and why such differences complicate the work of human rights advocacy in various contexts.

2. To study the creation of human rights treaties, conventions, and international norms, and to study the rise of human rights advocacy organizations. Collectively, governments, non-governmental organizations, academics, writers, and political activists have forged a "culture" of human rights. Within this "culture," people speak "rights talk"-what might more technically be called a discourse of human rights. Where does the discourse of human rights come from, and what limitations does it face?

Around the world, a wide range of persons and organizations speak the language of human rights within a bewildering array of geographical and discursive contexts. When a person, organization, or government speaks of human rights he or she or it does so within an ideological framework. We will study this kind of context, too, and you will be asked to express the context that shapes your beliefs about human rights and justice.

We will read autobiographies, novels and essays that help us explore the above issues. Literature offers culturally specific expressions that open up theoretical investigations of what it means to be human and what it means to have rights. We will study modes of representing human rights violations, and will consider whether literary modes of representation have a special role to play in human rights advocacy.

Throughout the program, this question will guide our work: How does human rights discourse help us respond to issues of justice and injustice?

Credit: Full credit can be earned by doing all of the following: Reading assigned texts in advance of class. Participating in class activities (participation is defined as active listening, speaking and thinking). Attending class (as attendance is a precondition of participation, absences will diminish your ability to earn full credit). Completing all assignments by the date due. Writing a narrative self-evaluation for your transcript. Attending an evaluation conference when you leave the program. If you do all the above at a passing level, you will earn sixteen credits each quarter. The quality of the work you accomplish will be described in a narrative evaluation.

Credit can be earned in international politics, political theory and literature.

Evaluation: Your evaluation will consist of your seminar leader's written evaluation of your work, your self-evaluation and the evaluation conference. You will be evaluated on your level of comprehension of the material, on your skills (writing, thinking, speaking, listening, research, presentation), and on your intellectual engagement with the major themes of the program as reflected in assignments and seminar.

Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate: As a framework for pursuing your education at Evergreen, the college provides six "expectations." By the time you graduate, you should aim to meet these expectations by seeking both breadth and depth in col-

lege courses taken prior to your arrival here, in Evergreen programs, and possibly in an internship or individual learning contract.

The Expectations:

1. Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work.
2. Participate collaboratively and responsibly in our diverse society.
3. Communicate creatively and effectively.
4. Demonstrate integrative, independent and critical thinking.
5. Apply qualitative, quantitative, and creative modes of inquiry appropriately to practical and theoretical problems across disciplines.
6. As a culmination of your education, demonstrate depth, breadth, and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning.

No single Evergreen program will allow every enrolled student automatically to "fulfill" all these expectations. Rather, the intention is to create an environment in which students arrive with a variety of backgrounds, everyone sets her or his goals, and everyone makes progress toward those goals in a given program.

In "Culture, Context and Human Rights," we will focus on the following:

Expectation One:
- In two required advising sessions with faculty (fall quarter week six, winter quarter week five) students will articulate the reasons for their chosen course of study and their purpose in studying in this program.
- In written self-evaluations and in evaluation conferences at the end of each quarter, students will reflect upon and take responsibility for their work in the program.

Expectation Two:
- The content of our program includes key topics in the study of diversity in the United States (class, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality) and select topics drawn from cultures in North America, Latin America, Africa and the Middle East. The Evergreen community is also diverse, and as we study various kinds of difference we will strive always to improve our ability to work across differences in the classroom.
- Seminars, workshops, exam preparation, the writing process and end-of-quarter presentations all emphasize collaborative work.
- We will study both the theory and the practice of human rights, and both kinds of study will enhance students' ability to participate politically, socially and intellectually in our society.

Expectation Three:
Effective listening, speaking, reading and writing skills will be developed in all elements of the program: assigned texts, research, seminars, lectures, workshops, student presentations, exams and essays. All these elements of your work demand and develop creativity.

Expectation Four:

- The demonstration of your integrative, independent and critical thinking will happen when you speak (in seminar, workshop, lecture, and presentation) and when you write (exams, essays, and written self-evaluations). Specifically, you should demonstrate your ability to critically analyze current issues and debates within the field of human rights, formulate your own position on complex issues through critical engagement with other writers and thinkers, ground your position in compelling evidence, and develop it with appropriate arguments.
- What and how well you listen and read will largely determine what and how well you speak and write, which will in turn largely determine the transcript evaluation written by the faculty.

Expectation Five:

In this program we will primarily be employing qualitative and creative modes of inquiry, as appropriate for the subject matter.

Expectation Six:

Students who will graduate fall or winter quarters should identify themselves and work with their seminar leader on a cumulative self-evaluation that reflects upon and synthesizes their education. Students planning to graduate during 2002 or 2003 should begin to think along these lines as well, and have a conversation about their plans during advising hours.

Reflections on Fall Quarter
By Greg Mullins

Thinking about last year's discussion on general education and expectations of Evergreen graduates, Steve and I decided to address those issues with a couple of experiments. I hesitate to call them "best practices" just yet, as the program is only half complete. However, I'm glad to share our experiment and some reflections on it.

For starters, we included the six expectations on our syllabus, along with ways this program would address them. It took me about an hour to write this up, and we drew attention to it on the first day of class.

We also decided to set aside time during week six of fall and winter for advising conferences with students.

During the winter quarter, we plan to ask students to write a reflective piece about their education in preparation for the advising conference.

Fall quarter, I asked the students to spend some time thinking about their goals and plans in advance of the conference.

Some thoughts about the fall quarter advising conference:

1. It felt much like an evaluation conference, which is to say that my evaluation conferences have always also been advising conferences.
2. The students appreciated the conference very much, and I agreed that this kind of conversation early in the program helped them and helped me.

3. On the first day of class we asked them to write up a list of their previous course-work, and that was very helpful for me to see during the conference.
4. Students came to this humanities/social science coordinated studies program from all kinds of disciplinary backgrounds. Many of them spoke of this program as a chance to broaden their education.
5. I usually open a conference by asking students how they came to Evergreen, how they came to enroll in a particular program, what goals they have, etc. Students tended to speak in terms of unexpected turning points in their education, and of remaking goals as their college years unfold.

EXAMPLE SIX

In their program "Talkin' Trash," Cynthia Kennedy, Sonja Weidenhaupt, and Sharon Anthony do a wonderful job integrating writing and quantitative reasoning. They clearly describe their learning goals for students, and they are very explicit in how they guide students in program activities. In the second week of the program, they ask students to complete a self-assessment questionnaire which they use as the basis for a second or third week advising conference focused on the "Talkin' Trash" program. In the second and third quarters, they anticipate focusing advising conferences on "Where do I go from here at Evergreen?" and on post-Evergreen goals of students.

