

DEDICATION

Andrei Maksimovich Hanfman
1913 - 1989

We, the members of this DTF, dedicate this report to the memory of Andrei Maksimovich Hanfman. Renaissance man and master of many Indo-European languages, Andrei established the language and areas study program at The Evergreen State College. He was born in Imperial Russia; he lived in interwar Lithuania and was educated in Germany and Italy. He suffered through the second World War, part of which he spent in a Nazi forced labor camp. He represented all that was best in the European intellectual tradition--gentility, culture, honor, and integrity. His dedication to international and intercultural studies constantly inspired our efforts. At the same time, his rapier-like wit demolished ideology masquerading as truth and prompted many of us to critique ephemeral or self-serving propositions. We dedicate this report to his memory and to the struggle for justice and understanding among all of the Earth's people.

Closed

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE



A30000 010638

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the many people who assisted in the preparation of this report. We particularly want to thank Jane Lorenzo and Bonita Evans for their help in preparing materials, drafts, and mailings during the work of the DTF. We also want to give special thanks to Linda Knight for compiling the results of the Faculty Survey and organizing DTF papers and records.

MEMBERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES DTF

NAMESIGNATURE

Gordon Beck

Mike Beug

Ken Dolbeare

Susan Fiksdal

John Filmer

José Gómez

Jennifer Harrison

Kris Johansson

Lovern King

Pat Labine

Lisa Levy

Liz Nogle

Sarah Pedersen

John Perkins

Tom Rainey

Setsuko Tsutsumi

Ainara Wilder

RECEIVED
MAY 08 1990

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE
VICE-PRESIDENT/PROVOST

Gordon Beck

Michael W. Beug

Susan Fiksdal

John Filmer

José Gómez

Jennifer Harrison

Kris Johansson

Lovern King

Pat Labine

Lisa Levy

Liz Nogle

Sarah Pedersen

John H. Perkins

Tom Rainey

Setsuko Tsutsumi

Ainara D. Wilder

(and Joye Hardiman were ex officio members of the DTF; their other duties did not permit them to attend regularly, but the DTF appreciated their comments during its deliberations. Andrew Hanfman was also an ex officio member of the DTF who came to many meetings. His contributions to this DTF as well as to the general cause of international studies were crucial. Our Dedication of this Report to his memory symbolizes the importance of his work. Ken Jacob, Russ Lidman, and Sonya Streier had hoped to participate in the DTF, but the press of other responsibilities kept them from fully participating. To all of these people, we express our thanks for their interest and for the contributions they were able to make.)

Table of Contents

I.	Summary	1
II.	The DTF's Work	3
	Summary of the charge and how we interpreted it	
	Information and consultation processes used by the DTF	
III.	Philosophical and pragmatic considerations for Evergreen's stance on international studies	5
IV.	Programmatic Analysis and Recommendations	7
	Organizing intercultural studies at Evergreen	7
	Structure of the Intercultural Studies Project	9
	Programs of the Intercultural Studies Project.	10
	Foreign language instruction	13
	Strengthening intercultural and international content of all Specialty Areas, Core, the Graduate Programs, and Evening/Weekend College	15
	Faculty development in service of intercultural and international studies	16
	Library requirements	18
	The question of requirements	18
	Opportunities for Evergreen to develop a more significant international atmosphere.	18
	Student clientele and the financing of study abroad.	22
	A need to reconsider the Strategic Plan.	22
V.	Issues in student services and administration	23
Appendix 1:	Complete charge to the DTF	
Appendix 2:	Summary of invited visitors to the DTF	
Appendix 3:	Complete results of the faculty survey	
Appendix 4:	Proposals for entry-level programs in Intercultural Studies	
	A. Entry program with integral foreign language component (Fiksdal)	
	B. Entry program with foreign language external to program (Perkins)	
Appendix 5:	Books and periodicals for the library	
Appendix 6:	Language instruction, media, and the library	
Appendix 7:	Explicit criteria recommended for problems	
	A. Criteria for establishing consortial relationships	
	B. Criteria for creating TESC-sponsored programs abroad	

C. Criteria for expanding language instruction

Appendix 8: Proposals for sites abroad

- A. Henderson/Belize
- B. Tsutsumi/Japan
- C. Beug-Smith/Japan

Appendix 9: Intercultural and international dimensions of MPI

Appendix 10: Useful contacts for study abroad opportunities

Appendix 11: "Integrating foreign languages into the college curriculum": the Earlham College model

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES DTF

FINAL REPORT

28 February 1990

THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON 98505

I. Summary

The DTF studied the general problem of enhancing international studies at Evergreen within its charge to be bold and within the framework of the Strategic Plan. Consideration was given to the testimony of various interested parties, suggestions from outside experts, and faculty opinion as derived from a survey and discussions. In addition, the DTF was mindful of the obligations and constraints stemming from our new mission statement, the size, funding, and enrollment levels of the College, and other factors in our history and context. The DTF developed four basic principles and two major recommendations, together with some ancillary suggestions.

A. Principles

* International studies should be developed within the overarching framework of intercultural studies. We should integrate international studies within such a framework because our real global challenge and opportunity is to achieve cross-cultural communication and understanding -- not just between nation-states, but also between and among cultures that may be located within given national boundaries or spread widely across the world.

* Intercultural studies represent a major intellectual challenge and an opportunity for creativity and innovation fully equal to that which gained the College its initial reputation in the world of American higher education. Where we once achieved recognition for our interdisciplinary innovations, we can now do so for our success in accomplishing the intellectual synthesis of intercultural teaching, learning, communication, and understanding.

* The subject matter of intercultural studies includes

(a) the language, values, myths, customs, personal identities, and social relationships of distinctive cultures;

(b) the worldviews and ways of knowing, the organization of social, economic, and political life, the ways of relating to nature and resources, and the forms of communication, expression (including art), and decision making that are characteristic of differing nations and cultures; and

(c) the various relationships between and among nations and cultures throughout the world, including ways of sensitively accepting and appreciating cultural diversity in our daily lives.

* Two features of American cultural life will continue to pervade any effort to construct an intercultural studies curriculum: racism and sexism. People of color and women continue to struggle for full equality in American life, and the necessities to struggle invariably affect the abilities of teachers to teach and of students to learn. Evergreen's efforts to build a high quality program in intercultural studies must deal with both racism and sexism simultaneously and explicitly, as they occur both here and in other countries and cultures.

