

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Analysis
ELPA 880: Academic Programs in Colleges and Universities

Professor Clifton (Clif) F. Conrad
Email: conrad@education.wisc.edu
Telephone: 608-263-3411

Office: 1261E Educational Sciences
Office Hours: By Appointment

Course Purpose and Objectives

"I try to make people realize that there is a lot to be found out, and that anybody can find it out if they will free their imaginations and live boldly and adventuresomely; I try to make them feel that thinking is delightful, and that it is not impossible to build up the Cosmos from the very beginning, provided people can forget the authority of parents and guardians and the sages of former times. Reverence for the aims and minds of great men [and women], contempt for their opinions and results, is what I aim at; to make people like them, not imitators of them. Revolution tempered by reverence – do you like that as a watchword?" --Bertrand Russell

As a beginning point, we can broadly define curriculum as the attitudes, beliefs, knowledge, skills, and pedagogical practices expressed by faculty, students, and administrators at course, program, and institutional levels. As such, the curriculum can provide us with valuable insights into the cultural, political, social, and intellectual priorities of colleges and universities. The overarching purpose of this advanced-level seminar is to enhance and sharpen our abilities to analyze, interpret, design, and evaluate – from a variety of perspectives – college and university curricula. Nested in this context, this course is designed to invite and enable individuals to:

- Become familiar with the literature on the college curriculum and identify promising research questions.
- Interpret the college curriculum from myriad historical and philosophical perspectives.
- Understand similarities and differences among general education, liberal education, and professional education.
- Have an in-depth understanding of traditional and emerging perspectives on college curricula.
- Understand recent trends and developments in the content, structure, and pedagogy of undergraduate (and, to a lesser extent) graduate education.
- Describe and understand alternative curriculum models and "distinctive curricula."
- Develop knowledge and skill in formulating, developing, and improving curricula and in evaluating programs.
- Enhance their understanding of the dynamics of academic change and strategies for bringing about change.

To anchor our collective and individual inquiry in this course, each student will participate in the design and implementation of a curriculum (namely, this course) through designing learning experiences and participating in planning, implementing, and evaluating course learning experiences. This inquiry will be guided by and demonstrated through students' development of their own learning portfolio, as described below.

Note: Copyright (Clifton Conrad).

Course Readings

The course is organized around these six domains: *Points of Departure; Curricular Conversations; Curricular Design; Curricular Change; Teaching, Learning, and the Curriculum; and Evaluation, Assessment, and the Curriculum*. Required readings will be drawn from the following three sources:

1. Conrad, Clifton & Johnson, Jason (Eds.) (2007). *ASHE reader on college and university curriculum: Placing learning at the epicenter of courses, programs, and institutions*. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom. (Available at the UW Bookstore and hereafter referred to as “ASHE Reader” or “Reader”.)
2. Additional chapters and articles are available as PDFs on e-reserve (**log-in to MyUW, click on your “Academics” tab, and follow the link to reserves next to your ELPA 880 course listing**).
3. A **Course Guide** that is included in this document immediately following the syllabus. For each of the six domains, the Course Guide: A) Lists the required readings for the respective domain; B) Provides brief instructor commentary on each reading in concert with prospective discussion questions for the reading (everyone is expected to complete all of the readings) and, C) “Clif Notes” in which the instructor provides background notes on the respective topic.

Classroom Environment

I encourage everyone to contribute to constructing a lively, intellectually vibrant, interactive seminar this semester. To that end, I invite and encourage everyone in the class ("teacher" and "student" alike) to assume an active role in critically reading and reflecting upon course texts, working to develop a welcoming classroom in which every individual feels safe sharing their perspectives, and engaging one another in challenging conversations in which we critically examine our assumptions, test new ideas, and construct richer understandings of the material under discussion. In preparation for seminar discussions, I encourage everyone to reflect on the following overall questions in light of the assigned readings and the corresponding sections of the COURSE GUIDE:

- What are the most important ideas expressed in the readings?
- How can the readings help inform our scholarship and professional practice?
- What connections between theory and practice can we make?
- To what extent are our experiences similar to or different from the major ideas expressed in the readings?
- What are the strengths and limitations of the ideas presented in the readings?
- What inquiry might be pursued to challenge or advance the ideas presented in the readings?

Course Requirements and Evaluation

Please Note: I am hopeful that we can, near the end of the term, spend one day visiting a few colleges/universities in Milwaukee or Chicago (or elsewhere). (Everyone would need to pay their own travel expenses and communicate to the instructor in writing that neither nor the UW-Madison would not be held accountable for any injuries suffered during the trip.) If there are any reasons why you would/might not be able to take such a visit please notify the instructor before the beginning of the class.

Assignments: A learning portfolio will be required of each student in this class. Portfolios not only provide students with an opportunity to reflect critically upon their effort, progress, and improvement in a class, but they also afford faculty and students with collaborative opportunities to discuss individual student progress and to explore different teaching and learning options that can enhance students' knowledge and skill development. Each class participant will be evaluated on the basis of a number of portfolio items. These items will be determined by the class, including their percentage of the final grade, and/or by individual agreement between the instructor and individual students.

Portfolio Item	Percentage of Final Grade
1. Autobiographical Statement (due: first class)	5%
2. Instruction Session (if selected, due at time agreed upon with instructor)	0-25%
3. “Teach Us” Session (if selected, due at time agreed upon with instructor)	0-25%
4. Culminating Course Project (if selected, due last class)	0-25%
5. In-Class Oral Presentation on Culminating Course Project (if selected, due last class)	0-25%
6. Learning Experience Proposed by Student (if selected, due at time agreed upon with instructor)	0-70%
7. Class Participation and Evaluation	15%
8. Professional Assessment Commentaries	5%
9. Concluding Evaluation	5%

The **portfolio items in bold** are **required** of all students and constitute 30% of the course learning experiences and final grade. Each student is required to propose a plan for the remaining 70% through a combination of remaining items. This proposal – which may consist of any combination of individual or collaborative learning experiences – must be sent to the instructor early in the term. Portfolio item descriptions are as follows:

Autobiographical Statement (5%). As the preface to your portfolio, this 2-3 page autobiographical sketch introduces you as a teacher and learner. Specifically, I would like you to provide an overview of those educational and life experiences that, from your perspective, have had a major influence on your professional development. Can you recall, for example, specific courses or course-related teaching and learning experiences that captured your imagination and nurtured your interest in a specific field? Are there certain learning experiences outside of formal classroom settings that you have found particularly enriching? Are there individuals (teachers, class peers, professional colleagues, family members) who have had a significant impact on your development as a learner? What have you learned about yourself as a teacher and as a learner?

Instruction Session (0-25%). For this portfolio item, you are invited to view yourself—individually or collaborating with one or more peers—as the class instructor(s) for part or all of a single course session. As such, you will be expected to plan the session, giving the instructor of record ample opportunity to review your plan ahead of time, and come to class prepared to facilitate our teaching and learning. A highly traditional approach, of course, would be to give an oral presentation and lead class discussion. Please seek to be more imaginative, e.g., bring in guests, plan a debate, or help organize an excursion to one or more colleges within a few hours' driving distance.

“Teach Us” Session (0-25%). For this portfolio item, you are expected to research a selected “philosopher” or “distinctive curriculum” and share what you have learned with the entire class. Your session will be limited to a maximum 20 minute timeframe. For both sessions, I encourage you to approach your task with intellectual curiosity and scholarly playfulness. Further perspective on “philosophers” and “distinctive curricula” can be found in the Syllabus Appendix.

Culminating Course Project (0-25%). For this portfolio item, you are expected to construct a focal point of your portfolio, drawing upon and illustrating your diverse skills as a curriculum planner or evaluator (or both). Since I understand that these skills can find expression in a variety of ways, your project can take one of several forms, including but not limited to: a traditional research paper, a scholarly thinkpiece, an audio-visual presentation, a case study of curricular change, a policy report on a curriculum-related issue, a curriculum revision plan, a proposal for a new academic program, a faculty development project.

In-Class Oral Presentation of Culminating Course Project (0-10%). If you choose to incorporate a Culminating Course Project in your learning portfolio, you will be required (to an extent – i.e., percentage – of your choosing) to share it with the class in the form of an in-class oral presentation. Your presentation can take many forms: a traditional scholarly presentation, an audio-visual presentation, a storyboard, or whatever else your imagination might produce.

Learning Experience Proposed by Student (0-70%). Propose a learning experience – one that is not given expression in any of the other portfolio items – that you think would contribute to your learning in the course.

Class Participation and Evaluation (15%). In your final portfolio, please include a one to three paragraph summary evaluating your participation in class discussions. In what ways did you contribute to class discussions? How do you evaluate your participation in small group discussions? How do you evaluate your skills as a listener? Team player? Problem-solver? Leader? Scholar?

Professional Assessment Commentaries (5%). This portfolio item requires responses to several questions, all of which are intended to encourage you to reflect on your ongoing development as a professional/scholar in the field of higher education. Please compose one to three paragraph responses to three of the following questions and be prepared to discuss them briefly in the final class meeting: What are the two or three most important things that you learned in this course that enriched your professional abilities as a teacher, program planner/evaluator, policy analyst, or academic administrator? Where did the “real learning” take place for you in this class? If you were designing a course on curriculum in higher education, what would it look like? What are the two or three things that you want to work on in your professional work setting as a result of your participation in this class? What have you learned about yourself as a result of this course? What are your greatest strengths—and greatest limitations—as a teacher, learner, curriculum planner/evaluator? Name one or more things that the instructor-of-record and other students did that contributed to your professional development in this class. What could the instructor have done differently to make the class more enriching for you?

Concluding Evaluation (5%). For this final portfolio item, you are required to evaluate your overall portfolio. On a single piece of paper, give yourself a grade for each portfolio item and an overall portfolio/course grade. Then, in one to four paragraphs, provide a rationale for your final portfolio/course grade. Do you think that your grade reflects what you learned in the class?

Instructor Evaluation: In evaluating your portfolios I will use the following criteria: clarity and skill in verbal and written work; imaginative and thoughtful application of course readings in class discussions and assignments; analytical rigor/interpretive robustness in coursework and the culminating project; and evidence of reflective practice and professional curiosity throughout the portfolio. As a matter of fairness, I will assess penalties for late papers. One, I will not provide extensive written feedback on late papers. Two, grades will be lowered one-half grade for each day that an assignment is submitted past its due date.

In my view, evaluation should serve as an enriching activity that helps us to learn more about what we do well and what we can improve upon. As such, I do not subscribe to a traditional model of student evaluation in which the professor-as-expert serves as the sole evaluator of students' work. It is my preference to involve students actively in the assessment of their own work (as well as my own). My preference is based on two deeply-rooted beliefs: First, I believe strongly that all of us, as engaged learners, need to learn to take responsibility for our learning. And second, I hold tightly to the belief that all of us, as professionals in teaching and learning organizations, need to learn how to reflect critically upon our own strengths and limitations. Self-assessment is often a difficult process because it invites us to self-reflect and admit our fears and examine our limitations while seeking to accentuate our strengths. From my perspective, self-reflection and assessment skills are prerequisites for leadership effectiveness in teaching and learning organizations. These beliefs are the impetus and foundation for the organization of this course around the development of learning portfolios.

Activity for 1st Class Meeting: Introducing Ourselves as a Course of Study

As a beginning point for us to get to know one another and to commence our study of college and university curricula in the broadest of strokes, I would like us to think about and share with one another the "courses of study" we can identify as having been influential in our individual lives. I propose that our lives can be viewed as a compilation of a number of courses of study that include but are not limited to formal schooling experiences, formal educational experiences outside of schools, professional experiences, and other life experiences. After taking a few moments to reflect on your life as a series of such courses of study, pair off with another individual in the class. Ask one another questions such as:

1. If you were to teach a seminar on your Life-as-a-Course-of-Study, what themes would you use to organize it?
2. What would you designate as some of the most challenging and valuable courses of study in your life? Why?
3. Where has the "real learning" taken place for you in your life?

These questions are suggested only as a guide. Feel free to ask other questions. When you are finished with your "interviews," go ahead and construct a "chart" of your "course of study" that may be presented to the other seminar participants. You may construct your own chart or you can ask your interviewer to assume the task. Be creative in your presentations. Regardless of the option you choose, you will be asked to introduce your colleague to the class, using her or his "chart" as a reference point.

Sources for Further Reading in College and University Curriculum Studies

To supplement the course readings and to assist you in your own inquiry, you may find the following journals useful:

Review of Higher Education, Journal of Higher Education, Innovative Higher Education, ASHE Higher Education Report, Thought & Action, Journal of Community College Research and Practice, Journal of College Student Development, Journal of General Education, Change, Academe, Perspectives on the History of Higher Education

You can access the full text for most of these journals through the UW Libraries web site (<http://www.library.wisc.edu>). Each journal varies in scope, audience, etc., so keep this in mind when exploring the extant literature related to your interests. For a synopsis of each journal, consider using Ulrich's Periodical Directory, accessible through the UW Libraries web site.

This is by no means a comprehensive list of journals related to studies in higher education or studies of curriculum. As a field of inquiry, education research draws upon disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary perspectives, and you are encouraged to follow the many paths your research question takes you in order to broaden and refine your interests. This includes, of course, extending your search for

literature beyond scholarly journals to books and other texts. To this end, access MadCat through the UW Libraries as well as other resources at your disposal such as online booksellers which offer searching capabilities that are increasingly more powerful than MadCat and other library search tools.

Notes on Academic Writing

All papers must follow the guidelines of a major style guide of your choice such as the *Chicago Manual of Style* (15th), the *Modern Language Association Style Manual and Guide to Scholarly Publishing* (2nd), or, most common in education research, the *Manual for the American Psychological Association* (5th). If you are not yet acquainted with a citation style, you are encouraged to do so as it will be necessary for major writing projects (e.g., theses, dissertations) that are likely on the horizon in your graduate studies.

Of particular importance in scholarly writing is appropriate use of references. While style guides will help you with the technical aspects of incorporating references in your writing, referring to other texts well is an acquired convention of the scholarly community in which you are writing as well as an art form. For your writing in this course and your future writing, be mindful of the following:

- Keep your references to popular sources (e.g., magazines, newspapers, web sites) to a minimum – remember that you are participating in an ongoing scholarly conversation in which the norm is to make reference to other voices in that conversation (e.g., books from university presses and other academic publishers, peer reviewed journal articles);
- Although you may infer otherwise from your reading of scholarly work, quality of references is more important than quantity – always only include references to materials you have actually read so you know you are referring to it appropriately (i.e., so you don't confuse your reader or undermine your credibility); and
- Recognize the impact that your references have on your prose – there are many ways to refer to others' work, so be creative and don't be afraid to move or otherwise adjust references (i.e., remember the words of Nathaniel Hawthorne: "Easy reading is damned hard writing.").

For more information on style guides, scholarly writing, etc., consult UW-Madison's Writing Center (<http://www.wisc.edu/writing/index.html>), the UW Libraries' collection of research tips (<http://www.library.wisc.edu/research-tips/>), or any of the following texts:

Becker, H. S. (1986). *Writing for social scientists: How to start and finish your thesis, book, or article*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Elbow, P. (1998). *Writing with power: Techniques for mastering the writing process*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lanham, R. (1987). *Revising prose*. New York, NY: Longman.

Strunk, W. & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Williams, J. M. (2003). *Style: Ten lessons in clarity and grace*. New York, NY: Longman.

Zinsser, W. (2001). *On writing well: The classic guide to writing nonfiction*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Notes on Scholarly Inquiry

When engaging in your own scholarship (and when interpreting others' scholarship), it is important to have a clear sense of what question(s) is guiding the inquiry. As a starting point, identify what interest you want to pursue (i.e., what troubles you? what fascinates you? what is unclear to you?) and think about what kind of meaningful question you want to ground in that interest. Consider, for example, whether you want to pose a *descriptive*, *interpretive*, *evaluative*, or *theoretical* question:

•**Descriptive questions ask...** When observing/examining _____, what are the salient features, characteristics, phenomena, etc., that come to mind? How can I relate my observations of _____ to others in such a way that they can capture my experience of observing/examining in a similar way – in such a way that they might replicate or come close to replicating my observations/examinations?

•**Interpretive questions ask...** When observing/examining _____, how can I enhance, complicate, challenge, etc., the presumptions and perspectives I (and perhaps others) have about and toward _____? In particular, how can I enhance, complicate, challenge my understanding of _____ in light of the ideas advanced by (a particular scholar or school of thought)?

•**Evaluative questions ask...** When observing/examining _____, what judgments about the worth or significance of a part of _____ can I make? And with what degree of confidence and qualification can I identify and share those judgments?

•**Theoretical questions ask...** When observing/examining _____, how can I and others best understand the relationships between discrete ideas, phenomena, etc., in _____? How do these ideas, phenomena, etc., stand in relation to each other? What causes and effects (loosely or strictly defined) can I identify and share with others?

These are by no means mutually exclusive nor are they the only way in which to understand variations and trajectories of research questions. Nonetheless, they should provide a good point of departure for your study of “_____” – which can be an idea or a concept (i.e., an abstraction identified or created by you), a text (i.e., a document or set of documents, a piece of scholarly work), or a data set (i.e., numeric, linguistic, or visual data already available or collected by you).

“Philosophers” and “Distinctive Curricula” (Guide for “Teach Us” Sessions)

Philosopher: If you elect this option, I would like you to select a major figure who has had an influence on the philosophy – that is, an individual whose *ideas* serve as primary touchstones in others' thinking, and who may or may not be a philosopher, per se – of American higher education. In broad strokes, summarize the individual's views and the impact that he/she has had on curricular, teaching, or learning issues. You may find it helpful to prepare class handouts that summarize your main points. I encourage you to select an individual of your own choosing, or someone from the following list:

E. D. Hirsch, Jr., Cardinal Newman, Robert M. Hutchins, Thorstein Veblen, Ernest Boyer, Alexander Meiklejohn, Lynne Cheney, Allan Bloom, Harold Bloom, Derek Bok, William Bennett, David Riesman, Alfred North Whitehead, A. Bartlett Giamatti, Clark Kerr, Ivan Illich, John Dewey, Paulo Freire, Parker Palmer, Henri Nouwen, bell hooks, Johnetta Cole, Adrienne Rich, K. Patricia Cross, Carol Gilligan, Arthur Chickering, Zelda Gamson.

Distinctive Curricula: If you choose this option, I would like you to research a "distinctive curriculum" at a specific college or university. You may structure your session in any way you like; my

only request is that you provide (in one form or another) information on the major components that make your selected curriculum "distinctive" and how its philosophy, structure, and content inform pedagogical practice. For example, the following institutions have "distinctive curricula" that you might find particularly interesting:

Alverno College	Milwaukee, WI
Bennington College	Bennington, VT
Berea College	Berea, KY
Brooklyn College of CUNY	Brooklyn, NY
Colorado College	Colorado Springs, CO
Cornell College	Mount Vernon, IA
SUNY-Empire State College	Saratoga Springs, NY
Evergreen State	Olympia, WA
Gallaudet University	Washington, DC
Hampshire College	Amherst, MA
Jones International University	National
Kalamazoo College	MI
Kaplan University	National
Miami-Dade Community College	Dade County, FL
National Technological University	Fort Collins, CO
Nebraska Wesleyan University	NE
Reed College	Portland, OR
St. John's College	Annapolis, MD & Santa Fe, NM
Shimer College	Waukegan, IL
Simon's Rock College of Bard	Great Barrington, MA
University of California-Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz, CA
University of Phoenix	National
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay	Green Bay, WI

COURSE GUIDE

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. Points of Departure	10-41
II. Curricular Conversations	41-52
III. Curriculum Design.	53-63
IV. Curriculum Change	63-68
V. Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum	69-77
VI. Evaluation, Assessment, and Curriculum	78-88
 APPENDIX (OPTIONAL)	
In-Depth Exploration of the Major Types of Assessment	89-103
Recommended Readings Bibliography	104-108
Selected Readings—With Annotations	109-110

I. Points of Departure

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: “Editors’ Introduction” READER, pp. viii-ix
2. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to “Section I: Points of Departure.” READER, pp. 3-6.
3. Clif Notes (see C. below).
4. Conrad, C. F., & Wyer, J. C. (1980). Liberal education: A dynamic tradition. In *Liberal Education in Transition* (pp. 4-18). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
5. Gutmann: “The Purposes of Higher Education.” READER, pp. 7-20 (SKIM)
6. Nussbaum: “Citizens of the World.” READER, pp. 21-39
7. Bok: “Purposes.” READER, pp. 40-49
8. AAC&U: “From the American Century to the Global Century.” READER, pp. 50-58 (SKIM)
9. Labaree: “Mutual Subversion: A Short History of the Liberal and the Professional in American Higher Education.” READER, pp. 59-68
10. Brint, Riddle, Turk-Bicakci, & Levy: “From the Liberal to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities: Organizational Analysis and Curricular Change.” READER, pp. 69-89 (SKIM)
11. Grubb & Lazerson: “Vocationalism in Higher Education: The Triumph of the Education Gospel.” READER, pp. 90-104
12. Walker: “History, Rationale, and the Community College Baccalaureate Association.” READER, pp. 105-112 (SKIM)
13. Ayers: “Neoliberal Ideology in Community College Mission Statements: A Critical Discourse Analysis.” READER, pp. 113-126

B. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

3. Clif Notes: In more than 30 pages of the course guide, the instructor provides a sweeping overview of higher education—from historical antecedents to American colleges to the emergence of the University to college and universities in the 20th and 21st centuries (with the major emphasis on the curriculum and teaching/learning) as well as some discussion questions and essay-type questions and a concluding section on myriad views of general, liberal, and professional education.

Questions: As you reflect on the legacy of curriculum over the last 2,500 years, what impresses you about that legacy? What surprised you, if anything, about that legacy? What do you find “disturbing” or “troubling” about the evolution of the discourse on college and university curriculum? What are you curious about that we might consider in class discussion?

3. Conrad and Wyer (Liberal Education: A Dynamic Tradition): Conrad and Wyer provide an overview of the classical and medieval background of liberal education—along the way exploring such concepts as arete and the trivium/quadrivium—to the rise of general education in the 20th century.

Questions: What questions come to mind as you read this chapter?

5. Amy Gutman (Purposes of Higher Education): She argues that higher education should not be necessary for promoting basic democratic virtues such as non-violence (which basic schooling should attend to)—she refers to this as “character training.” Rather, she contends that colleges and universities should be a place for men and women to learn how to think carefully and critically through wrestling with ideas of every sort (including unpopular ideas)—nested in a context of “academic freedom.” Instead of being “gatekeepers” to vocational posts colleges and universities should be “educators of officeholders.”

Questions: So what is/are the purpose(s) of colleges and universities? How compelling is Gutman’s argument?

6. Martha Nussbaum (Citizens of the World). She discusses the Athenians and their commitment to “inquiry”—including cross-cultural inquiry—as critical to citizenship. She discusses Diogenes—and his invitation to get people to “question themselves” and how the Stoic philosophers over the next several centuries made his insights respectable; in particular, we should give the “community of humanity” our first allegiance. In turn, we should not allow differences in race and ethnicity or gender to erect barriers around “identity groups.” Drawing on the Stoic (and Roman Emperor) Marcus Aurelius—Meditations is a classic—and the Stoic tradition, she argues that one should be familiar with cultural variety/difference (including language) through becoming an empathic interpreter who has “mutual respect” for difference. In connecting “world citizenship” to the curriculum, she argues that one should be devoted to one’s own region and history but, at the same time, develop a sympathetic understanding of distant cultures and racial, ethnic, religious minorities within one’s own culture. She discusses World Citizenship courses at the University of Nevada Reno but then goes on to discuss multicultural courses—including features that can advance prepare individuals for world citizenship—and then gives examples of ways to organize courses and programs such as the Cultural Encounters program at St. Lawrence University (a program that rejects a definition of multiculturalism as “identity politics” but rather as cross-cultural understanding that recognizes at the same time certain common needs along with the differences. (Note: She discusses the difference between “interculturalism” and “multiculturalism”—with the former celebrating common needs along with differences.)

Questions: Do you think about “difference” and “interculturalism” and “multiculturalism” differently as a result of reading this chapter? What do you think about “world citizenship” and how, if at all, should we develop curriculum and teaching and learning in ways to facilitate world citizenship? What think you of the Stoics? What are the major points of convergence and divergence between being a democratic citizen (Gutman) and a world citizen (Nussbaum)?

7. Bok (Purposes of College). Bok argues against one central purpose of a college education—notably the single purpose of intellectual development (such as Stanley Fish’s emphasis on intellectual skills)—and, instead, argues for eight aims: ability to communicate; critical thinking; moral reasoning; preparing citizens; living with diversity; living in a more global society, a breadth of interests, and preparing for work. He argues that all of this can be done without professors imposing their personal views. Along the way, he emphasizes that significant learning can take place outside of the classroom—such as through residential living and the extracurriculum.

Questions: Which of these purposes do you consider to be central to being an “educated person”? Should there be any “universal purposes” regardless of institutional type and student clientele, i.e., should there be a “universal” or shared definition of an educated person? Inasmuch as Bok argues against one single purpose of a college education, would he criticize Gutman and Nussbaum for being too narrow in their views?

8. AAC&U: (From the American Century to the Global Century) (LEAP). As noted in the introduction to this report (not included in our readings), there has been a “near-total public silence” about what graduates need to know and be able to do. In this reading, AAC&U begins by arguing that narrow learning is not enough and they go on to draw on the voices of employers and myriad other voices to argue that an educated person should contribute to every sphere of life—including environmental, civic, cultural, imaginative, ethical. The report goes on to argue that the arts, inquiry, analysis, and communication—and creativity, of course—should be central, though the student may pursue many “paths” to becoming educated. Finally, in the context of a global world, they go on to raise questions to guide college planning, e.g., what about cultivating risk-taking, innovation, entrepreneurship, problem-solving and such human qualities as “empathy” and “personal development.” They also are critical of the 20th century legacy of assigning general/liberal education to the first two years.

Questions: In what ways, if at all, is this reading adding to the discourse surrounding general/liberal education for the 21st century?

9. **Labaree: (Mutual Subversion: A Short History of the Liberal and the Professional)**. He begins by suggesting that there are two seemingly contradictory themes (a paradox that he will weave together, of course) regarding professional and liberal education. One: the shift from the liberal to the professional (elaborated on in the reading we will do by Grubb and Lazerson on the “education gospel”)—the market shift. Two: the shift from the professional to the liberal, that is, the “liberal arts and sciences disciplines” are in effect “colonizing” the professional schools, transforming professional education into liberal education. So how does he address this paradox? There are four tiers of American higher education: research universities, land-grant colleges, regional state universities, and “junior colleges.” Put simply, the lower three tiers show more vocational tendencies than the tier(s) above them. That said, he emphasizes that the lower-tiered institutions all try hard to run away from their vocational mission in order to imitate the high-status liberal model offered by the top tier but, in so doing, the best they have done is a pale imitation. Of course, there were two major forces operating, namely, “market pressure” and (surprise) “status emulation.” All of this said, at the conclusion of the reading he argues that “professional education” may be the big loser as, in broad strokes, the overarching “purpose” of the higher education may have become more vocational but the “content” of the curriculum/programs has become liberal—that said, he qualifies this by adding that while “liberal ed has colonized professional education” that students have little incentive to learn liberal content because they are interested in applied knowledge and their credential.

