

Culture, Text and Language

Self-Study

1998

**CULTURE, TEXT, LANGUAGE
1996-97 PLANNING UNIT MEMBERSHIP**

Co-Coordinator: Bill Arney & Rita Pougiales

Allen
Arney
Balderrama
Bailey
Carlson
Chamberlain-V
Cline-L
Curtz
Daley
Darney-D
Davis, S.
DeDanaan
Estes
Fiksdal-D
Finkel
Foote
Gilbert
Grissom
Hill, P.
Hill, V.
Hitchens
Imamura
Kimbrow-L
Kozick
Krafcik
Lentz
Levensky

Marr
Martin
McCann, C.-R
Moruzzi
Mulka
Nelson, A.
Nisbet, C.
Pailthorp
Pedersen-L
Pougiales
Powell
Rainey
Reed
Rideout-L
Romano
Rutledge
Salcedo
Saliba
Schrager
Sinclair
Taylor, N.
Teske
Thompson
Tsusumi
Wakefield-V
Williams, Sara
Wong, Y.

V = Visitor

L = Library Faculty

D = Dean/Director

R = Retired, teaching one quarter per year

**CULTURE TEXT LANGUAGE
ACCREDITATION REPORT**
Prepared by Bill Arney and Rita Pougiales

The recent, popular literature is as good a place to begin as any. Earl Shorris interviewed Viniece Walker, an inmate in Bedford Hills Correctional Facility in New York. "Why do you think people are poor?" he asked. "'You've got to begin with the children,' she said.... 'You've got to teach the moral life of downtown to the children. And the way you do that, Earl, is by taking them downtown to plays, museums, concerts, lectures, where they can learn the moral life of downtown.'

"I smiled at her, misunderstanding, thinking I was indulging her. 'And then they won't be poor anymore?'

"She read every nuance of my response, and answered angrily, 'And they won't be poor *no more.*'

"'What you mean is—'

"'What I mean is what I said—a moral alternative to the street.'"¹

Culture Text Language is the planning unit in the College that offers programs in the humanities, in the humanistically inclined social sciences, in cultural studies, and in language. It is the part of the college that offers students a moral alternative to the street. It seeks to ensure that its students will never be poor.

Curriculum

Emphases and offerings

The Culture Text Language area offers programs in humanities, social science and languages. While the area has changed name and broadened offerings over the years (most recently, expanding the humanities and social emphasis with language studies) there is much continuity with previous planning units. In the original iteration of this area, European and American Studies, programs focused on literature, history and philosophy. There has continued to be an emphasis on European and American areas of study; for example there are regular offerings in Shakespeare, Victorian Studies, modern European history, western philosophy, American literature, and modern American history. Largely through the continuity of faculty membership, there has been an ongoing set of offerings in each of these areas.

When the area changed from European and American Studies to Knowledge and the Human Condition the curriculum was expanded to include more cultural and media studies. Examples of new programs include Hype and Hucksters and Literary Journalism. And then when the area changed to Culture Text Language the significant addition was language and culture studies. Regular offerings in this area include programs in Japanese, French, Spanish, and Russian. On a less regular basis there are programs offered in Greek, Latin and German. The area has recently agreed to develop an emphasis in Middle East Studies which has implications for additional language programs.

¹ Shorris, Earl, "The Uses of a Liberal Education II. As a Weapon in the Hands of the Restless Poor," *Harper's Magazine* 295 (September, 1997): 50-9, pp. 50-1.

The most significant change in the area has been the inclusion of cultural studies and language. Influenced by the critique in postmodern theory and the changed academic preparation of new and younger faculty members (a reflection of changes in graduate education) the area's offerings have taken on a more culturally critical and interpretive nature.

The members of the area plan curriculum around four major emphases - cultural studies, humanities, western legacy and language and culture. While the faculty are not organized into formal subunits the curriculum is planned and organized around these emphases. "Interpretation," defined most explicitly by the processes involved in reading and exploring meaning in texts (defined quite broadly), is the intellectual core of the area. Any discussion of academic goals, emphases or outcomes originates in our common interest in "interpretation" as a stance toward texts and as intellectual abilities.

Cultural Studies. The area regularly offers programs investigating the cultural consequences of media and technology. Programs are offered emphasizing media criticism, film analysis, critical analysis of computer use, and popular culture. Programs such as Cultural Codes and Virtual College are examples of such programs. Programs currently under consideration include Creative Non-Fiction and User Friendly (program in media and technology). In addition to the study of media and technology such programs include teaching of relevant skills and application of those skills through projects.

Humanities. Members of this area have had a long standing interest in European and American Studies. There are regular offerings in literature and history of the United States, western Europe and eastern Europe. The curriculum reflects recognized literary periods (i.e. Victorian Studies, Romanticism) and geographical areas (i.e. The South, Balkans in Our Time). In addition, programs are organized around critical historical analyses (i.e. Paradigm of Progress and Literature, Values and Social Change). A growing emphasis in the area is on minority views and traditions within these areas. For example, recent offerings include a program on Tina Modotti and a group contract on Nikos Kazantzakis, etc.

Area Studies: Language and Culture. The most significant change in moving from Knowledge and the Human Condition to Culture Text Language was merging humanities and social science programs with programs in language and culture. The concept that brought these two areas together was the emphasis on interpretation and culture. The merger offers great promise for all the faculty involved, allowing for a deepening of the cultural analysis in all of our offerings and forefronting the centrality of language in the study of culture, literature and history of areas of the world. Programs in language and culture tend to be large with teams of three faculty. Programs in Spanish, French, Russian and Japanese are offered on a regular basis. On a more occasional basis programs are offered in German, Polish, Greek and Latin. The themes in the regular programs vary from year to year (i.e. Japan Today, Cultural Transformation of Japan), but there is continuity in the teaching of language, history and culture.

Western Legacy. The area regularly offers programs in the literature, history and philosophy of the western European classical period. We have offered programs that include Latin and Greek, although such programs are not offered on a regular rotating basis. We have offered such programs as Classical World: Greek, Out of the Cave: Plato, and Classical World: Roman Tradition. The offerings in this area have fallen over the last year with a series of faculty retirements. The interest is high, for both students and faculty; we expect to do more hiring of faculty to support this area.

What Do Students Learn?

Culture Text Language planning area has, as a central academic theme, the idea of interpretation. Area members maintain that it is the intellectual processes associated with interpretation—ability to read primary texts, to understand the literary and substantive content of a text, to interpret the meaning of a text—that must be used to uncover “student learning outcomes.” A faculty member in the program Paradigm of Progress wrote about her team’s efforts to place interpretation at the center of their efforts. “We had a strong sense of what we wanted our students to get - strong writing skills, strong ability to present and defend material, to be able to do analysis of historical data, of poetry and literature, and to be able to better assess statistical and numeric information.”

There is much discussion, often debate, among members of the area about the nature and place of “interpretation” in our common work. While the members have yet to establish a working definition or position on “interpretation,” it is used to define our emphases (we often describe ourselves as offering programs in humanities, language and the *interpretative* social sciences) and is the title given to the one program we are considering offering as a regular entry-level introduction to the area - “On Interpretation.” A program with that title is being offered this year, another one is planned for next year. This year’s program team wrote the following description:

This program prepares students for sophisticated work in the humanities and interpretive social sciences (fields like anthropology, sociology, history, and some sorts of psychology). Such disciplines attempt to understand human acts—from slips of the tongue to religious rituals, sonnets to political choices, cartoons to painted church ceilings. They all involve the same fundamental intellectual process—interpreting situations that have multiple sources of meaning, including the intentions of the actor, what some audiences make of those actions, and other contexts as well. We will pay close attention to the methods and tools of various disciplines, to ideas about the functions and values of art and to analyzing and critiquing philosophical arguments about what is involved in claiming to understand someone else’s actions.