<div align="center">

"Talkin' Trash" Syllabus
June 28, 2001

</div>

Description:

In the fall, we will address the fundamental question: "What is trash?" Given that "trash" is relative, the definition is open for debate. At its most basic level, trash is worthless or discarded material. Yet "one person's trash is another one's gold," and what we choose to keep is as important to who we are as what we discard. We prize that ratty T-shirt we've had for years and give away the brand new one. Our beat up junker is someone else's dream car. On a deeper level, trash is more than material objects. The word permeates many levels of our existence, including literary and artistic material as well as people and cultures who are regarded as ignorant or contemptible. Much of the fall will revolve around a research project where you will explore your relationship to trash. How much trash do you produce? What does your trash tell you about your life? What does it tell you about your values? Would you want to change anything about your trashing behavior?

Winter quarter we will turn our attention to the question "What do we do with our waste?" We will look at the infrastructure of trash—where is it produced and where does it go? How have people adapted their behaviors to changes in waste management such as the introduction of recycling programs? What is the impact of a flushing toilet and garbage pick-up on our relationship to and behaviors around waste? What are the environmental impacts of our society's waste? Do we act as responsible inhabitants or temporary residents in the places we live? We will explore these questions both as a large class and in smaller groups where students will investigate the waste produced by a business or institution of interest to them.

Finally, in the spring we will debate "What should we do with our garbage?" syn-

thesizing and applying issues we have investigated throughout the year. What sort of individual or societal changes, if any, do we propose? What are the mechanisms through which these changes could happen? A significant portion of the work in the spring will be focused on projects students choose according to their own interests.

Real-life case studies will provide a context for exploring the year's questions. Highlights of the program include guest speakers, retreats, field trips and community service projects. Throughout the year we will develop a set of skills, including library research, information technology, quantitative reasoning, oral and written communication, leadership and group dynamics. A significant portion of the program will be spent working collaboratively.

Learning Goals:

We have articulated several learning goals for the year in the "Trash" program. In steps throughout the year, we will provide you with the opportunities to learn these skills.
We also plan to work closely with you to help you articulate and work towards your personal learning goals. By the end of the year, we expect that you will have begun to develop:

- skills for working collaboratively
- an ability to communicate clearly through writing and speaking
- critical and integrative thinking as demonstrated through written work and discussions
- quantitative techniques including graphing, unit conversions, and introductory statistics
- an understanding of some of the environmental implications of waste disposal
- an understanding of how capitalism and economic structures influence how we choose, use and discard both products and people
- the ability to think complexly about our behavior around trash

Student Self-Assessment Questionnaire

As a way to get to know you as students better we'd like you for next Monday (October 1) to type a response to the six questions outlined below. This writing will help us to find out about how you see your self as a student and about the types of things you are working on.

Note: It will also be useful for you to keep a record of your responses. When you get ready to write your self-evaluation at the end of each quarter you will have something that reminds you of where you started from and that will help you to document your learning and growth over the year.

1. How would you describe your skills in the following areas? What are your

strengths and weaknesses?

(a) Writing

(b) Critical thinking (Critical thinking involves: "following evidence where it leads;
considering all possibilities; relying on reason rather than emotion; being precise; considering a variety of possible viewpoints and explanations; weighing the effects of motives and biases; being concerned more with finding the truth than with being right; not rejecting unpopular views out of hand; being aware of one's own prejudices and biases, and not allowing them to sway one's judgment.") (Kurland in Fowler, 1996)

(c) Quantitative skills (These skills include a whole slew of skills revolving around
thinking and manipulating numbers — anything from thinking about measurements to making calculations to interpreting numbers and tables that you see in newspapers or books.)

(d) Handling responsibility

(e) Getting yourself motivated

(f) Handing things in on time

(g) Working in an interdisciplinary setting (that is, working in either work or
school settings where you have to take into account a range of perspectives and types of knowledge—e.g., social, political and biological; or psychological, economical and environmental)

(h) Working with a diverse group of peers (diverse, for example, in terms of culture, experiences, preferences, skills and opinions)

(i) Working in groups

2. Are there other skills that are important to you that you either have or would like to develop?

3. What are your goals for this quarter/year?

4. What skills would you like to develop/learn?

5. Is there anything that you need particular help with?

6. Is there anything else you want to communicate to the faculty?

Reference—
Fowler, B. (1996). Critical thinking across the curriculum project. Retrieved September 27, 2001, from the Longview Community College WebSite http://www.kcmetro.cc.mo.us/longview/ctac/definitions.htm.

EXAMPLE SEVEN
In "Forms of Nature," Sherry Walton, Oscar Soule, Terry Ford and Kabby Mitchell clearly state learning goals, relate them to program activities, then evaluate students on a combination of major program components and learning outcomes.

"Forms in Nature":
An Interdisciplinary Study of the Relationships
of Individuals to Community and Nature
1999–2000

This program provided experiences at the introductory college level intended to both increase participants' knowledge and develop their skills as college students.

During fall quarter, each week began with a movement workshop, preceded by exercises in *Body Stories,* a text about physiology. Tuesday workshops focused on developing skills in expository writing with an emphasis on stating an author's main themes as well as constructing and supporting a thesis. Other Tuesday workshops explored issues related to identity and values development. In seminars on Wednesdays, students discussed a variety of texts and developed skills in effective communication. Texts for fall quarter included: *The Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven, Mountain in the Clouds, A Whole Brass Band, White Oleander, Man's Search for Meaning, Overstory Zero, The Long Haul, Ishi in Two Worlds, Ghost Dancing, King Solomon's Ring, Caucasia, Refuge, One Nation After All.* Classes on Thursdays explored issues related to ecology with weekly discussions of *The Olympic Rainforest.*

Winter quarter students continued weekly participation in seminar as well as participating in four thematically related workshops: African Dance, Politics of Identity, Urban Ecology, and Autobiography. The focus of each workshop related to the overall theme of coming home to self, community and nature.

African Dance—The movement section of the program was designed to complement the Urban Ecology, Political Identity and Autobiography pieces this quarter. We explored the African Diaspora through traditional West African dance, samba, salsa and readings. Students responded creatively to journal articles: "African Dance: Bridges to Humanity," by Tracey D. Snipe; "The Body Politic," by Bill T. Jones; "Political Issues of Jowale;" "Willa Jo Zollar Artist/Activist," by Susan B. Glazer; and "Breaking Karma,"
by Sapphire. The program also fostered an understanding of Kwanzaa and Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech. Guest dancers included Afua Harris of the Adefua African Dance Ensemble and Isabel Perez, who taught samba. The one optional field trip was to witness the Alvin Ailey II Dance Company. The quarter culminated with a final group movement presentation which integrated the themes presented in the classroom.