B. Recommendations

* An intercultural, global perspective appropriate to the subject area involved should infuse every program, contract, and course offered at TESC. Ways of knowing, communicating, and living that are different from the European-American traditions should be integrated into our teaching and learning in a manner analogous to our pedagogical commitments to writing and seminars.

* An "Intercultural Studies Project" should be formed. It should involve 20-30% of all our faculty plus continuing staff and budgetary support. Project work includes coordination of entry-level and advanced curriculum development in the areas that focus on intercultural studies. In addition, the project will conduct a variety of activities that encourage the development of intercultural curricular components in all other areas of the curriculum. Finally, Project faculty and staff will be a focal point for coordinating work of other units of the College in the support of improving the intercultural aspects of Evergreen's program.

C. Ancillary suggestions

* Efforts to enhance the intercultural and international dimensions of Evergreen's curriculum must be conceived as a package, e.g. we should coordinate institutionally supported efforts such as faculty and student exchange options, language instruction, library resources, student services resources. Our programs to date have not had such coordination.

* We should concentrate our resources in language instruction on the four languages we currently do best: French, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. After we have developed the capacity to do these excellently, consideration can be given to expanding our language offerings.

* Library resources must be upgraded in the areas of monograph and periodicals, language instruction facilities, media equipment, and support for off-campus programs.

* Faculty development is a pressing need. Especially important efforts in faculty development need to be focused on dealing with racism and sexism. Understanding another culture is impossible if critical elements of one's own culture remain unrecognized and unexamined.

* The international "atmosphere" at the College must be developed in a variety of ways.

* Student services and financial aid programs must be carefully tailored to new initiatives developed for intercultural studies.

II. The DTF's Work

Summary of the charge and how we interpreted it

This Disappearing Task Force (DTF) was charged on 13 October 1989 by the Provost, the Academic Deans, and Jeanne Hahn for the Agenda Committee of the Faculty Meeting. Our charge was complex and lengthy, and a complete copy is attached as Appendix 1.

It is important to understand that our charge was to proceed within the framework of the Strategic Plan. Specifically, the DTF was a major piece of the work to develop and implement the Strategic Plan's call for a richer curriculum in the area of international studies. The Strategic Plan itself called for more emphasis on the "Pacific Rim," which was widely interpreted to mean all areas bordering the Pacific Ocean.

Of necessity, some of our deliberations had to deal with improvement of the College's current curriculum in European cultures and languages, and no sentiment ever existed that we would diminish our current work in, e.g., French or Russian languages and culture. Nevertheless, we were charged to devote major attention for new developments to Asia and Latin America, the specific areas on the Pacific Rim mentioned in the Strategic Plan.

Limitation to the Pacific Rim also meant that we were not encouraged to consider development of work in Africa, Southwest Asia, or South Asia. DTF members recognized the importance of study of these areas, and we generally accepted our charge to focus most attention for new developments on the Pacific Rim. Nevertheless, omission of Africa from the Strategic Plan provides severe problems for creating intercultural studies at Evergreen, because a major component of American culture has its roots in Africa.

Our charge stated that our report should be in the form of criteria and priorities for further development of international studies. We were not, in other words, asked to develop specific plans for activities, but we were to develop a philosophy and sense of general direction, which, if approved, would be developed in detail by the academic leadership and specific faculty teaching particular programs.

We extracted a series of eleven specific questions from the charge (B, "Special Foci," pp. 7-12), which are listed below. These questions occupied the majority of the DTF's time, and our report emphasizes giving answers to them.

1. How can we best enhance the international content of Evergreen's curriculum?
2. How should we expand the Strategic Plan to give substance and meaning to Pacific Rim studies?
3. How should the teaching of foreign languages at TESC be improved?
4. Should we modify Evergreen's model of study abroad, and if so, how?

5. How should international studies be incorporated into weekend and evening college offerings?
6. How should faculty development be structured in order to enhance the College's ability to teach international studies?
7. What changes should be made in creating opportunities for Evergreen students to pursue international studies, e.g. through internships and study abroad?
8. What changes should be made in student life and the ambience at Evergreen in order to reinforce the enhanced international dimensions of the curriculum?
9. What sorts of changes are needed and how can opportunities best be created for staff development in the area of international studies?
10. Should Evergreen pursue the idea of some sort of permanent base camp for operations abroad, and if so, how?
11. Be bold within a context that is consistent with Evergreen's mission and historical traditions.

We note that our charge did not ask us explicitly to deal with either racism or sexism. Discussions with the Faculty during the writing of our report, however, made it clear that we must address both issues explicitly. Therefore our final report draws attention to the importance of these two issues in building intercultural studies.

Information and Consultation Processes Used by the DTF

The DTF met mostly on a weekly basis during all of the academic year 1988-89. Some meetings were devoted to hearing presentations by invited guests. At others, we considered position papers by members of the DTF or articles by others. A summary of the visitations by guests is listed in Appendix 2.

All faculty were given a questionnaire on the critical issues before the DTF. About fifty percent of the faculty responded, and the results of the survey were important in shaping our discussions. The survey and its results are in Appendix 3.

We attempted to keep a number of people informed about our progress by circulating minutes of our meeting to the President, Provost, Academic Deans, and Agenda Committee, plus to others who requested to receive them. In addition, the DTF chair gave short briefings on our progress to the Faculty Meeting, once in Fall Quarter and once in Winter Quarter.

A lengthy report on the DTF's work was delivered to the Faculty Retreat in May. An additional lengthy discussion with the Faculty occurred in Fall, 1989. These discussions were influential in the revisions made in our final report.

III. Philosophical and pragmatic considerations for Evergreen's stance on international studies

The DTF began its work with both the title and subject of "international" studies foremost in its mind. To be sure, the charge and the Strategic Plan both contained liberal uses of the word "intercultural," but we did not at first see what our work ultimately came to mean for us: International studies must be developed within an overarching framework of intercultural studies.

Conceiving international studies within a framework of intercultural studies was in itself a major conceptual breakthrough for the DTF. As we developed our thoughts, however, we realized that we had come upon an even more significant issue: Intercultural studies for the 1990s represents an unprecedented opportunity for intellectual and educational innovation.