Through different iterations of this program, along with the ongoing discussions in our area, we will determine whether to offer the program on a regular basis and clarify any common, area-wide agreements we want to make about “interpretation” and its relation to area programs.

In addition to an emphasis on interpretation, a number of faculty members link the academic content and intellectual emphases of the area to broader political and public concerns. One faculty member wrote about her program emphases in the following way:

It is my own belief that teaching the liberal arts must encompass teaching the practice of democracy, self reflection, responsibility for ones’ own learning and acts, and providing for humanizing experiences of shared power. In order to teach this way, I must give up the role of “expert” and model dialogue as well as action. I must ask deepening questions and challenge assumptions, opinions and lazy talk.

An emphasis on interpretation or the more public and political concerns in programs is not made at the expense of the substantive content of the curriculum in CTL. The area has very regularly offerings (described above) while also avoiding a set curricular pathway or set progression of programs. The latter curricular strategy is not possible given the numbers of faculty in our area, the high number of our faculty who teach outside of the area, nor does it fit with the faculty members’ primary interest in helping students to learn to read, write and make sense of the textual artifacts of their world.

There is, though, much agreement on the nature of the intellectual experience students have in programs. And it is the dimensions of this experience that must be clarified and analyzed for

insight to student learning. What follows are descriptions from faculty members of what they intend students to learn.

Faculty Generated Criteria The faculty's pedagogical intentions, the closest we might legitimately get to defining "learning outcomes" in our area, come in large measure from a shared judgment on the nature of academic work. For many it is understood that programs are designed to be collegial, intellectually engaging and shaped by the disciplinary traditions of those subjects taught within the area. In addition, the members of the area have adopted the concept of "interpretation" to reflect the intellectual processes at the heart of our common, curricular efforts. Thus the area is distinguished by flexible and open-ended curricular subareas (i.e. humanities, cultural studies, language and culture, Western tradition) and a common interest in the nature of the intellectual engagement for both students and faculty.

In the faculty questionnaire administered to area members in the summer of 1997 a number spoke about the academic accomplishments of students who participate in our programs. Comments such as the following were typical: "...we value studies that depend upon primary texts, on active research, on open questioning and on questions that require interdisciplinary study. I think students who work lots in CTL are really good at textual interpretation, pretty good at writing, and really good at understanding interdisciplinary study." Another faculty member who teaches primarily in the sciences wrote, "This was a group of students who were good academically. I've not had another group quite like them, and we all felt honored to work with them. Academically, they succeeded as well, some more than others, of course. But the good ones did projects of nearly graduate level work and the poor ones did projects that easily were the top pieces of work they had ever done and nearly all did the best work that they were capable of."

There are additional criteria in the language and culture offerings. Those shared among the language programs include (1) embedding the teaching of language with knowledge of the culture, (2) acquiring proficiency in all forms of language including listening, speaking, reading and writing, (3) developing cross cultural knowledge and (4) learning of language and culture within an historical context. In a report to the Long Range Curriculum DTF in the spring of 1995, faculty member Alice Nelson summarized the philosophy of the area. She wrote, "...we believe that learning language is the key to understanding other cultures, so we teach language and culture together. That is, we teaching language through cultural study, and culture through the study of language.."

Programs in language and culture area are designed as year-long and intensive. From the beginning of the program students are doing some amount of their work in the target language. All lectures are given in the language, as well students take tests, write papers and make presentations in the target language. By the end of the year it is expected that all students have proficiency in listening, speaking, reading and writing, and have completed the equivalent of two years of a college-level foreign language. Levels of proficiency and means of assessment are determined by the faculty within the programs.

In addition to these programs, students have the option (sometimes it happens within the programs) for foreign travel and study. Such travel is coordinated through the program faculty or through the office of international studies.

What do we know about student learning? From a review of student evaluations written by faculty there is a definite bias toward evaluating student achievement in academic skills and interpretations. The faculty comment regularly on the student's ability to read primary texts, to understand the content of those text and to interpret, to explore the meaning of those texts.

The most common bases for evaluation is student writing and participation in seminar. The programs offered in the area tend to include two to three seminars a week along with weekly or bi-

weekly writing; the faculty tend to provide ample opportunity for students to develop those skills and to receive regular feedback. The students are regularly, actively involved in intellectual activities where they are expected to interpret and analyze. This emphasis significantly influences learning outcomes in Culture Text Language.

The faculty in the area do not have a common basis for evaluating student ability in writing, interpreting and speaking. There are two influences that shape the review of student work. First, faculty tend to assume that the nature of the program bears directly on student learning and desired outcomes. For example, the material, the kind of reading, relevant for a program in philosophy or American literature establishes the criteria for evaluation; some areas of study require logical analysis, others a more contextual or textual analysis and evaluation of student learning must be based on the nature of the material being studied. Secondly, faculty tend to differ in the extent to which they try to explicitly teach these skills.

The best source of insight on student learning is contained in the major projects they complete. Each student's particular progress in reading, speaking and writing culminates around a major piece of "work" - their own intellectual work. (The portfolio projects included with our area's primary data includes a rich supply of student work). For example, a student in the Paradigm of Progress program opened her final paper with this statement of her focus and scope, "I will examine Elizabeth Gaskell's literary contributions in *Household Words* as a way to bring into the foreground the significance of how her writing and her relationship with Charles Dickens outlines the conflict Victorian women faced attempting to reconcile family obligations with individual freedom and achievement." That statement reflects a number of important emphases - textual analysis, literary analysis, sociology, history and political philosophy and history. As an "artifact" of student work in our area, it is a good example of student learning that blends the best of reading and research with a developed ability to think critically and creatively about a subject.

Students in twelve of the area's programs were given the CSEQ questionnaire. 57% percent of those students completed the questionnaire. Those 186 students represented about a third of the students enrolled in the area's programs. There were a number of categories where CTL students measured higher than the college's average. These categories included the following: ability to think analytically; understanding of the arts; broad general education; seeing importance of history; ability to learn on own; acquaintance with literature; understanding other people; aware of other philosophies and cultures; ability to put ideas together and see relationships; development of values, ethics; knowledge of the world; and writing clearly and effectively. Those categories in which CTL students scored very high were seeing the importance of history and acquaintance with literature. These better than average measures are closely connected to the academic emphases in the area: the content of the programs tend to be in humanities and the interpretative social sciences; students read original work and are urged to interpret them; students write often; and the themes and content of programs are historically and culturally based.

That same group of students completed the college Student Survey. When asked about what they had learned in light of the college's five academic foci, they scored very high (results are tabulated on table below). Of particular note are the large number of students who felt they had learned a great deal through "interdisciplinary education" and those who felt a strong sense of "personal engagement" in their studies. These two measures reflect well on the academic breadth of programs in the area, as well as the substantive (intellectual as well as personal) engagement encouraged for students.

Five Foci
Reported Experience by CTL Students

Five Foci	A great deal A	B	C	D	Not as all E
Interdisciplinary Education	47.1%	37.9%	10.9%	1.7%	2.3%
Collaborative Learning	35.1%	47.7%	12.6%	2.3%	2.3%
Teaching and Learning Across Differences	35.6%	42.5%	13.2%	5.2%	3.4%
Connecting Theory and Practice	35.1%	44.3%	14.4%	4.6%	1.7%
Personal Engagement	61.5%	32.8%	4.6%		1.1%

(The reader of this report is urged to review a separate study done by Tracy Wuster, a student from CTL. Tracy was interested in understanding faculty members' reasons for reading and teaching fiction. He designed and carried out an interview project with the faculty in CTL. His final paper is exemplary of the kind of intellectual work students can achieve in our area.)