Questions: What think you of his argument of “mutual subversion”—that is, “dysfunction.” On-the-mark or otherwise? By the way, what is “professional education” as compared with “liberal education”?

10. **Brint, Riddle, Turk-Bicakci, & Levy (From the Liberal to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities)**. The authors’ look at professional and liberal in terms of “majors” and trace the two over time—including the resurgence of liberal education in the 1960s to the resurgence of the “practical arts” from 1970 to 2000. Along the way, they identify fields of study that are growing—such as public administration, protective services, computer and information systems, including only a handful of fields in the liberal arts and sciences (psychology and life sciences). They did a study and this is their major finding: selective baccalaureate-granting institutions and institutions with strong academic profiles are the core of support for the liberal arts and sciences—while non-baccalaureate institutions, non-selective institutions, and master’s level institutions leaned heavily toward the practical arts. (In short, less prestigious equals more occupational/professional degrees.) Perhaps this is their most interesting finding, namely, an association between the arts and sciences and institutions created to serve socially disadvantaged groups (women’s colleges, historically black colleges and universities, and public universities).

Questions: Surprises?

11. **Grubb & Lazerson (Vocationalism in Higher Education: The Triumph of the Education Gospel)**. The Educational Gospel: The Knowledge Revolution has led to an emphasis on knowledge and information, requiring higher-order skills such as communication and problem-solving and reasoning. This has led to a greater emphasis on occupational education (called professional education to distinguish it from vocational education.) Over the last 60 years the authors’ trace the great transformation in majors from the liberal arts core to professional/occupational fields. Note: The authors’ emphasize the disparity in funding between public universities, state colleges/universities, and community colleges: 2 to 1 ratio (Universities to State Colleges) and 4 to 1 ratio (Universities to Community Colleges). Which students are disproportionately represented in the state colleges and universities and community colleges? The authors’ review the case for and against professional education (too technical, research over practice). They go on to suggest reforms to reshape professional education—including more emphasis on “learning.”

Questions: Inequality in the higher learning? Triumph of the Education Gospel? Curriculum innovations/reforms?

12. Walker (History, Rationale, and the Community College Baccalaureate Association)

Walker summarizes the recent development of bachelor's degrees at community colleges and argues that the "blurring of boundaries" is good for access, cost efficiency, workforce development.

Question: A blurring of boundaries a good idea? If so, for whom and to what end?

13. Ayers: (Neoliberal Ideology in Community College Mission Statements: A Critical Discourse

Analysis) Main thesis: Insofar as the community college mission is represented in neoliberal discourse (market, consumer-driven higher education), then the community college is reproducing class inequalities associated with advanced capitalism. In turn, he argues that neoliberalism is, in effect, the major enemy of participatory democracy. (In essence, he argues that instead of emphasizing "learning" and "learners"—including for democracy—community colleges are serving the needs of business and industry. In short, the curriculum is market-driven. In conclusion, he argues that resistance to the neoliberal hegemony is needed and the egalitarianism and civic missions of the two year college must be rescued.

Question: What, if anything, do you find unsettling in this reading? What are the major similarities and differences between Ayers and Grubb/Lazerson?

C. CLIF NOTES

Historical Perspectives: Antecedents of American Colleges and Universities

Greece, Rome, and the Concept of the Liberal Arts (5th century A.D.)

While the liberal arts were an important component of life in ancient Greece and Rome, it was in the fourth and fifth centuries that the curriculum found in the Greek and Roman schools assumed the fixed character of the course in the seven liberal arts. Martianus Capella developed an allegory that fixed the liberal arts at seven in the fifth century; Boethius (475-524) divided the seven liberal arts into the trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music). The idea of the liberal arts curriculum as the basic preparation for professional education was established in the medieval university.

The Medieval University (1100-1500)

A. Development of Continental Models and English Universities

1. Paris
 - a. Northern European Model of University (university of scholars, young students, emphasis on theology, philosophy, and trivium).
2. Bologna
 - b. Southern European Model of University (university of older students, law/professions, emphasis on quadrivium).
3. Oxford (1165)
4. Cambridge (1209)

Macro-European Influences on Higher Education (1636-1850)

A. European Influences on Higher and Postsecondary Education in the U.S.

1. Italian Renaissance (13th Century) and N. European Renaissance
 - a. Re-introduced knowledge and learning of classical cultures which led to beginnings of secularism as humanists began to hold chairs in grammar, rhetoric, and moral philosophy.

Humanists supported secular interpretations of the nature of man and knowledge via the ancients, set within a Christian context.

2. Reformation (16th Century)
 - a. With Protestantism, need for education so that everyone could read Bible, and need for educated officials (clerical and lay).
3. Enlightenment (17th and 18th centuries)
 - a. Reaction against traditional authority of Christian revelation. Paved way for Aristotelian philosophy, Greek and Roman classics, science and secularism: Truth lies within the power of human reason. At least until Darwin in the mid-nineteenth century, the Enlightenment laid the way for the growth of science without breaking away from the basic tenets of Christianity (that is, religion and science were "reconciled" by most people).
4. Summary: European influences circa 1850 in U.S. colleges and universities reflected in: 1) Quadrivium and Trivium, 2) Christian Values (Church and Reformation), and 3) Classical Studies and Humanism and Emergence of Science (Renaissance and Enlightenment).

Historical Perspectives: Beginnings in America (1636-1783)

Overall Developments and Themes (1636-1783)

A. Founding of Harvard College in 1636

1. "Harvard College was established at a place which had been a wilderness eight years before, in a colony whose history was less than ten years old, and by a community of less than 10,000. The impulse and support came from no church, government, or individual in the Old World, but from an isolated people hemmed in between the forest and the ocean, who had barely secured the necessities of existence. No similar achievement can be found in the history of modern colonialization; and, in the eight centuries since Abelard lectured by the Seine, there have been few nobler examples of courage in maintaining intellectual standards amid adverse circumstances than the founding and early history of the Puritan college by the Charles." (Samuel Eliot Morison, The Founding of Harvard College)

"After God had carried us to New England, and we had builded our houses, provided necessaries for our livelihood, rear'd convenient places for God's worship and settled the civil government; one of the next things we longed for, and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches, when our present ministers shall lie in the dust." (New England's First Fruits)

2. Jamestown was established in 1607, Plymouth in 1620, and Massachusetts Bay in 1630. Harvard opened in 1638 and graduated nine students ("commencers") in its first class in 1642.
3. With Harvard, establishment in America of the principle of lay board control.

B. Eight More Colonial Colleges

1. William and Mary (1693), Yale (1701), Princeton (1746), King's College/Columbia (1754), College of Philadelphia/University of Pennsylvania (1755), College of Rhode Island/Brown (1764), Queens College/Rutgers (1766), Dartmouth College (1769).

C. Theme: "Collegiate Way"

1. "One of the oldest traditions of the American college, a tradition so fundamental, so all-encompassing, that to call it merely a tradition is to undervalue it. For what is involved here is nothing less than a way of life, the collegiate way. The collegiate way is

the notion that a curriculum, a library, a faculty, and students are not enough to make a college. It is an adherence to the residential scheme of things. It is respectful of quiet rural settings, dependent on dormitories, committed to dining halls, permeated by paternalism. It is what every American college has had or consciously rejected or lost or sought to recapture. It is William Tecumseh Sherman promising to be a father to an entire student body; it is comfort and full tobacco jars in a Princeton dormitory; in an urban university it is counselors helping the socially inept to overcome their weaknesses." (Frederick Rudolph, *The American College and University*) *Major Influences on Higher Education (1636-1783)*

D. Medieval Universities, Including Continental But Especially English Universities (Cambridge and Oxford): Influence on Curriculum

1. Purpose (Training of "Christian gentlemen")
2. Classical Curriculum
 - a. Classical liberal arts curriculum (trivium and quadrivium)
 - b. Greek and Latin
 - c. Four-Year course of study
3. "Collegiate Way" (English)
4. Instruction
 - a. Oxford model of recitation and memorization
 - b. Discipline
 - c. Examinations (senior disputation)
5. Admission
 - a. Based on knowledge of the classics and classical languages.
6. Rituals (degrees, graduation ceremonies)

Governance, Management, and Leadership (1636-1783)

A. Lay Board Principle Established

1. All nine colonial colleges had lay boards. Harvard and William and Mary (for a time) also established the European tradition of a self-governing faculty, which marked an effort to strike a compromise between the independence of British professors and the need for accountability to founders. By the time of the Revolutionary War, however, the principle of an autonomous lay board was established throughout higher education.

B. Strong Presidential Authority/Leadership

1. Not least because it was difficult for lay boards to convene regularly and faculties were relatively weak, presidents usually exercised a great deal of authority and served many roles (leader, teacher, fund-raiser, registrar).

Curriculum and Instruction (1636-1783)

A. Classical Curriculum

1. Almost entirely in Latin and Greek.
2. Inflexible and rigid, with students in classes or "cohort groups."
3. "The curriculum of the early American college reflected the Renaissance combination of the medieval curriculum and the humanistic attention to the ancient classics set in the context of Christian morality." (Rudolph) "The curriculum of Harvard and the other colonial colleges was drawn from many sources, especially the Reformation and the Renaissance. If Latin was the language of the Reformation, Greek and Ancient Greek were the discovery of the Renaissance, and the curriculum of the colonial college made room for both. Beside the Reformation ideal of the learned clergyman was placed the Renaissance ideal of the gentleman and scholar." (Rudolph)

4. Anchored in the trivium and quadrivium, the curriculum emphasized logic, rhetoric, and natural, mental, and moral philosophy in tandem with Latin, Greek, Hebrew--and through these languages an exposure to ancients such as Plutarch, Cicero, Plato, and Aristotle.

B. Instruction (Pedagogy)

1. Recitation: exchange between tutor and student, with tutor citing and student reciting. Citation was an assignment in textbook or previous lecture or demonstration. (On occasion, a Socratic dialogue was realized.)
2. Lecture (reading)
3. Disputation: syllogistic disputation inherited from the medieval university. In brief, the tutor would state a thesis and the student, in Latin, would either affirm or deny said thesis and then set forth his position in a series of Aristotelian syllogisms. When finished, other students could object and he, in turn, could rebut through further syllogisms. (Forensic disputations gradually replaced syllogistic disputations by the end of the 18th century.)
4. Examinations (Public Exhibitions). President and tutors and others (governing board members, learned gentlemen) made up a board of examiners and questioned students in a public setting.

C. Attempts to Introduce Modern Subjects Mostly Failed

1. William Smith at the College of Philadelphia, Thomas Jefferson at William and Mary, e.g., modern languages, practical subjects such as navigation.

Faculty (1636-1783)

A. Temporary/Low Status

1. Faculty were young "tutors" who usually stayed for only a few years until they could secure gainful employment, e.g. a clerical position.

Historical Perspectives: Age of the Private College (1783-1860)

Overall Development and Themes (1783-1860)

A. The New Nation: State Initiatives and Thwarted Plans for a National University

1. Establishment of "State Institutions" (until Dartmouth College case, discussed below, most state charters creating new institutions gave them the status of private corporations): State legislatures established new relationships to existing institutions and to many new ones in the post-war years. North Carolina (1789), Georgia (1785), Tennessee (1794), and Vermont (1791) founded state-chartered, state-supported institutions before 1800. But "public universities" grew slowly throughout the ante-bellum period, even after Mr. Jefferson's University (University of Virginia) was established in 1819.
2. Establishment of Specialized Institutions: West Point (1802) and Rensselaer (1824).
3. Thwarted Plans to Establish a National University: As early as 1778 James Fenno and Benjamin Rush promoted the idea of a national university, an idea unsuccessfully championed by George Washington and by many others throughout the nineteenth century.

B. Dartmouth College (1819) Case

1. During the colonial period, some colonies made attempts to "take over" existing institutions, e.g., Yale and William and Mary. This continued in some states during the early nineteenth century. The state of New Hampshire tried to take over Dartmouth College and, for a time, there were two "colleges." In reversing the unanimous decision of the state court, the U.S. Supreme Court (under John Marshall) held that Dartmouth College was a private corporation. In so doing, the High Court established the sanctity of the "private contract," that is, the decision put the public on guard that the government would protect private corporations and assured investigators

and creditors that corporations were free of outside governmental influence. The long-range effect of the Supreme Court decision on higher education was: 1) to encourage the establishment of private colleges, 2) to make the distinction between private and public colleges, and 3) to establish the independence of the board of trustees.

C. Multiplication of Private Colleges and the Rise of Sectarianism

1. Growth of Private Institutions: During the first half of the nineteenth century, there was phenomenal growth in private colleges. Approximately 700 denominational colleges were established, with a failure rate of about 80 percent. By the beginning of the Civil War (1861), there were approximately 250 colleges--most of which were private.
2. Sectarianism: In most of the denominational colleges, there was a strong religious influence. Among other ways, this was manifest in compulsory prayers and church services and religious revivals. According to Frederick Rudolph, revivalism was a regular visitor at most American colleges before the Civil War: "Most colleges presidents and college faculties of this era felt that they--or God--had failed a collegiate generation if once during its four years in college there did not occur a rousing revival."

D. The College Under Assault: Attempts to Reform the Undergraduate (Classical) Curriculum and Liberal Arts College

1. Reform Impulses: At Harvard in the second decade of the century, several professors (Everett and Ticknor) did their advanced study in Germany and were greatly impressed by numerous features of German universities: good libraries, the lecture rather than the recitation method, the emphasis on scholarship, academic freedom for faculty, freedom for students to select their own course of study, the absence of in loco parentis. Like Jefferson, who was influenced by European higher education, they wished to reform colleges and introduce modern subjects and provide greater freedom for faculty and students alike. In the same vein, though less influenced by German and continental models, a number of college presidents wished to make colleges more responsive to the larger society.
2. Efforts at Reform:
 - a. Thomas Jefferson, founder, at U. of Virginia (self-governance for students, the elective system, introduction of modern subjects including languages).
 - b. President James Marsh at the U. of Vermont in 1820s (attempted to place new subjects on a par with the classics and to open the university to students not prepared for classical studies).
 - c. Professor Jacob Abbott at Amherst in 1820s headed faculty committee that proposed a parallel course of study (English lit. and American political theory) in addition to the classical course of study.
 - d. President Francis Wayland of Brown in 1840s urged free electives and a broader course of study.
3. Overall Failure of Reform Efforts
 - a. Most of the above efforts failed, as did numerous other efforts throughout higher education to reform the curriculum though, of course, there were minor changes at some institutions, including the introduction of modern subjects such as mathematics and the sciences. But the opposition to reform--as exemplified in the Yale Report of 1828 and Yale's influence throughout higher education--forestalled major changes in the classical curriculum.

E. Reaction to Proposed Reforms: Vigorous Defense of the Classical Curriculum and the Traditional Liberal Arts College--The Yale Report of 1828

1. Impetus: As David Tyack and many other historians have noted, the Yale Report was written in response to growing demands for reappraisal of the prescribed classical curriculum and accompanying interest in modern subjects and more practical education. In 1827 President Jeremiah Day asked the Yale faculty to look into the possibility of a more "vocational" component as well as to evaluate the role of the liberal arts and to examine the expediency of "eliminating the dead languages."

2. Yale Report of 1828: The report stated that the purpose of education is "the discipline and furniture of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge." It especially emphasized "mental discipline," laying the foundation for later professional training, "parental superintendence" on the part of the college--and it stridently defended the classical curriculum and the "dead languages" as the most appropriate vehicles for cultivating the "discipline" and "content" of the mind.

3. Impact Throughout Higher Education Forestalled Major Changes in Higher Education for Next 30 to 40 Years.

a. John Brubacher and Willis Rudy referred to the Yale Report in the following way:

"This report was probably the most influential publication in the whole history of American higher education between the Revolution and the Civil War. It marked a real turning point. As a thorough going defense of the traditional liberal arts college, it gave heart to academic conservatives everywhere. To be sure, this was but a temporary stemming of the tide; nevertheless, during the ante-bellum period, the Yale pronouncement exercised great sway."

F. Theme: Strident Opposition to Women in Higher Education, Initial Efforts to Accommodate Women in Higher Education

1. Widespread Male View of Women: In no small measure, women were viewed as intellectually inferior to men. Reflecting the widespread sexism that was publicly displayed within higher education are the comments of Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale in his Phi Beta Kappa address:

"The best diploma for a woman is a large family and a happy husband. She should place the `he' before the `arts' to obtain the degree of "Mistress of Hearts."

2. Female Seminaries as Precursors: Before the development of collegiate education for women, academies and seminaries worked out a program of mixed secondary and collegiate studies emphasizing English, science, modern language, history, and utilitarian subjects. The women's college movement was an extension of the female seminary idea.

3. Introduction of Women in Higher Education. Prior to the Civil War, there were two forms of higher education for women:

a. Co-education: Oberlin introduced co-education in 1837 and several of the state universities (Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana) followed suit in the 1850s and 1860s.

b. Women's Colleges: Although Wesleyan Female College (Georgia) was established in 1836 and a dozen or so women's colleges were established in the 1850s (such as Elmira College), it was not until after the Civil War that the women's college movement gained momentum.

Governance, Management, Leadership, and Finance (1783-1860)

A. Substantial Lay Board Influence

1. While trustee power was not unlimited, trustees retained strong control over budget, priorities, and planning.

B. Strong Presidential Authority/Leadership

1. The old-time college president was chief executive, fund-raiser, ceremonial head, teacher (the senior capstone class on moral philosophy), counselor and spiritual guide to students. On a small scale, the office of the president usually combined the present day offices of president, dean of students, bursar, chaplain, head of public relations, professor in philosophy department.
2. Uniquely American: In contrast to Europe, where a president or "rector" served for a limited period and with limited authority, college presidents in this country were sometimes towering figures, e.g., Francis Wayland at Brown and Mark Hopkins at Williams. As Frederick Rudolph put it: "The development of nonresident control helped to change the president from being either first among equals or spokesman or leader of the faculty into something far different-- representative of the governing board and a significant power in his own right."

C. Finance: Multiple Sources of Income

1. Early colleges--most of which were always on the verge of financial collapse--resorted to many sources of income:
 - a. Individual benevolence
 - b. Subscriptions (labor or produce)
 - c. Annuity arrangements
 - d. Paid agents (clergymen)
 - e. State funding (lotteries, land, tax exemptions, grants)

Curriculum and Instruction (1783-1860)

A. Continued Dominance of Classical Curriculum (see above)

1. In 1828-1829, the entire Yale curriculum occupied one page of the college catalog.

Students (1783-1860)

A. Student Responses to the Early Nineteenth Century College: "Collegiate Way," "Mental Discipline," and Suffocating Intellectual Life

1. In response to the "collegiate way" (common curriculum, residential living, rural setting, dorms, paternalism and discipline) and the absence of curriculum reforms, students responded in two major ways.
 - a. Student Disorders and Riots (vandalism, rowdiness, deaths). In the Harvard rebellion of 1823, 43 of 70 students were expelled.
 - b. Extracurriculum: Students established literary societies that led to the development of student libraries (books and journals) and student debates. Influenced by the German gymnasium, students organized athletic activities: boxing, hunting, swimming, skating, foot races, and marbles.
 - c. In a chapter on the extracurriculum, Frederick Rudolph said that during the first half of the nineteenth century there took place an "unseen revolution. For the American college, if it could not be reformed from the top, could be redefined from the bottom. If it was not seriously reshaped by the Jeffersons . . . , it was nonetheless significantly changed by now unknown and forgotten hosts of undergraduates."

Historical Perspectives: Emergence of the American University and the University Ideal (1865-1910)

Overall Developments and Themes (1865-1910)

A. The Federal Government and the Morrill Act of 1862 (Land-Grant Act)

1. The principle of the federal government providing land for public purposes can be traced to the Northwest Ordinance of 1787--hence the Morrill Act of 1862 (and the Second Morrill Act of 1890) was built on a series of earlier precedents. But the Morrill Act marked the first major federal commitment to higher education, including the idea of federal support to encourage the growth of public higher education in general, agriculture and the mechanic arts (engineering) in particular. Influenced by the "Plan for an Industrial University for the State of Illinois" developed by Jonathan Turner in 1851 and strongly supported by Congressman Justin Morale, the Morale Act provided that each state would receive public lands or land scrip equivalent to 30,000 acres for each senator and representative--provided that said income would be used to support a college which would teach agriculture and mechanic arts.

2. Approaches to State Use of Land-Grant Funds:

- a. Establish a curriculum in agriculture and mechanic arts at an existing college (e.g., Rutgers University and the U. of Vermont).
- b. Establish a new curriculum as part of a new state university or an existing state university (e.g., Wisconsin and Minnesota).
- c. Establish an entirely new institution for agriculture and mechanic arts (e.g., Michigan and Iowa).
- d. Develop separate but equal colleges (e.g., Indiana and Virginia established A&M institutions). Note: Separate colleges for blacks were established in Mississippi, Missouri, Arkansas, Alabama, Texas, and Kentucky.

3. Long-term effects of Morrill Acts (1862 and 1890): a) encouraged colleges and universities to respond to changing needs of the nation, b) encouraged colleges to foster equality of educational opportunity, c) gave some dignity to vocations, and d) encouraged the growth of science.

B. The American State University and the Idea of Service (Utility)

1. One of the most dominant developments of the late nineteenth century was the rise of the state universities. As reflected in the prestigious state universities (Michigan and Wisconsin), followed closely by other Big Ten universities as well as flagship institutions throughout higher education, the state universities were more or less committed to service in a variety of ways, including:

- a. All-Purpose Curriculum (see below).
- b. Providing educational opportunities to a broader range of students.
- c. Direct service to society. While service to state and society has taken many forms, the University of Wisconsin is often credited with being the prototypic state university--as reflected in the Wisconsin Idea that was articulated by President Charles Van Hise at Wisconsin early in the twentieth century. (This idea was emulated by many public institutions throughout higher education.) The Wisconsin Idea embraced several vehicles of expression. First, through providing faculty "expertise" to state and nation, e.g., assisting state government officials and dairy farmers. Second, through "extension" programs, courses, and activities intended to meet the needs of citizens of the state. Third, through "applied research."

C. Development of the All-Purpose Curriculum (Horizontal Expansion)

1. The Morrill Act Opens the Door: Cornell University as Prototype

- a. Founded by Ezra Cornell (Western Union) and Andrew D. White.
- b. President White developed the Plan of Organization of Cornell University, whose features included: 1) students might enroll in parallel courses (that is, students could enter

a sequence of courses stressing Latin and Greek, a sequence substituting modern languages for Latin and Greek, or a sequence emphasizing modern languages and an extended range of scientific studies). In Andrew White and the Modern University, Rogers stated: "The point to which President White gave the most emphasis in the plan of study of the new university was the complete equality of courses. How indeed was the great new field of prospective students to be exploited if those engaged in the new studies were considered academically declassed? The railroad magnet's son studying steam engines or business administration must now be made to feel equal to the clergyman's son studying Greek."

c. When Cornell opened its doors in the late 1860s there was the beginning of the elective principle in that students were allowed limited selection. Selection, however, was limited to the last two years.

d. Early in its history, Cornell became a co-educational institution.

e. Cornell introduced the study of American history to the American university, as well as social studies. In 1878 White travelled abroad, took courses in economics and political science, and returned to establish lectures in sociology for all students. These lectures became the forerunner of departments of sociology. In a nutshell, Cornell provides an illustrative case study in the application of Morrill Act funds and it also illustrates in part the impact of German university ideals (see below) upon the development of the American university. Andrew White, it should be noted, had earlier served on the faculty at the U. of Michigan when President Henry Tappen, during the 1850s, was attempting to emulate the German University Model in Ann Arbor. (Tappen was accused of trying to "Prussianize" the university.) White had also studied in Germany and had made a special trip to Europe just prior to the opening of Cornell.

2. Harvard University as Prototype

a. In his 1869 inaugural address, Charles Eliot--one of the major proponents of the American university--said that Harvard would offer "not just the classics but everything that interests man." Over the next three decades, and using the device of the elective system, Harvard greatly enlarged course offerings such that traditional fields of study were redefined and broadened to incorporate the new disciplines/fields of study. For example, the traditional field of natural philosophy gave way to physics, chemistry, biology, geology; moral philosophy became political science, sociology, economics, and anthropology; and belles lettres became poetry, drama, the novel.

3. The State Universities as Prototype

a. Although Cornell (part public, part private) and Harvard were exemplars of the movement to an all-purpose curriculum during the last third of the nineteenth century, so too were the great state universities: Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, among others.

D. The Elective System and the Rise of the University Idea

1. Growth of the Elective System: Influenced by German university ideals and committed to the view that the introduction of the elective system would provide a major vehicle for breaking down the hegemony of the fixed classical course of studies and introducing new fields as well as providing opportunities for specialization, proponents of the university ideal embraced the elective system. Between 1869 and the turn of the century, for example, President Eliot at Harvard established the elective system such that students could choose almost all of their courses; faculty, in effect, would offer their courses in an open market.

2. Limits on Electives and the Major: Many colleges and universities followed the lead of Harvard, though few went as far as Harvard. For example, Yale operated on the principle of "disciplined freedom by employing sequential courses, by groupings, and by requirements in

concentration and distribution. Other institutions used one or more of these approaches: distributions or groupings, major-minor requirements, sequential courses.

3. Elective System as Debate Between College Ideal and University Ideal: While on the surface the debate about electives concerned "student freedom" and the like, the underlying debate was about the purposes of the higher learning. As such, there were fierce public debates about the elective system throughout this period (for example, between President Eliot at Harvard and President James McCosh at Princeton--with the latter passionately opposed to the elective system on the grounds that it would destroy the old-time college). Eliot, in essence, saw the elective system as an instrument for bringing science and new disciplines into the curriculum, and for infusing a new spirit of inquiry and scholarship into the university. By the turn of the century, it was doubtless true in no small measure that the elective system had become the major vehicle for transforming many colleges into universities.