Politics of Identity —We examined the ways in which race, class, gender and sexuality influence the social construction of identity. Students were randomly assigned an identity other than their own to investigate throughout the quarter. Students read assigned or self selected articles each week, and investigated the construction of

their assigned identity through several data gathering projects including: a demographic data search on the Internet, reading five children's picture books and an autobiography and constructing a poster presentation of these readings, a textbook analysis, a current events collection, and television collection. Students were evaluated based on their completion and analysis of each of these performance tasks.

Urban Ecology—More than 50 percent of the world's population lives in cities. In this section of the program, we examined how we can better understand the total world in which we live by looking at natural processes in urban settings. This looking inward hopefully provides a sense of reality about addressing our problems coupled with a sense of optimism. *The Granite Garden* by Anne Spirn served as the text for this unit. Lectures were supplemented with guest speakers, films, and field trips. Guest speakers included Pat Pringle, geologist with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources and Joe Rousch, urban forester with the City of Olympia. Films included were *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces, The Air We Breathe, Urban Impact on Weather and Climate,* and *Multiply and Subdue the Earth.* The optional field trips included urban bird-watching, Freeway Park and Waterfall Garden in Seattle, visiting the local sewage treatment plant, and urban garden food production with its social role. Students were evaluated based on weekly quizzes, a paper on the geology of their hometown, a research proposal inspired by the film *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces,* and attendance on field trips.

Autobiography—In Autobiography, students were introduced to several techniques for generating autobiographical material: Progoff journaling, examining archetypal patterns, visualization and maskmaking. Students produced 10–20 pages of written material each week using a combination of the demonstrated techniques. These draft pages were used to complete a final autobiography project which took the form of either a narrative, children's book or praise poem. Regardless of the form chosen, students were expected to demonstrate their ability to create a life story with a central theme and legacy. The final autobiography projects were presented in small groups and were accompanied by a self-reflection that examined the learning that occurred through the autobiographical process.

Texts for winter quarter included: *My Family and Other Animals, Walden, The Narrative Life of Frederick Douglass, Let Me Speak,* and *The Granite Garden, as well as selected articles addressing the affects of race, class, and gender on identity development.*

Specific learning goals for the program were:

- write papers that compare and contrast significant concepts found in program texts and themes
- develop understandings of ecological relationships
- select appropriate data to represent concepts and relationships in nature
- develop an understanding of multiple constructions of self and other
- develop an understanding of the relationship between the construction of self and interactions with nature
- develop conversational, dialogue skills in seminar
- develop critical reasoning and analysis skills
- distinguish the difference between personal opinion and how to listen to the au-

thor
- consider multiple cultural perspectives and be able to support a perspective through reasoned judgment
- develop multiple modes of expression
- develop an understanding of kinesthetic learning as contributing to a healthy self

To work towards these goals, students read and discussed a seminar book each week, wrote seminar and synthesis papers, wrote a paper about the geology of their hometown, and an autobiography. They participated in writers' workshops, completed data-gathering projects including researching an identity other than their own, and created and performed movement pieces. To conclude each quarter, students developed a portfolio in which they provided evidence of their learning and reflections of self-assessment on how and what they learned.

Faculty Evaluation of Student Achievement

Ms. XXX earned 32 credits for her work in this program. She demonstrated through her participation in seminar, and her papers, projects and portfolio, a solid understanding of the concepts and skills explored during the year. Further, her work reflects her growth emotionally and intellectually.

Seminar (fall and winter)—Ms. XXX participated actively in seminar throughout the program, developing skill and confidence as the year progressed. She was always prepared, listened carefully to others, shared her own perceptions, and asked clarifying questions. She was well able to distinguish the difference between personal opinion and authors' points and was interested in considering multiple perspectives. Her willingness to state and support her opinions and to engage in debate greatly enhanced the
effectiveness of the seminar.

Writing—Introduction to Literature and Composition (fall and winter)—Ms. XXX's ability to write well-organized and thoughtful expository essays improved significantly. Her final integrative paper in the fall demonstrated a good ability to identify universal themes and create a thesis integrating multiple texts. In winter quarter she significantly improved her ability to provide sufficient supporting evidence from the text for her assertions. The content of her writing demonstrated a good ability to engage in the focus questions of each quarter.

Autobiography (winter)—Ms. XXX's attendance at class was sporadic. Her weekly preparation of draft pages, the basis for the final project, was fair. She chose not to use any of the provided guidelines for weekly writing. Her final autobiography was written in the form of a children's book. Through it, she demonstrated a very good ability to select and create a life story with a central theme and legacy. Ms. XXX explored the role of imaginative play through a lively story and a clever use of photographic collage. Her reflections indicated that this project was important and satisfying for her intellectually and emotionally.

Movement—Body Awareness (fall)—Ms. XXX's movement logs and portfolio reflections demonstrated a greatly increased awareness of her knowledge about,

and relationship to, her body. Her final movement project was sophisticated conceptually and nicely executed. It portrayed a relationship of self to nature through the presentation of three robots building a fourth robot, the antithesis of the natural world.

African Dance (winter)—Ms. XXX is an excellent, enthusiastic student, who continued to improve throughout the quarter due to her attitude and hard work. Ms. XXX was absent a couple times due to illness. Her creative responses were always captivating drawings or collages. They were interesting and informing. Her final group presentation was a delightful romp with three other whimsical characters. Ms. XXX did a marvelous job as the pink panther. I applaud Ms. XXX for her movement growth and her vivid imagination.

Ecology—Ecology of Temperate Rain Forests (fall)—The final ecology project required students to demonstrate their ability to collect and report accurate data, discuss the data, and analyze and interpret the data from their specific study in relationship to larger ecological issues. Overall, Ms. XXX demonstrated an emerging understanding of the ecological concepts explored this quarter. She was successful at defining terms, reporting and representing data, and including supplementary research. She needs to continue working on interpreting the data and connecting it to larger ecological issues.

Urban Ecology (winter)—Ms. XXX did a very good job with her written and oral reports on the geology of her hometown, St. Louis, Missouri. She was able to link the geology with the economic/social history effectively. Several students cited her talk as the source of what they remembered most about that part of the program. Her weekly quizzes demonstrated a satisfactory understanding of the urban ecology principles presented. She chose to look at the response of Good Samaritans in urban settings as her topic in the Social Life portion. She raised some interesting questions. Ms. XXX also attended the class field trip to the local sewage treatment plant.