Culture Text Language as a Planning Unit

The 1986 review of the Humanities Specialty Area began by noting that the catalogue described the area as "a group of faculty" and went on to lament the fact that the area was little more than a group, despite the fact that area members "did excellent, even outstanding work in teaching the programs offered by the Specialty Area." The report ended with a series of recommendations to make the area into a collegiate Division. Culture Text Language, the Planning Unit that is the successor to the broad area of teaching in the humanities, is a well functioning area of the college. It is not a Division in the sense envisioned by the 1986 report and in many respects the membership of the Unit is still best described as a "group." But after two years, the Unit appears to do well what the College expects of it. Members of the area come from a broad spectrum of disciplines; members still do "excellent, even outstanding work in teaching"; the work that needs to get done by the group gets done.

The Nature of the Group

Catalogue copy describing the Unit begins:

Charles McCann, the founding president of the college, spoke about teaching and learning at Evergreen in the following way:

"This college has collected scholars who, insofar as they inquire into their fields of interest, will by their presence here together form a living link between our present society and the past, a source of power with which to help us all meet the future. Students will work as colleagues with faculty and others, and together these people will TRY (that word is emphasized because it involves all of the college's people in continual change) to create a place whose graduates can as adults be undogmatic citizens and uncomplacently confident individuals in a changing world."

The faculty members in the Culture, Text and Language² share these views and offer programs in which faculty and students alike engage in scholarly inquiry into our social world. Programs in this area focus on questions related to knowledge and interpretations of the social world. Those questions are explored with content and strategies from the humanities, integrating perspectives from the social sciences, practices in the arts and natural and physical sciences.

The faculty members in Culture, Text and Language invite students to join them in the programs they offer and together create a "living link" between our present society and the urgent questions before us and the past. This area is distinguished in that its members' backgrounds and interests span the full breadth of the liberal arts, including humanities, sciences, arts and social sciences. As such it offers intermediate and advanced interdisciplinary programs relevant to all students at the college.

Former President McCann's description of the function of a liberal arts education is a good basis for thinking about our work in this area. Beyond such a broad conception of a liberal arts education, members of the area differ in their sense of what the area should be doing. Many people think that, in some way, the idea "story" and the practices of "story telling" are at the heart of our work. Others think that exposure to other cultures and training in other languages are important. The catalogue copy provides a general conception of the area and, perhaps more important, a statement of a principle that this area invites students to join in our inquiries. McCann's conception of the liberal arts along with this pedagogical principle form the axis around which this group gathers. But differences are central to this group.

And a group it is. Some members are long-standing members of the humanities area and the other college structures devoted to humanistic studies. Others are committed professors of language and culture, an area of study added into this Unit by the recent rearrangement of the college's curriculum. But many are refugees from other fields. (Members of the unit who are refugees are also humanistic scholars and have a commitment to teaching in the humanities.) The co-coordinators are both social scientists by training, for example, who did not want to be part of the feuds in the Social Science Unit. Two people came to CTL from scientific inquiry because they were opposed to the planned curriculum approach (see below) in SI. Again, however, they are both humanists: Tom Grissom, a physicist, is also a published poet and Josie Reed, a mathematician interested in the history of mathematics, also teaches writing. There is little internal to the area that binds this collection of faculty into something that could be called more than a "group."

² There is some dispute about whether we are more properly called "Culture, Text and Language" or "Culture, Text, and Language" or "Culture, Text, Language" or "Culture Text Language." In our opinion, it's good to have a place in the College where commas and conjunctions are matters of substantive concern.

The covenant signed by every member of the planning unit is very simple. It contains three points. Every member agrees to participate in decision making. Every member acknowledges that the decisions of the group are binding on all members. And the members agree to delegate to the coordinator(s) the authority to call meetings, represent the group to the deans and other coordinators, and to help plan the inter-area curriculum. Finally, the covenant says that anyone who will abide by the covenant is welcome in the area.

There was some effort (which may persist) to organize the Unit into sub-units. Those sub-groups were: The Western Legacy, Language and Culture, and Area Studies. These served well for the purpose of some discussions regarding the formation of the curriculum in the early stages. They may be useful in the future, but they achieved no sense of permanency.

There was one major change in the Unit brought about by the reconfiguration of the College into Planning Units. Each Unit was to choose a coordinator and—and this is the key change—the coordinator was to receive released time from teaching in the spring quarter. Two of the principal responsibilities of the Academic Deans—initiating hiring discussions and coordinating the formation of curriculum—devolved onto area coordinators. Coordinators attend meetings, not unlike Specialty Area coordinators, of the PUCs (Planning Unit Coordinators) and discuss issues related to hiring, staffing, and curriculum primarily, although some discussions range farther afield into matters of general college policy. Coordinators serve more in the capacity of department chairs than Specialty Area coordinators did, even though they still have no control over budgets, no near-final say in hiring, and no power except persuasion and negotiation over teaching assignments. They are very low-level academic administrators.

CTL selected Sarah Pedersen as its first coordinator. (She served, actually, before the spring released-time policy was instituted.) She effectively organized the group, conducted the discussions that led to the formulation of the 1996-97 curriculum, and shepherded the Unit's first hiring proposals through the hiring process (as well as representing the area in the Long-Range Hiring DTF's discussions that resulted in that process).

At the end of AY 1995-96, all the Units selected coordinators to serve an initial two-year term. CTL chose Bill Arney and Rita Pougiales to serve as co-coordinators. They conducted discussions early in the year regarding the structure and function of the area. They coordinated formulation of the curriculum, including a proposal from the area for an alternative to traditional Core programs. They organized discussions around the area's hiring interests and brought the area's hiring proposal to the college's hiring DTF. Their other major responsibility has been preparation of material for purposes of accreditation. They chaired meetings of the Planning Unit. They shared responsibility for attending meetings outside the unit. They have not effected a rigid division of labor; in general, theirs has been a shared co-coordinatorship.

Planning Unit Practices

Meetings: We began AY 1996-97, at the fall Faculty Retreat, with a discussion of the kinds of meetings we needed or wanted to have for the year. The coordinators initiated the discussion with the question of whether there was any reason to have any meetings at all. The consensus was, yes, we should have some, not many, probably not all that were scheduled in the academic calendar, and they should be devoted primarily to those issues on which the group needed some discussion. There was general agreement that Unit decision's would be made by those who attended the meetings. Meetings throughout 1996-97 tended to be short and to the point of the published agenda. Some questions that seemed, to some, closed, were still open at subsequent meetings. This caused some consternation but not so much that it became dysfunctional. We wouldn't say that there is better attendance than noted by the 1986 review. The group is still a group and many people attend only those meetings in which they perceive they have an immediate stake. (Indeed, some people do not attend any meetings at all. Some have said that they feel they were

"registered" with CTL by the deans, that they have no fundamental area-based concerns, and they prefer not to attend.)

Forming Curriculum: One of the main tasks of AY 1996-97 was formulating the curriculum for AY 1998-99. Some planning had occurred and, indeed, some teaching teams and their programs had been formed before the start of the year. Some planning occurred at the fall Faculty Retreat. Coordinators sent out a call for curricular proposals early in the year. They worked with area members individually and in small groups to put together a curriculum. In the winter, coordinators brought all proposals to the area to discuss "coverage." Some "holes" were noted and the coordinators worked with members to fill some of them. There was constant pressure throughout the year, first from the deans and then from the PUCs as a group and then from CTL coordinators, to staff Core and Inter-area offerings. CTL responded to these requests (but see the discussion of the area's "Alternate Core" proposal below) and, by the end of the year, the deans seemed reasonably satisfied with the curriculum as a whole.

We strongly suspect that CTL will continue to formulate curriculum on a more or less *ad hoc* basis. After all, the members of the area are more of a group than, say, a pool of human resources available to staff a pre-figured curriculum. Indeed, this practice marks this Unit off from the others in the college and has been the basis of some intellectually important antagonisms between CTL and the other Planning Units (discussed below).

Hiring Decisions: All hiring is done on a college-wide basis, at least in theory. Planning Units only initiate proposals for hiring. Those proposals are forwarded to the Long-Range Hiring DTF, which makes recommendations to the Academic Deans and Provost regarding the college's hiring priorities. The Deans and Provost, who set the budgetary parameters within which hiring takes place, either accept the list of hiring priorities or come back to the DTF to negotiate a final list of hires.