Evergreen, founded in the ferment of the 1960s and early 1970s, achieved its vitality and reputation by pushing the frontiers of legitimate, interdisciplinary, higher education. The DTF believes that the challenge of intercultural studies should be seen as a project that is as important in terms of pedagogical innovation as was Evergreen's original dedication to interdisciplinary studies.

Creating a framework for intercultural studies is a first-class challenge. Intellectual definitions and synthesis, budgetary and fiscal constraints, and the expansion of intercultural/international studies to new groups of students are all involved.

For subject matter, intercultural studies includes at least:

- * the language, values, myths, customs, personal identities, and social relationships of distinctive cultures;
- * the worldviews and ways of knowing, the organization of social, economic, and political life, the ways of relating to nature and resources; and the forms of communication, expression (including art), and decision-making that are characteristic of differing nations and cultures;
- * the various relationships between and among nations and cultures throughout the world, including ways of sensitively accepting and appreciating cultural diversity in our daily lives; and
- * the racism and sexism, here and in other cultures.

Not only must the content of intercultural studies be defined, methods must be developed, both intellectually and pedagogically, for synthesizing the different elements of the field. For example, if intercultural studies is a field, how does a college go about introducing students to it? What constitutes advanced work in the field? What are the minimum foundations for an intellectual program in the area?

One might even ask, is it better to conceive of intercultural studies as a worldview rather than a field of study? If so, what are the implications for developing a curriculum to address the issues of intercultural studies?

Questions of content and synthesis are sure to be difficult to answer, but a number of considerations led us to conclude that not only must "international" be

seen as part of "intercultural," but also that "intercultural" studies is an excellent opportunity for Evergreen to develop innovative programs that are desperately needed as models for American higher education.

Our reasons for reaching this fundamental conclusion about "intercultural studies" providing the most important guideline for developing international studies are varied. Most important, we believe, are the following:

* The United States is a multi-cultural country. Many efforts have been made to identify American culture as a "melting pot," but we believe it more accurate to acknowledge that the American people are better defined as a conglomeration of different peoples and cultures. Distinctions between the cultures are complex as they rest on differences in language, race, religion, national heritage, other features, or mixtures of several of these. Racism and sexism continuously impact the daily lives of the American people and inevitably affect the development of intercultural studies curricula. The DTF believes it is as difficult and as important to structure our educational program around this demographic fact as it is to provide opportunities for students and faculty to work on studies involving other nations and regions of the world. Moreover, no American can hope to understand people outside our national borders without also developing a framework for understanding the cultural diversity within this country. It is particularly important to deal with racism and sexism explicitly in our educational programs.

* We are frank advocates for an educational program that is socially and politically significant as well as of high quality. It is our judgment that the most pressing problems faced by our students will increasingly center on the inabilities of different cultures to live together on a small planet. We are concerned that national educational and political leadership for intercultural harmony has been so weak for many years. The DTF believes that exercising leadership in these matters is important and that Evergreen can provide ideas and resources that will be useful elsewhere as well as here.

* Evergreen is uniquely placed to develop new models for intercultural and international studies. Washington is very much a multi-cultural state with major populations of Native Americans, European Americans, African Americans, and Asian Americans. In addition at least two languages are spoken by large numbers of people here, English and Spanish. Finally, Washington's geography is such that we border another country, Canada, and we are a major importer/exporter of goods to Asia. All of these factors combine in a way to make it reasonable that we attempt to develop international studies within a context of intercultural studies.

* Evergreen's curricular structure and traditions have many advantages for experimentation and innovation in intercultural studies. We believe the field is inherently interdisciplinary and requires faculty of different backgrounds to lead its development. We have an enormous reservoir of experience in interdisciplinary education. Furthermore, our block-plan for programs is well-adapted to use off-campus locations for study. Those places may be either in the United States and its many cultures or in another country. Institutional structure, therefore, is in our favor to take a leadership role in the development of international studies within a context of intercultural studies.

A pragmatic consideration also influenced the development of our conclusions and recommendations: We are a small, modestly-funded college that tends toward large, unmanageable, aspirations to do all things. Our size is likely to be limited to 3000 student FTEs, or perhaps slightly higher, for many years. We cannot, therefore, expect a significant infusion of new faculty hires or other new funds from the State. Our resource base, in other words, is likely to be stable, which means we must create our changes primarily within the resource base we currently have. Creativity and wit in developing new conceptions of how we develop our curriculum and deploy our faculty resources must be at the heart of any new efforts we undertake. Furthermore, if we are to move in new directions, we must not add new tasks for ourselves without ending some work we previously offered.

In the course of the DTF's discussions, we came to the conclusion that we wanted to avoid any misunderstanding that enrichment of "international" studies was in competition with Evergreen's ongoing efforts to make our curriculum more "intercultural." We believe that the unlikelihood of significant new resources from the State is sufficient to require that enhanced international studies must be conceived under the rubric of intercultural studies. The fact that intercultural studies is also the intellectual heart of an innovative international studies curriculum is simply the capstone that would lead us to the same conclusion, even if new resources were in the wing.

IV. Programmatic Analysis and Recommendations

Organizing Intercultural Studies at Evergreen

Our primary recommendation is that Evergreen embrace the development of intercultural studies as the most unique, challenging, and important agenda possible for American higher education in the 1990's.

It is, however, by no means a trivial question about how to engage intercultural studies. What sort of organizational structure should be used to develop a curriculum that is both attractive to students and powerful for the encouragement of their development as citizens?

Evergreen has an ambivalent attitude to formal academic structures. We have banished departments, and at best our affection is mixed for specialty areas as structures in which to organize curriculum. Moreover, we demand and encourage faculty rotation into different parts of the curriculum.

We have tended to opt for "across the curriculum" mandates for many important issues, such as writing skills and dealing with issues of gender and cultural differences. As a Faculty, however, the College has rejected the notion that the Deans should audit or monitor the inclusion of particular subject matter in programs. Faculty autonomy, therefore, has traditionally dominated the

dynamics of program design at the College. Autonomy in program design and faculty rotation has been a prime ingredient in the imagination and success of our curriculum.

Most faculty would acknowledge, however, that the very autonomy that gives us our strengths has an associated weakness: the institution has a poor memory, and it has some difficulty creating a stable curriculum that will be repeated on a regular basis. Most colleges have trouble moving away from a set curriculum; we have trouble adhering to it, even when we want to. Attention to writing skills is perhaps the only item in which the College has nearly achieved its aspiration of "across the curriculum, every year, every program."