Multicultural Awareness:

Values and Identity Development (fall)—Her weekly workshop participation, learning logs, personal reflections and values project demonstrate that Ms. XXX shows a good understanding of the complexity and dynamic nature of identity and values development. Her awareness of her own values is solid, as is her growing appreciation of the variety and relativity of people's beliefs and experiences. She needs to deepen her knowledge about theorists such as Erikson and Massey.

Politics of Identity (winter)—Ms. XXX attended 8 of 9 class sessions and was always prepared for class. Her weekly response papers, in-class writing and data gathering projects demonstrated a very good understanding of the ways in which race, ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality affect identity development.

Overall, Ms. XXX had a productive first two quarters at Evergreen. She was an active

participant in all program activities, worked hard and successfully at improving her written and oral communication skills, learned a great deal about herself as a person and a learner, and increased her knowledge about movement, values, cultural identity and ecology.

Suggested Course Equivalencies (in quarter hours) TOTAL: 32
4 – Ecology of Temperate Rainforests
4 – Body Awareness
4 – Values and Identity Development
4 – Intro to Composition and Literature
4 – African Dance
4 – Autobiography
4 – Politics of Identity
4 – Urban Ecology

EXAMPLE EIGHT
Although they are both new to their positions, Louis Nadelson (director of the Quantitative Reasoning Center) and Sandra Yannone (director of the Writing Center) have approached their jobs with great energy, thought and enthusiasm. They have revamped their tutoring systems, presented numerous workshops within programs, and consulted widely with faculty and staff colleagues. It is still too soon to determine exactly how their centers will fit into the faculty's general education tenets, but both Louis and Sandra are off to a great start. They have contributed their thoughts and goals below.[98]

<div align="center">

The Writing Center
From the Formica Table: A Newcomer's Manifesta
By Sandra Yannone

</div>

Since I joined the Evergreen community only a few months ago, I feel slightly awkward in my new role as a "writing expert" on campus. My own experience as a writer and a writing center professional has taught me that writing is as complex a process for a college as it is for each individual writer. Keeping this tenet in mind, I'd like to share my observations about the current status of Evergreen's writing culture and what the future might hold.

Departments of English and composition programs usually live schizophrenic lives as both the stewards and scapegoats of their campus writing culture. In the absence of a formal composition program, the Evergreen faculty has had to insure that students receive adequate writing instruction without "killing the messenger." This quality control has enabled the College to imbed two national writing trends—writing
intensive courses and Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)—successfully into the curriculum. Former Evergreen faculty member Peter Elbow no doubt contributed to their implementation; however, Elbow could not have accomplished his groundbreaking work without his colleagues. As Director of the Writing Center, I have not lost sight of this crucial fact. A glance at any of my first few weeks is a testament to the strength of WAC at Evergreen. Here are three examples from one particularly rich

---

[98] See appendix for the combined goals of Yannone and Nadelson for the Learning Resource Center.

day:

Sonja Wiedenhaupt stopped by the Writing Center to discuss her frustration with the "Trash" program's writing assignment. Seated at the red Formica kitchen table that doubles as my desk, Sonja asked her burning question: How do I respond to a stack of papers when it's clear that many students did not engage with their ideas in a meaningful way? After we hashed through her issue, we shifted focus to discuss the frustrations I was feeling about writing this article on the relationship between general education requirements and writing. My burning question: What could I offer to an intense debate that preceded my arrival without committing professional suicide?

I logged on to my e-mail after my meeting with Sonja and found a message from Burt Guttman:

> I'm a faculty biologist, and I'm in my last year before retiring. I've always done quite a bit of writing development in my programs, even though that's not my primary interest. In cleaning out my office, I found some materials on writing that faculty folks have developed over the years … I wonder if I can run my material past you so you can see if there's anything you want. You might be able to use an extra copy of something, and there might be something you haven't seen before.

I haven't encountered many faculty members at other institutions where I've worked who would contact a writing center director to share writing expertise. Usually, this type of interaction requires extensive solicitation on the part of a director. Burt's generous example demonstrates that Evergreen's longstanding WAC initiative is working; the commitment to teaching writing has reached areas of the curriculum most institutions only dream of reaching.

I scrolled further through my sea of messages to discover e-mails from colleagues at other institutions seeking advice about how to save their writing centers from budget cuts. Failure to generate credit always makes writing centers vulnerable; yet, without a center, an institution risks putting more stress on faculty in all disciplines to teach writing without support. I paused for a moment to reflect on the juxtaposition of all these missives. In an era where many writing centers are struggling to survive,
Evergreen developed a unique model of program tutoring to complement traditional tutoring models.

During New Student Orientation I encouraged students to make their writing public, rather than solitary, acts. I encouraged them to share drafts with peers, to utilize tutors in the Writing Center, to seek out new sets of eyes whenever possible. I also have some words of encouragement for faculty and staff as we delve into new challenges for Evergreen's curriculum.

First, I would like to suggest the formation of a DTF along the lines of a WAC Advisory Board to assist me with the numerous and complex questions related to the continued development of Evergreen's writing culture.

Second, following Burt Guttman's thoughtful example, I want to encourage each of you to contribute to a WPA project: the Writing Practices Archive. Creating a physical space in the LRC as well as a cyberspace for faculty resources will enable us to share our unique teaching and build on Evergreen's WAC legacy.

Third, my observations have led me to conclude that the mission of most WAC programs to "teach writing" often turns into an unstated lowest common denominator: to teach grammar. I would like us to consider the linguistic and practical advantages of labeling what we do in writing-intensive courses as "teaching the process of writing" rather than "teaching writing." The former deliberately encompasses all facets of the writing process: brainstorming, revision, editing and proofreading.

Finally, writing-intensive courses and writing assignments designed without attention to the writing process achieve only marginal success in the development of students' writing and critical thinking skills. As a result of Sonja's burning question, another Trasher, Sharon Anthony, came to the kitchen table. After dishing two hours with the "Trash" tutors, we tweaked the "Trash" syllabus to incorporate a series of program workshops and weekly individual conferences. "Trash" will teach the process of writing without compromising course content.

Let me be blunt: I am not advocating that we use a cookie cutter approach to teach anything at Evergreen, particularly something as complex as the writing process. However, I believe we can learn from "Trash's" example and devote a summer institute to customizing its process-oriented teaching model to your program. The initiative all started with one faculty member sitting at a red Formica table asking one question. I invite you to come feast at the table in my office anytime. Who knows what we can serve up for your learning community?