CTL had a long series of discussions about hiring during AY 1996-97. During that year, the college hired Bill Ransom as a faculty member in creative writing. (This fills, finally, one of the pressing needs noted in the 1986 review.) The approved hire in Comparative Religion was put off until AY 1997-98. Beyond that the area settled on a hiring proposal for five positions: European History, American Studies, Classics, Middle East Studies, and Anthropology. The DTF agreed, dependent on budgets, to hire people in European History, American Studies, and Middle Eastern Studies, all of whom would begin service in AY 1998-99. While there was some disappointment about "losing" the anthropology position and less about the classics position, this aspect of our work together seemed satisfactory and successful.

Collection of Data: The co-coordinators have the responsibility for collecting data for and writing the accreditation report. The group has shown itself, again, to be a group, in the good and bad sense, when it comes to these activities. The co-coordinators issued pleas for everyone to submit a *curriculum vitae*, descriptions of programs offered in the past five years, and a statement of scholarly and artistic activity. After many pleas, we received *vitae* from 70% of our members, program descriptions from 15%, and statements of scholarly activity from 40%. This seemed a low response to us. The other side of this is the fact that the academic dean in charge of summarizing the college's statements of scholarly activity said that he had had his best response from Culture Text Language.

Representation of CTL to the rest of the college: Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the planning unit's work this year has not taken place in the unit but in other institutional venues. The co-coordinators have represented the unit and its interests in Planning Unit Coordinator meetings,

attended by all the coordinators and chaired by Academic Dean Jin Darney, in a group working on catalogue format, in public relations efforts, and in the Long-Range Hiring DTF.

It was in the Long-Range Hiring DTF, and less so in the PUC meetings, that we learned about an important fault line that seems to separate CTL from the other planning units. In his presentation of the unit's hiring proposal, co-coordinator Bill Arney said of the area that we have the clearest rules for curriculum formation in all of the college, viz., that, generally speaking, our curriculum consists of what our members want to teach. (See below for the connection between this view and our hiring efforts.) We do not, he said, have a pre-figured curriculum that must be "staffed" by faculty who are viewed as "human resources." Instead, our faculty's offerings constitute the CTL curriculum. Period. This set off a small firestorm of commentary, particularly from the sciences, on the question of why members of one area get to teach what they "like" while members of other areas are, apparently, being slotted into preformed curricula. Subsequent discussion and reflection led us to realize that there is a division of views on how the College should function. We can put the matter this way: Are we a college or are we a demand responsive, consumer oriented institution?

One scholar has dated a change in higher education in the United States away from a collegiate orientation and toward a demand responsive orientation to the post-World War II period.³ By "demand responsive," Joel Spring meant that institutions began to base their offerings and work (particularly research work) on demands external to the institution. Students became, eventually, "consumers" of a "product" offered by colleges and universities who made demands. Those institutions that were "successful" were those which, on the teaching side, could meet the demands and compete for students and, on the research side, could compete for funding by outside entities demanding research that was useful. Colleges and universities shaped themselves to these two sets of demand. Historically, colleges had been shaped by the interests and work of scholars. Of course, they paid attention to students and the world around them, but the prime mover of collegiate work was the scholarly activity of the members of the college. This factor seems to have lost much of its force in the late twentieth century.

Of course, Evergreen was founded in the collegiate tradition. (Indeed, one of the more memorable moments was a vote in response to a Provost's proposal to rename the institution as a university. Byron Youtz, a beloved administrator, seemed to want the name change as part of his legacy, which made the vote of the faculty *against* the proposal that much more dramatic.) Faculty offered programs based on their interests and based on their readings of what were important questions in the world at the time. The College was originally fashioned as a part of the late-sixties protest against the changes in colleges and universities described by Spring.

It would not be unfair to describe recent structural changes in Evergreen as moving in the direction of "consumer orientation" and "demand responsiveness." (The state legislature has tied some funds directly to meeting statistical goals that are "consumer" oriented. The coordinator for Environmental Studies notes, whenever the chance arises, that "70% of entering students are actively concerned about the environment" as a way of justifying his requests for more resources.) In that context, Culture Text Language is seen (by people inside and outside the area) as the locus for "the old Evergreen" way of doing things. Detractors of this view suggest that we are sticks in

³ Spring, Joel H., *The Sorting Machine: National Educational Policy Since 1945*, New York, N.Y.: McKay, 1976.

the mud, dinosaurs,⁴ etc. Others see CTL as representing an important, intellectually defensible position in the academy today. Indeed, that is why we have members from all areas of inquiry.

Members of our area believe that their work *is* the curriculum of the area. What they decide to offer is what the students should take. (This is not a naively faculty-centered view. Our members, of course, pay attention to what students are interested in and formulate their curricular offerings by slaloming between their expertise and their understanding of student concerns.) As the catalogue copy says, students are *invited* to participate in the work of our programs. This invitation is the traditional heart of a college, and it is on this invitation that CTL rests its claim to intellectual, collegiate respectability.

Parenthetically, the antagonisms between CTL and the other planning units may help contribute some measure of cohesion to the area. It's a principle of sociology that an external threat or antagonism is one of the best ways to give a bunch of people a sense of being a group. The only question is whether our members are enough of a group now to notice that there are other groups arrayed against us.

Planning Unit Functions

The new Planning Units have two basic functions: formulating curriculum and making hiring proposals.

Curriculum Planning:

The catalogue describes our curriculum this way:

Culture, Text and Language offers programs in language and culture, area studies, cultural studies, philosophy and psychology. In the language and culture offerings students have an opportunity for intensive, challenging, interdisciplinary study. The study of language at Evergreen is integrated fully with the study of culture. Because we believe that learning languages is the key to understanding other cultures (and vice versa), we teach them together. That is, we teach language through the study of history, literature, philosophy and art; and culture through the study of language.

Spanish and/or Latin American cultural studies are offered each year. Programs of Japanese and Russian studies occur on an alternating two-year cycle, as do programs centered on French-speaking cultures of Europe, Africa and the Caribbean. Latin or Greek is also offered every two years in the program The Classical World. Programs in Irish studies, German studies and sociolinguistics are offered periodically.

The area also offers programs in cultural studies with emphases in anthropology, sociology and psychology. The focus of these programs includes ethnography, popular culture, media studies and cultural theory. In these

⁴ Some years ago someone anonymously sent dinosaur pins out to some members of the faculty. This occurred at a time when the administration was trying to update the college and when the most popular joke heard from candidates for president was, "It is often said that changing a college is harder than moving a graveyard." For a time the dinosaurs wore their pins as badges of honor/protest. The table in the CAB where a bunch of older faculty ate became known as "the dinosaur table."

programs current issues, events and practices offer foci for exploring relevant historical and philosophical traditions.

The area regularly offers programs that inquire critically into European history and philosophical traditions. Programs are organized around rigorous study of key texts such as Plato's *Republic* or Hannah Arendt's *The Human Condition*. Program emphases include philosophy, history, political theory and literature.

Note: For students interested in part-time language studies, modules are offered, mostly in the evening, in French, Spanish and Russian at the first- and second-year levels. In addition, summer programs are available for intensive language study. Evergreen also participates in several study-abroad programs that encourage language fluency.

CTL had extensive discussions about two issues this year. The first was a question of how much "pre-figuring" of the curriculum was sufficient or good for the unit. The second came from the first and concerned our view of the Core Programs.

At the fall Faculty Retreat, the co-coordinators initiated a discussion of how much pre-figuring of the curriculum was acceptable or important. This discussion was motivated by two things: first, the college's requirement that we lend 20% of our members' time to Core and 20% to inter-area programs and, second, a discussion from the previous year that concluded that it would be good if the area would offer a program in either "Interpretation" or "Great Works" each year. The Faculty Retreat discussion focused on the first issue.