E. The Growth of Graduate Education (Vertical Expansion)

1. Although the U. of Michigan awarded the first master's degree in 1851 and Yale awarded the first Ph.D. in 1861, it wasn't until after the Civil War that graduate education grew rapidly. Over the ensuing 40 years many colleges became "universities" as liberal arts colleges were reorganized into universities which offered advanced study leading to master's and Ph.D. degrees. (Until the turn of the century, the master's degree was usually sufficient to secure a professorship. After 1900, however, the "Ph.D. Octopus"--as William James called it--was in full swing and those desiring to teach at universities were expected to hold the terminal degree.)

2. Johns Hopkins University (1876) as Exemplar of Research University. Although it was originally developed as a graduate institution (and hence was atypical), Johns Hopkins was widely emulated not least because it incorporated many of the characteristics of the German university. Daniel Coit Gilman--formerly president of the University of California--described the purpose of the new institution:

An enduring foundation; a slow development; first local, then regional, then national influence; the most liberal promotion of all useful knowledge; the special provision of such departments as are elsewhere neglected in the country; a generous affiliation with all other institutions, avoiding interference and engaging in no rivalry; the encouragement of research; the promotion of young men; and the advancement of individual scholars, who by their excellence will advance the sciences they pursue, and the society where they dwell.

Gilman continued, reaching rhetorical heights in defining this new university:

It is reaching out for a better state of knowledge than now exists; it is a dim but indelible impression of the value of learning; it is a craving for intellectual and moral growth; it is a longing to interpret the laws of creation; it means a wish for less misery in the schools, less bigotry in the temple, less suffering in the hospital, less fraud in business, less folly in politics; it means more study of nature, more love of art, more lessons from history, more security in property, more health in cities, more virtue in the country, more wisdom in legislation, more intelligence, more happiness, more religion.

Besides establishing academic departments and centering the university around the advancement of knowledge, Gilman sought at Johns Hopkins to emulate German universities in numerous other ways that would facilitate his vision of a university: learned societies, learned journals, distinguished visiting scholars. At Gilman's retirement in 1902, President Charles Eliot of Harvard said:

President Gilman, your first achievement here has been . . . the creation of a school of graduate studies which not only has been in itself a strong and potent school, but which has lifted every other university in the country in its departments of arts and sciences. I want to testify that the graduate school of Harvard University, started feebly in 1870 and 1871, did not thrive, until the example of Johns Hopkins forced our Faculty to put their strengths into the development of our instruction for graduates. And what was true of Harvard was true of every other university in the land which aspired to create an advanced school of arts and sciences.

3. By the turn of the century, there were roughly 20 leading graduate universities in the United States. Besides Harvard and Johns Hopkins, the private institutions included newly-established institutions (U. of Chicago, Stanford, and Clark) as well as older institutions (Columbia, Yale, Princeton). Public institutions included the Universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana.

F. The Idea of a University

1. What was the emerging idea of a university? At Cornell University and Iowa State University, the university seemed to be defined as a place where anything could be studied--from Greek and physical chemistry to bridge-building and diseases of the cow--with all subjects on equal footing. For Charles Eliot at Harvard the idea of a university was mostly a matter of "spirit." At the University of Virginia, the university idea rested on a broad base of courses and departments in which a student could study in depth. At Johns Hopkins, a university embraced a graduate faculty of arts and sciences whose life revolved around the advancement of knowledge. Daniel Coit Gilman defined the university in this way: "The university is the most comprehensive term that can be employed to indicate a foundation for the promotion and diffusion of knowledge--a group of agencies organized to advance the arts and sciences of every sort, and train young men as scholars for all the intellectual callings of life."

2. By the turn of the century, the main characteristics of a university included: a graduate school, professional schools, an all-purpose curriculum, a professional faculty, and an "organized" institution that was infinitely more complex than the traditional liberal arts college.

G. Conflict Over Basic Purposes (1865-1910 and Beyond)

Values:	<u>Undergraduate College Ideal</u> English (Teaching) Humanities Belief Ivory Tower Aristocratic Whole Person	<u>University Ideal</u> German (Research)/American (Service) Sciences Fact Connected to Society Democratic Cognitive Growth
---------	---	---

Purpose:	Transmission of Liberal Arts	Transmission of All Knowledge (Liberal/Professional/Vocational)
Curriculum:	Prescribed	Advancement of Knowledge Elective
Character:	Breadth of Study	Depth and Breadth
Teaching:	Lecture	Seminar, Laboratory, Lecture
Clientele:	Elitist	Democratic
Extracurr:	Collegiate Way	Rejection of Collegiate Way
Relationship to Society:	Indirect Service (Training of Leaders)	Indirect and Direct Service (Wisconsin Idea)

H. Counterrevolution (1908-1910): The Ongoing Effort to Reclaim the Past

1. In his Emergence of the American University, Laurence Veysey discusses the counterrevolution to the university ideal circa 1908-1910. Ardent proponents of the old-time college and traditional emphases on "liberal culture," the humanities, and the "well-rounded person"--what the nineteenth century liberal arts college symbolized--rejected the rise of the "university ideal." Veysey argues that the 20th century tendency has been to "blend and reconcile" these competing university ideals. To wit, he cites a professor of Greek at Columbia University who said in 1907 that the three chief aims of the university are culture, utility (service), and research, and concluded: "We may seek at times . . . to separate these notions, but they are really so interwoven in the complete idea of a university that no clear boundary lines can be drawn between them." While Veysey's thesis can be amply defended, there are many observers of higher education who contend that the university ideal--as expressed throughout the twentieth century--has been far more influenced by German (research) and American (service) ideals than English (teaching) ones.

I. Institutional Diversity: Colleges for Women and Blacks (African Americans)

1. Women's Colleges and the Rise of Coeducation

a. Women's Colleges: A total of 119 women's colleges were established by 1900. Many of these colleges--such as Vassar (1865) and Wellesley (1875)--were established in the Northeast, since most eastern colleges refused to admit women. (Harvard and Columbia reluctantly established "coordinate colleges" for women, having refused to admit women directly.)

b. Coeducation: In the West and newer institutions in the East (such as Cornell), many institutions (private and public) introduced coeducation following the Civil War. By the early twentieth century, all state universities admitted women save Virginia, Georgia, and Louisiana.

2. Higher Education for Blacks

a. Often despite great resistance, a number of black colleges were established after the Civil War. (Many of these colleges, including such institutions as Hampton and Fisk, began by offering mostly secondary school work and then gradually introduced college-level work. Many historically black colleges did not become four-year colleges until well into the twentieth century.) The Second Morrill Act of 1890 specifically prohibited payments of federal funds to states which discriminated against blacks in admission to their tax-supported colleges. In response, southern states established "dual systems" of higher education--and the doctrine of "separate but equal" was given judicial sanction by the Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896. The result was the founding of 17 black land-grant colleges in southern and southwestern states.

Major Influences on Higher Education (1865-1910)

A. The American Idea of Service, the Industrial Revolution and Utilitarian Needs, the Federal Government and Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 (Horizontal and Vertical Expansion)

B. German University Model: Research and Advanced Study, Disciplines, and Specialization

1. Roughly 9,000 Americans pursued graduate study in German universities during the nineteenth century and many were greatly impressed by German universities. While the English undergraduate model was not wholly replaced, the German university model had an enormous impact on the emerging American university, as expressed in the increased emphasis on research and Ph.D. training, the development of academic disciplines (as opposed to broad fields of study), specialization (which led to the development of "majors"), and the elective system.

Governance, Management, and Leadership (1865-1910)

A. Prophets of the New Ideals: Presidential Leadership in the Age of the University

1. This was the age in which university presidents clearly exercised significant--and highly public--leadership in higher education. They included:
 - a. Charles Eliot at Harvard (1869-1909)
 - b. Daniel Coit Gilman at California and Johns Hopkins (1872-1901)
 - c. Andrew White at Cornell (1867-1885)
 - d. James Angell at Michigan (1871-1909)
 - e. David Starr Jordan at Stanford (1891-1913)
 - f. William Rainey Harper at Chicago (1892-1905)
 - g. William Watts Folwell at Minnesota (1871-1885)
2. What did these men--and others like them--have in common? A commitment to the university idea and, in many instances, to the German university ideal. In addition, they tended to be fairly conservative in non-educational matters--including religion. For the most part, they accepted prevailing laissez-faire views. For example, Andrew White was a businessman as well as a professor, who stressed that he tried to learn from such "foremost business men" as Cornelius Vanderbilt. William Rainey Harper expressed concerns about trends toward socialism at the end of the century. In no small measure, their successes were tied to the purse strings of some of the leading figures in the "Gilded Age," including John D. Rockefeller, James Duke, Cornelius Vanderbilt, and J. Pierpont Morgan.

B. The Organized Institution: Organizational and Administrative Expansion and Differentiation

1. Administrative Complexity: During the 1870s and 1880s, most presidents were able to operate without large bureaucracies. But their encompassing styles of academic and administrative leadership became old-fashioned by the 1890s. Vice-presidents, librarians, registrars, admissions officers--these and other administrative positions were introduced as traditional presidential responsibilities were dispersed.
2. Academic Complexity: Concurrent with the development of administrative complexity, there was rapid growth and differentiation in academic structures (university senates, colleges, schools, departments) and academic officers (academic deans, department chairs). In many ways, academic departments became the indispensable vehicle for disciplinary and professional specialization--and the distinguishing feature of the organized university.
3. By the turn of the century, the roots of the modern organization of the university had been established. There were two major streams: a) a bureaucratic structure that was administratively complex, and b) a complex academic structure.
4. Not coincidentally, there was increasing "standardization" throughout higher education by the early twentieth century. To wit, entering students were expected to be 18 years of age, credit hours were introduced, and prospective students were expected to take entering exams.

C. The Distribution of Power: Trustees, Presidents, and Professors

1. Presidents and Trustees Dominate: While faculty gained a large measure of control over the curriculum and academic matters, trustees and presidents continued to exercise more influence than any other constituent group. Beginning in the 1880s and continuing throughout the twentieth century, boards were charged by faculty in particular with interfering in the administration of institutions--of failing to observe their proper function as legislative rather than executive bodies. In the 1880s and 1890s, boards dismissed faculty who took controversial positions as faculty questioned orthodoxies--notwithstanding the "academic freedom" championed by Thomas Jefferson and others throughout the nineteenth century. [From 1836 through much of the nineteenth century, orthodoxy was the rule on campus. Until the American revolution, for example, professors at William and Mary were required to subscribe to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. About the only thing that changed during the nineteenth century was the public issue on which conformity was demanded (e.g., religious orthodoxies were replaced by political ones--such as expected views on slavery).]

2. Illustrations of Presidential/Trustee Influence Over Faculty Views:

- a. Evolutionism (Darwinism). In 1878, Professor Alexander Winchell wrote a tract on the pre-Adamite origin of man. He was dismissed by the trustees at Vanderbilt. In the early 1870s William Graham Sumner began using Herbert Spencer's The Study of Sociology, which reflected evolutionary thinking. President Noah Porter "invited" him to withdraw it.
- b. Economic Issues: Property, Socialism, Labor, Currency. Among the charges levelled against faculty were: encouraging strikes, defending Eugene Debs, advocating municipal ownership of utilities, favoring free silver, opposing monopolies and a protective tariff. To wit, the economist Richard Ely at Wisconsin wrote extensively on labor problems, corporate abuses, and even Marxist socialism. He was encouraged to curtail his writings, but he did keep his position and, as such, won what the historian Richard Hofstadter called a "victory" that many of his contemporaries might have envied. At Stanford, Edward A. Ross advocated "bimetallism" and got into some difficulty. When Ross went further and indicated that he favored municipal ownership of street railways and publicly criticized the practice of encouraging Oriental immigration for purposes of providing "cheap labor" as a threat to the American standard of living, he was let go by President David Starr Jordan.
- c. In 1915, with the establishment of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), tenure was associated with academic freedom. And in the 1950s academic freedom became a constitutional right. Still, there were many cases throughout the twentieth century of presidents and trustees undermining faculty rights--from Charles Beard at Columbia to the McCarthy era and beyond.

Curriculum and Instruction/Teaching (1865-1910)

A. The All-Purpose Curriculum, Graduate Education, Elective System, Major

B. Lecture and the Seminar (German influences)

Faculty (1865-1910)

A. Rise of Academic Man (Sic)

1. The professoriate changed dramatically during the latter part of the nineteenth century. With the emergence of the university and the Ph.D. degree, the academic life as a bona fide career choice was established. With it, an academic hierarchy was developed--including faculty ranks--that persists to this day. Further, academics increasingly embraced values associated with research: specialization, graduate education, research and publication, self-promotion and the like.

Historical Perspectives: Higher Education in the 20th and 21st Century

Overall Developments and Themes

A. Triumph of the Multipurpose University and Resultant Strains

1. Writing in the late 1960s, Clark Kerr described the origins of the modern university and suggested that there were strains in the institution:

The modern American university draws primarily on three strains of history. First, on the British tradition of high quality training for a select group of undergraduates; second, on the German tradition of research for society and specialized training for graduate students; and third, on the American genius for service to many, if not most, elements of the surrounding community. Out of these three strains of history have come the three major functions of our contemporary universities. The second and third functions--research and graduate training, and service--have proved quite compatible. The first, undergraduate instruction, is finding it harder to coexist in its entirety with the other two.

B. Growth in Student Enrollments and Mass Higher Education (1945-Present): Increased Access to Higher Education

1. Very few students attended college prior to the twentieth century; in 1900 only about 4 percent of the college-age population attended college. Especially with the federal GI Bill in 1944, federal passage of student aid legislation in the late 1950s and 1960s and, most especially, the massive federal investment in student aid (via Pell Grants and others) following the enactment of the 1972 Higher Education Amendments, student enrollment in higher education increased dramatically: in the last 25 years, well over 40 percent of 18-22 year-olds have enrolled in college. Especially dramatic was the growth in student enrollments between 1960 and 1980, as overall student enrollment increased from 3.5 million to over 12 million during this period.
2. Until the early 1950s, private colleges enrolled over one-half of all students; they currently enroll less than one-quarter. Today, students are enrolled in more than 3,500 institutions, including more than 1,900 private institutions and more than 1,500 public institutions (including more than 1,200 community and junior colleges).

C. New Institutions

1. Two-Year Colleges (1901-Present): From Junior Colleges to Community Colleges
 - a. Explanations for the rise of junior colleges: need for trained workers, public concern about social equality, inaccessibility of four-year colleges, and university leaders who wanted to abandon the first two years of colleges.
 - b. Origins of two-year colleges: 1) expanded secondary schools; 2) Truncated four-year colleges; and 3) new two-year colleges.
 - c. Growth: By 1948, there were a total of 650 junior colleges, with junior colleges located in nearly every state; fully one-half were private and most enrolled relatively small numbers of students. Since then, the public sector has grown dramatically and today fewer than 200 of the 1,200 two-year colleges are private. The median public two-year college currently enrolls nearly 3,000 students, and roughly one in five community colleges enrolls over 7,000 students. By the 21st century, the following nine states had highly-developed community college systems: Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, New York, Ohio, Michigan, Virginia, and Washington.
 - d. Curricular Diversity: For the first half of the twentieth century, two-year colleges emphasized collegiate education and "academic transfer" programs. In the last 40 years, community colleges have also emphasized myriad programs and activities: 1) vocational

and technical (career) education; 2) continuing education; 3) remedial/developmental education; and 4) community service.

2. Regional Colleges and Universities (many formerly teacher's college).

3. Urban Universities (such as the University of New Orleans, Cleveland State University, University of Illinois at Chicago, Georgia State University).

D. Growth of Professional Associations and Accrediting Agencies

1. New England Association: (1884)
2. Association of American Universities (AAU): 1900
3. Association of American Colleges (AAC): 1915
4. American Association of University Professors (AAUP): 1915
4. American Council on Education (ACE): 1918

E. Curriculum: Ongoing Attempts to Rescue "Liberal Culture" via General Education

1. Group-Distribution and Concentration (Major) System Established in 1909 by Abbott Lawrence Lowell at Harvard: Copied by Many Colleges and Universities Throughout Twentieth Century.
2. General Education "Movements" Throughout Twentieth Century: In response to the breaking-up of the classical liberal arts model and a common core of liberal studies, most colleges and universities developed general education programs that, for the most part, were aimed at recapturing at least part of the old liberal arts core through reclaiming roughly one-third of the undergraduate curriculum. While many institutions were content with "distribution" requirements, others sought to develop more inclusive cores which were organized (in whole or in part) around Great Books or, more commonly, interdisciplinary courses and experiences.
 - a. Columbia University in 1918 developed a survey course on War Issues which subsequently became part of "Contemporary Civilization" and the general education program at Columbia.
 - b. During the 1920s, many other colleges developed general education programs that included broad survey courses and, in general, sought to recapture the "liberal culture" associated with old-time liberal arts colleges. These included institutions such as Michigan State University, Reed College, and the University of Chicago.
 - c. In the 1940s, Harvard once again served as bellwether with the publication of General Education in a Free Society, which led many institutions to renew efforts to strengthen their general education programs--including adding survey courses in Western civilization.
 - d. During the 1980s and early 1990s, there was another round of reform attempts which, in many instances led to modifications in the "canon."

F. Students: Student Personnel Movement (1920-Present)

1. The student personnel movement of the twentieth and twenty-first century represents both an effort to restore a more unified experience to undergraduate students and an effort to revive the old-time college's concern for the "whole student." (The rapid growth of the student personnel movement has often been attributed to the growing reluctance on the part of many faculty to place much emphasis on student development writ large.) The student personnel movement has grown rapidly as deans of student affairs and their staffs (including counselors and advisors) have gained a foothold in colleges and universities.

G. Curriculum: Rise of the Professions

1. While several professions (such as education and medicine) witnessed the establishment of professional schools during the late nineteenth century, not until the twentieth century did

professional schools become signature features of the higher learning. In the last 40 years, colleges and universities have been influenced more and more by professional schools at the expense of schools and colleges of letters and science (liberal arts and sciences)--especially at the undergraduate and master's levels where roughly two-thirds and seven-eighths, respectively, of students are enrolled in professional degree programs. (At the doctoral level, about one-half of all students are enrolled in professional programs.)

H. Faculty: Professionalization of the Faculty

1. In The Academic Revolution, David Riesman and Christopher Jencks argued that faculty have become a major force in colleges and universities, especially in the post-World War II era. Not least because of outside funding they attract, many people support this view.

I. Major Purposes of Higher Education

1. As noted by Clark Kerr in The Great Transformation in Higher Education: 1960-1980, historically six purposes have been served by higher education:
- a. Individual Aspirations
 - b. Religious Convictions
 - c. Political Participation
 - d. Economic Growth
 - e. Absorption of Immigrants
 - f. National Power and Regional Advantage

J. Contemporary Curriculum Trends

1. Growing Role of Public Institutions (Large Public Institutions and Community Colleges)
2. Changing Demographics (More Older, Part-Time, Female, Racially and Ethnically Diverse Students and in terms of SES)
3. Public Concern about Quality
4. Assessment Movement
5. The Total Quality Management Movement in Higher Education

K. Distinguishing Features of Curriculum in Higher Education in the U.S.: 21st Century

1. Diversity (Purposes, Curriculum, Students).
2. Equality of Educational Opportunity.
3. Strong Role of Voluntary Cooperation (e.g. accreditation).
4. Commitment to Service: Clientele, Programs, Activities.
5. Scope and Magnitude of Higher Education.
6. Significant influence of Market and Market-Related forces
 - a. Outcomes, in turn, are not often the result of purposive planning.
 - b. Since "producers" (colleges and universities) have been relatively numerous, their behavior often seems to be influenced by competition for "buyers"--which strengthens the buyer's influence over the product (higher education).
7. Unique Role of General Education.
8. Institutional Flexibility
9. Significant Role of Voluntary Associations

Questions for Discussion:

1. What were the origins of the "seven liberal arts" curriculum?
2. Discuss the impact of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Enlightenment on the curricular development of the American college and university.

3. How did the great English and Scottish universities influence college curricula in this country?
4. Identify the major attempts to modify the curriculum during the late eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century. Who were the reformers? What were they trying to accomplish? How successful were they?
5. How did the German university influence the development of college and university curricula during the latter part of the nineteenth century?
6. What social, political, economic, and educational forces brought about the curriculum reforms of the late nineteenth century?
7. What were the major reforms in graduate and undergraduate education during the latter part of the nineteenth century?
8. What were the major features of the "typical" undergraduate curriculum by the end of the nineteenth century?
9. Discuss the development of graduate education in the United States with particular reference to the establishment of John Hopkins University. Can it be said that Johns Hopkins set the pattern for the development of graduate education in the United States? What features, if any, were carried over into other graduate programs? Why did it have this impact?
10. Trace the development of professional education in higher education during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and twenty-first centuries.
11. Trace the evolution of the community college in terms of curricular development.
12. As you review the major recent developments in curricula during this century, what themes or common patterns seem to cut across many of the innovations? What have been the major curricular innovations in the late twentieth century and twenty-first century?
13. Do most of the recent (twenty-first century) innovations in curriculum represent "new" curricular approaches, or are they mostly older practices cloaked in a more modern garb?
14. Colleges and universities often have been regarded as monolithic institutions with similar historical roots. Trace the historical evolution of the following five types of colleges and universities and comment on the similarities and differences in their curricular evolution: (a) land-grant universities; (b) state colleges and regional universities; (c) community colleges; (d) elite private institutions; and (e) private liberal arts colleges.
15. Trace the evolution of liberal education in America. What are its origins and patterns of development? How has the liberal curriculum changed in the last two hundred years?
16. Give several examples of institutions which have kept their general education programs viable for a long period. What policies, practices, and procedures have been used to keep these programs active and viable?

17. Trace the history of general education in the twentieth century. Where did the major reforms take place? Identify the similarities and differences in approaches used to develop programs of general education.

18. What socio-educational forces brought the general education movement into being? Are the same forces operative today?

19. What characteristics or features of American colleges and universities tend to support liberal/general education? What characteristics tend to undermine liberal education?

Essay-Type Questions

1. Change and Innovation in the American Undergraduate Curriculum: From Harvard to the Present

The following quotation is taken from William DeVane's Higher Education in Twentieth-Century America:

It is characteristic of the country that supports our heterogeneous educational establishment, so diverse in size, structure, purpose, and quality, that no strong national organization has ever been created to regulate or standardize it, or even to advise it with authority. Contrary to the European practice, our government has never had a minister of education. . . . In spite of the recommendations of several early presidents of the country, Washington and Jefferson among them, no national university was ever established, and to this day the city of Washington is not the educational center that some of our large cities are. Control of higher education has been left to local, private or state initiative. In this climate of *laissez faire*, there has been a "wild, uncontrolled, and uncritical expansion," shocking to the Europeans but truly in the American grain.

Write an essay on "Change and Innovation in the American Undergraduate Curriculum: From Harvard to the Present." Begin your essay by stating whether there has been "wild, uncontrolled, and uncritical expansion" in the undergraduate curriculum from the 1636 founding of Harvard College to the present. Then go on to write an essay in which you argue either for or against the proposition that change and innovation have characterized the development of the undergraduate curriculum since 1636. State your main thesis and go on to support it. Devote roughly two-thirds of your essay to the period from 1636 to the 1960s, spending the remaining one-third on contemporary developments in college curricula. Be sure to support your thesis with reference to pertinent historical evidence as well as the current literature on undergraduate education.

2. Persistence and Change in College and University Curricula: From 1636 to the Present

In The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States, C. DeWitt Hardy commented upon the development of curriculum in American higher education:

From the preceding historical description it is clear that American Higher Education has fitted its programs (curricula) to the changing American environment, while following at the same time an essentially unchanging purpose. It has in every age reflected the needs of the age, but it has also carried down through its history a tradition of liberal learning that sets it apart from other kinds of learning.

Write an essay on "Persistence and Change in College and University Curricula: From 1636 to the dawn of the new Millennium." In your essay, respond to both of the points raised by Hardy (as well as a question that his quotation raises) by addressing three major questions: (1) In what sense, if any, has there been an "essentially unchanging purpose" in American higher education (in terms of the curriculum) across the last three and three-quarters of a century? Do you agree with Hardy that the "essentially unchanging purpose is a . . . tradition of liberal learning?"; (2) In what sense, if any, has American higher education "fitted its programs (curriculum) to the changing American environment" over the same period?; (3) In light of your analysis of the first two questions and the relative weight you have assigned to the themes of persistence and change, what are the consequences of persistence and change for the current condition of the undergraduate curriculum? That is, how have curricular persistence and change affected the contemporary curriculum? (For example, has one or both led to curricular continuity, revitalization, and integration or chaos, confusion, and disarray?) In any event, develop your own thesis and support it.

In your essay, draw upon your knowledge of college and university curriculum from 1636 to the present, referring to specific periods and developments to support your response. Devote approximately two-thirds of your essay to the period from 1636 to the 1960s; the remaining one-third should be concerned with curricular development (persistence and change) in the late 1960s through the first decade of the twenty-first century. In developing your essay, you should refer (where appropriate) to pertinent developments, trends, innovations, models of undergraduate education (including liberal education), and major curricular concepts which provide support for your major theses regarding persistence, change, and the consequences of both for the current condition of the undergraduate curriculum.

3. A Cyclical View of Curriculum Development: From Harvard to Recent Developments in College and University Curricula

Along with many other scholars, Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee sought to explain history in terms of "cycles." While their "philosophies" of history have not enjoyed widespread support among historians in the last 40 years, many scholars--at least in private conversation--agree that there is more than a grain of truth in their philosophy of history.

As you look at the history of curriculum in American higher education, do you agree or disagree with the statement that much of what has happened and is now happening in college and university curricula has an earlier precedent--or has seemed to have happened before? Go on to write an essay in which you build a case either "for" or "against" a cyclical view of curricular development in American higher education. Base your essay on the use of historical and contemporary materials--including names, events, dates, and curricular developments--from the founding of Harvard in 1636 to the innovations and reforms of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, and the twenty-first century.

Views of General, Liberal, and Professional Education: Definitions of "Liberal" and "Education"

Latin Roots

1. "Liberal" comes from the Latin, liberalis, meaning "to free."
2. "Education" comes from the Latin, educare, meaning "to draw out."

Anchored in these definitions, my definition of a liberal education is one which frees us to draw on multiple perspectives in order to know ourselves and our society. Or, to put it differently, a liberating education is one in which we draw upon our own and others' knowledge in a spirit of free and open inquiry.

As this definition suggests, I tend to view liberal education as a perspective--if you prefer, a way-of-knowing--rather than a commodity (e.g., a core curriculum, the liberal arts and sciences, the Great Books). For better or worse, many other individuals over the years have not shared this perspective.