The Quantitative Reasoning Center
Goals of the Quantitative Reasoning Center, 2001–2002
By Louis Nadelson

Introduction

Louis L'Amour once said, "The best of all things is to learn. Money can be stolen, health and strength may fail, but what you have committed to your mind is yours forever." As I start this new position, I am constantly reminded of the truths in this statement. These words compel me to ensure that students have the opportunity to commit to their minds the concepts and approaches of quantitative reasoning.

With this in mind, my goals for this position do not only to focus on student learning, but also on the facilitation of faculty and curriculum enrichment. As I cannot teach every student at TESC about QR, I realize that my primary role is to instill a delight of quantitative reasoning in the minds of each faculty member. By doing this, I can assure that QR is part of the curriculum and that every student has the opportunity to commit to their minds the concepts and approaches of QR and thus excel in these areas.

I realize that this position was created for several reasons, and with many responsibilities. The impetus for the position resulted from the General Education Plan, which calls for TESC graduates to be able to reason quantitatively. Thus, there is a call to assure that quantitative reasoning is part of the curriculum that all students encounter in their educational careers at TESC.

Due to the nature of integrated, liberal arts curriculum at TESC, quantitative reasoning should be a natural part of almost every course or program. However, this is not always the case. It appears that the lack of quantitative reasoning in the curriculum is due primarily to a limited of understanding of faculty experience teaching QR. Therefore, in order to assure that QR is part of the curriculum I have to approach this situation from several perspectives. These include: maintaining the QRC, supporting faculty and programs, and involvement with curriculum planning and development.

Goals

There are three essential levels in which I am dedicating my time and efforts. The first being the local QRC, the second is support of faculty and programs and the third is with curriculum planning and institutes. Although these areas are interrelated they do reflect the multiple layers that need attention to ensure that quantitative reasoning is integrated throughout the curriculum.

This Year

I have been focusing my attention this year on three major issues. First, I have worked to develop a meaningful place for students to come and get support with QR by making the QRC a helpful and hospitable place. I have hand-selected a cadre of tutors that have a wide range of skills to meet a variety of student learning needs. I have presented in over 15 programs the QRC, explaining the hours and availability, using this outreach to contact both students and faculty.

Second, I have been working on getting to know as many faculty as I can, and offering my assistance in developing curriculum, planning or workshops to meet their QR needs. I have also specifically selected four programs to work with directly: two core programs—"Trash" and "Ecology of Hope," one science program—"Introduction to Natural Science," and one graduate program—Masters in Teaching. I meet regularly with these faculty and plan curriculum and then attend their classes to work with their students. This helps me to keep familiar with student needs and capabilities and to work with faculty in a team setting that will build confidence and relationships for further support and development.

Third, I have been working toward planning and curriculum development. I have met with the PUCs and have attended a few planning unit meetings. I have discussed the possibility of summer institutes and other faculty development opportunities with several key people such as Nancy Taylor, Emily Decker and Brian Price. Additionally, I will attend the retreats and other new and nearly new faculty gatherings to further become familiar with what people are planning and keeping them cognizant of the importance of QR integration into the curriculum.

Sandy Yannone and I have been working collaboratively on a number of projects and are meeting on a regular basis to assure that our efforts and momentum remain constant. We have been discussing ways to promote the centers, utilize staff effectively and improve communication. Additionally, we have been touching on the development of meaningful summer institutes that integrate writing and QR.

I feel that I am meeting the goals that I have laid out according to needs and recommendation of the deans, and the hiring committee. It is difficult to determine the impact that I am having in such a short period of time, but the response to my efforts has been positive. It is the long-range impact that will determine how effective my process is at integrating QR into the curriculum.

Mid Range Implementation

The goals for the next two years are to guide as much as possible the curriculum development and implementation to assure that QR is a component of student work. While I can work with this year's , it is the 2002–2003 curriculum that is being planned now and the 2003–2004 curriculum that is being proposed, that has a much better chance for influence and impact. Thus, it is important that I work with the planning groups and the PUCs very closely over the next two years to establish a tone of importance and confidence to assure that QR is a component across the curriculum.

Additionally, I will continue working with programs, selecting four each year to work directly with while providing support and resources to others as needed. I will also continue to work on faculty development and student support viewing these as essential, ongoing components to the position.

Long Range Implementation

It will take time for systemic change in the curriculum and for quantitative reasoning to be a sustained component of the curriculum. Change will be slow, yet will progress. But there are a number of hurdles that must be overcome to assure that the change is substantial and sustained. These hurdles include:

- faculty knowledge and comfort with quantitative reasoning
- a diverse population with a variety of needs
- the nature of the integrated studies liberal arts curriculum
- perceptions of curriculum and the importance of quantitative reasoning

Conclusion

Realizing the complexity to establishing an environment and the conditions for systemic change, I am working on short and long term goals at three levels: the Quantitative Reasoning Center, with faculty and programs and with planning and development. Making relationships and developing curriculum with faculty and then visiting the course meetings to assist with implementation is vital to assuring that there will be systemic change and continued interest in integrating quantitative reasoning into the curriculum.

EXAMPLE NINE

Academic Advising played a key role in shaping the faculty's Gen Ed recommendations, and will continue to support faculty, staff and students as we move toward a system that is more faculty-student centered. Below, Kitty Parker reflects on what the revised system might look like. Phyllis Lane and Kitty stress that an important part of their future work will be developing a guide or handbook for faculty to use in student advising. Please see Appendix Four for a complete list of services available to students and faculty.

<div align="center">

The Revised Advising System
by Kitty Parker

</div>

This is a description of the current advising system showing the approved Gen Ed faculty components and suggesting some of the revisions that may be needed within the Academic Advising Office. Since retention begins at admission, I have begun the outline with what preliminary advising is available to students seeking admission to the college. I include activities created and supported by other offices—such as Orientation—since they are part of the overall system. I also have included some of the major "passive" advising tools that are provided to students (such as written information or WebSite), as well as intrusive group and individual advising activities.

These revisions to Evergreen's advising structures come about as we shift from a model where faculty have been assumed to be advising students but where this cultural norm has eroded over time. The agreement of the faculty to conduct regular advising with their students should make our overall advising system much more visible and should also encourage students to both value and pursue some level of academic planning.

Expected changes from increased advising options with faculty, and more visibility of advising include:

1. Although Academic Advising will continue to serve as a "safety net" for students with emergent problems, over time we expect to see a shift from a significant amount of "triage" advising to longer range planing. Advising staff will continue to support this change.