The conclusion of a probing discussion was that CTL faculty are unwilling to accept any pre-figuring of the curriculum beyond what is absolutely essential. Additionally, the area voiced an intellectually defensible concern about Core programs and made a proposal to the College for an "Alternative Core" program. Furthermore, the area said that the way it prefers to meet the College's requirements about Core and Inter-area staffing is by planning the curriculum first and then looking at whether the result meets the requirements. (That is, the area objected to planning Core and Inter-area programs first and then planning the remainder of the curriculum.) The area left it to itself and the persuasive powers of the coordinators to correct any problems with the distribution of effort. The CTL faculty made their position on how to plan curriculum quite clear and this was the position the coordinators represented to the rest of the college for the remainder of the year.

Attached is the Alternative Core proposal. Many members of the area felt that Core has become a kind of first-year ghetto. They argued, based partly in empirical studies by Sam Schragger and earlier work by Kirk Thompson, that first-year students do as well or better, certainly not demonstrably worse, if they are in programs with non-first year students (but with faculty who will accommodate first-year people). The area agreed to meet its 20% Core commitment by offering both Core programs and a number of "all level" programs that would admit a varying percentage of first-year students. The proposal was not well received administratively, as might be imagined, since it would require an additional layer of registration machinery. The Academic Dean and Registrar called a meeting, attended by no one, at which they set the rules for all-level programs. They decided that all-level programs would admit 25% first-year students and that slots would be reserved for them, which meant that any program designated "all-level" would virtually be guaranteed 25% new students. This was contrary to faculty interests, but there have been no complaints so far. More worrisome is the fact that the perennial late-year fuss about an "understaffed Core" happened again this year. The CTL faculty made this alternative Core proposal as a serious alternative, but it has not been taken *entirely* as such. We have gotten some

measure of consideration for the idea, but it has been treated mostly as an administrative and logistical *problem*, not so much as a good idea. The first major salvo against the proposal came in the form of a study of retention rates. Freshmen in all-level programs have fairly high drop-out rates.

The other "pre-figuring" issue is the question of whether CTL ought to offer "Interpretation" or "Great Works" every year. This is mostly an internal matter; however, it could be an external concern if people begin to think that we have no "entry" program for the area. Some members of the area are strong proponents of the idea that we *must* offer either "Interpretation" or "Great Works" on a consistent basis. They argue that this is the only way to insure that students have the basic skills necessary to pursue advanced studies in the humanities. They argue, further, that the area, in AY 1995-96, made the decision to offer this sort of "entry" program. This is a continuing sore point for some members and their concerns were voiced in the faculty questionnaires. The problem with this view is that it conflicts with the area's voiced interest in not being willing to accept any pre-figuring of the curriculum and in not planning certain parts of the curriculum before others. The coordinators, who have little authority to enforce the offering of this or that program, have decided to proceed on an *ad hoc* basis. We intend to let the proponents of a yearly offering of "Interpretation" or "Great Works" have their say each time we start planning curriculum, have a look at whether the offerings of our members cover their concerns, and hope for the best. We have no good way of compelling people in CTL to offer these programs.

Curriculum: The Culture Text Language planning area was in its first year of operation in 1996-97. It is a new area composed of what were three separate areas: Knowledge and the Human Condition, Language and Culture Center, and Center for the Study of Science and Human Values. Each of these areas offered programs on a regular, annual basis. Thus, in looking at the previous five years of curricular offerings we have included programs offered from each of these areas.

The programs reviewed for this study were offered during academic years 1992-93 through 1996-97. For the first four years the three combined areas, on average, offered between 17 and 19 programs; typically the Language and Culture Center offered 3 to 4 programs, Center for the Study of Science and Human Values offered 2 programs, and Knowledge and the Human Condition offer 10 to 12 programs. In academic year 1996-97 that number jumped to 38 offerings, the largest increase was in humanities offerings. See charts labeled Disciplinary Breadth for 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97.

The average length of programs changed markedly over these years. Whereas in 1992-93, 43% of the programs were 3 quarters in length, (36% two quarters, and only 21% one quarter in length) by 1996-97 those percentages were reversed. 13% of the programs offered that year ran for three quarters and 50% ran for 1 quarter. So the large increase in numbers of programs offered is partially explained by the increase in numbers of one quarter programs. But the gradual reduction in three quarter programs merits discussion in the area.

Most of our programs awarded credits in humanities and social science. In academic year 1992-93, 57% of the programs included credits in *only* those two areas. 14% of the programs offered only humanities credits and 21% offered credits in humanities, social science and either art or science. In academic year 1994-95, 77% of the programs awarded credits in humanities and social science. By 1996-97, the percentage was 64%. It appears that in years when the percentage of programs offering humanities and social science credits is high, those programs with only humanities credits is lower; and then the reverse, in years when programs with humanities and social science credits is low, as in 1995-96 when it was at 33%, those programs offered only in the humanities is high (53% that year). See chart titled Summary of Programs on next page.

We feel attention must be given to what we have found about disciplinary breadth. There are very few programs that offer credits other than in humanities and social science. Our limited breadth may not reflect the intention of the area members, who have often described themselves as representing the full academic breadth in the liberal arts.

Enrollment: Enrollment in the area has increased over the last five years, that increase has paralleled the merging of the previous three areas (Knowledge and Human Condition, Language and Culture, and Center for the Study of Science and Human Values) and the overall increase in the number of offerings in Culture Text Language. The table below includes enrollment data for the last five years. Included in the table are the enrollments in the full time programs as well as in 4-credit modules offered by the area.

Enrollment in CTL for 1993 Through 1997

Academic Year	Knowledge and Human Condition	Language and Culture	Center for Study of Science and Human Values	Modules ⁵
1993-94	264	108	57	28
1994-95	262	206	22	34
1995-96	227	113	107	40
	Culture Text Language	Language programs within CTL		
1996-97	511	140		58

The overall increase in enrollment in the area is a result of the merging of previous areas; it also reflects an overall increase in the membership in CTL. Following the Long Range Curriculum DTF report, which included the adoption of new planning units, a number of faculty left other areas to affiliate with CTL. We assume that enrollment in the area should stabilize as we also establish a pattern of program offerings. For example, in 1998-99 we are offering a higher than usual number of one-quarter, one-faculty group contracts in literature. In subsequent program planning we should move back toward broader programs with faculty teams.

Hiring: As mentioned above, CTL has been successful with hiring proposals for the past two years. We will hire at least five people over a two to three year period. We will fill, in addition to the Creative Writing position, positions in Comparative Religion, European History, American Studies, and Middle East Studies.

The last position—Middle East Studies—is, again, the fulfillment of a long-standing, nearly forgotten commitment of the faculty to hire in this area. It was only because of the strong, persistent efforts of a few members of our area together with having in our area the chair of the DTF that recommended a hire in Middle East Studies to the faculty eight years ago that the area made its successful proposal this year. The discussion of this proposed hire highlighted a certain tension in our area. The tension is not easy to characterize well but it does have to do with a tug between hiring to replace retiring faculty in traditional fields in the humanities and hiring in areas of new interest or increasing emphasis. At the personal level, the tug is between younger members of the area and older ones (although the division is not as clear as that makes it sound). Some people

⁵ Modules are offered for 4 credits. The numbers recorded here are in full time equivalencies.

believe that the wedding of humanities, languages and cultural studies, and area studies into one, large Planning Unit has created these tensions. The coordinators believe that, were the area not so large (if there were more planning units, for example), these tensions would still exist but would be manifest at other levels of the college's administration. They are satisfied that the CTL Planning Unit is not a bad place for these discussions to take shape and are willing to continue to facilitate these discussions in the arena provided by the Planning Unit.