The Greek Ideal of a Liberal Education

A. Beginnings: The beginnings of modern liberal education can be traced back to the Greek city-state. In Athens, the ideal of a liberal education was grounded in two classical Greek concepts: paidea and arete. These concepts were defined as follows:

1. Paidea = from the Greek, pais or paidos, the upbringing of a child. More broadly, the concept of paidea is related to the Latin concept of humanitas ("the humanities), or the "general learning that should be the possession of all human beings" (Adler, 1982).
2. Arete = "the ability to live one's life well and the knowledge of what it is to be human" (Conrad and Wyer, 1980, 6).

B. The Greek Ideal of a liberal education, therefore, centered around the following question: "What kind of paidea leads to arete?" To put it another way: "What kind of general learning leads to a knowledge of what it is to be human and to live one's life well?" (and, as such, frees each of us to live our own lives openly and honestly).

C. As Clif Conrad and Jean Wyer have written, the Greek Ideal of a liberal education was that it was intrinsically a "moral activity": "It was not moral in a narrow religious context but rather in a sense that there was something vital at stake, an idea or a situation that demanded free choice and commitment along with a concomitant willingness to bear great risks" (1980, 7). The Greek ideal of liberal education was, in a pithy Socratic phrase, to "know thyself."

Four Essential Features of a Liberal Education

1. While we have briefly touched upon the Greek Ideal of a liberal education and examined how various individuals have defined a liberal education, we have not specifically addressed what a liberal education should do for students. In his splendid essay, "Reviving the Connected View" (Commonweal, February 2, 1979, pp. 42-48), Bernard Murchland provides us with an interesting perspective on this topic.

2. Murchland takes a broad view of the liberal arts as follows:

"The liberal arts are the arts of emancipation, the free and the freeing arts. They aim to free the mind from ignorance, the will from bondage and society from tyranny. Freedom is the core value

of the liberal arts tradition. Thus viewed, liberal education should be a training in freedom; it should tell us what our freedom is and how to use it."

3. With this view firmly in mind, Murchland outlines what he believes are three "essential" features of a liberal education, noting what each should teach students. These "essential" features are cultural formation, values formation, and skills formation.

1. Cultural Formation: A liberal education should transmit those "great ideas and deeds that [have] shaped the past and [now] shape us" for these ideas and deeds comprise the "basic elements of our cultural formation."

As Murchland puts it, a liberal education "should convey a dramatic sense of what the greatest minds have thought, what the greatest artists have wrought, what the greatest leaders have done." From his perspective, a knowledge of the past is vitally important, for it allows the "liberally educated mind [to] develop the ability to reach backwards in time, to identify imaginatively with the past." In this way, educated people demonstrate their abilities to make connections between the past and the present; they bring an historical and cultural consciousness to bear on their understandings of former and current events.

2. Values Formation: A liberal education "should aim to make value issues central to the intellectual life. . . and to make it clear that a college, like other organizations, is a community of moral agents." A liberal education emphasizes values formation by challenging students to examine and understand how their values have been shaped by their own familial, cultural, educational, and social settings.

As Murchland writes:

"My understanding of value formation is based upon the following premise: all ideas and intellectual systems take rise from prior value assumptions and have ethical ramifications in society and in individual lives. Students should be trained to detect the value matrix out of which theories emerge and become familiar with how values are formed and operate in society. They should become, let us say, value alert. . . ."

3. Skills Formation: A liberal education should also teach students those intellectual skills and habits of mind that will allow them to reason critically, communicate forcefully, and think broadly and freely.

The following skills and habits of mind have frequently been mentioned as intended outcomes of a liberal education:

a. Intellectual and Social Skills

- Higher Order Thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, evaluation, problem- solving)
- Communication skills (clarity of expression in writing, speaking, listening)
- Quantitative skills (mathematical and computational skills)
- Library and information research skills
- Interpersonal skills

b. Attitudes or Habits-of-Mind

- Intellectual integrity (respect for evidence, respect for reason, respect for contingent nature of truth)
- Open-mindedness (willingness to suspend judgment, tolerance for ambiguity, respect for others' views)

- Cultural sensitivity (respect for diverse cultures and traditions)
- Intellectual motivation (curiosity, initiative, appetite for learning)
- Aesthetic sensibility (appreciation for the fine arts, literature, and natural beauty)
- Intellectual commitment
- Sense of civic responsibility (social consciousness and responsibility)

4. Murchland's conception of liberal education is not altogether different from Paul Dressel's. As Dressel explains in his classic, College and University Curriculum (1968), a liberal education should provide students with a knowledge of their culture as well as various academic disciplines, strengthen their written and verbal communication skills, and heighten their awareness of their own and others' values:

"Liberal education is defined not by knowledge, but rather by behavior and the quality of actions and thought. The objectives of liberal education, then, should describe what constitutes a liberally educated person. First, such a person knows and understands the essential ideas and concepts necessary to live effectively in his own culture. Second, he is familiar with the modes of thought of several disciplines and is able to utilize these appropriately in making his own judgements. Third, he communicates ideas through reading and listening and by clearly expressing his own ideas in writing and speaking. Fourth, he understands the values upon which his society is based; he is aware of some of the differences between these and the values of other societies and cultures; and he consciously accepts a personal set of values which guide his own judgement and actions."

What is General Education?

General education goes by many names: the core curriculum, the common learning, the first two years of "required study." In recent years, the attempt to distinguish between general education and liberal education has become futile, in large part because scholars and practitioners alike have conflated the two.

Some Definitions of General Education

1. "General education represents those courses that the college regards as so important that they are required of all students, regardless of academic major or intended career." [Source: Gaff, Jerry. (1991). New Life For the College Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.]
2. "General education is a mediating influence that through institution-wide requirements ensures that all students obtain, from the many courses and programs an institution may make available, some knowledge of the ideas and culture that were once themes of the total liberal arts college." [Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1977). Missions of the College Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.]
3. General Education is "the breadth component of the curriculum. . . . [It is] the learning that should be common to all people." Its purpose? "To help students understand that they are not autonomous individuals, but are members of a human community to which they are accountable." [Source: Boyer, Ernest and Levine, Arthur. (1981). A Quest for Common Learning. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Improvement of Learning.]

Purposes of General Education

While many purposes have been promulgated for general education in American colleges and universities, the three most prominent are:

- a. To bring curricular coherence and unity to an otherwise fragmented and overspecialized undergraduate course of study.
- b. To promote social integration by teaching a diverse student clientele the knowledge, values, beliefs, and traditions upon which Western societies have developed and prospered.
- c. To provide students with a broad-based knowledge of the "truth strategies" (i.e., ways of knowing) in various disciplines and to assist students in developing general intellectual skills and habits of mind.

Four Models of General Education

More often than not, general education programs have been structured according to four basic models: the distributive model, the major-dominated model, the core curricular/integrative model, and the competency-based model. [As an aside, many of these models have also been used to structure entire undergraduate programs of study. We will address these and other curricular models in greater depth later in the term.]

1. The Distributive Model

This is the most common model of general education. Put simply, this model circumscribes a specified number of courses to satisfy general education distribution requirements across targeted content areas, such as three courses in the natural sciences and two in the social sciences. Students may elect specific courses from an approved menu within the targeted areas.

In the distributive model, the tagging of specific courses is aimed at ensuring that general education courses are specifically designed in light of the overall aims of a liberal education--rather than driven by the demands of various disciplines. Most colleges and universities in the twenty-first century continue to structure their general education requirements around a distributive model.

2. The Major-Dominated Model

In this model, academic departments establish their own general education requirements for students. As such, it is quite possible that engineering students will complete different general education requirements than their peers majoring in history or business. Rather than being driven by an ideal of what "every educated person should know, this model allows faculty and administrators in specific majors to determine what they believe every "educated engineer" or "educated businessperson" should know.

3. The Core Curriculum/Integrative Model

This model requires all students to participate in a common, usually interdisciplinary, learning experience. A coherent set of courses are assembled--often around a unifying theme, such as the Great Books at St. John's or, as at Stanford, around the intercultural theme of Cultures, Ideas, and Values. In a similar vein, the core curriculum can be constructed around several unifying themes, such as interdisciplinary course clusters on "Cultures Past and Present," "Gods, Heroes, and Humans: Sources of Western Traditions," and "People, Perspectives, and Population"). In recent years, many institutions have developed imaginative core curricular models, including various learning community structures (which often group undergraduates into cohorts and require them to enroll in theme-based, interdisciplinary courses that require a good deal of collaborative learning).

4. Competency-Based Model

In this model, general education is defined as a set of outcomes or competencies--such as effective communication skills, aesthetic sensibilities, or problem-solving skills. Students must demonstrate their mastery of these competencies in order to fulfill general education requirements.

To illustrate, the general education program at Brigham Young University is based on a competency-based model. Students are required to pass a total of 15 evaluations in three separate skills areas: Basic Skills (reading, writing, mathematics, health), Higher Order Skills (analysis, comparison, synthesis in the arts, letters, social and natural sciences), and Advanced Skills (advanced writing skills and a major skill). Students may elect their own method for completing the requirements, including courses (traditional, workshop, individual study, group study) and evaluation methods (e.g., essays, traditional paper and pencil tests, demonstrations, portfolios, oral exams).

A Definition of Professional Education

Professional education represents those disciplines (and their respective courses) that emphasize "practical" or "useful" knowledge in preparation for a specific career. Among others, professional disciplines include business administration, education, engineering law, medicine, nursing, social work, and the visual and performing arts.

Tensions between Liberal and Professional Education

The debate between the "liberal" and the "useful" arts has raged in academe for many decades. Bruce Kimball has aptly portrayed this division as largely philosophical and semantic:

Contemporary society argues that the useful is more important than the liberal; Faculty from liberal arts disciplines argue that the liberal is better than useful; Faculty from professional fields argue that the useful is actually liberal; and faculty teaching the liberal arts argue that the liberal is actually useful." (Bruce Kimball, "Liberal versus Useful Education: Reconsidering the Contrast and Its Lineage," Teachers College Record 87 (1986): 575-587.)

In this chart, John Gallagher provides a sketch of the debate:

	Liberal Education (the "liberal arts")	Professional Education (the "useful arts")
Focus of Debate	This tradition argues that "the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake creates fully-rounded women and men with sharp enough minds to succeed at anything they attempt." (Gallagher)	This tradition argues that the "pursuit of practical knowledge, particularly the scientific, sharpens minds as effectively as the study of Greek or Latin, and addresses the broad needs of the people." (Gallagher)
Emphasis of Education	To teach individuals how to think clearly and to appreciate the wisdom of the collective past for its own merit	To prepare individuals for careers and to contribute to the collective good of society (through the creative application of knowledge to social, economic, technological, and political problems)
Perspective on Knowledge	Knowledge is an end in itself; it is valuable for its own sake (Such a perspective leads to an emphasis on basic research that seeks to understand and advance knowledge for its own sake.)	Knowledge is a means to an end; it is worthwhile only when it is applied (Such a perspective leads to an emphasis on applied and policy-related research that seeks to use knowledge to solve problems, inform policy, or contribute in some way in the service of others.)
Concerns of Each	Those who argue for the merits of liberal education are concerned with the growing fragmentation, hyperspecialization, and vocationalism of the curriculum--problems which they blame largely on the predominance of professional education in the academy. Fragmentation--in terms of incoherent, "department-style" curricula and the lack of a common glue to integrate and bind together peoples of a common national heritage--is of paramount concern to liberal education proponents.	Those who argue for the merits of professional education are concerned with the growing irrelevance of the curriculum and the "ivory tower" attitude of colleges and universities toward their constituents and communities. Proponents of professional education and, more specifically, "useful knowledge," are especially troubled by the lack of university responsiveness to and leadership in improving the educational, social, economic, and political well-being of our communities and society.
Advocates	Cardinal John Henry Newman, the Yale Report of 1828, Thorstein Veblen, Abraham Flexner, Robert Maynard Hutchins, William Bennett, Mortimer Adler, Allan Bloom, Chester Finn, Lynne Cheney	Benjamin Franklin, Francis Wayland, the Morrill Act of 1862, Andrew White, Charles Eliot, John Dewey, Clark Kerr, Carl Kaysen, Sidney Marland, Jr., Derek Bok

Re-Visioning Liberal and Professional Education as Liberating Studies

In an essay Jennifer Grant Haworth and I wrote on this topic, we argue that the debate between liberal education (i.e., liberal knowledge) and professional education (i.e., useful knowledge) is an illiberal and useless one for all involved ("Liberating Education in Modern Metropolitan Universities," *Metropolitan Universities*, 1991, 2(2): 21-30). Much like Peter Marsh, we believe that this schism is "little more than a tautology . . . this is obscured by lingering evaluative connotations that associate liberal education grandly with thought and professional education crudely with skills (1988, 12). Set in this context, we contend that the ongoing debate between the liberal and the useful arts must be set aside and replaced with a new emphasis on "liberating education." Instead of viewing liberal and professional education as commodities (each with their respective general education or major curriculums), we cajole faculty, students, and administrators to adopt a "liberating" perspective on the two by instilling an unfettered spirit of free inquiry and dialogue into all collegiate study. As we wrote in our article:

"According to Zelda Gamson, a "liberating education" is premised on three central features. First, it values the development of a broadened, contextualized "critical awareness" among individuals. Second, it stresses the importance of applying this "critical awareness" to everyday, practical problems. And third, it encourages individuals to develop and use their knowledge and skills to liberate and empower themselves and others (Gamson 1988).

When applied to undergraduate education, this "liberating" perspective takes on special importance. No longer are the liberal and professional disciplines illiberally conceived as the "thoughtful" and "useful" arts. Rather, these barriers are transcended by a common belief in "liberal learning" across all disciplines. As Ernest Lynton and Sandra Elman explain, it is this "liberating" approach that is at the crux of a truly liberal education for all students:

Liberal education is concerned with relationships and complexity, with exercising judgment and dealing with conflicting values. . . acquiring such [liberal] competence is inherently a synthesizing, multidisciplinary activity, bringing together the insights and methodologies of several pertinent disciplines. Whether liberal education is seen as helping professionals understand the context in which they function in their occupation or enabling individuals to exercise their civic responsibilities in a knowledgeable and rational fashion, the central need is to be able to bring a variety of perspectives to bear on complex issues (1987, 64).

"With its emphasis on the need for liberal learning across disciplines, a liberating approach seeks to develop the skills of holistic thought, critical awareness, contextual understanding, and synthetic reflection in students and faculty. These skills, for example, assist liberal arts and professional education students in understanding the context in which various professions are rooted and likewise help them to "practice their professions with a enlarged sense of the know-why of their calling as well as the know-how" (Curtis 1985, 12). In our essay, Jennifer and I advance a rationale for our thesis:

"Why emphasize 'liberating education' as a focal point for the metropolitan university? We offer three reasons. First, the diverse (cultural, occupational, age, gender) student population at metropolitan universities begs us to be open to a variety of ways-of-knowing and to the liberating views such a broad context-aware and interdisciplinary perspective can offer to these students. Second, with the high percentage of professional education students enrolled in metropolitan universities, the need for contextual and critical awareness is absolutely necessary to help them develop professional judgment and "reflective practice" (Schon 1985) skills in addition to general technical skills and competencies. Further, a liberal education helps all liberal and professional education students and faculty to develop a broadened perspective on the complex nature of reality. Finally, when faculty and administrators begin to work together and see the common ground

between their disciplines, not only will students be more liberally educated, but university responses to metropolitan issues will be more broadly construed and liberally defined. It is at this point that the university as an intellectual center devoted to liberal learning will be reasserted and sustained."

Possible Questions for Discussion:

1. In the introduction to The Reforming of General Education (1968), Daniel Bell wrote:

The bone structure of the liberal arts college has been the idea of general education. This has not necessarily been a commitment to cross-disciplinary or integrative courses which provide a number of diverse subjects or problems, though often, as at Columbia, Chicago, and Harvard, such was indeed the case. It has been, as a minimum, some commitment to a coherent arrangement or statement of curriculum, which was intellectually defensible within the aims of a liberalizing education. This has meant, in practice, that the college has stipulated some courses, or sequences of course, which students were required to take outside of any specializations
(p. xxiii).

The philosophical rationale for general education programs differs from program to program. The program may assume (a) a common cultural heritage, (b) a commonality of human experience, or (c) a common body of knowledge with which the "educated" person should be familiar. Some have argued that these assumptions can no longer be made and that general education faces a crisis today, largely because it can no longer be justified. Develop a cogent, intellectually defensible argument on behalf of general education.

2. Define liberal education. Is liberal education the same as general education? Can vocational and professional studies be liberal?

3. Key Curriculum Questions Concerning General/Liberal Education:

- a. What knowledge is most important to a liberal/general education? Why?
How should knowledge be structured in building a program of liberal education?
- b. How should cognitive skills (and qualities-of-mind) be attended to in the overall curriculum (including general education)?
- c. Assuming that ethical/moral/values development is an important part of a liberal education, how can colleges design curricula that place emphasis on values development?

4. The 1828 Yale Report stated: "The two great points to be gained in intellectual culture are the discipline and furniture of the mind: expanding its powers and storing it with knowledge." Appraise that statement from the vantage point of the present. What is known today about teaching and learning that might lead the authors of the Yale Report to revise their fundamental thesis? Does the report still represent an articulate defense of the liberal tradition?

5. "Now wisdom and goodness are the aim of higher education. How can it be otherwise? Wisdom and goodness are the end of human life. If you dispute this, you are at once entering upon a metaphysical controversy; for you are disputing about the nature of being and the nature of man. This is as it should be. How can we consider man's destiny unless we ask what he is? How can we talk about preparing men for life unless we ask what the end of life may be? At the base of education, as at the base of every human activity, lies metaphysics" (Robert Hutchins in Margolis, The Aims of Education, p. 21). Discuss the aims

of higher education. To what extent should institutions of higher education in the 21st century be concerned with "goodness" and "wisdom?" How have other writers formulated the individual and social aims of higher education? Would you develop distinct and different sets of aims for universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges? Is there a common set of aims which all institutions of higher education should share?

6. What are the distinguishing qualities of an educated person?

II. CURRICULUM CONVERSATIONS

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to “Section II: Curricular Conversations.” READER, pp.157-159
2. Clif Notes (see C. below)
3. Lucas: “Another Season of Discontent: The Critics.” READER, pp. 160-181
4. Hofstadter & Smith: “The Yale Report of 1828.” READER, pp. 186-194
5. Washington: “Industrial Education for the Negro.” READER, pp. 195-199
6. DuBois: “The Talented Tenth.” READER, pp. 200-210
7. Dunn: “The Educational Philosophies of Washington, DuBois, and Houston: Laying the Foundations for Afrocentrism and Multiculturalism.” READER, pp. 211-219
(SKIM)
8. Dewey: “President Hutchins’ Proposals to Remake Higher Education.” READER, pp. 220-222
9. Hutchins: “Grammar, Rhetoric, and Mr. Dewey.” READER, pp. 223-226
10. Reynolds: “A Canon of Democratic Intent: Reinterpreting the Roots of the Great Books Movement.” READER, pp. 227-247
11. Harvard Committee: “Theory of General Education.” READER, pp. 248-264
12. U.S. Presidents Commission on Higher Education: “Education for a Better Nation and a Better World.” READER, pp. 270-281

II. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

2. **Clif Notes:** In the course guide, the instructor takes note of a potpourri of perspectives on liberal education and then goes on to explore competing stakeholder claims on the undergraduate curriculum including both traditional and emerging voices. He then identifies four faces of the curriculum debate: canon, multiculturalism and cultural diversity, “political correctness,” and pedagogy.

Questions: Which, if any, of these four faces of the curriculum debate are currently being debated and are likely to continue being debated in the foreseeable future? Are there any other “faces” of the curriculum debate that are currently on the table or are likely to emerge in the near future?

3. **Lucas (Another Season of Discontent: The Critics):** Lucas provides an overview of the “discontent” over the curriculum by many critics (Robert Paul Wolff, Jencks and Riesman, Page Smith, Dinesh D’Souza, Michael Apple, E.D. Hirsch, Allan Bloom, Roger Kimball, Charles Sykes) representing often diverse perspectives) over the past few decades. Among the corrupting influences identified are: “multiculturalism/political correctness,” “canonicity, careerism and the entrepreneurial university,” “the impoverishment of the public sphere,” “publish or perish,” loss of community, “mindlessly mixing” vocational and academic courses, among others.

Questions: What “challenges” regarding the curriculum have endured over time, and what challenges have either been solved or set aside? In what ways does this reading enrich and enlarge the “contemporary conversation about the curriculum?”

4. **Hofstadter & Smith (The Yale Report of 1828):** Part One, written by Jeremiah Day, is a classic statement of an “educated person” with its emphasis on the “furniture” and “discipline” of the mind. To quote from the report the instructor’s favorite passage: *“Those branches of study should be prescribed, and those modes of instruction adopted, which are best calculated to teach the art of fixing the attention, directing the train of thought, analyzing a subject proposed for investigation; following, with accurate*

discrimination, the course of argument; balancing nicely the evidence presented to the judgment; awakening, elevating, and controlling the imagination; arranging, with skill, the treasures which the memory gathers; rousing and guiding the powers of genius.” Part One goes on to discuss “balance of character.”

Question: What, if anything, do you find “evocative” from this reading and, not least, pertinent to the “curriculum conversations of the 21st century?”

5. **Washington (Industrial Education for the Negro).** This article (for purposes of context: this was written over a century ago) and the two that follow invite reflection on college and university curriculum in terms of addressing inequality—reflections not only on inequality in terms of race and ethnicity and socioeconomic status but gender and sexual orientation and other inequalities as well. Booker T. Washington argues for “industrial education: *“We want more than the mere performance of mental gymnastics. Our knowledge must be harnessed to the things of real life. I would encourage the Negro to secure all the mental strength, all the mental culture—whether gleaned from science, mathematics, history, language or literature that his circumstances will allow, but I believe most earnestly that for years to come the education of the people of my race should be so directed that the greatest proportion of mental strength of the masses will be brought to bear upon the every-day practical things of life, upon something that is needed to be done, and something which they will be permitted to do in the community in which they reside.”* Also quoting Washington: *“I plead for industrial education and development for the Negro not because I want to cramp him, but because I want to free him. I want to see him enter the all-powerful business and commercial world.”*

Question: How persuasive do you find this article in the context of the 21st century—with regard to historically marginalized groups based on race and ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation among others?

6. **DuBois (The Talented Tenth).** W.E.B. DuBois called Washington “The Great Accommodator” and argued that the focus should be “educating” and not merely training the “talented tenth” of the African American community—and he has high praise for Historically Black Colleges and Universities—who in turn would return to their communities and uplift others. As he argues: *“A university is a human invention for the transmission of knowledge and culture from generation to generation, through the training of quick minds and pure hearts, and for this work no other human invention will suffice, not even trade and industrial schools.”* Note that more than one-half of African-American graduates at the end of the nineteenth century had studied to be “teachers” (clergyman was next).

Questions: Washington or DuBois? Or does their debate set up a false dualism between the “liberal” and the “professional/occupational/vocational”?

7. **Dunn (The Educational Philosophies of Washington, DuBois, and Houston: Laying the Foundations for Afrocentrism and Multiculturalism):** Frederick Dunn summarizes the positions of Booker T. Washington (“*accommodationist or technical skills-oriented philosophy*”) and DuBois (“*radical or liberationist and intellectual-oriented philosophy*”). Important Note: Nested within the context of the time—Plessy vs Ferguson in 1896 and “separate but equal”—DuBois arguably had little choice but to argue for segregated education. Charles Hamilton Houston, who grew up in the 20th century, espoused a “desegregation” philosophy.

8. **Questions:** Dunn argues that Washington and DuBois and Houston “form a continuum, a living legacy” . . . that will ultimately lead to the transformation of the society and greater measures of social justice for all.” Agree/Disagree/Other? Does/should their legacy inform contemporary discourse regarding curriculum, teaching, and learning? And if so, in what ways might it do so?

8. **Dewey (President Hutchins’ Proposals to Remake Higher Education):** John Dewey reviews Robert Hutchins’ classic text The Higher Learning in America (1936). Dewey applauds Hutchins for his diagnosis of “evils” in the Higher Learning (such as “aimless”), but takes “aim” at Hutchin’s solution,

namely, the celebration of the modes of inquiry pursued by the Great Thinkers (notably Plato and his pupil Aristotle)—including a “*belief in the existence of fixed and authoritative principles as truths not to be questioned*” and “*aloofness of higher learning from contemporary social life*” (which is reflected in “the constant divorce set up between the intellect and experience”).

Question: Is Dewey’s argument as relevant today as it was nearly a century ago?

9. **Hutchins (Grammar, Rhetoric, and Mr. Dewey):** Hutchins responds to Dewey in a spirited manner, ‘tho the careful reader might question this “debate” is more a “political debate” than a meaningful debate. That said, it is important to note that Hutchins’ celebrates the “great books” (eternal truths?) in contrast to Dewey and his emphasis on “experience.”

Question: In what ways, if at all, does Hutchins diminish Dewey’s argument—and vice-versa?

10. **Reynolds (A Canon of Democratic Intent: Reinterpreting the Roots of the Great Books**

Movement): Reynolds invites us to revisit conversations like those between Dewey and Hutchins. That invitation is nested in the thrust of her inquiry, namely, to (re) examine the “Great Books Movement.” In her words: “*A historical examination of the roots of the great books movement quickly veers away from the notion that classical text promoters harbored a nefarious desire to share truths among elite gate keepers—a concept that early canonists themselves sometimes mistakenly fueled in debates that started at the point of the instruments (the books) rather than the intents of liberal education.*” (The article discusses Alexander Meiklejohn’s residential learning community at UW-Madison in the late 1920 and early 1930s. I love this characterization of Meiklejohn and Scott Buchanan as having the ability to ask “*gentle, courteous questions that went off in one’s mind like time bombs and caused a major illumination when they exploded.*” More specifically, Reynolds’ discusses the efforts Scott Buchanan at the U. of Virginia and Mortimer Adler at the U. of Chicago to promote the Great Books. [Personal Note: Professor Conrad once served on a panel with Mortimer Adler. For perhaps the only time in his academic career, Professor Conrad’s voice was “unsparingly silenced” and he was allowed not a single word, much less an opportunity to express a fledging thought, at any point in a lengthy “panel” (sic) discussion.] She then goes on to discuss their success at St. John’s College in Annapolis to introduce a Great Books curriculum.

Question: How compelling is Reynold’s argument to rebut the proposition that the “great books” have constituted an effort to “support the politics of oppression”—an argument based on the proposition that Hutchins and Buchanan and Adler were trying to “democratize” liberal education by providing an opening to students from varying socioeconomic backgrounds, and that an idea is not a movement?

11. **Harvard Committee in 1945 (Theory of General Education) (The Redbook).** Written at the end of World War II, this document arguably was a powerful statement of liberal/general education. After paying tribute to Dewey’s emphasis on “the scientific way” of thought and the notion that “truth” is never absolute, they go on to define a “general education.” Beyond traditional areas of knowledge, they go on to identify traits of mind (such as “effective thinking” and “discrimination among values”) as well as place emphasis on the development of “wholeness” in college graduates as well as “citizenship.”