These organizational problems weighed heavily on the DTF's mind as we deliberated how to recommend that a serious effort be launched in intercultural studies. It was easy to list what we didn't want:

- * We did not want to make a recommendation that would be wonderful in theory but have no chance of succeeding within the organizational traditions of the College.

- * We did not want to make a recommendation that would fit well with the College's structure yet have no chance of engaging the challenge of intercultural studies in a way commensurate with its importance.

- * We did not want any recommendation that would tend to isolate intercultural issues in a way that freed some faculty of an obligation not to engage them because they were already taught somewhere else.

- * We did not want an organizational structure that would in any way avoid a direct engagement with the pervasive problems of racism and sexism.

Our conclusion is that the College must engage in some "organizational innovation" in order to create a structure that is capable of meeting the challenge of intercultural studies yet compatible with the best features of our traditions.

We recommend that Evergreen institute "The Intercultural Studies Project." The "Project" must be capable of doing two things, which can be separate from each other: First, it must have institutional longevity, i.e. it must have a continuing budgetary allocation and staff FTE associated with it. Second, it must be a place to which faculty are attracted to design curriculum. Our use of the term "Project" symbolizes that creating a high-quality intercultural studies curriculum is likely to be an ongoing challenge for several years.

Our aim for the Project is to create a unit of the College that combines the flexibility and autonomy of program design that currently exists in specialty areas with the stability of ongoing monetary, staff, and space allocations. The Project is neither a specialty area such as we now know them nor a department, which we have rejected for good reasons.

The Project will serve as a home base for several critical functions:

- * encourage the development of new programs on intercultural subject matters;
- * facilitate the improvement of existing programs in terms of intercultural content;
- * promote the development of curricula that engages the issues of racism and sexism in a way that encourages building faculty skills and is conducive to learning by all students;
- * coordinate the overlapping activities and interests of existing programs on intercultural subject matters (e.g. films, speakers, conferences, etc.);
- * coordinate faculty development programs in intercultural studies;
- * serve as an easily identified part of the College in the catalog so that Intercultural Studies has high visibility in the curriculum;
- * provide, in cooperation with Academic Advising, a repository for specialized advising materials for students;
- * provide in cooperation with the Dean of Student Development an office for international students; and
- * provide a locus for developing materials useful in intercultural studies; both here and elsewhere (e.g. publications and conferences on a regular basis).

Structure of the Intercultural Studies Project

A faculty member should serve as the Convener for the Project and have responsibility for intellectual leadership in the coordination of the curriculum that is sponsored by the Project itself. The Project also needs continuing staff support that reflects its importance. The Staff Director and other support staff (probably already existing) would have responsibility for the various administrative and coordinating functions served by the Project.

Faculty membership in the Project should be solicited from all existing areas by self-nomination. Faculty who are drawn to this Project full-time should expect to engage in it over a period of at least several years.

To appreciate the seriousness of what we are proposing, we envision that, within several years of its organization, about 20% (30 FTE) of the entire faculty would be engaged in the programs of the Intercultural Studies Project at any one time. As many as 10-15 programs will be offered by the Project every year. Perhaps as many as 40 FTE faculty would be affiliated with the Intercultural Studies Project.

For comparison purposes, consider that about 25% of our faculty are actively teaching at any given moment in Core and 17% in Science, Technology, and Health.

Our proposal would put the Intercultural Studies Project as the single biggest curriculum generating unit at the College, and only the faculty resources devoted to Core would be larger.

We in no way intend any invidious distinctions between those faculty who are engaged in the Intercultural Studies Project and those who are in an existing specialty area. The College must continue to provide curriculum that requires some of the same structures we now have. Moreover, we do not see the Intercultural Studies Project as having "iron borders." It must contain many faculty who view it as a major and ongoing commitment, but it will also need and want many faculty who would see it as attractive on a once every several years basis.

It should also be understood that the Project, because it is envisioned as a major commitment of College resources, should expect to lead the College in the expansion of intercultural education to all parts of the curriculum as appropriate. What we are attempting to do with the recommendation for the Project is create a critical mass of faculty, staff, students, and resources so that the activities of the Project will benefit of the entire campus.

Some may ask whether the DTF has any specific recommendations about which existing specialty areas might disappear in order to allow the emergence of this new Intercultural Studies Project. We do not, but it is our observation is that many existing programs from the Language and Culture Center, Political Economy and Social Change, Humanities, Native American Studies, Applied Social Theory, Expressive Arts, Environmental Studies, and Science/Technology/Health have high relevance to the curriculum of the Project.

In some cases, Intercultural Studies can be served by existing programs that are "cross-listed" with the Project. In other cases, perhaps some existing specialty areas should cease operations and the faculty join the Project as a place for curriculum design.

We believe that, if the faculty embraces our proposal, a period of ferment and reorganization will occur among our faculty resources. We recognize some faculty may be delighted, others upset. It is only the importance of doing something significant in Intercultural Studies that leads us to propose such a major restructuring of our curriculum and scheme of faculty organization.

Programs of the Intercultural Studies Project

Intercultural Studies must ultimately provide a full range of programs, intermediate through advanced, to study the languages, cultures, literatures, arts, economies, environmental perspectives, and governance schemes of different peoples living inside and outside the U.S. The emphasis will be on comparative studies in order to help students understand their own American cultural backgrounds; therefore, we will provide a special focus on the cultural diversity of the U.S.

Our primary goals are to develop a student's capacity to engage in intercultural communication and to understand diversity in ways of knowing. We believe that students in this area should be versed in four major subjects that define culture: personal value systems, inter-person communications, inter-nation governance, and relations between people and nature.

The size of the new Project is large and might involve up to 600 students and 30 faculty per year. If we assume the typical student works for two years in the area, we must imagine that up to 300 students and 15 faculty would be engaged in entry level work in the Project at any one time. The DTF believes that no more than 4 faculty should be on a team, so we must envision about 4 entry level programs each year.

Each of the entry-level programs will be different in terms of some of their objectives, content, and directions for probable career pathways. We would expect Intercultural Studies, therefore, to have a complexity analogous to Science, Technology, and Health, which has three entry level programs: computer science, physiological and molecular biology, and health.