One of the reasons that CTL is not a bad place to have a little contentiousness over hiring is that everyone in the Unit seems to realize, at deeper than a rhetorical level, that our one criterion for hiring is the best interests of the college as a whole. We have no pre-figured curriculum that we can argue needs to be staffed. We have no subfields to speak of that can complain of being underrepresented or otherwise treated unfairly. We can only begin our arguments for proposed hire with sentences like, "It seems to us that a liberal arts college ought to have a specialist in European History...." The area has suffered tremendous losses through retirements and deaths. (See our hiring report.) It would be impossible to replace the *spirit* of the college that leaves with those people. And we will not argue that those *people* ought to be replaced, because they cannot be. The only argument CTL will make in favor of one hire over another one will be based on our vision of a liberal arts college. Our arguments will from now on, it seems, be made against the strong breeze of "student demand" and "staffing needs" and the like. But an argument on behalf of maintaining Evergreen as a college is the only form of argument that seems available to us.

Future Hiring Priorities Hiring priorities in the area will be establish in two ways. On the one hand we will argue for faculty positions in areas necessary for the college as a whole. Our recent proposal to hire in American History is a good example of such thinking. Such a faculty member is needed across the curriculum not only in CTL. And, on the other hand, we will propose hires in areas of more specific interest to our members. For example, the proposal to hire in Middle East Studies represents a new emphasis in the curriculum, one meant to expand offerings in the language and culture area.

At this point, members of the area have identified faculty positions in archeology, English literature, French, cultural studies, classics, European history and material culture, to name just a few. We expect that our hiring priorities will be established through a combination of the ongoing teaching interests of our members, retirements and our continuous consideration and reconsideration of the academic needs of the college as a whole.

Faculty

The faculty members affiliated with Culture Text Language area are drawn from across the curriculum. Among our fifty or so members are faculty with training and years of experience teaching in the arts, social sciences, humanities, languages, and physical and biological sciences. (See the section of academic resumes.) In effect, CTL houses faculty who are drawn together not by specific curricular interest or identity but by the prospect of collegiality and intellectual breadth and interests. As one faculty member responded in a questionnaire, "Culture Text Language seems to be on the way to becoming the 'real' Evergreen—the place where we do broadly interdisciplinary programs centered on a theme or question, where faculty teach with a variety of partners, and where the curriculum changes annually."

We find this quote to be both a good summary of the planning principles of the area as well as a good expression of a shared pedagogical bias among the members of CTL. The members of the area have avoided establishing a set curriculum that has to be implemented yearly or bi-annually; at the

same time, faculty members tend to teach in one of four areas (language and culture, area studies, humanities, and cultural studies) and have a tacit, if not explicit (as with the language programs), agreement to offer certain programs on a regular basis. For example, Tom Rainey and Patricia Krafcik offer the Russia program on a regular cycle. Members who teach in humanities assure regular programs in American and European literature, Great Books, and writing. So to characterize the area as without a curriculum is to misrepresent it; in the absence of a set and prescribed curriculum the area is best understood as a group of faculty members who collectively agree to offer, on a regular basis, programs that include academically rigorous and relevant material.

CTL Faculty Survey

As part of this review, faculty members in CTL were asked to complete a short questionnaire. Brief summaries of responses will be made a little further along but there were four themes that seemed pretty consistent in the responses.

When asked about the area and what drew each respondent to it many people mentioned flexibility. In some cases they referred to flexibility in curriculum planning, in other cases they meant flexibility in the nature of teaching. There was no sense that members wanted to be left alone or valued doing whatever they wanted; rather it was an expression of the importance (perhaps not felt elsewhere in our college work) of making and implementing judgment on academic matters. As one faculty member described this, "Another strength is the looseness of our structure, which allows for maximum creativity and individual initiative."

A second common point made was about collegiality. Members were drawn to the area assuming that the common work would be done in a convivial and collegial fashion. As one faculty member wrote, "I think we have something of the curiosity, energy, innovation, open mindedness, commitment to students, etc. that defines the college. People see it and want to be a part of it." In this sense, there is something of the very traditional notion of a college which was known not by its offerings or degrees but by its faculty. The members of CTL, in a very traditional sense, plan and teach as members of a college. One member wrote sparingly, "We are not a curriculum delivery system."

A third theme that emerged from the questionnaire is that the chief intellectual and academic nature of the area centers on "interpretation" and critical reading of primary texts. There was near unanimity on this point. When describing the offerings in the area members cited the four areas of emphasis and in all cases wrote specific descriptions in terms of the nature of engagement and learning. For example, "...we value studies that depend upon primary texts, on active research, on open questioning and on questions that require interdisciplinary study." Or as another faculty member wrote, "I think students who work lots in CTL are really good at textual interpretation, pretty good at writing, and really good at understanding interdisciplinary study."

A final theme that emerged from the responses is the recognition that the area is unsettled; in some people's minds there are key contested areas such as hiring priorities. Everyone recognized the large and heterogeneous nature of the area; for a few it was troublesome and interfered with the work of the area, for others it was a concern that they wanted to be aired more publicly and extensively. A summary of the questions and responses is included at the end of this report.

Ethnographic Study of the Teaching of Literature As a part of this review we did a more extensive qualitative study of the teaching of literature within the area. The study, which was based on intensive interviews with a majority of the faculty in the area, was conducted by student Tracy

Wuster. The project originated out of his broader interest in the place of literature and humanities in his own education, and broadened into questions well suited for a qualitative field research project. Tracy asked just two questions - Why teach literature in a liberal arts college? And Why do you teach literature? The results of his study are not easily generalizable. The real advantage, for purposes of this review, are the rich, often quite complex comments by the faculty regarding the academic issues inherent in the teaching of literature and the place of literature in a liberal arts college.

The reader of this report is urged to read Tracy's final paper but there are a few general points that can be made here. Toward the end of his study Tracy recognized a tension among the faculty regarding the *place* of literature at the college - for some faculty literature, as a study onto itself, was most important while for other faculty literature provided a means, a particular kind of text, to get at issues or concerns. In Tracy's mind the differences in these approaches was significant in the faculty's understanding of literature but also in what it revealed about the faculty's efforts planning and teaching *interdisciplinary* programs.

As important as the tension he uncovered was the understanding he came to about the importance, or centrality, of literature throughout the curriculum. Because literature often addressed serious issues in a way that the faculty felt was more complex or perceptive it was used quite broadly in the curriculum - in the arts, sciences and humanities. While Tracy conducted only a few interviews with science faculty he was able to propose that literature often provided the means for faculty to provide a more interdisciplinary program. In programs where the topic or focus did not easily lend itself to disciplinary breadth, literature - because its subject can be so broad - allowed for more breadth.

There are some interesting implications of Tracy's report. Certainly within CTL he has provided us with a compilation and analysis of faculty opinion about the teaching of literature. His recognition of the broader use of literature within the college could well help focus a discussion among the faculty on the kinds of disciplinary emphases useful across the curriculum. Such a discussion might help in planning programs as well as in hiring. At a time when our hiring appears to be getting more narrow, moving towards greater specialization in the faculty, this finding might help the faculty as a whole think not only about planning unit requirements but also about the broader, college-wide academic needs that would allow us to not only offer our students depth but also assure an interdisciplinary context.

Faculty Questionnaire Summary of Responses

These four themes were abstracted from responses to a short questionnaire we sent out to all the faculty. The questionnaires went out in the summer, at this writing we have only about 25% in. The faculty were asked six questions about the area and their judgment on our common work. What follows is a compilation of responses:

1. How would you define the curriculum in the Culture Text Language Planning Area; indicate what kind of studies go on in this area?

I have to qualify my effort at "definition" by saying I am new to CTL shifting from social science planning group. What impressed me about CTL was: (1) its openness that suggested "true" efforts at interdisciplinary curriculum. (2) A small group of faculty that indicated interest in the "cultural studies" movement with the possibility of forming a cultural studies SPACE in the spirit of the once "BIRMINGHAM CENTRE." My own preference is for an open-structure that permits the evolution of a strong interdisciplinary curriculum component.