2. Overall, we expect increased use of our services in the Advising and Career Development offices. As students come to value academic planning, we are likely to be not only a referral for many faculty, but a more visible resource for

students doing more thorough thinking about their plans.

3. Need for faculty advisor training and individual consulting through Academic Advising staff—including but not limited to theory, techniques, FERPA and Banner training. To meet these needs, Academic Advising is considering how to conduct summer institutes and is considering a program for consultation that could include a "faculty advisor partnership caseload."

4. All advising activities and formats will be adjusted to include information and support for achieving the Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate.

5. As outlined in the strategic plan, we will be identifying ways we can effectively use technology to reach out to students and ensure their planning needs are met. For example, Academic Advising is looking into ways of supporting students in keeping their portfolios online, and ways to develop a manageable e-mail advising system.

6. One of the major findings we have pursued though the "Transitions" program has been to create one-on-one conversation with students about their education and to help create more connection with adults (faculty and/or staff) at the college—noted by Alexander Astin as a major retention factor. The strategic plan identified improvements to academic advising as a goal for the next few years. Having students meet with individual faculty each year will help move in this direction. (There is still work to do to ensure a consistently high quality experience in these sessions.) In addition, we recognize that some students will more naturally come to Academic Advisors (or other advising staff) for this support.

7. Finally, the Advising office will be responsible for ensuring students of new (first year) and visiting faculty have the opportunity to participate in an advising conference based on a written reflective piece. Current thoughts on how this could happen include working directly with the faculty to set up an appropriate system within the program, and alternatively creating a set of workshops to develop the reflective writing followed by individual conferences with staff advisors.

The theory behind the curriculum below includes acknowledgment that students earlier in their career have a greater need for information, and as they progress, they have increased need for consultation about the complexities of their decision-making. (Creamer)

The theory is based in developmental theory in that it acknowledges that students typically enter college at a dualistic stage, and thus the workshops are designed to push them to a more complex understanding and to make use of their peers in constructing their understanding of their academic pathways. (Perry) As later stages of the
"Mapping" workshops are developed, we will continue to ground our work in these bases and in our own research through such projects as the "Transitions to Success

Pilot Project." Finally, as we seek to provide optimal levels of challenge and support, we use highly interactive teaching methods whenever possible, focus on constructing knowledge and avoid didactic models.

Students seeking admission:
Admissions Information Sessions, various Admissions activities such as Preview and Theme Days, individual sessions with admissions counselors, campus tours, catalog, WebSite, discipline fliers.

Note: Admissions and Academic Advising collaborate on many activities and have an agreement that Admissions will advise students until they are admitted, and then Academic Advising will take responsibility for them. We also agree that Academic Advising will back up the Admissions counselors when students need more specific advising than Admissions staff feel comfortable with or when (by specific request) Admissions staff is on the road recruiting and back-up is needed. Further, we have plans during this coming summer to review our work and collaborate in ways to ensure students get the information they need at all points on the continuum, while eliminating annoying duplication.

Admitted students—before school starts:

Themes: *information gathering, preliminary planning.*
- **New Student Advising Form**—included in Registration and Advising mailing. For those who return the form, a needs assessment is made and for those students making apparently inappropriate choices, follow-up is made by phone or e-mail to assist student in making an appropriate decision.
- **New Student Advising Workshop**,[99] (intended to occur before registration)—This workshop is offered to all new students. In the upcoming year, Academic Advising will continue to follow up with all students who do not attend and encourage them to attend. For the freshmen in this group, advisors will follow up aggressively to encourage participation in the workshop and to ensure students' questions are answered and any advising needs are met.
- **First Year Programs Advising Day**—includes advising workshop and mini-academic fair for first year programs, a student services fair, plus registration support (and various activities for parents).
- **Academic Fair**.
- **Orientation activities**—e.g., workshops, information session, *Courage to Learn.*

First-year students
Themes: *Settling in; finding out who I am in this new context; knowledge of useful resources; increased understanding of partnership and responsibility in academic planning.*
- **Mapping Your Education I**—This workshop is a sequence of experiences intended to help students define their values about the liberal arts and think about their

---

[99] New Student Advising Workshop includes *Evergreen 101,* an information session about the nuts-and-bolts of how the curriculum works, how to get advising, and also handles current registration questions. The second part of the workshop is *Mapping Your Education I*—a Finkel-style workshop designed to help students begin thinking about their academic planning, list their academic strengths and weaknesses, consider the Five Foci in relation to their academic planning and to begin to develop a change in locus of control for academic planning

planning style. Students practice self-assessment about strengths and gaps, and the workshop culminates in writing a short statement of academic intentions to use in planning study at Evergreen. This workshop is offered to all newly admitted students.

- **Mapping Your Education II**—This workshop consists of stories about overcoming obstacles and becoming successful students and academic planners. The stories are told by Evergreen seniors. The videotape is followed by a sequence of small group experiences intended to increase a student's understanding of, and valuing of breadth in their education. This workshop is intended for students completing their first year of study at Evergreen.
- **Evergreen 102** ("re-orientation") **session**—similar to "Evergreen 101" but formatted differently and including connections to student activities - offered within Core programs by Core Connectors and reviewing curriculum and advising options at a time when students may be more likely to take the information in). This workshop will also be offered as part of our calendar for transfer students. New for fall 2001.
- **Core Connector curriculum**—advising and workshops specific to program needs, advising hours for program students, announcements and information sharing.
- **How's It Going Cards**—distributed within Core programs. Students indicating problems receive follow-up from a Core Connector.
- **Faculty advising conference**.

Sophomores
Themes: *Exploration; development of appreciation for both breadth and depth; increased understanding of partnership and responsibility in academic planning.*
- **Faculty advising conference**.

Juniors
Themes: *Focus; gathering information; identifying appropriate consultants; move toward depth or fill in breadth as needed.*
- **Mapping III**—This workshop is currently in development and is focused on conducting longer range academic and career planning, as well as meeting the Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate. "Mapping III" is designed for students preparing for their junior year.
- **Mapping IV**—This workshop is in the planning stages and will focus on helping students prepare for their senior year, including final planning to meet the Expectations of Evergreen Graduates.
- **Faculty advising conference**.

Seniors (including B.A./B.S. candidates and post-bac students)
Theme: *Transition to life after Evergreen*
- Faculty support for summative self-evaluation.