Foreign language instruction is a major factor to be accommodated in the Intercultural Studies Project. We discuss this subject in detail later, but at this point we want to indicate that most of the entry-level programs would include language study in some way as an integral part of its format. Others, however, might include the role of language or artistic expression in the cultures being studied instead. We see linguistic and artistic expression as essential components of these entry level programs because they so clearly address the cultural ways of knowing and communicating.

An example of an entry-level program with foreign language as an integral part might include three major areas of study: foreign language; cultural expression in the arts; and cultural manifestations of political economic and environmental institutions. We would think of these three divisions as something like 5, 5, and 6 quarter hours, respectively. See Appendix 4.a for details.

Another example for an entry level program might include a year-long coordinated studies program for 12 hours per quarter that would integrate three themes: interpersonal relations, international relations, and relations with nature. As the year progressed, the program would move from a discussion of models to comparison or integration of models to implications for governance. Students would have to take a foreign language concurrently with this program or have a demonstrated ability in a foreign language. See Appendix 4.b for details.

In all entry level programs, the primary purpose would be to demonstrate that there are multiple perspectives for knowing, communicating about, and acting upon the human experience. For example, one approach might be to examine several explanations in environmental science from a western perspective and then from a Native American perspective. In the first, we would study terminology and examine research; in the second, we would hear stories from elders. In another approach, we may be able to find certain environmental phenomena, explained from several points of view, each valid within the context of that society.

For those programs with an integral foreign language component, we would study language with program content in order to understand other cultures' ways of knowing. An important means of understanding culturally different epistemologies is to examine verbal and nonverbal ways people express that understanding through stories, drama, art, dance, and science.

More advanced language students could do some of this work in a foreign language: read, watch films, and listen to some lectures. The content would lend itself naturally to these activities and inspire other students to progress rapidly. The language component would not seem "tacked on," a problem that frequently plagues foreign language instruction.

The advanced programs in the new Project would deal with particular questions or issues from an historical perspective or a contemporary one. These would include an advanced coordinated studies program as well as several group contracts, including programs previously offered in the Language and Culture Center. Some possibilities include:

- * Language and Culture programs with a new focus on diverse cultural groups within those cultural areas where these languages are spoken (French, Japanese, Russian, Spanish). For example, in the French Culture program we have an emphasis on francophone literature, and on French colonialism. Because we are offering a language component in the entry level program, we would hope to attract intermediate and advanced language students in these programs.

- * Timely/timeless issues such as "border zones" which treat our international borders as well as problematic borders elsewhere. (We thank Gil Salcedo for this suggestion.)

- * Advanced programs in environmental studies, which would include the study of comparative political systems and international organizations in environmental governance. Such programs could also address cultural and economic imperialism and its manifestation in environmental concerns. For example, the Indian government has settled in the Bhopal case for an extraordinarily low figure. Why is this the case?

- * Independent study of cultures and languages not covered in our other programs in the form of cluster contracts with intercultural emphasis such as what Lovern King is now providing. These might also be group contracts exploring rich cultures such as Latvia or Egypt.

- * Programs in the teacher's certification program aimed at developing intercultural sensitivities would be excellent additions to Intercultural Studies.

- * Expressive arts programs dealing with comparative or non-U.S. forms of expression could be part of Intercultural Studies as well as Expressive Arts.

- * Internships for students in areas where the population they encounter is culturally very different from their own, both inside and outside the borders of the U.S. We see these internships as indispensable for students wishing to focus on intercultural and international studies.

Foreign language instruction

We recommend enhancing our capacity to teach French, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish. Our goal should be to offer 100 and 200 levels of instruction in each of these four languages each year. We do not wish to exclude the offerings of other languages, such as Czech, Latvian, Polish, Italian, German, and Lithuanian, but we want to emphasize the importance of reaching a critical level of quality and quantity of French, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish before devoting resources to other languages. The DTF believes that it will be essential to add new languages in the future. How to select which new languages, however, will present difficult choices. Appendix 7.c provides criteria and priorities to be considered in the decision making.

An important issue to be addressed is how to structure this language instruction so that it is exciting and accomplishes the goals we establish for it. The language instruction must also meet the needs of people enrolled in Core programs, the entry level programs in the Intercultural Studies Project, and programs in other specialty areas. This DTF with a very broad charge was not able completely to resolve the issues of foreign language instruction, so we recommend that a new DTF be appointed to deal with them in a sharply focused way as a part of the work of the Intercultural Studies Project. Nevertheless, we offer the following suggestions on ways to proceed.

The DTF urges that all programs consider ways to incorporate foreign language instruction. One useful model we have found comes from Earlham College where faculty planned ways to make foreign language studies valid across the curriculum rather than applicable only to the foreign language classroom. They developed a group of "facilitators"--faculty who could help students work with brief but significant passages from the original Spanish, German, French. Cooperating faculty choose the relevant passages.

The advantage of the model is that the facilitators do not need to be fluent in the language, they just need to have good reading ability. In addition, students can work with original passages at an intermediate or advanced level. We would expand the languages offered in this way to fit our faculty profile, adding at the very least Japanese and Russian. We should consider grants to help us train facilitators as Earlham has done. A description of the Earlham model can be found in Appendix 11.

The Project will include the study of foreign languages as a major commitment, but we also envisage as alternatives (or supplements) the study of language and English structure as essential components. This section of the report examines the ramifications of our recommendations for language study in some detail.

We have specific recommendations in the area of distribution of coursework, faculty resources, print and nonprint library resources, a language laboratory, satellite access, computer programs, and interactive video.

First, and most obviously, we will have increased demand for foreign language instruction if some core programs and three entry level programs offer

language instruction. If the Intercultural Studies Project reached the size we recommended above, and if each entry level program offered foreign language instruction, we would be teaching about 300 students in 13 sections of 24 students each:

ENTRY LEVEL PROGRAM NEEDS

LANGUAGE	SECTIONS	HOURS/WEEK	TOTAL HOURS/WEEK
French	2	5	10
Spanish	5	5	25
Japanese	3	5	15
Russian	3	5	15

Note that the total hours/week indicate a full faculty load of class hours in Japanese and Russian, somewhat less in French, and somewhat more in Spanish. Note also that the class size is quite large. This size is permissible only if we expand our print, nonprint, video and computer resources. We should also expect some faculty to take advantage of these language classes.

It may be possible to offer Russian and Japanese in introductory courses only every other year, preparing students to enter the appropriate area studies programs the year following those courses.