It all depends on what you mean by the word "curriculum." Under one definition, there is no curriculum; we just offer what the faculty wants to offer (unless this has changed since I've been gone, which I doubt). Under another definition, the curriculum is "offerings in the humanities and qualitative social sciences." Under a third definition, it is offerings in area studies, the Western legacy, and cultural studies.

(a) A humanities curriculum poorly wed to studies of particular cultures.

(b) Studies in the humanities; in particular cultures; and in what could be called either diversity or political correctness (race, class and gender).

CTL seems to be on the way to becoming the "real" Evergreen - the place where we do broadly interdisciplinary programs centered around a theme or question, where faculty teach with a variety of partners, and where the curriculum changes annually. Even with the predictable repeat of language and area studies, we still offer a widely varied curriculum.

Defining the curriculum: Basically the curriculum comes out of the knowledge and interests of the faculty, which in our case happens to be very broad. I think we have some common understandings and priorities, but none of these are cast in stone. For example, we value studies that depend upon primary texts, on active research, on open questioning and on questions that require interdisciplinary study. We have over the last couple of years settled on three subareas, I think. 1. That is, we generally feel obliged to offer curriculum in what might be called classical humanities (American and European history, literature, philosophy, art history ,etc. 2 We have an ongoing and pretty firmly established obligation to offer language and culture studies in French, Spanish, Russian, Japanese, the classical world, and periodically other cultures. 3. We have a developing interest in media and cultural studies, although the definition of this subarea is controversial. It includes anthropology, ethnography, media studies, literary criticism, gender studies, etc.

I think we do not have a single curriculum, since the planning area covers a wide range of disciplines, each of which demands different preparation and skills.

We study cultures in all their symbolic forms, i.e. in the signs, symbols, languages and terms various cultures (including our own) generate. I like the catalog intro we worked on.

2. What re the biggest changes you have seen in CTL students (previously Humanities and then Knowledge and the Human Condition) in the past five years?

My own experience (Science, Technology and Health; Native American Studies and Core) clearly indicates that undergraduates have changed calling for new educational strategies. It is analogous to the idea that relations between men and women, people of color and "whites," "straight" and gay/lesbian, and so on have changed or at least been modified. In a word in my judgment contemporary undergraduates present new challenges because they are different from past students.

The merger with Language and Culture. Loss of sense of a small group of colleagues working together by choice and shared interest. Unseemly squabbles over hiring.

The most obvious change is in the shift from thinking about ourselves as Humanities to thinking about ourselves as about Culture and Text and Language. Except for David Powell, hardly anyone asks us to offer a "major" in any of the humanities. We don't seem to have any agreement on what we ought to teach, but rather a commitment to teach together. We are open to membership by anyone from across the college, and have welcomed folks from all other planning groups.

Less willingness to do difficult self-directed work. More willingness to be entertained by faculty.

Students (and changes): I can't point to definite changes. Students are no better and no worse than five years ago. The only difference I might point to is the increased number of students that expect to work long hours and go to school too. This definitely curtails their learning and their ability to give their all to the program.

The gap between students who have a clear, predetermined aim in their studies and the ones who do not is getting wider. Therefore, it is becoming more difficult to plan courses that will suit the needs of all the students.

3. What are the biggest changes you have seen in CTL faculty in the past five years?

My limited experience in teaching with faculty with humanities background has been that they are open to feminist, multicultural, gay (lesbian and so on) studies; in a word they are conscious of new knowledge(s) which is much appreciated. Their openness to, for example, "critical race theory" has been appreciated. Also to cultural studies issues.

...the creation of CTL as a group seems to have brought more people from more diverse disciplines and with more diverse interests together. But "together" may only mean they sometimes meet in the same room, or even less, that their names are "together" on a list in the dean's office.

Tremendous attrition, without replacement, of faculty in the humanities and in what we used to call European and American Studies.

The changing membership (see above) has altered the "look" of the area; the group has become more balanced in seniority--and I believe that the less senior faculty are more willing/comfortable speaking up. We do have an age chasm, and I think we need to be explicit in talking about that--as more senior folks retire, the chasm will widen and then disappear. But who will replace the senior folks in leadership? in guiding the area?

New, younger faculty with "Race, Class, Gender" on their minds.

I think the merging of language and Culture, and Knowledge and the Human Condition has been largely a good thing. The area is more active, more current, more sociable and even though we are still a "bunch," we are working together better than before. I don't think we ever will be or want to be an organized curriculum delivery system. We are too in love with intellectual inquiry, impromptu connections, etc. and we long ago gave up the idea of coverage as a guiding principle for our existence. Having more women and more young

people in the area has definitely made things better. There is however a tension in the group between those that want to do more current, up to the minute curriculum and more traditional curriculum (although not in the traditional manner.) I think this tension is pretty healthy right now, but it needs to be out in the open and the topic of serious discussion.

We have more refugees from the social sciences than before which is fine with me if it doesn't significantly change the humanities context of our programs and emphasis on original texts and literature.

None, only that the area has expanded and now includes more disciplines and interests, which has contributed to the loss of coherency in curriculum.

4. Should CTL stay a planning area as constituted? Change? How?

I would suggest a series of small group (perhaps something like a focus group model (?)) encounters to plan the future of CTL. My major concern would be to include "VOICES" not normally heard and attempt to contain the predictable on-going dominant "VOICES," if that is possible. None the less, regardless of the structure that finally emerges I would hope that the CTL structure supports and protects "the margins" in the planning group.

Based on how things felt to me a year ago, at the end of the year: Yes.

NO - things worked better before merger, change back or meet often in the sub-groups we once formed: "Western legacies," "Cultural Studies," and particular area interests.

I like the combination of the language and culture with the more free-form part of the group. It keeps us alert, I think. I'd like to see more discussion of Thad's Interpretation program, and I think the area has GOT to take on the question of Core. The All-Level proposals really came from CTL and we didn't follow through with them--they did not serve first year students well this year, and are seen as an excuse not to deal with Core. We've got to be more responsible toward first year students.

Yes, I think we are doing well enough. More people are engaged in the talk than before and we are clearly providing an educational philosophic position that the college needs. People from outside the humanities join us because they feel welcome, our tent is very big. That is good because it means we do have an identity of some sort, although I can't quite describe it. What holds us together? I think we have something of the curiosity, energy, innovation, open mindedness, commitment to students, etc. that defines the college. People see it and want to be a part of it. No, the area is not fully functional, but considering what we were like five years ago, I think we are in pretty good shape.

No, we are too large to function efficiently. We should work in smaller, more cohesive planning groups (or subgroups).

5. What are humanities students at Evergreen best at? Worst at? do you know what other areas your students study within? They are (list)? What do CTL students do when they graduate?

My own experience has been with students who (sometimes unknowingly) come to appreciate interdisciplinary educational strategies and self-directed learning (which includes the humanities, of course). Most of the students who have kept in contact with me have found careers in human services, and in related legal/administrative systems. Some have gone into public education. Most of these students have continued on to graduate study and done well.

Humanities students may be Evergreen's strongest students. They are certainly stronger than the social science and education students I used to deal with from 1976 to 1988. They are open minded, inquisitive, willing to work hard, interested in writing, reading, discussing. They are collaborative and, given the right

conditions, they love to work in intellectual communities. What they are worst at, not surprisingly, is a result of what they do not get exposed to at Evergreen. Thus, they don't have a solid background in any one field, or in anything, and they often haven't done a sustained, focused, piece of work in depth. But if they want to do the latter, they can do it before they're done. I don't know what other areas they study in, except for a smattering. Some study the arts, some the hard sciences, some social sciences, some education. Across the board. Graduation could lead them anywhere--or nowhere.

(a) Articulating politically correct opinions. (b) Critical reasoning. (c) No pattern visible. (d) No pattern visible, except that very few go to good grad schools.