Question: In what ways, and to what extent, does contemporary debate over the college curriculum reflect the Redbook?

12. **U.S. Presidents Commission on Higher Education (Education for a Better Nation and a Better World) (1947).** The Truman Commission’s widely-cited work is nested in the aftermath of World War II and, not surprisingly, emphasizes the importance of education for democracy and establishing better relationships with other countries. The report is worth reading for its ideas of what is needed to more “fully realize democracy”—including cultivating social responsibility and “world citizenship.”

Question: Might all of us learn from the “voices” and “experiences” of the past—the Truman Commission, Dewey, Hutchins, and so on—for purposes strengthening curriculum, teaching, and learning in our colleges and universities?

Possible Exercise: Divide the class into four groups: Yale Report of 1828, Harvard Redbook of 1945, Dewey-Hutchins Exchange, and U.S. Presidents' Commission on Higher Education. Imagine a conversation among these groups in which the animating question was: What does it mean to be an educated person in the 21st century? What issues would come up in the conversation? What would likely be their major points of agreement and disagreement?

C. CLIF NOTES

A Potpourri of Perspectives on Liberal Education

Cardinal John Henry Newman, The Idea of the University (1852, p. 106):

"A liberal education is the education which gives a man a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgment, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them. It teaches him to see things as they are, to go right to the point, to disentangle a skein of thought, to detect what is sophistical, and to discard what is irrelevant. It prepares him to fill any post with credit, and to master any subject with facility. . . . I speak of a knowledge which is its own end, when I call it liberal knowledge, or a gentleman's knowledge, when I educate for it and make it the scope of the university. . . . [A liberal education] educates the intellect to reason well in all matters, to reach out towards the truth, and to grasp it."

Jeremiah Day and the Yale Report of 1828:

A liberal education should emphasize the "two great points to be gained in intellectual culture," namely, "the discipline and furniture of the mind, expanding its powers and storing it with knowledge. The former of these is, perhaps, the more important of the two. A commanding object, therefore, in a collegiate course should be to call into daily and vigorous exercise the faculties of the student. Those branches of study should be prescribed, and those modes of instruction adopted, which are best calculated to teach the art of fixing the attention, directing the train of thought, analyzing a subject proposed for investigation; following, with accurate discrimination, the course of argument; balancing nicely the evidence presented to the judgement; awakening, elevating, and controlling the imagination; arranging, with skill, the treasures which memory gathers; rousing and guiding the powers of genius. All this is not to be effected by a light and hasty course of study; by reading a few books, hearing a few lectures, and spending some months at a literary institution. The habits of thinking are to be formed by long, continued and close application. . . . If a dexterous performance of the manual operations, in many of the mechanical arts, requires an apprenticeship, with diligent attention for years; much more does the training of the powers of the mind demand vigorous, and steady, and systematic effort."

Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning In America (1936):

A liberal education and, in particular, the Great Books (which Hutchins recommended at the core liberal arts curriculum at the University of Chicago) "draw out the elements of our common human nature, because they connect man with man, because they connect us with the best that man has thought, because they are basic to any further study and to any understanding of the world."

Daniel Bell in The Reforming of General Education (1966, p. 49):

"Liberal education, for me, is more than the cultivation of the humanities, although it is certainly that. It is an emphasis on the grounds of knowledge. For this reason I reject the commonly made distinctions between general education as dealing with broad relationships and specialized instruction as presenting detailed material within an organized discipline. The relevant distinction, I feel, lies in the way in which a subject is introduced. When a subject is presented as received doctrine or fact, it becomes an aspect of specialization and technique. When it is introduced with an awareness of its contingency and of the conceptual frame that guides its organization, the student can then proceed with the mind open to possibility and to re-orientation. All knowledge, thus, is liberal (that is, enlarges and liberates the mind) when it is committed to continuing inquiry.

William Bennett, To Reclaim A Legacy (1984)

Bennett's view of liberal education is inextricably linked to the humanities, which he described as "a body of knowledge and a means of inquiry that convey serious truths, defensible judgments, and significant ideas. Properly taught, the humanities bring together the perennial questions of human life with the greatest works of history, literature, philosophy and art."

Zelda Gamson and Associates, Liberating Education (1984):

"Liberal education has to do with a certain kind of awareness, one that is broad and critical. . . . Intellectual skills and discipline are a very important part of this awareness, especially as they lead to a critical examination of ideas, one's own as well as others. . . .

"[Liberal education] should have a strong contemporary, even practical, bent. It should give people a better way of understanding their lives and the major forces shaping the modern world. It also endows them with the intellectual skills and the commitment to apply what they know to the world--a responsibility for enlightened action."

From Gamson's perspective, a "liberating education" is premised on three central features. First, it values the development of a broadened, contextualized critical awareness among all individuals. Second, it stresses the importance of applying this critical awareness to everyday problems. And third, it encourages individuals to develop and use their knowledge and skills to liberate and empower themselves and others.

Factors Precipitating and Influencing Efforts to Reform and Transform the Curriculum

In "Curricular Transformations: Traditional and Emerging Voices in the Academy," Jennifer Grant Haworth and I contend that the college and university curriculum is heavily influenced by prevailing events, values, and beliefs in the larger society. More specifically, we suggest that three broad societal changes--and an internal debate within academe fueled by emerging perspectives and knowledge claims--are closely linked to the widespread interest in strengthening undergraduate education and have shaped the debate over the direction of reform.

A. Changing Demographics and Student Diversity

Especially since the early 1980s, the ethnic and racial composition of our society has changed dramatically, and there have been more diverse (age, racial, and ethnicity) characteristics among college students than before.

B. Traditionalist Educational Policy Agenda

During the mid-1980s, the then Secretary of Education, William Bennett, and many others (including the American Association of Colleges and two best-selling authors, Allan Bloom and E.D. Hirsch, Jr.) advanced a traditionalist educational policy agenda--one which called for greater attention to basic skills, a renewed emphasis on the humanities and the great books of Western civilization, and more emphasis on accountability. More specifically, these reformers called for reclaiming the national legacy (Bennett), restoring curricular integrity (Association of American Colleges), re-opening the American mind (Bloom), and ensuring cultural literacy (Hirsch).

C. Increasingly Pluralistic Environment

In the past few decades, there has been a much wider appreciation that the environment of higher education--nationally and internationally--has changed dramatically. The world has become a "global village" economically, socially, politically, and culturally. At least in the abstract, there seems to be a general consensus that the students of today and tomorrow need to be better prepared to be successful in our highly interdependent world. As Robert Hughes put it in his essay in Time magazine:

The future of America . . . will rest with people who can think and act with informed grace across ethnic, cultural, and linguistic lines. And the first step in becoming such a person lies in acknowledging that we are not one big world family, or ever likely to be; that the differences among races, nations, cultures and their various histories are at least as profound and durable as the similarities; that these differences are not divagations from a European norm but structures eminently worth knowing about for their own sake. In the world that is coming, if you can't navigate differences, you've had it (February 3, 1992, p. 47).

D. Emergence of New Perspectives within the Academy (Emerging Voices)

Over the last several decades, but with greater force during the 1980s and 1990s, many faculty within higher education have adopted a variety of new perspectives--including perspectives variously advanced by feminists, multiculturalists, poststructuralists, and critical theorists. In sweeping terms, these faculty more or less argue that the current curriculum is narrowly defined by a narrow world view that has minimized the knowledge claims of various groups--including women, minorities, and non-Western authors. In turn, they call for revitalizing the curriculum not through reclaiming the national legacy, but by incorporating diverse voices into the curriculum.

Competing Stakeholder Claims on the Undergraduate Curriculum

Traditional Voices: Defense of the Canon and Traditional Ways of Knowing

Traditional voices more or less argue that the curriculum has become watered down by "relativistic" points of view in recent years--and that the traditional liberal arts and great books canon need to be restored to the center of the undergraduate curriculum. To begin with, these voices support a traditional view of knowledge and knowing--one which assumes that knowledge consists of a series of universal truths that exist "out there" (independent of the knower). Believing that the kinds of "knowledge most worth knowing" in a Western, democratic society are based in those universal truths that have endured the test of time, traditional voices argue that the driving purpose of the undergraduate curriculum

should be to educate students about these time-honored truths--truths especially "revealed" in the humanities and great books. To this end, traditionalists view the teacher more or less as a sage whose main task is to impart universal truths to students.

From a pedagogical standpoint, traditionalists argue that the role of the teacher is not to entertain students or to involve them actively in their learning through "cheap dramatics" or "practical activities." Rather, it is to transmit time-honored truths to students in an objective, value-free way. Consequently, most traditionalists "impart" knowledge to students through lectures and, occasionally, discussion.

Emerging Voices: Criticism of "Old Knowledge" and Traditional Ways of Knowing (Incorporate Pluralistic Perspectives and Ways of Knowing)

"A chorus of new voices has recently been heard in the academy. These stakeholders . . . have shared a single perspective in common: the belief that knowledge is partial, incomplete, and distorted An array of emerging knowledge claims regarding content and process in the undergraduate curriculum have been expressed recently by these stakeholders. Anchoring themselves in the epistemological assumption that there is no single objective truth and hence knowledge is socially constructed, these stakeholders have proposed that the purpose of an undergraduate education should be, in the words of Nannerl Keohane, president of Wellesley College, not `to reclaim a legacy . . . but to build upon it for a fuller understanding of the works of human beings in the present and the future.' To achieve this purpose, the traditional canon must be expanded to include a balanced view of multiple--rather than single--knowledge perspectives. . . . For these stakeholders, newly emerging knowledge claims from interpretivist, feminist, critical theory, poststructuralist, and multicultural scholarship must be integrated into the curriculum" (Haworth and Conrad).

While diverse in their perspectives, these individuals (including Patrick Hill, Henry Louis Gates, Jr., bell hooks, and William Doll) do share a single perspective in common: the belief that knowledge is partial, incomplete, and distorted. These individuals reject the notion that "universal truths" exist and, instead, argue that knowledge is socially constructed within various contexts. As such, different individuals in different communities (racial, ethnic, gender, socio-economic, geographic, and other kinds of "knowledge communities") are bound to have differing perspectives on reality (and, hence, on various "knowledge constructs" such as justice, community, or democratic freedom). A rich undergraduate curriculum will, from the perspective of these individuals, provide students with a broad-based understanding of how individuals from various socio-economic classes, racial and ethnic backgrounds, genders, and Western and Non-Western cultures make sense of their worlds and, in particular, such taken-for-granted concepts as equity, democracy, community, and the "American dream."

Owing to their "constructivist" view of knowledge, these stakeholders reject the model of many traditionalists that the role of the teacher is to transmit objective, "universal truths" to students. Rather, they tend to embrace a pedagogical model in which students and faculty are continually engaged in active learning, case studies, dialogical conversations, and collaborative peer learning.

Faces of the Curriculum Debate: Canon, Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity, Political Correctness, Pedagogy

In our essay, Jennifer and I suggested that the debate over knowledge--what "counts" as knowledge (what knowledge claims), how do we come to know that knowledge (ways of knowing), and who gets to define what counts as knowledge--has, along with several societal influences, greatly influenced the

debate over how to revitalize the undergraduate curriculum. We also briefly described competing stakeholder claims. Below, I elaborate on four faces of the curriculum debate:

1. **The Debate Over the Western Canon**: Should the prevailing emphasis on Western thought and the Great Books of Western civilization remain the primary focus of the undergraduate curriculum? Should newly-emerging perspectives--such as feminism, critical theory, and post-Colonial perspectives--as well as texts be incorporated into the curriculum?

Traditionalists argue for the maintenance of Western thought in the canon, but they do not necessarily dismiss out of hand the inclusion of minority, female, or non-Western authors. Traditionalists are strongly opposed to the inclusion of authorial works that do not meet their prescribed intellectual standards.

Scholars embracing emerging perspectives, on the other hand, argue for a broadening of the canon. They maintain that the traditional canon oppresses and alienates students with its almost exclusive focus on works written by dead, white European males (DWEM's). Many refer to the emphasis on Western thought as a new form of "cultural imperialism" in our nation's universities; others insist that the Great Books are little more than "instruments of political oppression." Both Western thought and the Great Books "enslave" women, minorities, and non-Western students to the hegemony of dead, White male European power structures.

Can these two positions be reconciled? Will integrating both "enrich" the canon? Can we reach--or are we beyond--reaching a consensus of sorts on "what knowledge really is worth knowing"? Can we agree on the knowledge that "all educated people should possess"?

2. **Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity**: Traditionalists are not opposed in principle to women's studies or ethnic studies courses. Their primary concern is that too many of these courses are taught by zealous ideologues who are less concerned with presenting alternative perspectives on the development of Western civilization and more concerned with informing students of their "oppressed states" and "transforming" their political beliefs. They deny that minorities and women are "victims" of oppression.

Academics embracing the "new scholarship" argue that students have for too long been denied access to the perspectives of "underrepresented" groups. Particularly in a multicultural society, students must become familiar with the perspectives of various ethnic, racial, gender, and non-Western groups. Moreover, to assume that this information can be imparted "neutrally" is to deny the social, cultural, and political forces that have suppressed this knowledge (and hence these social groups) in our society.

To what extent should multicultural perspectives and cultural diversity become a much more vital part of the curriculum and campus community?

3. **Political Correctness**: The debate over the politicization of knowledge and practice in the curriculum and on campus is another major weapon in the raging cultural war over the higher learning. Traditionalists often argue that political correctness takes three forms in our nation's colleges and universities:

- a. First, according to John Roche, political correctness is based on the assumptions that there are "certain ideas, issues, and actions" that are simply "unacceptable within the academic community" and it is up to academics to "reeducate students" by "eschewing the incorrect."

Herein the question arises as to whether all white males are intrinsically sexist, all Caucasians are racist, and all heterosexuals are homophobic. Discussions over speech codes and "sensitivity training" are also located frequently under this rubric of PC. Many academics embracing the "new scholarship" support the political foundation of many of these ideas. Traditionalists argue that the "new left" has taken these issues too far and become blatantly ideological. Not infrequently, traditionalists lament that this development has led to the emergence of a "political rather than an educational agenda" on our campuses.

b. Second, traditionalists such as John Roche and Dinesh D'Souza maintain that political correctness seeks to emphasize differences over commonalities. As a result, traditionalists often seek to discover those eternal truths or enduring legacies that hold us together as a people, whereas those embracing emerging perspectives often stress those cultural, economic, and gender differences that divide us as a nation.

c. Third, Roche and D'Souza among others argue that political correctness is intimately connected to fundamental differences over what different groups define as knowledge. Traditionalists, on the one hand, believe in objective knowledge and the existence of a "fundamental truth." Consequently, they suggest that objective standards exist. Academics embracing the "new scholarship" argue that all knowledge is socially and culturally constructed and, as such, "truth" may vary from group to group. They deny the existence of objective standards and, instead, argue that all standards are arbitrary. The most ardent of these individuals argue that all knowledge is relative; the most radical suggest that the current "truths" taught in the Western canon fundamentally reflect the prejudices of the "dominant ruling class and culture." Hence, such teaching is inherently oppressive to those who are not in the ruling class (usually women, minorities, and international students).

In addressing "political correctness" in the curriculum, certain questions seem to stand out: Should colleges and universities be more "politically correct" in their curricula? Should they do more to promote multiculturalism and curricular innovation? Should they change institutional structures and cultures and "hidden curricula" that have been associated with racism, sexism, and other forms of discrimination? Alternatively, have colleges and universities already gone too far toward "political correctness" such that freedom and integrity associated with the university is being eroded?

4. **Pedagogy:** Finally, traditionalists and "new scholars" argue for different approaches to "how we teach the knowledge that is most worth knowing." Should college and university faculty treat knowledge more or less as a series of "universal truths" (or a "commodity") and emphasize mostly didactic and hierarchical ways of teaching, or should they use more "connected" or "dialogical" approaches in which faculty and students are jointly engaged in teaching and learning?

Possible Questions for Discussion:

1. What is the so-called "cultural wars" debate within American society? Who has joined the fray and what are they debating (multiculturalism?)? Do you agree with Robert Hughes' argument that there are two major factions (paleoconservatives and neoconservatives who are patriotically correct vs. "pushers of political correctness" who elevate victimhood)--each led by demagogues? Hughes' argues for "the real multiculturalism" ("learning to see through borders" and diversity) and rejects "cultural separatists" who "want to Balkanize culture" on the grounds that "separation is the opposite of diversity." Agree or disagree?

2. Turning directly to higher education, Haworth and Conrad examine traditional and emerging voices within higher education? Who are these voices and what are they saying about knowledge (e.g., Western canon vs. enriched/overthrown canon, objectivist knowledge vs. constructivism) and pedagogy? Do you agree with Haworth's and Conrad's proposition that a new emphasis on "how we come to know what we know" has signaled a transformation in the undergraduate curriculum?

3. The philosopher John Searle has suggested that the "real issue" in the recent debates over the undergraduate curriculum "is not the inclusion of more works by women, or more works by Blacks, or more works from outside the Western tradition; that broader representation is proper and justified [and] has been conceded." Instead, he maintains that the "real issues--the ones underlying a wide range of campus debates--include the assumptions by many that Western values are inherently oppressive, that the chief purpose of education is political transformation, and that all standards are arbitrary" (cited in D'Souza, Atlantic Monthly, 1992, p. 52). Do you agree with Searle's observation? Why or why not?

4. In the context of the curriculum debate, it might be argued that the traditionalists and "new voices" ask very different questions about the curriculum. If so, how do they differ? What sets of questions do you think are most important? Are these two sets reconcilable?

5. In the conclusion to Illiberal Education, Dinesh D'Souza argues: "If the university model is replicated in society at large, far from bringing ethnic harmony, it will reproduce and magnify in the broader culture the lurid bigotry, intolerance, and balkanization of campus life" (p. 79). In a similar vein, George Roche has suggested that the raging cultural wars on American campuses will lead to "more racial tension and violence on campus in the future--on the part of nonminority students who are resentful of the preferential treatment minorities receive and of the PC attitude that brands them as oppressors--and on the part of minorities, who are taught to resent both real and imagined injustices and to sue them as justification for retaliation" (p. 209). Do you agree with D'Souza's and Roche's predictions? Why or why not? If so, what can we as college and university administrators do to stem the rising tide of intolerance on college campuses?

6. In general, what criticisms do many "new voices" make about the views of neo-conservatives or traditionalists such as D'Souza? Why are some people so upset with the traditionalists?

7. Drawing on all of our readings, what are the major curricular agendas advanced by emerging voices? That is, what do they propose for transforming the curriculum--including pedagogy?

8. Some emerging voices have raised questions about what they more or less view as "excesses" of political correctness and the diversity movement. For example, Daphne Patai has expressed concerns about "ideological policing" and "identity politics" and Carlos Cortes argues for E Pluribus Unum (EPU) Multiculturalism. How do you assess such criticisms? Is there a "middle ground" between traditionalist and new voices--as John Thelin has suggested?

9. At this juncture, how would you position yourself in the current debate between and among traditionalist and emerging voices? What are your views? In particular, what are your views of diversity, multiculturalism, and community. Why is diversity important?

10. At a conference on liberal education, a New York Times reporter learned that most young scholars agree with the following statement: "Just about everything . . . is an expression of race, class, and gender." If this reporter had interviewed you, would you have expressed a similar sentiment?

12. In an address delivered at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association and reported in a newsletter (see *The Pen*, Division J, AERA, Summer 1992, pp. 8-11), Yvonna Lincoln stated the following (p. 8):

Criticisms of the old knowledge, including most of what is contained in what we traditionally call 'the Western canon,' generally are mounted by spokespersons for those who have lived what are termed marginalized, oppressed, or subordinated lives. This usually includes, at a minimum, women and persons of color, although gradually, the terms are being expanded to include any racial or ethnic minority, children, and persons with alternative sexual orientations. The criticisms go something like this: most of what we call either social or scientific knowledge is constructed knowledge; that is, it does not exist apart from those who "find" or "discover" it, but is enacted from a set of beliefs related to the community from which it springs. That old knowledge is rooted in the concerns, both social and political, of those who produced it.

That constructed knowledge, having been produced by predominantly white, middle-class males, reflects one and only one kind of knowledge: scientific, rational, or hypothetico-deductive knowledge. There are quite possibly [Note: I interpret this as severe understatement] other kinds of knowledge or intelligences to which we might attend, and specific ways of knowing which are excluded by the priesthood of science. Further, the social structure which has created the "expert" classes and the scientific priesthood also fosters relations of subordination and marginalization in other structural, social, educational, and economic arenas. As a result, both the knowledge and the social structure which constructed and maintains the knowledge may be considered patriarchal and oppressive, and rooted in metaphors that are violent and debasing.

From your perspective, to what extent do you think most "emerging voices" in the twenty-first century would agree with Lincoln's interpretation of their voices? What perspectives (e.g., feminist and critical theory) may have influenced her interpretation? How do you interpret and respond to the issues she raises about "power"--including who gets to define what counts as knowledge--in the competing knowledge claims (curriculum) debate?

13. Carlos Cortes among others has raised some penetrating questions regarding the "excesses" of political correctness and the diversity movement in our nation's colleges and universities. To wit, Cortes argues for "E Pluribus Unum (EPU) multiculturalism. To what extent is there division in the ranks of these so-called "new orthodoxy" scholars? Is there a "middle ground" between traditionalist and new orthodoxy points-of-view?

14. Our readings raise questions which demand our attention as college and university administrators, scholars, and students. Based on what you have read, what would you: a) define as some of the more pressing questions that we will face in developing college and university programs over the next decade, and b) suggest as viable strategies for dealing with diversity and multicultural challenges (such as multiculturalism/interculturism) on our nation's campuses?

III. Curricular Design

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to “Section III: Curricular Design.” READER, pp. 293-296
2. Clif Notes (see C. below)
3. Conrad: “Organizing Principles.” READER, pp. 297-314
4. Stark & Lattuca: “Curriculum Perspectives and Frameworks.” READER, 315-330
5. Briggs, Stark, & Rowland-Poplowski: “How Do We Know a ‘Continuously Planning’ Academic Department When We See One?” READER, pp. 331-347
6. Newton: “Tensions and Models in General Education Planning.” READER, pp. 363-372
(SKIM)
7. Merisotis & Phipps: “Remedial Education in Colleges and Universities: What’s Really Going On?” READER, pp. 373-384
8. Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens: “Pedagogical Strategies for Educating Citizens.” READER, pp. 405-425

B. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

2. **Clif Notes.** In the course guide, the instructor outlines some of the classic approaches to curriculum design—including the work of Ralph Tyler, Paul Dressel, Conrad (classic?), Berquist, Conrad and Haworth. In addition, he poses some putatively “enduring” questions regarding the design of programs and courses.

3. **Conrad (Organizing Principles):** Conrad advances a three-step framework for curriculum planning. The first, and most important step concerns the choice of an organizing principle. He identifies five such principles: academic disciplines, student development, great books and ideas, social problems, and selected competencies. In so doing, he sketches the historical influences, examples, and strengths and challenges associated with each of the organizing principles. He then goes on to discuss a second phase referred to as “curricular emphases” (e.g., “locus of learning” and “curriculum content”) and a third referred to as “building a curricular structure” (e.g., location of learning environment).

Question: Discuss this reading drawn from his 1978 book. How were his organizing principles identified? What organizing principles are missing? Of the curriculum frameworks that Conrad has advanced over the years, why do most individuals prefer this framework over the others (to the surprise and disappointment of the architect.☺)?

4. **Stark & Lattuca (Curriculum Perspectives and Frameworks):** This reading is a comprehensive review of several decades of scholarship on curriculum design; not only do they identify the major approaches to curriculum design advanced in the literature but they discuss the strengths and limitations of the various models.

Question: By circumscribing curriculum as an “academic plan,” what do they bring into focus (that is, how is thinking about curriculum in this way helpful?) and what do they obscure (if anything)? What do you think they mean when they discuss a “theory of curriculum”?

5. **Briggs, Stark, & Rowland-Poplowski (How Do We Know a ‘Continuously Planning’ Academic Department When We See One?)** The authors’ conducted a study to learn whether, and to what degree, and how academic departments incorporate “continuous improvement principles” (akin to “total quality management”). Anchored in their synthesis of the practices of “exemplary departments,” they advance four criteria (“continuous and frequent curriculum planning processes,” “awareness and responsiveness,” “participation and teamwork,” and “use of evaluation for adaptive change”) and five

indicators for each criterion—criteria and indicators that faculty and administrators can use in continuous curricular planning as well as testing models of curricular planning.

Questions: What about this “idea” of continuous curriculum planning? When and how does most curriculum planning take place at the campus-wide and departmental levels? What do you think of the approach they have advanced?

6. **Newton (Tensions and Models in General Education Planning)**: Newton identifies four areas of tension (“polarized interests”) in most planning in general education: knowledge (unity vs. fragmentation), student learning (breadth vs. depth), faculty competence (generalist vs. specialist) and content (Western culture vs. cultural diversity). He then describes how these tensions play out in three basic curriculum models: Great Books, Scholarly Disciplines, and Effective Citizen.

Questions: What other “tensions”—less transparent, in all likelihood—currently exist? (Imagination invited).

7. **Merisotis & Phipps (Remedial Education in Colleges and Universities: What’s Really Going On?)**: After reminding us that remedial education has always been with us, they go on to report their findings, namely, that few (20 percent) institutions offer no remedial courses. That said, institutions are reluctant to acknowledge that they are engaged in much remedial work; Merisotis and Phipps indicate that at least 78 percent of higher education institutions enrolled underprepared students and that, in all probability, more than 30 percent of students require remediation. Implications for curriculum design: Remedial education ought to be embraced and incorporated systematically—not shunned.

Questions: On the basis of your experience, do you think that most faculty and students shun the idea of “remediation.” From your perspective, how widespread is it? How would you “know it when you see it”? How might remediation be systematically addressed in the undergraduate and graduate curriculum?

8. **Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens (Pedagogical Strategies for Educating Citizens)**:

In this evocative reading, the authors identify components of curriculum design that hinder or contribute to moral and civic learning. As to the latter, they suggest using “pedagogies of engagement” such as service learning and other forms of experiential education, problem-based learning, and collaborative learning.

Questions: Imagine that you were given the responsibility of designing the undergraduate curriculum for a new university and you were advised to use the chapter by Colby and colleagues as a touchstone (the trustees of this institution liked this chapter). What might the distinctive features of the curriculum look like? How might you envision the curriculum with respect to depth (concentration/major), general education, and the overall experience (teaching and learning). How might you build on and extend your design using key ideas from the other readings on curriculum design?