Advanced programs in these languages will continue to be taught every two years. If we succeed in generating the interest for language study we anticipate in the entry level programs, we must anticipate more interest in advanced level programs as well. Still, offering these programs more often than every two years does not seem feasible at this time.

To avoid locking faculty able to teach foreign languages into that mode exclusively, we ought to consider our faculty resources sufficient only if we have three faculty in each language area. Consider that these faculty will also act as facilitators in any academic program, an added teaching load.

Training Adjunct Faculty: A major topic of our discussion in ways to improve language instruction centered on adjunct faculty. We take a strong position on adjunct faculty hiring. Only the most qualified adjunct faculty should be considered, and they should be prepared to attend intensive workshops on teaching for proficiency and innovative language teaching methodology. We also recommend the hiring of full time over part time faculty. We have discussed how to coordinate efforts in each language area and ensure innovative, exciting classes. At this point we recommend a sustained program of workshops for all adjunct faculty which provide methodologies, theories, and materials appropriate to our primary goals in language instruction, namely teaching for proficiency with primary emphasis on speaking and listening. Funding for this training should be sought through grants.

The proficiency movement is relatively new, but has established uniform guidelines for achievement at multiple levels. To be trained as an evaluator requires a week long intensive program. We should consider sending at least one representative for each language to that program each year until all of our

the European Economic Community similarly indicated that Americans would have to learn to compete and cooperate with other countries, cultures, and ideas. Although English still is useful as a common language in many places, it is now clear that American college students are poorly served if they do not pay attention to developing some skills in a foreign language. Moreover, they need to learn foreign language within a context that enhances their understanding of how other cultures know, organize themselves, relate to the rest of the world, and develop their natural resources.

In addition, increasing shifts of human population within the United States indicated that although America had always been a multi-cultural society, it was not necessarily a "melting pot." Major areas of the United States now have Spanish as a commonly-spoken language. Development of Native American insistence that treaty obligations be respected indicated that organized cultures persisted, despite years of efforts to extinguish them. Blacks or African-Americans continued their long-standing efforts to achieve equality and dignity within the white majority. Many other "minority" groups also sought to make their culture a vital part of American life.

As a leader in innovative education, the Faculty of The Evergreen State College must embrace the task of making "intercultural literacy" a vital and living component of the Evergreen experience. All Core programs, each specialty area, and the Graduate Programs have an obligation to teach with the explicit assumption that global knowledge includes ways of knowing, communicating, and living that are different from those understood within the Anglo-American or Euro-American tradition. It must be noted, however, that heterogeneity exists even within the Euro-American culture, because Europe itself is hardly a homogeneous culture or language.

To this end, the DTF recommends that the motif of comparative intercultural and international perspective must be considered in the design of every program that is offered at this College. To be sure, the ways in which this motif is incorporated will differ depending on the subject matter and the skills of the faculty member. The goal should be to improve our offerings over time. Financial support must accompany faculty efforts to develop their intercultural and international skills. All of us must take the job as being of utmost importance.

Faculty development in service of intercultural and international studies

Intercultural studies, including international studies, is a difficult and sometimes expensive field in which to work. For this reason, it is essential that Evergreen adopt a procedure that is well-considered and efficient if it is to provide meaningful assistance to faculty development efforts.

The DTF recommends that development assistance to faculty for improvement of intercultural studies be conceived as a "package" in which several elements are brought together:

- * Faculty exchanges within and outside the United States;
- * Provost-designated travel funds for maintaining contacts and experience essential for the curriculum;
- * Arrangements for visiting faculty from the United States and abroad;
- * Student exchanges from other parts of the United States or from abroad;
- * Recruitment of students from specific cultures within the United States or abroad;
- * Library resources;
- * Resources for student services staff to serve the special needs of students who might be recruited to assist in promoting intercultural studies; and
- * Provost-designated grants to develop intercultural themes to be used in the curriculum.

The heart of this recommendation is that the College must consider very carefully exactly how it will build a strong supporting environment for intercultural studies on the Evergreen campus. We believe our past efforts in this regard, although valuable, have not enjoyed the coordination and planning they must have in order to make our resources effectively used. The above package, we believe, has the elements needed to make our resources return benefits with the greatest strength and quality.

As an example of the "package" concept, consider the following example. As a way of implementing the Strategic Plan and this DTF's report, the Faculty, Deans, Provost, and President have agreed that Evergreen should have a program that develops in-depth strength for students to study in a particular "host" country, e.g. Mexico or a Central American republic. Once this strategic decision is made, the faculty development package would consist of the following:

- * the Provost and Deans should work with involved faculty to create faculty exchange opportunities with a Latin American university in the "host" country;
- * the Deans should have a travel budget specifically for faculty who wish to travel to the "host" country or to other countries with high relevance for our "host" in order to do research and maintain currency in their specialty;
- * the Deans and Provost, in collaboration with involved faculty, should work to bring visiting faculty to Evergreen from the "host" country, for example on Fulbright fellowships;
- * if the College has the appropriate support services, we should encourage student exchanges with a Latin American university in the "host" country with which we have worked out faculty exchanges;
- * if the College has the appropriate support services, we should recruit foreign national students from the "host" country to matriculate at Evergreen;

* Library resources should be developed to provide excellent material on the "host" country with which we have faculty and student exchange possibilities;

* the Provost should have a special fund to provide research grants for work on the "host" country.

Library requirements

The DTF believes that our current library resources are inadequate for our current curriculum. It is essential that a major effort be made to upgrade the resources we have: All new curricular offerings in the area of intercultural and international studies must be supported by adequate library resources. Additionally, current library collection and service weaknesses should be addressed before new curricular initiatives are undertaken. Appendices 5 and 6 provide more details about the changes needed.

The Question of Requirements

The DTF debated at some length whether the College should have specific degree requirements for intercultural studies. Our conclusion is that we should aim for the "strong recommendation" rather than pose a specific requirement. We envision the recommendation to be analogous to our advice that all entering freshmen take a Core program. That recommendation is almost universally followed. We believe a comparable set of opportunities, many of which will be available from the Intercultural Studies Project, will provide a similar success for this idea.

To this end, we recommend that the Deans and the Convener of the Intercultural Studies Project develop the appropriate language to be included in the annual catalog. This language should appear prominently in the sections detailing what Evergreen is about, because it will be a major vehicle for informing prospective students about the College's commitments. Admissions and Academic Advising staff also should develop appropriate supporting materials to make "strong recommendation" an important element of Evergreen's program.