Advising services available to all students upon request:
- Career Development—workshops, appointments, drop-ins
- Academic Advising drop-ins, appointments, workshops
- Faculty advising
- Student Advising handbook
- Academic Advising Workshops
- Web sites for Career Development, Academic Advising, Faculty Voices, Study

Abroad, etc.
- Academic Fairs

Advising services available to special populations:
- KEY—individual advising, workshops
- FPAS—individual advising, workshops, special activities
- Access—individual advising, workshops, individualized accommodation
- International and Study Abroad students—workshops, specialized advising and support
- Part-time students—newsletter, evening hours advising options
- Housing students (especially those involved in the First-Year Experience)—Prime Time Advising Office— outreach, tutoring, academic and career advising
- Wait-List-Only students—students who are registered only on a wait list at close of registration period— individualized outreach advising
- Students in programs with registration problems (e.g., program ends unexpectedly; Core programs ending in fall or winter; programs dividing unexpectedly)

Specific Support for General Education Initiatives

1. Academic Advising staff will participate in summer planning institutes by offering workshops for faculty on advising and by offering individualized consulting to help faculty develop ways to integrate advising into academic programs.

2. Academic Advising will offer a "Mapping Your Education" workshop series (described above) and in-program workshops in career development focusing on self-assessment, decision-making, career and life work planning, graduate school advising, as well as individual advising and guidance. Advising staff can facilitate these workshops within academic programs or provide "Finkel style" outlines directly to faculty for their use.

3. Core Connecting. In addition to working directly with first-year students in the connected program, advisors will be available to consult with faculty to develop advising procedures as an integrated part of the academic program. Consulting may take place in the annual Core Workshop arranged by the Academic Deans for First-Year Programs, or at other individually arranged times. Advisors will seek out faculty to suggest this planning in advance of the development of the syllabus.

4. Develop/update *Handbook* and *Resources and Guidelines for Advisors* pamphlet to include current information that faculty need for good advising.

5. Update publications, and web and written resources for use by faculty in advis-

SECTION FOUR
Recommendations

"The vague desire for a vague culture … will lead us nowhere."[100]
José Ortega Y Gasset

Widespread integration of quantitative reasoning, science and the arts into Evergreen's curriculum is still a work in progress. Certainly, particular faculty teams have significant experience in these areas, but the college as a whole does not. That was, after all, the basis for the Commission's recommendation, and this was the problem faculty discussed for two years. As things stand, we have given ourselves great leeway in addressing general education. What we have now is an opportunity to shape our approach to general education in a way that is consonant with Evergreen's history and purpose. The experiments described above indicate that we have begun to do that intentionally and thoughtfully. We need to continue this work, especially as it relates to quantitative reasoning, science and the arts. We will implement the tenets endorsed by the faculty in the same way we have other key aspects of college pedagogy and philosophy: incrementally and variously.

What follows is a list of recommendations to help us do that. These recommendations come from faculty and staff interviews, the academic deans, Evergreen's delegation to the AAC&U Greater Expectations project (Phyllis Lane, Kitty Parker, Emily Decker, Russ Fox, Jin Darney, Brian Price and Enrique Riveros-Schäfer), from the initiatives for curricular reform adopted by the faculty, and from the author.

Jin Darney notes that "these recommendations are based on our collective experience: that faculty have a lot to teach each other, that we learn and change through experience, and that our experience has led us these sorts of recommendations."[101]

The institutes and other activities recommended below should take place annually for at least the next five years.

Recommendation One
Summer Program Planning Institutes

Nearly all faculty interviewed agreed that these should happen every summer. So far we've done two. The first (in 2000) was somewhat prescriptive in the sense that Gen Ed "workshops" were coupled with program planning time. The faculty most valued the chance to interact with each other in the "public" planning periods. They learned from other faculty teams, and received constructive critique on their own program designs. They did not so much appreciate the Gen Ed workshops. The second summer's institutes (2001) also provided public program planning time, but, instead of workshops, made various "experts," or "kibbitzers," available to advise teams in planning their programs. Faculty preferred the latter model, although one academic dean suggested that the college's institutional priorities might be better served by the former. In addition to faculty program teams, the following people should participate in summer program planning institutes: the Writing Center

---

[100] José Ortega Y Gasset, quoted in Page Smith, *Killing the Spirit: Higher Education in America,* New York: Penguin Books, 1990, 151.
[101] Jin Darney, critique of a draft of this document, 1/10/02.

director, the Quantitative Reasoning Center director, faculty instructors from the summer arts institute, faculty consultants for science program planning, and representatives from Academic Advising.

Recommendation Two
Summer Quantitative Reasoning Institutes

As a college we do not yet know what we mean by quantitative reasoning across the curriculum, or what shape quantitative reasoning should take in respect to general education. We need to work on this. It does us no good to leave this so vaguely defined. As the Quantitative Reasoning Center director gains experience at Evergreen, and allies with other faculty in presenting program workshops and contributing to program planning, he should become a key figure in helping us chart this course. Other faculty (Rob Cole, for example) also have very significant experience teaching math, and should be included in this effort.
The QR Center director should also be available to advise faculty at summer program planning institutes.

Recommendation Three
Summer Writing Institutes

Sandra Yannone, Bill Ransom and former Writing Center interim director Olivia Archibald have all noted that assigning writing does not equal teaching writing (or, as Sandra Yannone said above, the writing process). In the earlier years of the college, we paid a lot of attention to teaching writing across the curriculum. We need to resume this emphasis.
We have a rich resource of writing teachers at Evergreen; we should employ these people in helping all of us become better teachers of writing and the writing process (writing, reflecting, revising and peer review). The Writing Center director should also be available to advise faculty at summer program planning institutes.

Recommendation Four
Summer "Hands-On" Arts Institutes

Sally Cloninger noted that it simply isn't productive to talk about how to inject arts content into the curriculum. Faculty need to experience the art. Drawing, she suggested, is a good way to begin.[102] We should present hands-on, basic, summer art institutes for faculty. Faculty instructing these institutes should be available to advise their colleagues at the summer program planning institutes.

---

[102] Author interview with Sally Cloninger, fall 2001.

Recommendation Five
Release Time for Science Program Planning

One science faculty with strong interest in Core programs and broad interdisciplinary teaching and learning should be given at least a quarter's release time annually to work with faculty teams on science across the curriculum. This person might focus on presenting appropriate workshops in existing programs, or on assisting faculty with planning of future programs. The person on release time should be available to advise faculty at summer
program planning institutes.

See Insert A: Diagram, "Program Planning Process."

Recommendation Six
Continuing What We Already Do

Faculty nearly universally value reflective, social and planning time with their colleagues on faculty and staff. Some examples are the faculty retreat, the Washington Center's annual curriculum planning workshop, core planning workshops, "dinners for eight," Finkel workshops, and last summer's faculty symposium. We should work to continue these efforts and others like them.