Overall Questions: As you reflect on our readings, what do you see at the “critical components” needed in meaningful curriculum planning? What is missing in the literature? What scholarship is needed on curriculum design and, specifically, what “burning question” would you like to address or have others address?

C. CLIF NOTES

Classic Approaches to Designing Curricular Design

Ralph Tyler's Four Questions

Perhaps no other approach to curriculum design and development has been as influential as Ralph Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (1950). In a nutshell, Tyler's approach is constructed around four questions that, he suggests, must be answered in structuring knowledge in any curriculum, regardless of context. These questions are:

- What educational purposes (goals or behavioral outcomes) should the school (curriculum) seek to obtain?
- What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
- How can these educational experiences be effectively organized (into Courses or sequences of courses)?
- How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained? (Tyler, 1950, pp. 1-2)

From Tyler's perspective, this goal-driven, rational approach to curriculum development can be used at any school for any purpose. Effective curricula, he argues, are those that are most successful in achieving their stated goals.

Paul Dressel's Curricular Taxonomy and Basic Considerations

Like Tyler, Dressel emphasizes a rationalistic approach to curricular design and development. While more elaborate, Dressel's approach nonetheless emphasizes many of the same planning characteristics outlined in Tyler's approach (clarification of goals, selection of appropriate learning experiences, evaluation of goals and outcomes). Dressel builds his planning framework around the concept of decision-making; that is, that faculty, when designing academic programs, must make decisions in relation to various continua and essential elements. These are described below.

Four continua upon which institutions differ in selection of learning experiences:

<p>Student-Centered (emphasis on student growth and development)</p>	← →	<p>Disciplinary-Centered (emphasis on the accumulated wisdom reflected in disciplinary knowledge)</p>
<p>Problems, Policies, Actions (emphasis on application of knowledge to present/future problems)</p>	← →	<p>Abstractions, Ideas, Theories (emphasis on theoretical knowledge)</p>
<p>Curricular Flexibility (course selection/plan is adapted to meet individual student needs)</p>	← →	<p>Curricular Rigidity (course selection/plan is prescribed)</p>
<p>Curricular Integration (emphasis on relating theory with practice; cross-disciplinary connections – coherence between curriculum and learning experiences)</p>	← →	<p>Curricular Compartmentalization (emphasis on either theory or practice; connections between disciplines, theory, and practice considered irrelevant – incoherence between curriculum and learning experiences)</p>

Three Essential Elements which need to be interwoven or balanced into the curriculum:

1. Liberal and vocational education (content)
2. Breadth and Depth
 - a. Dressel defines breadth as: Knowledge of some of the essential facts and concepts in all major areas of knowledge; understanding of the structure, basic concepts, and modes of thought of the various disciplines; awareness and understanding of those ideas and values which have had a marked impact on the development of Western culture; awareness of the interrelationships of disciplines; insight into and active concern with the major problems of society; and commitment to a set of values and conscious attempt to reinforce them by thought and action.
 - b. Dressel defines depth in the following manner: Detailed knowledge of the facts and terminology of a discipline; knowledge of the language, culture, politics, economics, and geography of a country or region; sufficient mastery of the structure and methods of scholarly investigation to engage in independent study in a discipline; thorough investigation of a problem, of the information and methods of attack required to deal with it, and the implications of various possible solutions to it; study of all aspects of the culture of a designated place and period; mastery of some methodology or technique (e.g., statistics, laboratory analysis, musical instrument, art medium, computer) Dressel, 1968, pp. 20-21).
 - c. Continuity and sequence (organization), where "continuity" means "that terms, ideas, and skills introduced early in a program. . .continue to be used" and "sequence" refers to the relationship among "learning experiences" throughout a program (Dressel, 1968, 21).
 - d. A concept of teaching and learning (pedagogy/learning experience)
 - e. Continuous planning and evaluation (assessment)
3. Ten facilitating agents (organizational structures that make the above possible)
 - a. Curricular requirements
 - b. Organization of teaching and learning (structured lecture courses, unstructured seminar courses, tutorials, and independent studies)
 - c. Noncourse (or outside-of-class) experiences (on- and off-campus work, service, and leisure experiences)
 - d. Daily and weekly schedules
 - e. Annual academic calendars (semester, quarter, trimester)
 - f. Evaluation (examinations, grades, program reviews)
 - g. Student and faculty loads (number of courses taught by faculty; number of courses taken by students)
 - h. Selection, orientation, and advising of students
 - i. Selection, orientation, and evaluation of faculty
 - j. Administrative organization, financial, and budgeting practices (Dressel, 1968, p. 23)

Clifton Conrad's Approach to Curriculum Planning (1978)

Like Tyler and Dressel, Clif Conrad provides yet another rational approach to curriculum design and development. In my 1978 book on curriculum, I emphasize organizing principles as the driver for curriculum planning and then draw from (to some extent) Dressel's continua and structural considerations to guide additional planning efforts. The framework is presented on pages 11 and 12 of the book.¹

¹See Conrad, Clifton F., The Undergraduate Curriculum: A Guide to Innovation and Reform. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1978.

William Bergquist's Curricular Models and Taxonomy

William Bergquist expands upon Tyler's and Dressel's writing in his approach to curricular design.² Like Tyler, Bergquist starts from a rational and goal-driven base: what purpose or organizing idea should inform a program's curriculum--and the learning experiences within it--throughout? These organizing ideas (or curricular models, as they are frequently termed) are:

Heritage-Based (e.g., St. John's College and Shimer College . . . similar to Conrad's "Great Books" organizing principle)

Thematic-Based (e.g., University of Wisconsin-Green Bay . . . similar to Conrad's "social problems" organizing principle)

Competency-Based (e.g., Alverno College . . . similar to Conrad's "selected competencies" organizing principle)

Career-Based (e.g., Berea College)

Experience-Based (e.g., Antioch College)

Student-Based (e.g., Evergreen State College, Bennington College, Ursuline College . . . similar to Conrad's "student development" organizing principle)

Values-Based (e.g., Oral Roberts U.)

Future-Based (e.g., University of Massachusetts)

Bergquist argues that these models, or organizing principles, are held together by their common emphases on two curricular dimensions: the extent to which curricular content is oriented around generalized knowledge (breadth) or specialized knowledge (depth), and the extent to which the curriculum is oriented around prescribed (required) or elective course work.

Bergquist also pays particular attention to various structural features in his approach to curricular design. Specifically, he mentions six curricular dimensions that should be of interest to curriculum planners. These are:

--Time: the duration and schedule of instructional units

--Space: the use of instructional and non-instructional areas for teaching and learning

--Resources: human, financial, and capital resources for instructional use

--Organization: the arrangement and sequencing of instructional and academic administrative units

--Procedures: planning, implementation, and evaluation issues related to curriculum and instruction

--Outcomes: those desired results (usually student learning outcomes) of a particular instructional unit or academic program (Bergquist, 1981, p. 5).

These curricular dimensions, Bergquist suggests, are hierarchically related. As he puts it, "changes in time and space" are more easily accommodated because they require simple "structural changes." Other dimensions, however, pose more of a challenge. Changes in procedures or outcomes, for instance, are far more difficult because they "require changes in processes and attitudes as well as structure" (Bergquist, p. 6).

²See Bergquist, William H., Gould, Ronald D., and Greenberg, Elinor Miller. Designing Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

*Clifton Conrad and Jennifer Haworth's Decision-Situation Approach*³

In our article on a decision-making approach, Jennifer and I use an alternative to a rationalistic approach to designing curricula--one that emphasizes the key roles that stakeholders play in constructing academic programs. Rather than starting first with the traditional, goal-driven mission-objectives-operations scheme, our approach recognizes and stresses the dynamic and contextual character of curricular planning and the key roles that different stakeholders play in this process.

Put simply, Jennifer and I advance an approach to curriculum planning that places the experiences of stakeholders directly at the center of the curricular decision-making process. We acknowledge and, indeed, stress, the pivotal role that primary stakeholders--mainly faculty, program administrators, and students--play in making decisions that directly affect the day-to-day lived realities of participants in academic programs. In particular, we indicate that stakeholders make choices in five key decision-situations that greatly affect the character of a particular program. These five decision-situations (or, as George Keller puts it, the "high five") are:

1. Approach to Teaching and Learning (didactic, facilitative, dialogical)
2. Program Orientation (academic, professional, connected)
3. Departmental Support (weak or strong)
4. Institutional Support (weak or strong)
5. Student Culture (individualistic, participative, synergistic)

The advantages of a decision-situation approach to curriculum development include:

1. Approach places the experiences of stakeholders at the center of curriculum decision-making (rather than rationalistic goals or inanimate organizational structures);
2. Approach makes pedagogy (teaching and learning), departmental and institutional support (human commitment) as important as academic orientation (content);
3. Approach contrasts sharply with conventional rational planning approaches, with their emphases on goals to the exclusion of the actual day-to-day lived realities of participants in academic programs. This approach does not reify planning (i.e., make it into something in and of itself), but places it squarely within a socio-historical setting.
4. This approach involves a variety of stakeholders directly in the curriculum design process. It does not restrict curriculum planning only to faculty and administrators.

Rational and Constructivist Approaches

A. Characteristics of a Rational Approach

1. Views curriculum as the sum of its structural parts (components).
2. Emphasizes a rational, goal-directed view of curriculum where rationality is defined as a series of actions organized in such a way as to lead to predetermined goals with maximum efficiency. Logic: a. Choose Goals; b. Determine means (curricular structures) to achieve goals; c. Pursue goals through determined means/structures; d. Evaluate to see if goal is achieved; and e. Change goals or means in light of feedback.
3. Embraces a modernist certainty that there is one best-way (Grand Narrative) to curriculum development regardless of local context. Does not consider political or cultural variables.

³See Conrad, Clifton F., and Haworth, Jennifer G. "Master's programs and contextual planning." Planning for Higher Education 21 1993: 12-18.)

4. Assumes that knowledge is ahistorical and acontextual; that is, that the meaning of knowledge does not change in different contexts and settings and, as such, can be "packaged" to fit into different curricular models.

5. Assumes that curricular models are ideologically neutral.

6. Assumes that stakeholders do not actively interpret, give meaning to, or select the knowledge that is taught in a curriculum; rather, all they do is "arrange the pieces of the puzzle."

B. Characteristics of a Constructivist Approach

1. Assumes that individuals play an active role in defining and making sense of knowledge within a given setting and context; as such they make key decisions about what knowledge they will include and legitimate within a curriculum (therefore, the curriculum is a cultural construct).

2. Assumes that the curriculum is ideological and political.

3. Assumes that since stakeholders construct their own realities of knowledge within a given context, that they are at the center of understanding and constructing curricular content and meaning

Factors that can Affect the Design of Curricula

A. External Forces/Factors

- accrediting bodies
- licensing requirements
- state boards of higher education (quality mandates and resources)
- societal trends
- market demands
- competition with other postsecondary providers
- religious orders/hierarchy
- disciplinary and other intellectual influences and currents
- technological developments
- elementary and secondary education trends
- expectations of graduate and professional schools
- textbooks
- perceived quality standards (public expectations, literature)
- external grant money (from state and federal governments, private foundations for faculty research, curricular and pedagogical innovations)
- legal rulings
- media influences

B. Internal Forces/Factors

- faculty power blocs, subcultures
- faculty resistance to change (curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation/assessment)
- institutional culture (attitudes, beliefs, sage/heritage, traditions)
- faculty teaching load
- faculty and student critical mass
- faculty teaching load
- student demands and enrollment patterns
- institutional assessment mandates and practices
- resources (financial, capital, human)
- co-curriculum
- curricular advisory committees
- faculty and administrative turnover

Questions to Check for Understanding:

1. What is a rational approach? What assumptions inform this approach, e.g., that curriculum models are ideologically neutral?
2. What is a constructivist approach?
3. Compare and contrast constructivist and rationalist approaches to developing curricula? What are the strengths and limitations of each?
4. Critique the "classic" approaches to curriculum planning in higher education, paying particular attention to the work of Tyler and Dressel. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches--both in terms of conceptual/analytical power and promise for improving curricular practice?
5. Provide a critique of the Conrad/Pratt model, the model of Bergquist and his colleagues, and the "decision-making approach" of Conrad and Haworth. What are the strengths and limitations of each?
6. Much of the recent literature on college curricula places emphasis on the overall curriculum planning/design process. The work of Bergquist, Conrad, and Conrad and Pratt reflects this emphasis. On the basis of your own analysis and synthesis, construct your own curriculum planning model. You may explicate a framework that is similar to one of the existing models. But since all of the recent models seem to carry some liabilities, your own model may have a hybrid quality. On a single page or two, outline your model by identifying key concepts and organizing principles as well as the most important features of your model. Be prepared to defend your schema in class.
7. Curricular model-building in higher education has been ridiculed by many faculty. Do you think that curricular model-building will help to improve the effectiveness of undergraduate education? Why or why not? In a practical sense, in what ways can models be used to facilitate curriculum planning.

Enduring Questions for Discussion about Designing Programs and Courses

1. What is the role of purposes, goals, objectives, and outcomes in curriculum development or revision? How important is agreement on objectives in curriculum planning?
2. Should statements of objectives include more than statements of content? If so, how can objectives be formulated such that goal statements are not confined to content?
3. The traditional manner of organizing undergraduate curricula in colleges has involved heavy reliance on academic disciplines. Programs of study have been organized by departments and around disciplines. What is a discipline? What are the strengths and weaknesses of using disciplines as a basis for the curriculum? When academic disciplines are used as the basis for organizing the curriculum, what are some of the implications for general education, concentration, and professional programs?
4. Particularly in the last decade, many colleges (from Earlham College to the University of Houston at Clear Lake) have introduced interdisciplinary, multi-disciplinary, intradisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and supradisciplinary programs. What are some ways of structuring interdisciplinary programs? Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of using an interdisciplinary approach as a basis for curricular organization.

5. Among others, Paul Dressel argues that sequencing is usually ignored in curriculum planning. How can sequencing be linked to curricular development?

6. How important is curricular integration? Should responsibility for integration rest with the faculty or students? Both?

7. Evaluation of overall student learning is seldom discussed in the context of curricular development. At the curricular level, what are some of the ways that students can be evaluated?

8. In almost any discussion of curriculum, a number of basic issues are sure to be debated. These include:

(a) Should the emphasis be on general or specialized education?

(b) Should the emphasis be on breadth or depth?

(c) Should the program be elective or prescribed?

(d) Should the program be oriented to student needs or academic content?

For each of these issues, express the arguments likely to be used by each side. Draw out the implications of each view for the design of the curriculum.

9. In the previous sections, what have you learned that can help you to analyze a curriculum? Are there conceptual frameworks and concepts which can serve as useful analytical tools?

10. Writing in the Review of Educational Research (1960), John Goodland said that "curriculum theorizing to date is best described as abstract speculation; curriculum research as 'dust-bowl' empiricism; and curriculum practice as a rule-of-thumb guesswork (often a wet thumb at that, held aloft to test the direction of the prevailing breeze)." What evidence can you cite to support or deny this claim?

Essay-Type Questions with a Focus on Designing Programs and Courses

1. Much of the current literature on higher education focuses not so much on the content of academic programs as on the curriculum design or planning process. Write an essay on curriculum design in which you elaborate and support a particular approach to curriculum design or planning. Your essay should be divided into three parts:

a) Outline a model of curriculum design in which you identify the key organizing principles and concepts as well as other central features. You may explicate your own model or construct a "hybrid" model which combines and integrates at least two models from the literature (the latter model may include elements drawn from your own thinking, but will be drawn primarily from the literature). Your model should be presented in sufficient detail for you to be able to respond to the next two parts of the question.

(b) Identify and briefly explicate the important curricular "issues" that are embedded in your model--issues that, in your view, should be addressed by those involved in curriculum design. Put another way, identify and clarify the major curricular issues that any committee involved in curricular design should ultimately address.

(c) Make a case for the analytical rigor of your model by comparing and contrasting it with other models of curriculum design that are found in the literature. Insofar as possible, make the argument that the concepts and organizing principles incorporated in your model go beyond other models in illuminating the important issues that curriculum developers should address (if your model combines two or more models from the literature, show how your model improves upon each of those models).

2. In reviewing the book by James Coleman and his colleagues, Youth: Transition to Adulthood, George Keller makes the following observation about the development of the American educational system:

We tend to think that our educational system is fixed, rationally designed, and sensible. But it is actually the result of thousands of historical accidents. High schools, for example, are relatively new and were originally conceived as an alternative to colleges and not as college preparatory schools. At no point in American history has any educator, excepting perhaps John Dewey, tried to think through the question Coleman asks--"What are the appropriate environments in which youth can best grow into adults?"--and come up with an entire educational system that fits what we know about human growth and the needs of society, even though the question is as old as Plato's Republic.

While we can hardly ask you to do in a short essay what no educator ("excepting perhaps John Dewey") has tried to do, we may ask you to indicate how you would proceed to reorganize the curriculum of an undergraduate college of approximately 2,500 students in such a way that it would provide "appropriate environments in which youth can best grow into adults." This is essentially a task in curriculum building. Begin with a statement regarding what you consider to be the essential purposes of a certain type of undergraduate college (for example, community college or liberal arts college). Proceed with a brief discussion of how these purposes may be related to "appropriate environments in which youth can best grow into adults." Then, in terms of your understanding of how a college curriculum is developed, indicate the key concepts and organizing principles which you would embrace in designing an undergraduate curriculum to relate purposes and environment. Finally, discuss examples of current innovations or institutional programs which might be incorporated into your institution to express the kind of relationship between purposes and environment that would most effectively contribute to the kind of educational institution you are seeking to develop.

3. You have just been named chairperson of a curriculum committee charged with the development of a new undergraduate curriculum at a small college. As a recent Ph.D. in Higher Education, you have read widely in the literature on curriculum design. While you are convinced of the potential utility of curriculum design models, you are also persuaded that asking members of the curriculum committee to read academic articles and books on curriculum design might prove counterproductive. Accordingly, you decide to translate and distill the relevant literature on curriculum design in an informal working paper which can help the committee to design the new curriculum. More specifically, your working paper will draw upon at least three curriculum design models or frameworks, synthesizing those elements of all three models which you think should be major considerations in the committees' planning and deliberation. Drawing upon at least three curriculum design models from the higher education literature, prepare a working paper in which you explore what substantive issues the committee must sooner or later consider. In other words, what are the key issues that should guide the curricular design process, i.e., what factors should be considered, what concepts should come into play, what substantive ground must be covered? In drafting this paper, your task is not to suggest innovative programs, but to outline with cool rationality a holistic design framework (based upon the integration of at least three curricular models) that identifies the key issues that the committee must face.

IV. Curricular Change

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world: indeed, it's the only thing that ever has." --Margaret Mead

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to "Section IV: Curricular Change." READER, pp. 429-431
2. Clif Notes (see C. below)
3. Schneider & Shoenberg: "Habits Hard to Break: How Persistent Features of Campus Life Frustrate Curricular Reform." READER, pp. 432-438 (**SKIM**)
4. Anderson: "Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education." READER, pp. 439-460
5. Palmer: "Divided No More: A Movement Approach to Educational Reform." READER, pp. 461-467
6. Hubball & Burt: "An Integrated Approach to Developing and Implementing Learning-Centered Curricula." READER, pp. 468-481
7. Awbrey: "General Education Reform as Organizational Change: Integrating Cultural and Structural Change." READER, pp. 496-507 (**SKIM**)
8. Butin: "The Limits of Service-Learning in Higher Education." READER, pp. 508-524
9. Talburt & Boyles: "Reconsidering Learning Communities: Expanding the Discourse by Challenging the Discourse." READER, pp. 525-539
10. Lattuca, Voigt, & Fath: "Does Interdisciplinarity Promote Learning? Theoretical Support and Researchable Questions." READER, pp. 540-556
11. Conrad, C. F. (1999). Change and innovation in graduate and professional education in major public research universities. In D. Ward & N. Radomski (Eds.), *Proud traditions and future challenges: The University of Wisconsin-Madison celebrates 150 years* (pp. 109-128). Madison, WI: Office of University Publications.

B. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

2. Clif Notes: The instructor (mercifully) is unusually pithy regarding curricular change in his notes on Curricular Change. There is one domain—strategies to bring about change—that he is persuaded is an area where research in higher education is very much needed.

Question: What is a promising "burning question" regarding academic change in higher education?

3. Schneider & Shoenberg (Habits Hard to Break: How Persistent Features of Campus Life Frustrate Curricular Reform): The authors' identify major obstacles to reform at the course, program, and institutional level: the insularity of departments (disciplines as silos), the unnecessary bifurcation of the curriculum into breadth (general education) and depth, the constraints of standardized course credits and units, the mismatch between credits transferred and actual learning experiences, the divergence between campus goals and faculty rewards, and the lack of a definition of a baccalaureate degree. (They remain hopeful that reform is "in the wind.")

Question: What other obstacles deserve mention?

4. Anderson (Changing the Curriculum in Higher Education): Margaret Anderson provides a feminist critique of the curricular status quo—a critique made more than two decades ago but one that is arguably as compelling today as it was when she advanced it. The quotation she cites from Adrienne Rich provides a window into her animating thesis: "As the hitherto 'invisible' and marginal agent in culture, whose native culture has been effectively denied, women need a reorganization of knowledge, of

perspectives and analytical tools that can help us know our foremothers, evaluate our present historical, political, and personal situation, and take ourselves seriously in the creation of a more balanced culture.” In broad strokes, she methodically advances considerations for building an inclusive curriculum (providing myriad institutional examples), five phases of curriculum change (including a reconsideration of male-centric history), and discipline-specific appraisals—as in the arts and humanities, sciences, social sciences.

Question: To what extent, and in what specific ways, does the problem-definition of Anderson remain as vital today as it did in the late 1980s? What obstacles to change remain today and what strategies for overcoming those obstacles are the most promising? Building on and extending a feminist critique, what other voices continue to be silenced in large measure in many college and university curricula?

5. Palmer (Divided No More: A Movement Approach to Educational Reform): Parker Palmer proposes a “movement approach” to change (especially in terms of teaching and learning)—an approach that can overcome the “organizational mentality” that a conventional “organization approach” (with roles, rules, and carefully prescribed relationships) is constrained by. He then goes on to describe four progressive stages, offering perspective on how movements may be brought about intentionally.

Question: What is your perspective on such a “movement” approach? Have you ever been a part of—or witnessed—a “movement” approach that was successful?

6. Hubball & Burt (An Integrated Approach to Developing and Implementing Learning-Centered Curricula): The authors’ begin by sketching the notion of “learning-centered” (“learning-centred” in British Columbia) curricula and then go on to advance an “integrated approach to developing and implementing learning-centered curricula. In so doing, they sketch a conceptual framework—an integrated approach that combines both “pedagogical” and “organizational change” strategies. Applied to curriculum reform in the UBC (U. of British Columbia) Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, their framework includes practical strategies for these four components of the model: “learning context strategies,” “planning strategies,” “assessment strategies,” and “programming strategies.” To illustrate, their “learning context strategies” include leadership strategies, teamwork, representative input, responsiveness, incentives and sources of reward. (Their strategies were drawn from the literature and experiences with curriculum committee participants from a wide range of UBC faculty members engaged in reform (they used focus group interviews among other techniques).

Question: Critique this “integrated approach” through the lens of Parker Palmer. What would Palmer see as the strengths and limitations of this approach? What about you?

7. Awbrey (General Education Reform as Organizational Change: Integrating Cultural and Structural Change): Complementing the notion of “learning-centered” reform (a radical idea?), Awbrey says that “although campus-wide general education efforts may focus on what is best for students, recognizing why faculty hold the beliefs they do about what is best at a much deeper task that involves systematic examination of the cultural context in which the change is taking place.” Drawing on the literature, she sketches a model of organizational culture which, in turn, she applies to the case of reform in general education. She concludes that by identifying “potholes” on the road to the reform of general education and, in turn, suggesting that reform should integrate both cultural change and structural change guided by “cultural inquiry.”

Question: Cultural change—another important dimension to meaningful change/reform?

8. Butin (The Limits of Service-Learning in Higher Education): This reading, along with the next two readings, moves from the institutional level to the program/course level and, in so doing, focuses on the promise and limitations of three widespread innovations in curriculum: service-learning, learning communities, and interdisciplinary courses. In this reading, Butin is breathtakingly clear about what he sees as the pedagogical, political, and institutional limits of the service-learning movement—and he takes

issue with the proposition embraced by some that service-learning should be the standard bearer for Social Justice (he advances an evocative argument regarding the latter).

Question: Butin suggests that service-learning is not “simply” a “universal, coherent, neutral pedagogical practice” as is often assumed and, in turn, he invites the reader to reflect on the limits of “radical and transformational” change in the higher learning. Is he too severe on service-learning and/or does he raise a larger point about the need for introspection regarding what can and cannot be changed in the curriculum—and how change should come about?

9. Talburt & Boyles (Reconsidering Learning Communities: Expanding the Discourse by

Challenging the Discourse): In a challenging work, Talburt and Boyles explore the “fundamental tenets underlying the idea and practice of learning communities” (such as claims made about their “progressive” history and the “idealized ways” they are talked about). They conclude that learning communities—freshman learning communities (FLCs)—is a good idea but they may have undesirable effects. In so doing, they draw on the voices of participants in learning communities.

Question: What insights might we draw from this reading about bringing about “curriculum change?”

10. Lattuca, Voigt, & Fath (Does Interdisciplinarity Promote Learning? Theoretical Support and

Researchable Questions): The authors’ challenge the presumed benefits of interdisciplinary courses and programs. As a point of departure, they review definitions of interdisciplinarity and then go on to propose a research agenda on interdisciplinarity.

Question: Why did the editors (Conrad and Johnson) of the ASHE Reader place this reading under “curricular change” as against “curricular conversations?” What were they—might they have been—thinking? Were they—thinking?

11. Conrad, C. F. (Change and Innovation in Graduate and Professional Education in Major

Public Research Universities): The author examines two legacies regarding change at the graduate and professional levels—one of “distinction” and one of “reluctant accommodation to change.” In this chapter, the author provides a “template for change and innovation”—one that places the cultivation of “teaching and learning communities” at the epicenter of graduate no less than undergraduate education. Along with strategies for change (such as developing and nourishing cultures that create opportunities for change and innovation) and the need for a commitment to change on the part of universities, the author makes a number of suggestions for nourishing a “culture of change and innovation” in our colleges and universities.

Question: This reading raises the question: What will it/does it take for colleges and universities to embrace meaningful change—from the institutional to the program to the course level—at the undergraduate and graduate level?