Opportunities for Evergreen to develop a more significant international atmosphere

A number of issues before the DTF required us to address how Evergreen could enhance the international-intercultural dimensions of the College. Our options sorted into two major categories: (1) enhance the international-intercultural aspects of the Olympia campus, or (2) expand the relationships of the College

with other institutions of a different culture, either within the United States or abroad, but away from the Olympia campus.

Our attention on the question of what to do about the Olympia campus itself divided into four major ideas, some of which were mutually compatible, some not:

- * Opportunities for faculty members to examine the ways in which racism and sexism affect (1) their own lives and the lives of their students, (2) their subject matters, and (3) their pedagogies;

- * Increase the number of faculty and students of color from the U.S.;

- * Obtain more faculty of non-U.S. background, either as permanent hires, visiting hires, or through exchange programs, either our own or from programs such as the Fulbright program;

- * Increase the number of international students studying at Evergreen, either as matriculated Evergreen students, exchange students here for one or more quarters, or as students on campus through other auspices (e.g. EF Language Institute); and

- * Invite a foreign university to establish a presence on the Evergreen campus in a way that was mutually beneficial to them and to us.

When we turned to actions away from the Olympia campus, our debate again sorted into four different types:

- * Establish a permanent Evergreen "base camp" or "branch campus" abroad;

- * Form a partnership with a foreign university or organization;

- * Join a consortium of other American colleges and universities that jointly undertake instruction abroad; and

- * Develop a network of contacts abroad that generate opportunities for Evergreen faculty, staff, and students to have an experience in a foreign country.

Choosing one or more of the above eight options involves a complex calculus in terms of shaping Evergreen's commitments. Our contribution to what will of necessity be a larger and longer debate is to note that three levels of considerations need to be included in the decision making:

- (1) the basic strategic commitments of the College,

- (2) the explicit criteria to be applied to a particular decision, and

- (3) the competing priorities among the mix of possible commitments and within the criteria affecting a particular option.

In this section we outline our recommendations on what the intent of our strategic commitments should be. We also indicate our sense of priorities about

the possible commitments. Suggestions for explicit criteria for various issues are included in Appendix 7 as examples. Appendix 7.a deals with the criteria for establishing consortial relationships with other institutions. Appendix 7.b focuses on the criteria for creating TESC-sponsored programs abroad. Criteria for expanding foreign language instruction are noted in Appendix 7.c

* The DTF recommends that the College's current commitment to hiring U.S. nationals who are people of color remain the highest priority for the development of strength in the intercultural studies area.

* The DTF recommends that consolidation of our current strength in offering curriculum on cultures speaking French, Russian, Spanish, and Japanese be of highest priority in terms of intercultural studies that demand foreign language skills. Study abroad generally means study of a foreign language, and these are the four foreign languages we are best equipped to teach in terms of faculty strengths. We should not attempt to go beyond these four on a major basis before 1992. If possible, expansion beyond these four should be considered when funding for new faculty hires is available.

* The DTF recommends that it is essential to have foreign nationals on the Evergreen faculty. We cannot speak to exact numbers, but given the probable limitations on our faculty size, we recommend an increased effort to bring foreign nationals to the faculty through exchange programs and visiting positions.

* The DTF recommends that our first priority for students of diverse cultural background must be serving U.S. nationals who are people of color.

* The DTF believes it is valuable to have foreign students at Evergreen, but we are concerned that our current Student Services staff are already stretched too thin. It is educationally unsound to bring foreign students to Evergreen without adequate support services. Recruitment of foreign nationals, therefore must occupy a lower priority unless funds are also obtained to provide support services for them. (We cover this issue in more detail in Section V.)

* The DTF notes that we cannot offer everything by ourselves. Membership in a judicious selection of consortia with other colleges and universities should be seriously explored as a major way of amplifying our offerings. At the same time, these consortial arrangements must be judiciously entered into so that we are not forced to abandon those features of our curriculum that we value highly. Consortial arrangements include relationships with both U.S. and non-U.S. institutions.

* The DTF notes that the East-West debate will continue to exert large influences on world politics, and Evergreen's curriculum should continue to offer materials that will enable our students to obtain an education about those matters. Increasingly, however, the North-South conflict will come to predominate in world politics. For this reason, Evergreen should give increased attention in its curriculum to less-industrialized countries and their interactions with the heavily industrialized parts of the world. This principle is one major reason for making Latin America, rather than Spain, the focus of our efforts that involve Spanish language studies.

One of the most interesting yet vexing problems faced by the DTF centered around the question of building opportunities for our students and faculty to work abroad or in a different culture within the United States. Because our charge was to focus on "international" studies, most of our attention was directed to the issues of study abroad.

Several position papers on study abroad were made available to the DTF or were written by DTF members. Of particular importance were documents that outlined possibilities or proposals for the establishment of a "base camp" owned or managed by Evergreen in a foreign country. Belize and Japan were the two countries for which written documents were prepared, and they are included in Appendix 8.

It should be noted that severe definitional problems are associated with any proposal for a "branch campus." Just what is it supposed to do? Who are its students? Who teaches? Who pays for capital and operating costs? The DTF does not attempt to answer these questions in any more detail than provided in Appendix 8. We note, however, that it is unproductive to have a debate about the merits or lack thereof of a branch campus unless these definitional questions are answered first.

* The DTF is frankly divided over the wisdom of whether the College should have a base camp or a branch campus abroad. A strong, articulate majority believes such a set up is unneeded in terms of providing a good opportunity for matriculated Evergreen students. In addition, the majority believes such a venture is an unwise expenditure of money. This majority is not persuaded of the wisdom of a branch campus, even if funds to build and operate such an institution came from abroad and generated a surplus that could be used by Evergreen, as has been suggested for Japan. The majority fears that such an operation could distort deeply held Evergreen values and traditions.

An articulate minority opinion, however, holds that a branch campus abroad would provide exciting opportunities for Evergreen students and faculty. If it could be run entirely on funds not coming from the State of Washington, the minority believes the branch campus would be worthwhile; if a surplus could be generated, so much the better.