CTL students are NOT necessarily humanities students. I think students who work lots in CTL are really good at textual interpretation, pretty good at writing, and really good at understanding interdisciplinary study.

I think it would be hard to profile our students. Once we get students in a program we try to give them the background and skills they need to do our broadly interdisciplinary work. By spring quarter in year-long programs, they do have these skills (i.e. Cultural Codes students could do serious ethnographic study; Victorian studies students could write serious research papers.) We do not do a good job with history. It is seen as a service discipline providing background for literature, arts, etc. Very few students take history seriously and students are not prepared to do graduate work in history in most cases. We do better with literary studies, literary criticism, area studies and maybe anthropology, but generally I think we do not attempt to do disciplinary studies in a really focused way. There are exceptions that occur periodically but students can not count on getting the equivalence of a major in philosophy, anthropology, art history, etc. and I think that is fine.

Most of the students I know are genuinely interested in studying, in reading and thinking. Rightly or wrongly they are focused on the content of the program and not on where it will take them. Our students are readers. They are fun to talk to.

They are best, with some training, at writing and close textual analysis. They are worse at numerical and scientific reasoning.

Students are: good at learning, even when they may not have all the necessary background.
worst at adjusting to academic rigor and standards.

6. What is the major strength of CTL area? The major weakness?

... what brought me to CTL was my impression that it was an open-structure willing to support and protect independent curriculum that might initially have to exist on the margins (for example, I am under the impression that CTL has most of the faculty of color; is that a correct impression?) The major weakness perhaps is not having yet a strategy for integrating 'marginal' proposals with respect and appreciation. The dominant voices continue to prevail and perhaps even overwhelm potential significant contributions from the margins.

The major strength of CTL is that it is the group most likely to preserve, conserve, and carry forward the central pedagogical values upon which Evergreen was founded. The group, in my mind, is crucial to the college. I am very happy we did not define ourselves as a "humanities" group, as we were invited to.

- (a) Programs are frequently taught by faculty who are collaborating creatively.
- (b) Error in merging the humanities with Language and Culture. Has resulted in incoherence in the humanities and unpleasant squabbles over hiring (coherence could be restored by honoring our clear decision to offer "Great Books/Stories/Works" and "Interpretation" on a regular basis).

The major weakness, as everyone knows, is that because we refuse to create required pathways for our students, we have very little ground on which to stand in lobbying for new hires. And without those hires, our ability to carry out our "mission" (as formulated in the above paragraph) is seriously threatened.

Our major strength is our conception of the area and our ability to explain that to our colleagues across campus. We have a clear sense of why we do what we do, and we explain it well. The faculty in our area are excellent teachers and work well with students. Our difficulties arise when our colleagues don't understand our way and want us to look just like SI.

The second major strength (to get out of order) of CTL is its convivial and collegial spirit. This strength is not distinct from its first, and it is also crucial.

The second weakness may be that CTL's membership is loaded toward "dinosaurs." (I'm not sure if this is true, having no list before me, but it feels that way). Thus, we may have trouble passing on Evergreen's core values to the next generation of faculty, those who will lead when we have retired or departed.

Strength: A curriculum in the humanities is planned each year.

Weakness: The faculty in the area apparently do not have any interest in doing anything as a whole group.

We are a bunch! That's good and bad. We don't work together enough, but we are getting better. We refused to be organized, ordering, predictable, lock step, etc. This is good and bad: good because we are flexible and meet new issues as they arise; bad because we can't make a claim on hiring, on staffing etc. because we do not have a guaranteed curriculum that we must offer. The exception is language and culture, which I think is in good shape and will continue to grow. That is fine, but we must recognize the energy and drain that language studies has on faculty and on staffing. As a member of the Japan program this year, I know first hand how much language teaching requires. We taught 17 hours a week. But I really do believe TESC should pay more attention to language. It could be a greater strength. Random thoughts: our faculty is lopsided. We don't have enough historians and we are losing literature teachers. We want to do new, up to the minute things, but we don't have the people or the students to really make them work: Middle East Studies, Cultural Studies, other languages. We are terribly short of art history from all over the globe. (SO, you see, I do have an interest in coverage, but I know that Evergreen is small and we can't offer everything, so how do we decide. This decision process has been difficult this year. (Consider the comparative religion talk which was agonizing, only partly productive and quite divisive.)

The major strength is the many, many very fine faculty members, with a long and impressive track record in interdisciplinary studies. Another strength is the looseness of our structure, which allows for maximum creativity and individual initiative. We are still weak in foreign languages and will be weak, without significant hiring, in European and Asian studies. I think we need at least one person who offers regularly one form or another of China studies.

Major strength of the area: its flexibility

Major weakness: the same, when it doesn't it degenerates into chaos.

Flexibility for faculty is our strength. Lack of predictability for students is our weakness.

Students

How Do Students Use The Area?

In order to answer this question we decided to review the academic histories of students from eight programs offered in the planning areas that predated Culture Text Language. These include Knowledge and the Human Condition, the Center for the Study of Science and Human Values, and Language and Culture.

We reviewed student academic histories and compiled data around the following variables: number of quarters in humanities, language, science, art and social science programs (this was determined by the planning area offering the program). We also recorded the number of modules,

internships and individual contracts each student did along with the overall number of years in attendance at TESC.

From this data we wanted to ask the following questions: How many quarters, out of their overall undergraduate years, are students enrolled in humanities/language studies? What range of academic programs do students in humanities tend to take? How many quarters of language study do students tend to take? Do students studying language also take other humanities programs?

We compiled data from the following programs: Bilingual Education and Teaching; Hispanic Forms; Japan Today; Knowledge, Truth and Reality; Literature, Values and Social Change; Paradigm of Progress; Postmodern Bodies; and Shakespeare's America.

The analysis is not complete on these programs. But there are some interesting patterns.

- Over 50% of the students in humanities take more than one program. Very few study in the humanities throughout their education. The mean number of quarters in humanities computed by all the program reviewed was 4.03, for all programs except language programs it was 4.02
- The average number of quarters spent in language study was 3. The majority of students doing languages tend to do one year or less. A smaller number, less than 10%, completed two or more years of language.
- Of the students that study languages they tend to complete additional credits in humanities programs. Roughly half of the students who complete a year of language will go on and do an additional year of study in humanities.
- In addition to their work in humanities, students were most likely to take programs in the social sciences. As many as 50% of the students reviewed took one or more quarters in social sciences.
- Students were as likely to take something in the arts as in the sciences although the percentage for both areas was lower than for social science. As few as 10% (mostly students in the language programs) and as many as 30% (from the philosophy and great books programs) of the students enrolled in one or more quarters in science or art.

There are some important questions and issues that arise from the data. For example, there seems to be a 20% greater chance that students who complete a program in humanities will also be drawn to a program in social science. This may reflect similar content or emphases in these two areas. It may also reflect the influence of the faculty teaching in these programs.⁶ One question, then, might focus on the nature of faculty teams and the extent to which team composition (and the academic tendencies among the team) shape the overall educational interests of the students. In other words, to what extent do we promote a liberal arts education for our students within any one program? In a similar vein, to what extent has our use of planning units promoted or diminished students' interest in a liberal arts education?

Evidence of the tendency of faculty to influence the academic interests of students may be reflected in the large number of students who take language and humanities programs. Rather than only take more language programs students seem to be interested in exploring other text-based fields.

Students enrolled in humanities programs tend to take one or two programs. There seems little evidence of "super majors" among the students. With the rare exception, most students took programs from two or more planning areas. As one administrator put it, this area seems to have become the college's "sophomore year."

⁶ For example, there were a number of students (20%) from Paradigm of Progress program that went on to do more study in the sciences. Janet Ott, faculty biologist, was a member of that team.

There was no noticeable "progression" in programs. This is not surprising since the area does not offer sequenced programs. Perhaps the only interesting pattern recognized was that students who took more than one program in humanities did so contiguously.