Overall Questions: What reading(s)—and what about the reading(s)—did you find most compelling/insightful/useful with respect to thinking about curriculum change? What reading(s) did you find banal/unoriginal/obvious? If you were given the responsibility of changing the undergraduate curriculum at a university, what obstacles might you expect and what strategies might help to overcome them? Finally, and not least, do you see undergraduate and graduate curricula evolving in certain directions in the next few years—that is, being meaningfully shaped by curriculum change/reform efforts in such venues as “service-learning” and “interdisciplinarity”?

C. CLIF NOTES

Obstacles or Barriers to Curriculum Change and Transformation

Many curriculum changes currently being proposed--such as changes aimed at introducing greater cultural diversity and new ways of teaching and learning--are often associated with curriculum "transformation." Most of our readings highlight various reasons why colleges and university (especially faculty) are resistant to fundamental curriculum change. Drawing on these writings as well as various other writings, listed below are some obstacles that have been identified in the literature:

- the inherently conservative bias of the academy promotes a culture that recoils against deviations from the status quo ("why fix it if it ain't broke");
- inertia and fear of the unknown are creatures of academics and administrators alike which, for better or worse, often combine to block curricular innovation and change (faculty and administrators do not want to make the effort to revise curricula or attempt new ways of teaching and learning or these same individuals fear how change may affect their own standing in the academy or their colleagues' and students' thinking and behaviors);
- since authority and power are often diffuse in academic organizations (lines of decision-making are not clear), it is difficult to organize and implement change in any systematic way;
- since institutional reputation is not usually based on change and innovation, there is often no major incentive for change;
- change often threatens powerful vested interests;
- it is difficult to "prove" that new innovations are superior to the status quo; and
- colleges and universities are highly differentiated organizationally and in terms of participants (faculty, administrators, students, employers).

Parker Palmer's "Organizational" and "Movement" Approaches to Change

An "organizational approach" to change, as Parker Palmer explains it, is based on the assumption that bureaucratic rules, roles, and structures necessarily define what kind of change in an organization can occur and how it will occur. This approach--also known less affectionately today as "restructuring"--has taken the corporate and academic worlds by storm of late. The thinking is that if something "must change," then the way to "fix it" is to rearrange a few boxes and establish a few new policies. Usually, structural approaches to change are driven by external events that demands some kind of "new" organizational response (e.g., restructuring the curriculum to include more multicultural perspectives or downsizing corporations to deal with a tighter economy).

Parker Palmer proposes an alternative approach to change--a "movement" approach that he says is "paradoxical": [those involved in the movement] abandon the logic of organizations in order to gather the power necessary to rewrite the logic of organizations" (p.13). A Movement Approach is comprised of four stages:

- Choosing Integrity: Isolated individuals stop leading divided lives.
- Corporate Support: People find each other and form groups for mutual support.
- Going Public: Empowered by community, these groups of individuals learn to translate

- their "private problems" into "public issues"; and
- Alternative Rewards: These individuals work to develop alternative rewards that sustain the movement and help to bring about organizational changes in conventional reward structures.

Strategies to Facilitate Change

A. Clif Conrad's Strategies

1. Create a Climate for Change
 - a. Create the Need for Change
 - b. Communicate and Publicize the Proposal

2. Build Faculty Support
 - a. Utilize Opinion Leaders
 - b. Involve a Wide Range of Faculty
 - c. Establish the Compatibility of the Change
 - d. Emphasize the Benefits of the Innovation for Faculty
 - e. Build Coalitions: Know When to Fight
 - f. Know When to Compromise

3. Exert Administrative Leadership
 - a. Combine Initiative with Involvement
 - b. Serve as a Compromiser

4. Organize for Implementation
 - a. Incorporate an Explicit Implementation Plan into Proposal
 - b. Build an Effective Structure of Rewards and Resources
 - c. Choose an Appropriate Mechanism for Administering the Program
 - d. Select Key People for Administering the Program
 - e. Incorporate a Plan for Faculty Development
 - f. Make Adjustments Throughout the Implementation Process

B. Bill Toombs' and Bill Tierney's Strategies⁴

- a. Create a climate, even a demand for change.
- b. Diminish the threat associated with innovation and avoid hard-line approaches.
- c. Avoid being timid.
- d. Appreciate timing.
- e. Gear the innovation to the organization.
- f. Disseminate and evaluate information.
- g. Communicate effectively.
- h. Get organizational leaders behind the innovation.
- i. Build a base of active support.
- j. Establish rewards.
- k. Plan for the period after adoption.

⁴See Toombs, William W. and Tierney, William. Meeting the Mandate: Renewing the College and Departmental Curriculum. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6, 1991.

Possible Questions for Discussion:

1. Parker Palmer proposes a "movement approach" to reform of teaching and learning. He suggests four stages in a movement approach: 1) isolated individuals stop leading "divided lives"; 2) these people find each other and form groups for mutual support; 3) empowered by community, they learn to translate "private problems" into public issues; and 4) alternative rewards are developed that sustain the movement and may force changes in the conventional reward structure. Critique his movement approach.
2. Clifton Conrad notes that most studies of change have been associated either with a "political" or "planned change" approach. From your perspective, what are the strengths and limitations of these various approaches? In terms of professional practice, do you think that curriculum reformers should be guided by a model or theoretical perspective on change--or simply strategy and tactics?
3. Flaws in Traditional Change Strategies: A few years ago Jack Lindquist identified some common flaws in traditional change strategies: amateurism, myopia, nickel-diming (not enough funding), unwillingness to compromise, top or bottom-heaviness (that is, too much administrative or faculty participation), and overestimating human nature. Based on your readings and experiences, what do you think are the most common flaws in traditional change strategies?
4. Who are the key participants in change? What should be the roles and responsibilities of key administrators in terms of curricular review and curriculum change. Specifically, examine the roles of the (a) department chairperson, (b) college dean, (c) academic vice-president, (d) president, and (e) board of trustees. What should be the roles of faculty and students? Employers?

Essay-Type Questions

The following quotation is taken from Judson Jerome's Culture Out of Anarchy: The Reconstruction of American Higher Learning:

In the old days students and faculty used to have in common, if nothing else, their complaints about the stodgy and bureaucratic administration, but now administrators sometimes find themselves aligned with the students against a faculty epitomized by narrow departments locked in defense of their disciplines against marauders with integrative concepts and a preoccupation with social problems. There is now general agreement (except among faculties) that faculties are the major obstacle to change.

Write a brief essay entitled "Obstacles to Curricular Change in Higher Education." Define what you mean by change. Then focus your essay on an analysis of the obstacles to change as you have defined it, referring to the literature on academic change where appropriate. At some point in the essay state whether you agree or disagree with the point made in the quotation, i.e., that faculties are the major obstacle to change.

NOTE: PAGES 69-88 ARE STILL IN DRAFT: WILL BE COMPLETED BY JUNE 24, 2008

V. Teaching, Learning, and Curriculum

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to “Section V: Teaching, Learning, and the Curriculum.” READER, pp. 559-561
2. Clif Notes (see C below)
3. Fendrich, L. (2007, June 8). A pedagogical straitjacket. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(40), B6.
4. Haworth, J. G., & Conrad, C. F. (1997). Perspectives on academic program quality AND An engagement theory of academic program quality. In *Emblems of quality in higher education: Developing and sustaining high-quality programs* (pp. 1-13, 27-39). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
5. Fear, Doberneck, Robinson, Fear, & Barr: “Meaning Making and ‘The Learning Paradigm’: A Provocative Idea in Practice.” READER, pp. 562-573
6. Conrad, Johnson, & Gupta: “Teaching-for-Learning: A Model for Faculty to Advance Student Learning.” READER, pp. 574-584
7. Baptiste: “Pedagogical Implications of Human Capital Theory.” READER, pp. 597-609
8. hooks: “Embracing Change: Teaching in a Multicultural World.” READER, pp. 610-613
9. Ropers-Huilman & Taliaferro: “Advocacy Education: Teaching, Research, and Difference in Higher Education.” READER, pp. 614-630

B. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

INCOMPLETE AS OF MAY 16 : TBA

2. Clif Notes:
3. Fendrich, L. (A pedagogical straitjacket)
4. Haworth, J. G., & Conrad, C. F. (Perspectives on academic program quality AND An engagement theory of academic program quality):
5. Fear, Doberneck, Robinson, Fear, & Barr (Meaning Making and ‘The Learning Paradigm’)
6. Conrad, Johnson, & Gupta (Teaching-for-Learning: A Model for Faculty to Advance Student Learning):
7. Baptiste (Pedagogical Implications of Human Capital Theory)
8. hooks (Embracing Change: Teaching in a Multicultural World):
9. Ropers-Huilman & Taliaferro (Advocacy Education: Teaching, Research, and Difference in Higher Education):

Overall Question: How are teaching and learning connected to the curriculum? How might we think about teaching, learning, and curriculum separately? What responsibilities do teacher have for student learning? Learners have for quality teaching?

C. CLIF NOTES

Curriculum Design, Pedagogy, and the Teaching/Learning Experience

Throughout the course, I have invited you to think about curriculum as closely linked with teaching and learning--and we have read a significant amount about teaching and learning in higher education. Here, I pose two questions:

1. Why have I placed so much emphasis on teaching and learning in a course in curriculum? Is that emphasis justified?
2. What are the primary implications of our readings on teaching and learning for how we approach curriculum design?

Below, I share a few of my thoughts in regard to these matters.

A. Connecting What we Teach with How we Teach

Too often we ignore discussions of teaching and learning when we address curricular matters. The curriculum, from the view of many, is only about arranging courses and selecting appropriate knowledge to convey in those courses. As long as we've figured out WHAT should be taught and HOW that knowledge should be arranged, we've accomplished our purpose--or so these individuals maintain.

Such a view of curriculum might work for some, but for me it is noticeably incomplete. From my perspective, decisions about WHAT to teach should not be separated from decisions about HOW we teach. My view, of course, has been largely influenced by a national study of master's education that I conducted with my colleague Jennifer Grant Haworth. In that study, we learned that decisions related to HOW we teach what we teach are terribly important. In fact, we found that in terms of the daily experiences of faculty and students, no decision had more of an effect on the overall character of participants' experiences in master's programs than the approach to teaching and learning.

From my perspective, then, decisions about content--or what knowledge should be included in the curriculum--should not be isolated from decisions about how to teach that content. We would do well to remember that the messenger is often just as important as the message. Put differently, while the content of what we teach is important, it is equally important to consider how we teach and communicate that knowledge to others. From my perspective, the two walk hand in glove and should be studied in tandem.

B. The Importance of Epistemology

Just as the recent debates over the undergraduate curriculum have highlighted the epistemological assumptions that shape our perceptions of "what knowledge is most worth knowing," so too have these debates helped us to understand how our epistemological assumptions influence our approach to teaching and learning. Palmer and Belenky et al. help us to understand how the epistemological assumptions traditionalists embrace--with their emphasis on objective knowledge and the separation of the knower and

the known--shape their pedagogical practices (i.e., "banking" approach: impart truths to students in a neutral manner). Similarly, these authors help us to see how different epistemological assumptions--that knowledge is a social construct that is developed through interactions with others--influence the teaching/learning process (i.e., "connected" approach: teachers and students engage in interactive dialogues in which they critically examine, question, rediscover, and generate knowledge).

Whether we are talking about WHAT knowledge to include in the curriculum, HOW to structure or organize knowledge, or HOW to teach knowledge, our decisions are fundamentally tied to our personal views of knowledge. We cannot ignore the importance of epistemology in curricular, pedagogical, or teaching/learning matters. Indeed, from my perspective, Parker Palmer is right: the way we know has tremendous implications for the way we live. My hope is that after completing this course you will be much more aware of how your epistemological assumptions shape what knowledge you believe is most worth knowing, how you choose to organize that knowledge and, of course, how you teach that knowledge to others.

C. Moving Beyond the "Formal Curriculum" to the Experienced Curriculum

My third reason for discussing approaches to teaching and learning in this course is, finally, a very practical one. We could sit around for the entire term and discuss how to structure knowledge according to Bergquist's model, but that would only provide us with an understanding of the curriculum as we "formally" know it in college catalogs. As Palmer, Conrad et al., and Belenky, et al. tell us, there is much more to curriculum than its formal components and structures. These selections cast another perspective on curriculum--they describe how the curriculum is experienced-in-practice by those who participate directly in academic programs. These articles make explicit the connections among WHAT is taught, HOW it is taught and HOW all of this affects participants' teaching and learning experiences in colleges and universities.

From my perspective, such connections are critical to an understanding of "curriculum in higher education." Too many of us forget that it is human beings--not inanimate planning models or armchair theories--that animate and breathe life into "curriculum." These readings challenge us to turn an attentive ear to the stories of those who are at the center of the curricular experience. In so doing, they force us to deal head-on with HOW our curricular and pedagogical choices affect the overall character of participants' "lived" teaching and learning experiences.

In a nutshell, I think that teaching and learning should be at the center of curriculum design. As such, I think that teaching and learning should be carefully examined in any curriculum planning effort, including considerations of: a) how program faculty view themselves as teachers and learners and how their views affects how they approach teaching and learning; b) how program faculty view students and what this, in turn, means for how they teach students and the learning expectations they hold for them; and c) how program faculty view the teaching and learning process in toto and what this means for how they structure learning experiences.

A Personal View: Parker Palmer, and his Influence on My Philosophy of Teaching and Learning

In *To Know As We are Known*, Parker Palmer puts forth a strong critique of traditional (what he calls "conventional") ways of teaching and learning. Such an approach is grounded in an "objectivist" way of knowing (epistemology) that emphasizes control, detachment, and manipulation in the teaching/learning process. In other words, conventional forms of pedagogy estrange the "knower from the known" and, in so doing, encourage manipulative and controlling conceptions of knowledge and

professional practice. In many respects, Palmer's description of conventional pedagogy parallels Belenky, et al.'s "banking" conception of instruction. Convinced that such an approach to teaching and learning violates the spirit of truthful inquiry, Palmer puts forth a new pedagogical approach that is grounded in an epistemology that values participation, dialogue, humility, and relationship. This "relational" pedagogy leads teachers and learners toward fuller and richer understandings of the truth by "drawing out" and building intimate relations between the knower and the known.

After describing the epistemological (nature of knowledge) and ontological (nature of reality) foundations upon which his "relational" approach to teaching and learning is based, Palmer provides several concrete suggestions for how we can translate his "theory of personal truth" into a practical pedagogy. He centers his suggestions around a pithy phrase: "To teach is to create a space . . . in which obedience to truth is practiced." What follows is a thumbnail sketch of Palmer's suggestions.

A. Three Characteristics of Palmer's "Learning Space"

1. Openness: A learning space for mutual, "truthful" dialogue in which a diversity of perspectives are welcomed from all participants.
2. Boundaries: A learning space that is carefully defined by certain boundaries--including the recognition that conflict and silence within an hospitable learning environment can facilitate the learning process.
3. Hospitality: A supportive, yet challenging, learning space where participants receive each other's ideas with openness and care.

B. Potential Ways in Which Teachers Can Create an "Open, Hospitable" Learning Space"

1. Physical Space: Arrange classroom in u-space or circle to allow for interaction and community among all participants in the learning process.
2. Conceptual Space (Created through Words):
 - a. Ask learners to carefully examine short passages of assigned reading material.
 - b. Prepare lectures that provide useful analytical frameworks for "bounding discussions."
3. Auditory Space (Created through both Interactive Dialogue and Silence)
4. Creative Space
 - a. "Educare"--to draw out . . . individual ideas.
 - b. Speak questions rather than answers.
5. Emotional Space
 - a. Set an example by sharing personal anecdotes, thinking aloud, taking risks . . . develop a personal relationship with other learners in the class.
 - b. Demonstrate an ethic of caring rather than one of competition.
 - c. Engage in ongoing (formative) evaluations of course with learners.

C. Five Ways to Enhance "Truthfulness" in the Classroom

1. Connect the classroom to the realities of the outside world.
2. Encourage learners to practice obedience, or fidelity, to truth.
This requires listening carefully to one another and responding faithfully to the personal implications of what we hear. (Where: Fidelity obligates from within, conformity obligates from outside.)
3. Encourage a synergistic, communal ethic of learning among learners.
This ethic is based on two assumptions:
 - a. That all participants can teach and learn from each other.
 - b. That the whole (all participants teaching and learning from each other) is greater than the sum of its parts.
4. Remember the voices of all involved--teacher, students, and subject--and encourage personal dialogue among them.

5. Encourage living relationships among all participants in the learning process. Interact with one another as full partners in learning.

In elaborating, Palmer emphasizes the intimate bonds between teaching and friendship. As Palmer suggests:

"Practicing obedience to truth in the classroom, practicing responsive listening between teacher, students, and subject, is not finally a matter of technique. It depends ultimately on a teacher who has a living relationship with the subject at hand, who invites students into that relationship as full partners. Here is the largest hospitality on which this sort of teaching relies: the hospitality of a teacher who has a fruitful relationship with the subject and who wants students to benefit from that friendship as well" (pp. 103-104).

As a guest in one of my classes several years ago, but most especially through his writings, my own philosophy has been greatly influenced by Parker Palmer--more precisely, perhaps, he has given voice to a philosophy of teaching and learning that I have come to embrace over the last few years both on the basis of reflections on my personal experiences and through listening to many diverse voices (mostly through my field research and my reading). In particular, I have come to believe that the search for truth is relational and communal and, as such, I strive to teach and learn in a classroom community in which all participants are invited and encouraged to dialogue with one another in the ongoing search for truth and understanding.

While nearly every page of Parker Palmer's book has provided me with food for thought, his ideas on pages 28 and 29 have had the most profound affect on my philosophy of teaching and learning. The ideas expressed here have had a very significant impact on how I view myself as a teacher, learner, colleague, and friend--even as a father of two women. To act "truthfully" on the beliefs that animate this view requires me to reexamine my attitudes and behavior in the world--both within the confines of my own solitude and within communities of kindred spirits who are committed to speaking truth to power. Here is one passage from Parker's book which helps center my own philosophy:

"The teacher is a mediator between the knower and the known, between the learner and the subject to be learned. A teacher, not some theory, is the living link in the epistemological chain. The way a teacher plays the mediator role conveys both an epistemology and ethic to the student, both an approach to knowing and an approach to living. I may teach the rhetoric of freedom, but if I teach *ex cathedra*, asking my students to rely solely on the authority of 'the fact' and demanding that they imitate authority on their papers and exams, I am teaching a slave ethic. I am forming students who neither how to learn in freedom nor how to live freely, guided by an inner sense of truth.

If this is the case, then as a teacher I can no longer take the easy way out, insisting that I am only responsible for conveying the facts of sociology or theology or whatever the subject may be. Instead, I must take responsibility for my mediator role, for the way my mode of teaching exerts a slow but steady formulative pressure on my students' sense of self and world. I teach more than a body of knowledge or a set of skills. I teach a mode of relationship between the knower and the known, a way of being in the world. That way, reinforced in course after course, will remain with my students long after the facts have faded from their minds" (pp. 28-29).

Over the last few years, I have especially come to appreciate Palmer's dictum: the way we know in the world has enormous implications for the way we live (and teach and learn) in it. Please take a few moments (minutes? hours?) to reflect on that.

Questions Regarding Students – “Learners” – and the Curriculum

1. What does a college or university need to know about its students as it develops or revises its overall curriculum? How can a college find out more about its students?
2. In recent years, some scholars have argued that adults learn differently than younger students. One of the best-known theories in adult education begins with the assumption that learning for adults (andragogy) is different from learning for children (pedagogy). How do the major assumptions and curricular designs differ between andragogy and pedagogy? Should curriculum planners examine closely their assumptions about student learning?
3. Developmentalists--such as Nevitt Sanford, Jane Loevinger, William Perry, Jean Piaget, and Arthur Chickering--share the view that people grow by passing through a series of increasingly complex stages, each of which builds on and incorporates the previous stage. Further, most developmentalists believe that intellectual, moral, and ethical growth occur in tandem. In turn, their learning theory is based on relationships that emerge when intellectual, moral, and ethical growth are linked. What are some of the implications of using developmental theory in planning the curriculum?

Women's Ways of Knowing: Connected Teaching

In the last chapter of their book, Mary Ann Belenky and her colleagues advance a "connected" view that emphasizes the importance of shared inquiry, personal experience, and communal dialogue in the teaching and learning process. Central to their view is the concept of teacher as midwife as opposed to the traditional "banker" model. In their words: "While the bankers deposit knowledge in the learner's head, the midwives draw it out. They assist the students in giving birth to their own ideas, in making their own tacit knowledge explicit and elaborating it. . . . Mid-wife teachers do not administer anesthesia. They support their student's teaching, but they do not do the students' thinking for them or expect the students to think as they do."

More specifically, mid-wife (connected) teachers:

1. "[P]reserve the student's fragile newborn thoughts, to see that they are born with their truth intact";
2. "[F]oster the child's growth . . . [and] support the evolution of their students' thinking";
3. "[T]ry to discern the truth inside the students";
4. "[F]ocus not on their knowledge (as the lecturer does) but on the students' knowledge";
5. "[E]ncourage students to use their knowledge in everyday life";
6. "[W]elcome diversity of opinion in class discussion";
7. "[T]reat the student as a subject rather than an object";
8. "[D]o not use students to develop and support their own argument and point of view";
9. "[M]odel thinking as a human, imperfect, and attainable activity rather than "hide the imperfect processes of their own thinking, allowing their students to glimpse only the polished products";
10. "[T]ry "to connect, to enter each student's perspective"; and "are not just another student; the role carries special responsibilities. It does not entail power over the students; however, it does carry authority, an authority based not on subordination but on cooperation".

In developing "connected classes":

1. Mid-wife teachers tend to use Paulo Freire's problem-posing method: "Through dialogue, the teacher-of-the-students and the students-of-the- teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers";
2. There is a "culture for growth in which members can nurture each other's thoughts to maturity";
3. No one apologizes for uncertainty;
4. Class is a "conversation";
5. Class is a "community, unlike a hierarchy . . . [in which] people get to know each other. They do not act as representatives of positions or as occupants of roles but as individuals with particular styles of teaching."

Two Philosophies of Teaching and Learning

	Dialogic/Constructivist	Didactic/Objectivist
View of Knowledge	Authoritative	Dynamic/Contingent
Purpose of Teaching and Learning	To transmit, master, and store information for future use	To examine, discuss, re/discover, and construct knowledge and meaning
Mode of Communication	Unidirectional transmission	Interactive dialogue
View of Teacher	Hierarchical: Teacher is viewed as "authoritative expert" whose role is to "fill students with knowledge and skills"	Collaborative: Teacher is viewed most as a co-learner whose role is to interact dialogically with students in teaching and learning
View of Student	Student is viewed as a "blank slate" whose role is to receive, master, and store transmitted knowledge – student is viewed as a passive object	Student is viewed as a co-learner who brings a wealth of tacit knowledge to the classroom – his or her role is to interact with and learn from other learners, including both teachers and peers
View of Teaching and Learning	"Banking" approach: the teacher (as expert) didactically transmits knowledge to students, emphasizing student mastery and storage of this knowledge for future use	Connected approach: teacher (as co-learner) introduces students to extant knowledge while concurrently encouraging learners to draw upon their tacit knowledge in rediscovering and generating knowledge and meaning

Note: Adapted from Conrad, C. F., Haworth, J. G., & Millar, S. (1993). *A silent success: Master's education in the United States*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Possible Questions for Discussion:

1. Mary Ann Belenky and her colleagues are highly critical of traditional education as "banking" as well as the "adversarial doubting model." They criticize "traditional emphases" on separation over connection, assessment over understanding, debate over collaboration and, quoting Adrienne Rich, they criticize the "masculine adversary style of discourse." To what extent do you share their critique of didactic teaching? What do you think of their suggestion that women are more critical of traditional teaching than men? From your perspective, does didactic teaching have any place in higher education?

2. Belenky and her colleagues are sometimes quite critical of "the conflict model" of college teaching. Based on their research, they report: "Women did tell of occasions when teachers challenged their ideas--and we have retold some in this book--but they did not describe them as occasions for cognitive growth. On the whole, women found the experience of being doubted debilitating rather than energizing". From your perspective, do "conflict" and "challenge" have any role to play in connected teaching? Under what conditions, if any, can "challenge" contribute to students' learning? (Parker Palmer, for example, emphasizes the importance of open and honest disagreement in "truth-seeking communities" provided that it is coupled with strong support and caring.)

3. Parker Palmer describes himself as a "well-educated [person] who has been schooled in a way of knowing that treats the world as an object to be dissected and manipulated, a way of knowing that gives [him] power over the world" (p. 5). He explains that such a way of knowing caused him to treat the world as "an object to be manipulated" to "suit his personal needs" (p. 6). Has your education taught you a similar way of knowing? What implications has this way of knowing had on your own life? Professional practice? (In so doing, consider Palmer's observation: "The way we interact with the world in knowing it becomes the way we interact with the world as we live in it") (p. 21).

4. Consider the following quotation from Palmer: "If you want to understand our controlling conception of knowledge, do not ask for our best epistemological theories. Instead, observe the way we teach and look for the theory of knowledge implicit in those practices. That is the epistemology that our students learn--no matter what our best contemporary theorist may have to say" (p. 29). Do you agree with Palmer? Cite examples from your own experience.

5. Parker Palmer puts forth an interesting conception of truth as "troth." In his words, "to know in the truth is to become betrothed, engage the known with one's whole self, an engagement one enters with attentiveness, care, and good will. To know in truth is to enter into the life of that which we know and to allow it to enter into ours. Truthful knowing weds the knower and the known In truthful knowing the knower becomes co-participant in a community of faithful relationships with other person and creatures and things, with whatever our knowledge makes known. We find truth by pledging our troth, and knowing becomes a reunion of separated beings whose primary bond is not logic but of love" (p. 31). What do you make of Palmer's definition of truth? Can such "trothful dialogue" really occur in colleges and universities? Have you ever experienced such dialogue in your studies?

6. If we came to embrace Palmer's definition of truth in the academy, what implications would such a view have on how we approached and made sense of the recent "cultural wars" debate? How would this conception of truth affect and change our approach to teaching and learning? How would it impact the way administrators worked with others on campus?

7. Parker Palmer offers many compelling reasons for why teachers and students "cling to a conventional pedagogy" that separates the "knower from the known" by emphasizing "spectator education" the "authority" of the teacher-as-expert, and anti-communal, "survival-of-the-fittest" classroom cultures. Among these include convenience and the power that accrues to teachers by controlling the classroom

agenda (thereby hedging against any challenges to their authority or ignorance). But Palmer says teachers are not the only persons who "resist" a relational pedagogy. As he puts it:

"Students themselves cling to the conventional pedagogy because it gives them security, too, a fact well known by teachers who have tried more participatory modes of teaching. When a teacher tries to share the power, to give students more responsibility for their own education, students get skittish and cynical. They complain that they teacher is not earning his or her pay, and they subvert the experiment by noncooperation. Many students prefer to have their learning boxed and tied, and when they are invited into a more creative role they flee in fear" (p. 39).