An alternative to establishing a branch campus abroad would be to invite a foreign university, probably Japanese, to establish a base of their own on the Evergreen campus. The College owns land, and a foreign university's presence here could have a high, positive impact on the intercultural-international diversity of Evergreen. The DTF also notes that if non-U.S. nationals want to learn English language and American culture, they are advised to do it here; not in their native land.

Student clientele and the financing of study abroad

One of the most striking pieces of information that emerged in our deliberations was the fact that nationally a rather limited spectrum of American students have studied abroad. Approximately two-thirds of them are women, but only one-third are men. Well over one-half are in the liberal arts, with only small representations from the sciences, business, and education. Four-fifths or more go to Europe with only small contingents going to Asia, Latin America, or elsewhere. (Council for International Educational Exchange, 1988)

We do not have comparable figures for Evergreen, but we have no reason to expect our statistics would be much different with the exception that we send substantial numbers of students to Latin America and Asia as well as Europe.

It is the implications of these figures that give us pause, however. It is refreshing to learn that study abroad nationally seems to be an opportunity that is taken more by women than men. Nevertheless, the proportion may be explained by the idea that men see themselves on faster career tracks than women and thus avoid the "wasting of time" that study abroad may seem to them. If so, it is a deplorable situation and reflects poorly on the messages American higher education has given to men students and their preparation for future life and work.

Our sentiment is that Evergreen must move to tell both its men and women students that they need education in understanding other cultures and languages. Moreover, our strong message must be that students in education, business, and science need such educational opportunities as much as or more than students in general liberal arts programs. Appendix 9 contains a description of how MPI, for example, currently approaches intercultural and international issues.

It is also abundantly clear that opportunities must be available in areas other than Europe. Perhaps only on the latter point is Evergreen "ahead" of national norms.

We also have a strong suspicion that study abroad is seen primarily as a "white ethnic enclave." Expenses of going abroad may partially explain the paucity of people of color who enjoy such an experience, but we fear that other messages may also be discouraging students of color from participation.

Accordingly, the DTF recommends that a major task of the Intercultural Studies Project is to make its programs fit the needs of all students, both genders and all colors, and all areas of study. In addition, the Project, in collaboration with the Faculty, Deans, Provost, Vice President for Development, and President, must work to remove all financial barriers to participation in studies which take a program to live and work in another culture, either here or abroad.

A Need to Reconsider the Strategic Plan

For most of its deliberations, the DTF adhered closely to the dictates of

the Strategic Plan, which indicated that international/intercultural studies should develop first in the Pacific Rim area. Accordingly, our initial thinking was guided closely to considerations of efforts in Latin America and in East Asia, particularly Japan. Discussions with various groups, however, ultimately led the DTF to reconsider its initial stance of not questioning the Strategic Plan. We were particularly concerned with the question of Africa, because so much of American culture is dependent upon its African American component. We were equally concerned with the serious omission of the issues of racism and sexism in the Strategic Plan.

Ultimately we came to the conclusion that we could not effectively engage the issue of racism in an American college unless Africa and the culture of African peoples were included within the Intercultural Studies Project. For these reasons, the DTF recommends to the President that a re-examination of the Strategic Plan is in order, specifically (1) to deal with racism and sexism explicitly and (2) to set a framework within which the College can deal in a substantive way with the cultures and peoples of Africa. In addition, faculty and students who have cultural roots in these areas of the world must perceive that Evergreen's curriculum is a place for them to work.

At the moment, the DTF does not recommend the development of language studies based on Africa. Our sense is that the four languages we identified for improvement (French, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish) must be the foci of our concentration for the next several years.

V. Issues in student services and administration

Three major problems emerged in the area of student services and administration. First, how could Evergreen enhance the attractiveness of intercultural studies to American national minority groups? Second, should Evergreen make a larger effort to attract foreign nationals to our campus, either as regular matriculated students or as some other type of visitor? Third, what sorts of changes are needed to serve students who embark on intercultural studies, particularly those whose study takes them away from the Olympia campus. These three issues are intimately connected.

On the surface, the third problem area deals with questions that could be answered by administrative changes in various student services offices. For example, some students reported it was difficult to register when they were out of the country. Students also pointed out that it was frequently hard to obtain information about opportunities for study abroad. Some expressed a desire for more internship opportunities that would take them overseas. All of these sorts of questions could be resolved by the appropriate student services offices, and the Intercultural Studies Project would be a logical place to develop and coordinate the needed adjustments.

Budgetary and policy questions, however, make easy resolution of any of these issues unlikely. These issues can best be seen by asking which of the

following are of highest priority to the College and to our recommended Intercultural Studies Project:

- * Increased financial aid for American nationals who will not go abroad
- * Increased financial aid for students to study abroad
- * Increased student development staff to advise and support American nationals
- * Increased student development staff to advise and support foreign nationals who are at Evergreen
- * Establishing a program to bring in foreign nationals as matriculated Evergreen students
- * Maintaining a relationship with another organization that brings foreign nationals to Evergreen as tenants (our relationship to EF Languages)

DTF members do not think that they were able completely to absorb all of the student services issues, but we make the following observations about problems that need further attention.

(1) Counseling and advising services designed for American national minorities and low income students (First Peoples Coalition, KEY Special Services) report that they are already stretched thin by the demand for their services. At the moment they are also the only place on campus for foreign nationals to seek assistance. This is a demand that they feel they cannot meet with quality. New staff and training procedures are needed for meeting the needs of foreign nationals. Housing Services is also not equipped to deal well with foreign national students who have problems needing support services.

(2) Evergreen's relationship with EF Languages has had some excellent features, particularly in terms of financial support of auxiliary services, but the DTF notes that the interactions between EF students and ours have not been extensive. We raise the question of whether those contacts can be increased or whether the College should seek more to bring in foreign nationals as matriculated students. Our sense is that the most important reason to have foreign national students on campus is to foster friendships and conversations between American students and their foreign counterparts. Whatever arrangement we have must be supportive of this overall objective.

(3) As in matters of curricular policy, it seems that it is easy to spark a concern that resources aimed at student support services for American minorities are at risk or in competition with resources for student support services for international studies. The DTF believes it is essential to avoid such impressions. One of the duties of the Intercultural Studies Project is to foster the cooperation and communication among all elements of the College so that perceptions of competition for scarce funds do not arise. It is particularly important that efforts to improve the international aspects of Evergreen's curriculum do not come at the expense of serving an increasing number of American national minorities.