Recommendation Seven
Annual Advising Conferences

Every full-time and half-time program should include faculty-student academic advising conferences based on a self-reflective piece by students. The "works in progress" section above suggests many ways of doing this. The Academic Advising Office is collecting a tool kit of best practices and will make them available to faculty.

See Insert B: Diagram, "Advising Process."

Recommendation Eight
Assessment and Reporting

The Academic Deans and/or the Provost, in association with the Director of Institutional Research, and the Assessment Study Group should report to the faculty annually on the effectiveness of general education implementation, including examples of best practices, effective methods of assessment and recommendations for improvement. The Assessment Study Group should work closely with selected programs to help develop assessment methods and best practices. The study group and faculty from these selected programs should present a summer institute and/or workshops in the academic year to advise faculty on how to incorporate assessment best practices into their programs.

See Insert C: Diagram, "Assessment and Reporting."

Program Planning Process
Incorporating General Education
(Recommendations One to Five and Twelve)

Faculty Teaching Teams

Summer Program
Planning Institute

Summer Institutes
Arts
Quantitative Reasoning
Assessment
Writing

Faculty teams plan programs with
special attention to
incorporating arts, QR, assessment,
writing, science and advising

Resources available:

Arts:
Work with faculty instructor
and colleagues to achieve basic profi-
ciency and incorporate art
into programs

QR:
Work with faculty instructor and col-
leagues to plan incorporating QR into
programs

Assessment:
Work with director of Institutional
Research and Assessment Study
Group to incorporate and
experiment with assessing a
selected number of programs

Writing:
work with faculty instructor and col-
leagues to learn how to teach writing in
programs

Resources available:
"Public" planning time with col-
leagues; consultants available to
teams to help them incorporate
arts, QR, assessment, writing, sci-
ence and advising in programs

Syllabi that accurately describe the
actual work of the program

**Interdisciplinary team-taught
programs implementing
faculty-approved general
education tenets**

Advising Process
(Recommendation Seven)

Faculty Teaching Teams

Resources available:

Writing Center

Quantitative Reasoning Center

Academic Advising
(see text of document for specific services
available from Academic Advising)

Access Services for Students
With Disabilities

Campus Children's Center

Career Development Center

Center for Mediation Services

Counseling and Health Centers

Enrollment Services

Evening/Weekend Student Services

Financial Aid

First Peoples' Advising Services

Grievance Officer

Housing Office

International Programs and Services

Key Student Services

Police Services

Prime Time Advising

Prior Learning From Experience

Recreational and Athletics

Registration and Records

Sexual Assault Prevention Office

Student Activities

Student Affairs Office

Student and Academic
Support Services

Student Employment Office

(see Appendix 4 for descriptions and contact
information for the services listed above)

Six expectations and
program-specific learning
outcomes described in syllabi

Student self-assessments
(examples are described in
the text of this document)
or other student-written self-
reflective piece
assigned by faculty

Faculty-student advising
conference based on student
self-assessment or other
self-reflective piece assigned
by faculty

Possible referral of
student to one of resources
listed in Appendix 4 and sum-
marized at left

Student academic plan

Assessment and Reporting
(Recommendation Eight)

Assessment Study Group	**Selected programs incorporating faculty-approved general education tenets**

Program faculty and Assessment Study Group work together to develop and test assessment methods

Program faculty and Assessment Study Group identify, describe and analyze best practices

Assessment Study Group publishes best practices, analysis and recommendations and presents Summer Institute with faculty colleagues on how to incorporate assessment principles and methods into programs

Recommendation Nine
Role of Academic Advising Office

The director of academic advising, Kitty Parker, played a prominent role in the Gen Ed DTF's work. Her work helped shape the faculty's recommendations on incorporating advising within programs. This was a significant accomplishment. The advising office also has valuable ongoing programs and workshops available to faculty and students. The "core connector" program appears to be successful in many cases, and certainly academic advising does
excellent work in student orientation, in one-on-one meetings with students, and in various specific workshops. Academic Advising has developed specific ways to support faculty and to clarify the ways in which they can support the college's general education goals. (See
"Example Nine: The Revised Advising System," above). An updated advising guide for faculty is in process, as well as a set of workshops that will support students.

See Insert D: Diagram, "Role of Academic Advising Office."

Recommendation Ten
Administrative Oversight for General Education

The provost should assign oversight responsibility for Gen Ed implementation to an academic dean, who will work closely with faculty and the planning unit coordinators to carry out the faculty's tenets on general education.

See Insert E: Diagram, "Adminstrative Oversight Responsibility."

Recommendation Eleven
Small Grants for General Education Implementation

The Provost's Office is accepting applications for small grants of up to $3,000 per program to augment implementation of Gen Ed in individual programs. These grants may be used for field trips, speakers, and activities which promote the faculty's general education tenets.
The Academic Deans will evaluate applications and award grants. (For complete details, see Appendix Five.)

Recommendation Twelve
Syllabi which Reflect the Actual Work of the Program

In order to accurately assess the effectiveness of implementation of general education, program syllabi should be explicit and comprehensive about the work students do in

Role of Academic Advising Office
in Implementing General Education
(Recommendation Nine)

Academic Advising

Academic Advising Tool Kit:
(Resources, Best Practices and Guidelines for Advising)

Core Connectors

"Mapping Your Education" workshops

"Programs to Professions" workshops with Career Development and PUCs

Individual Student Advising

Internship Orientation

Writing Self-Evaluations Workshops

Small Group Diagnosis

Study Abroad Workshops

Consulting on advising at Summer Planning Institute

Faculty Program Teaching Teams

Academic Programs

Students

Faculty-Student Advising Conferences

Student Academic Plan

Administrative Oversight Responsibility
for General Education Implementation
(Recommendation Ten)

```
                    ┌──────────────────────────┐
                    │  Academic Vice President │
                    │       and Provost        │
                    └──────────────────────────┘
                                 │
                    ┌──────────────────────────┐
                    │      Academic Dean       │
                    └──────────────────────────┘
                                 │
  ┌────────────────────────┐    │
  │ Assessment Study Group │    │
  └────────────────────────┘    │
                    ┌──────────────────────────┐
                    │ Planning Unit Coordinators│
                    └──────────────────────────┘
                                 │
                    ┌──────────────────────────┐
                    │    Faculty Program       │
                    │    Teaching Teams        │
                    └──────────────────────────┘
                                 │
                    ┌──────────────────────────┐
                    │  Implementation of fac-  │
                    │ ulty-approved Gen-Ed tenets│
                    │ throughout the curriculum │
                    └──────────────────────────┘
```