What is your reaction to this statement?

8. Parker Palmer has written that most of us "want a kind of knowledge that eliminates mystery and puts us in charge of an object-world": Above all, we want to avoid a knowledge that calls for our own conversion. We want to know in ways that allow us to convert the world--but we do not want to be known in ways that require us to change as well" (pp. 39-40). How accurate is Palmer's view--especially in our classrooms?

9. Parker Palmer has written:

"The original and authentic meaning of the word 'professor' is 'one who professes a faith.' The true professor is not one who controls facts and theories and techniques. The true professor is one who affirms a transcendent center of truth, a center that lies beyond our contriving, that enters history through the lives of those who profess it and brings us into community with each other and the world. If professors are to create a space in which obedience to truth is practiced, we must become 'professors' again. To do so, we must cultivate personal experience of that which we need to profess" (p. 113).

What do you think of Palmer's conception of a "professor?" Do his ideas apply to all teachers (regardless of official title)? What implications does his view have for all of us (professors, administrators, students, trustees, and so forth) as teachers in colleges and universities?

10. Robert Hahn is rather skeptical about the new language of "science" as an approach to thinking about teaching, highlights the salience of the "subtext" in teaching, and speaks of teaching more as "art" than science. In what ways is such thinking similar to and different from Palmer and Belenky, et al.?

VI. EVALUATION, ASSESSMENT, AND CURRICULUM

A. READINGS

1. Conrad & Johnson: Introduction to “Section VI: Evaluation, Assessment, and the Curriculum.” READER, pp. 677-679
2. Clif Notes (see C. below)
3. Cross: “What Do We Know about Student Learning, and How Do We Know It?” READER, pp. 700-708 (**SKIM**)
4. Hamilton: “A Principle-Based Approach to Assessing General Education.” READER, pp. 709-719 (**SKIM**)
5. Brooks: “Measuring University Quality.” READER, pp. 720-733
6. Ash & Clayton: “The Articulated Learning: An Approach to Guided Reflection and Assessment.” READER, pp. 734-745
7. Beyer, Gillmore, & Fisher: “General Learning.” READER, pp. 746-770
8. Jones: “Myths about Assessing the Impact of Problem-Based Learning on Students.” READER, pp. 771-775
9. Courts & McInerney: “Qualitative Program Assessment: From Tests to Portfolios.” READER, pp. 776-794
10. Haworth & Conrad: “Engaged Teaching and Learning: Staking a Claim for a New Perspective on Program Quality.” READER, pp. 795-800
11. Macdonald: “Developing Competent e-Learners.” READER, pp. 801-809

B. INSTRUCTOR COMMENTARY AND PROSPECTIVE DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

INCOMPLETE AS OF MAY 16 : TBA

2. **Clif Notes:**
3. **Cross (What Do We Know about Student Learning, and How Do We Know It?)**
4. **Hamilton (A Principle-Based Approach to Assessing General Education):**
5. **Brooks (Measuring University Quality):**
6. **Ash & Clayton (The Articulated Learning: An Approach to Guided Reflection and Assessment)**
7. **Beyer, Gillmore, & Fisher (General Learning):**
8. **Jones (Myths about Assessing the Impact of Problem-Based Learning on Students)**
9. **Courts & McInerney (Qualitative Program Assessment: From Tests to Portfolios):**
10. **Haworth & Conrad (Engaged Teaching and Learning: Staking a Claim for a New Perspective on Program Quality):**
11. **Macdonald (Developing Competent e-Learners):**

C. CLIF NOTES

Overview of Program Review: Definitions, Rationale, Purposes

In 1990, more than 80 percent of all colleges and universities and state governing and coordinating boards conducted reviews of academic programs on a regular cycle (Barak and Breier, 1990, p. 2). In the few decades since, the review of academic programs in colleges and universities has become a standard activity in higher education today. But what exactly is program review? Why is it a needed activity in our nation's colleges and universities? What purposes does it fulfill?

A. Definition and Defining Characteristics

In a nutshell, program review provides for a comprehensive evaluation of an entire academic program at a college or university. According to policy statement issued by the Council of Graduate Schools in 1990, academic program reviews have at least seven defining characteristics:

1. In the United States, most academic program reviews are initiated and conducted within individual institutions. Even in those cases where statewide governing or coordinating boards require mandated reviews, most delegate the mechanics of the actual review process to the individual institutions themselves.
2. Program reviews are both descriptive and evaluative. They provide more than descriptive information on a program; they also pass evaluative judgment on the quality of the program, its faculty, students, and resources.
3. Academic program reviews are typically directed toward program improvement. They are not merely conducted to maintain the status quo; their intent is to identify program strengths and weaknesses and to forge recommendations that enhance overall quality.
4. Departments engaged in program review are evaluated largely on the basis of academic criteria and not financial or political ones. In other words, the department is judged largely on its strengths and weaknesses and not on its "ability to produce funds for the institution" (p. 6).
5. Program review is an "objective" process insofar as it involves faculty in self-studies and brings in external reviewers to assess the accuracy of those self-studies. As CGS puts it, "although no such process can be completely objective, a well-constructed program review leads to a careful, arms-length evaluation by at least some individuals with no vested interest in the results" (p. 7).
6. Program reviews are conducted independently of other reviews, such as accreditation and licensing reviews.
7. Program reviews "result in action." That is, on the basis of recommendations and reviewers' comments, departments develop plans to implement changes on a specific timetable. These changes are linked to broader departmental and institutional planning and budgeting processes.

B. Importance of Program Review

Why is program review needed? Why has it become such an important activity in colleges and universities? The rationale for program review is fairly straightforward: it provides for periodic, comprehensive reviews of the strengths and weaknesses of academic programs. As such, it helps

administrators and faculty to understand empirically (a) how well a particular program has accomplished its original goals and (b) where it is weak and in need of improvement. This information, particularly when coupled with workable recommendations and subsequent action, is aimed at ensuring the continuous quality improvement of academic units.

C. Types and Purposes of Program Review

There are two types of program reviews: **formative reviews**, which are targeted toward program improvement, and **summative reviews**, which tend to emphasize the reallocation of resources (including program termination) as their driving force. Institutional reviews, by and large, tend to emphasize formative purposes; accreditation and state-mandated reviews, summative purposes.

Depending on the primary objective of the review (improvement versus reallocation of resources/accountability), the following additional purposes animate program review efforts:

- to assess program quality, productivity, need, and demand (formative and summative)
- to improve the quality of program offerings (largely formative)
- to ensure the wise use of resources, particularly by assessing the cost-effectiveness of programs (largely summative)
- to determine program effectiveness and to consider possible modifications (formative and summative)
- to facilitate academic planning and budgeting (formative and summative)
- to satisfy external calls for program accountability (largely summative)
- to scale back or terminate programs (summative)

Robert Barak and Barbara Breier provide an informative chart, in their book Successful Program Reviews (1990), that delineates differences between institutional, accreditation, and state-mandated program reviews. As you read over their chart, notice that institutional reviews tend to emphasize program improvement as their driving purpose, whereas the others stress accountability purposes.

Comparison of Institutional, Accreditation, and State Program Reviews
 (Barak and Breier, *Successful Program Review*, 1990, pp. 6-7)

Feature	Institutional Reviews (Dept., School, College)	Accreditation Reviews (Professional and Regional)	State Coordinating Agency Reviews
Primary Purpose	To develop programs, analyze their direction and content, and assess their quality.	To assess whether a program or institution meets minimum standards.	To evaluate the accountability and efficient use of an institution, program, or segment of postsecondary education vis-a-vis its peers.
Primary Measures	Indicators of quality deemed appropriate by institutional/departmental personnel.	Minimum approved standards of the discipline, state, or region.	Input and outcome measures based on need, cost, productivity, and quality.
Primary Evaluators	Departmental or institutional personnel.	Peer reviewers.	Ranges from institutional self-reviewers to outside peers to extra institutional reviewers on state agency staff.
Secondary Evaluators	Peer consultants, advisory groups representing business, industry, or profession; current students and graduates.	Departmental or institutional personnel via self-study.	Program graduates, business or industry raters.

Criteria Used to Assess Program Quality

Over the last several years, a number of criteria and accompanying indicators have been used in the program review process to evaluate the quality of academic programs. These criteria are often quite similar across postsecondary institutions.

For the most part, four criteria typically guide program reviews: program quality, productivity, need/demand (including centrality to institutional mission), and cost. Depending upon the nature and mission of the institution, other criteria may also be included. At Ohio State University, for example, quality is the major criterion, but other criteria--including cost-effectiveness and program value (defined

as market for graduates, contribution of the program to the university's instructional program, and the relationship of the program to societal needs) are also emphasized (Conrad and Wilson, pp. 31-32). At Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, the major criteria are quality of instruction and learning, quality of faculty, centrality of the program, program value, and program potential (Conrad and Wilson, p. 32).

The following table provides a listing of the major criteria and indicators that are frequently used in academic program reviews. Note: The following was adapted from Conrad and Wilson, 1985, p. 31 and Barak and Breier, 1990, pp. 23-25.

A. Program Quality: Criteria and Indicators

1. Quality of Faculty

- educational training and qualifications (e.g., number of faculty with Ph.D.'s)
- scholarly and research productivity (e.g., number of articles published per faculty member over the last five years; number of citation counts per faculty member over the past five years)
- research funding (e.g., average grant support per faculty member over the past five years)
- awards, honors, and prizes
- number of faculty and average teaching and advising loads to ascertain critical mass
- student evaluations of teaching

2. Quality of Students

- educational qualifications and academic achievements (e.g., average high school or undergraduate g.p.a. for enrolled students over the past five years; average ACT/SAT or GRE scores for enrolled students over the past five years)
- student involvement (e.g., student participation in faculty-sponsored research and service projects over the past five years; student participation in journal clubs, tutorials, individualized studies over the past five years)
- number of enrollments by student level (e.g., undergraduate, master's, doctoral, certificate over the past five years to ascertain critical mass)

3. Quality of Curriculum

- listing of core and specialized course work offered over the past five years
- description and assessment of the quality of culminating experiences (theses, senior projects, capstone courses)
- graduate program rankings, if applicable

4. Quality of Support Services (library, labs and equipment, physical plant, computer facilities)

- space allocations by type (faculty offices, classrooms, labs)
- number of library volumes in disciplinary and supporting cognate areas
- adequacy of computer and equipment support

5. Financial Resources

- budget sources
- adequacy of funding for faculty salaries, student assistantships and financial aid, equipment and supplies, faculty travel and development

6. Quality of Program Administration/Leadership

7. Student Outcomes

B. Program Productivity: Criteria and Indicators

1. Department Enrollments (numbers of each degree program)
 - five-year credit-hour enrollments
 - five-year headcount enrollments
2. Program Completion Rates (for each degree program in department)
 - number of degrees and certificates granted over five years
 - proportion of starters completing the program after five years
3. Faculty Productivity
 - student-faculty ratio
 - class size distributions
4. Program Courses
 - number of courses taught annually by degree level over the past five years
5. Graduate Outcomes
 - number and percentage of graduates obtaining full-time employment in the field
 - number and percentage of graduates passing professional qualifying exams over a five-year period
 - test scores on graduation exams over a period of years

C. Program Need/Demand: Criteria and Indicators

1. Centrality to Mission and Other Campus Programs
2. Value to Society
3. Success in Meeting Students' Needs
 - proportion of completers/leavers satisfied with instruction in program
4. Program Autonomy
 - proportion of total program credit hours by program faculty
 - service instruction to other programs
5. Lack of Duplication with Other Programs
 - enrollment of similar programs in region
 - number of other courses in same discipline taught at institution
6. Present and Projected Student Demand
7. Employment Demand for Graduates
 - number of existing and projected job openings
 - proportion of local employers expressing need for the program

D. Program Cost: Criteria and Indicators

1. Cost Effectiveness
--discipline costs/state average
--program costs/institutional average
2. Non-Pecuniary Costs and Benefits

Common Methods of Assessing Student Learning

A. Tests

1. Definition: A test is a "collection of items developed to measure some human educational or psychological attribute" (Worthen and Sanders, 1987, p. 302).
2. Types: There are many types of tests available in the literature. These include commercially-available standardized norm- and criterion-referenced tests, locally developed tests, and oral examinations.
 - a. Norm-referenced tests discriminate between students, showing how particular students stand in relation to a broader (and often national) reference group on the same test. For instance, the SAT is a norm-referenced tests: students complete the exam and receive results that compare their performance on mathematical and verbal aptitude test items to others who have recently completed the test nationwide (e.g., "You performed better on this test than 83% of the other high school juniors who took the SAT this year").
 - b. Criterion-referenced tests compare student performance on a test against an absolute standard and not against a comparison group of peers. Typically, mastery and competency learning methods of instruction use criterion-referenced tests. Students are expected to answer a certain percentage of items correctly on a test to demonstrate their mastery of certain minimal standards before they are allowed to move on to the next level (or to receive a degree). For example, we might construct an entry-level foreign language exam that requires students to answer at least 70 percent of the questions correctly in order to test out of Intro Spanish. Students are therefore assessed against a pre-determined standard of competence, not against each other. If 95 percent of the test-takers on a given day meet the 70 percent standard, all 95 percent test out of Intro Spanish. Many basic skills and advanced placement tests are criterion-referenced tests.
 - c. Locally-developed exams are multiple-choice, true/false, or essay exams constructed by faculty for use in a local setting. Most of these exams are designed to assess students' knowledge of the specific subject-matter content that they have learned in a particular class. Most course-related "final exams" and program-related "comprehensive exams" in colleges and universities are locally-developed exams.
 - d. Oral examinations assess the extent of an individual student's knowledge in a particular subject area. Students are quizzed by faculty and are expected to demonstrate their understanding of the subject content through clear and precise dialogue. Dissertation proposal and final defenses are examples of oral examinations.

B. Competency-Based Assessment Methods

1. Definition: Competency-based methods are designed to collect data on actual student performance in relation to pre-determined outcomes, or competencies. The student must demonstrate a level of mastery through the completion of "real-world" tasks and assignments. For instance, if a student was expected to demonstrate competence in verbal communication skills, the student would more than likely be asked to give a speech, be interviewed on a mock-talk show or both. Similarly, to assess faculty competence in teaching, a faculty member would probably have to demonstrate his or her teaching skills in a large lecture, a small seminar, and in one-on-one tutorials.

2. Types: Performance appraisals and simulations are the two competency-based methods.

a. In a performance appraisal, students, faculty, or employees are required to demonstrate--in a hands-on way--their skills in relation to a single or set of stated goals, competencies, or criteria. As Pat Hutchings puts it, performance appraisals are "less a single method than a way of thinking about learning; it has to do with developing in students abilities to comprehend, connect, and apply." In the K-12 sector, performance appraisals are now being referred to as "authentic" forms of assessment.

Typical examples of performance assessments/appraisals include:

- repairing a car engine in a community college automotives course
- demonstrating the correct usage of different dental instruments in a dental hygiene program
- the completion of an original music score for a class in musical composition
- the development of a marketing plan for a marketing class
- developing lesson plans in a secondary education methods course
- planning, conducting and analyzing data from a scientific experiment
- conducting historical background research, interviewing key stakeholders, and analyzing documentary data to write a bill or introduce a new policy initiative for an American Government course

There are many more examples. The key point here is that students are expected to demonstrate that they know how to "comprehend, connect, and apply" the knowledge they are learning in a tangible way.

b. Simulations "approximate" performance appraisals insofar as students demonstrate their tangible understandings of certain competencies within an artificial setting. Examples of simulations include:

- mock trials for law students
- surgery on cadavers for medical students
- flight simulators for pilots-in-training
- planning, managing, and analyzing financial portfolios in a simulated Wall Street environment for business students
- "practice teaching" in education methods classes for education students
- simulated workshops in many arts and sciences disciplines (e.g., at Alverno College, sophomore students engage in a "day-long simulation in which they act as a citizens' advisory committee to a local library confronted with a censorship issue. In the course of the day, they engage in group problem-solving, individual writing tasks, and extemporaneous speaking" (Hutchings, p. 23). The simulation requires them to demonstrate their working competencies

in analytic thought, oral and written communication, problem-solving skills, and decision-making.

c. Strengths and Limitations for Performance Appraisals and Simulations

The strengths and limitations for performance appraisals and simulations are very similar. In terms of their strengths, they:

- provide a fairly valid measure of what have been learned
- measure knowledge and low and high-level skills (unlike test, which largely measure recall knowledge)
- provide relevant and timely feedback to students on their own developing competencies
- provide faculty with formative feedback on how well they are accomplishing the goals of their own courses, programs
- strongly related to locally-developed goals, objectives

In terms of limitations, competency-based methods are:

- often costly, in terms of faculty and student time
- produce more "subjective" results than "objective" standardized tests
- "reactivity" effects might minimize reliability, validity (minimize by being less intrusive. . .use videotapes, audiotapes, mirrors)
- multiple rates might threaten reliability, validity (minimize by training raters, agreeing on set criteria)

Bottom Line: Performance appraisals and simulations are "generally the most highly valued but costly form of student outcomes assessment--usually the most valid way to measure skill development" (Prus and Johnson, p. 609).

C. Portfolios

1. Definition: Portfolios provide a multidimensional collection of a student's (or employee's or programs's) work which offers tangible evidence of individual learning outcomes. Portfolio assessment provides direct evidence of what faculty, students, or a program are actually doing.

2. Uses: Portfolio-based approaches to assessment have historically been used for four purposes:

- to compile individual products of learning in the fields of writing, fine arts, teacher development (as well as many new fields recently);
- to evaluate prior learning for college credit with older students;
- to assist in student program planning and advising; and
- to evaluate programs by keeping tangible evidence of their effectiveness, performance (program-based portfolio assessment has been used more frequently in evaluating general education programs)

3. Types: There are at least three different types of portfolios: developmental, representational/exemplary, and program-based.

a. "Development portfolios contain work samples that represent an individual's growth in one or several areas over time" (Murnane, 1993, 1). For example, students could place successive drafts of an essay or lab report in the portfolio as well as the final teacher-scored draft. Similarly, faculty could include various classroom assessment techniques and their final student evaluations of teaching in a developmental teaching portfolio. Developmental portfolios are often used for formative purposes and, as such, they provide faculty and

students with valuable opportunities to reflect on what they are teaching and learning, how they are going about teaching or learning, and how they can improve.

b. Representational/Exemplary portfolios contain various examples of what an individual has determined is their best work. For instance, a student might include in a representational portfolio for an employer only those papers, projects, lab reports and so forth that best represent his or her competencies in a specified area. Similarly, a faculty member might include those items that best illustrate his or her abilities as a teacher: videotapes of effective teaching, exemplary syllabi and course materials; and examples that demonstrate effectiveness in evaluating student performance.

c. Program portfolios provide tangible evidence of what a program has been doing over a given timespan. These portfolios can include information on student test scores, synthesized information from student and faculty portfolios, videotapes of effective teaching and learning, employer and alumni survey results, and so forth.

4. What's Included in the Portfolio

a. Clearly stated goals/outcomes are critical to portfolio assessment. Faculty must determine course or program goals and state these goals in terms of tangible student learning outcomes (knowledge, basic skills, higher order thinking skills, values and attitudes) before determining what "products" or "items" should be included in a portfolio.

b. Once goals/outcomes are established, items for inclusion should be selected that provide evidence of student learning in each of the predetermined goal/outcome areas. Depending on the field of study, appropriate portfolio items might include:

- journal or lab book entries
- attitude and interest surveys
- successive drafts of a paper or project
- videotapes of presentations, lab techniques, and similar "active learning" demonstrations
- tests and quizzes
- computational exercises, problem sets
- student narrative self-evaluations (on individual items, for the portfolio as a whole, or both--this component is necessary to help students assess their own learning and to empower them to take responsibility/ownership for their own learning)

5. Strengths and Limitations:

Portfolio-based approaches to assessment have the following strengths:

- they track student progress/development over time and, particularly when well-done, provide students and faculty with concrete evidence on (a) what kinds of changes have occurred in the student or teacher and (2) how different teaching and learning experiences have impacted on different student/teacher learning outcomes
- the multi-dimensional nature of portfolio assessment provides a more comprehensive, "authentic" and trustworthy picture of a student or teacher's learning outcomes (i.e., what they can actually "do" and have "done" over time)
- particularly well-suited to evaluating "non-quantitative" learning outcomes (such higher-order thinking skills)
- narrative student evaluation component of most portfolio-based assessment approaches challenges students to develop self-assessment skills and to take responsibility for their own learning
- immediacy of teacher feedback to students

- provide helpful formative information to faculty on student learning that can lead to improvements in instruction, program
- program-based portfolio assessment requires to state program goals/student learning outcomes explicitly and to make connections between goals, evidence, and program improvement
- collaborative nature of program-based portfolio assessment helps faculty to build bridges across courses in a program, thereby promoting holistic analysis of student learning outcomes

Portfolios have the following limitations:

- they require faculty to be clear about course-related (and, where applicable, program-related) goals for student learning--a tall order for many faculty who have a difficult time operationalizing the expected course- and program-related knowledge, skills, and competencies they expect students to learn
- multiple evaluators of portfolios might threaten reliability, validity (minimize by training evaluators, agreeing on evaluation protocol/standards, requiring peer de-briefings)
- cost and management concerns: portfolios can be costly in terms of faculty time and it is often difficult to determine what items should be included and how that information should be stored
- they fail to provide comparative information with a reference group (use faculty and employers from other institutions who use portfolios to assess student learning outcomes)

“In-Depth Exploration of the Major Types of Assessment: Examples, Purposes Content/Skills/Attitudes Addressed, Strengths and Weaknesses”*

Clif Conrad, Joan Kwako, and Kristina Gislason

August, 2003

*Joan Kwako wrote a paper on assessment. Building on and extending this work, Clif Conrad and Kristina Gislason converted the paper to an outline form and drew on additional sources in preparing this overview of assessment. (Copyright is assigned to Joan Kwako on the grounds that she may choose to publish all or parts thereof.)

Overview

- Assessment is a complex process dependent upon a whole network of classroom practices.
- Good assessment presumes a variety of strategies and procedures that are anchored in multiple indicators and sources of evidence.
- Since no one assessment can completely describe or measure what a student has learned or understands, an adequate assessment of what a student knows can only come from multiple assessment measures. These can include, but are not restricted to, the following: student writing, collaborative tests and projects, observations, and journals and portfolios, as well as the more commonly used quizzes, homework, and tests.

Traditional Assessments

Sources:

Courts, P.L., & McInerney, K.H. (1993). Assessment in Higher Education: Politics, Pedagogy, and Portfolios. Westport, CT: Praeger. Ch. 5.

Davis, B.G. (1993). Tools for Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Pp. 28-31.

Weimer, M. (1993). Improving your classroom teaching (Vol. 1). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications. Ch.7.

1. Examples (Texts, Quizzes, Homework, Problem Sets, Final Examinations)

- When the term *traditional assessment* is used, what is usually meant is *summative assessment*.
- Summative assessments seek to determine what a student knows at the end of a chapter, unit, or series of lessons on a topic.
- Summative assessments are graded and returned to students with a number and/or a letter grade at the top.
- In summative assessment, a number or letter grade often becomes more important than the learning the assessment was intended to measure. Moreover, normative grading—the basis on which grades are often based, encourages competition more than personal growth and development.
- Although tests are just one of the tools used in traditional assessment, they receive the most attention for the following reasons: the ease with which they can be administered and scored, the pervasiveness of them in our educational system, and the fact that they enable teachers to judge, to some degree, students’ progress quickly and easily.

2. Purposes

- Traditional assessments are most frequently used to evaluate students and eventually assign them a final grade.

3. Content, Skills, and Attitudes Addressed

- Tend to emphasize content (knowledge) acquisition

4. Strengths

- Multiple Choice Tests
 - Can assess levels of knowledge other than memorized facts---provided that they are worded carefully.
 - Ideal for large classes that teacher expects to teach again.
 - A teacher can invite students to write multiple choice questions, thereby sharing a bit of control of evaluation with them and such involvement may make them more empathetic/sympathetic to the instructor's role in it.
 - There can be a degree of objectivity inherent in traditional assessments, especially when assessments have only one right answer. This objectivity is even more apparent when the answer is the main, if not the only, goal.
 - Can cover a wide range of content—from simple knowledge to complex concepts.
 - Can be written to test multiple levels of learning.
 - The major strength of traditional assessments is the ease with which they can be designed and scored.
 - Some textbooks include sample tests and many include test banks from which the instructor can choose appropriate questions. These features reduce greatly the time and effort needed to create tests.
 - The grading of these types of tests is facilitated with the help of the textbook publishers. If sample tests and a test bank are included, the answers are included as well. In turn, there is no need for the instructor to work out test problems or reflect on potentially thoughtful answers.
- Short-Answer or Identification Exams
 - Require knowledge of details, can assess thinking if students are asked to compare concepts.
 - Respected by students as being fair and permitting adequate coverage of assigned materials without asking for petty details.
 - Students can directly express what they understand.
 - Work well in small classes.
 - Can test complex learning outcomes.
 - Instructor can explore students' thought processes and at the same time require students to use and develop their writing skills.
 - Take less time to prepare than multiple-choice.
- Essay Exams
 - Students can display detailed knowledge as well as reveal their understanding of overall contextual issues.
 - Good for examining students' ability to think critically, independently, and originally; can measure one's ability to organize, integrate, interpret material and express oneself.
 - Ideal for measuring higher-level analysis, synthesis, or evaluation and for increasing student writing skills.
 - Studies show that students study more efficiently for essay exams than for objective tests.
 - Helpful when returned with feedback.

- Move students beyond memorization of details: they are more likely to focus on broad issues, general concepts, and interrelationships rather than on specific details.
- If professors read the exams, they get information on what students are learning.

5. Weaknesses

- Traditional testing methods involve students working alone and are characterized by individual competition: “competition for grades; competition against personal standards; competition for attention.” This can lead to a solitary experience for many students and can squelch the possibilities of shared interaction.
 - This type of competition may encourage a few top students to succeed, but for the majority of students a competitive environment is often detrimental to their learning.
- From an affective perspective, traditional tests often invoke feelings of anxiety severe enough to substantially limit student performance.
 - It is possible that anxiety surrounding test taking can serve to motivate students to rise to the challenge; however, it is much more likely that this kind of anxiety will interfere with thinking and eventually compel students to give up.
 - Many times formal testing situations cause students who doubt their abilities to perform worse than they are capable of performing.
- The time limit inherent in traditional testing situations restricts the types of questions one can ask; the majority of questions are usually procedural and encourage rote and superficial learning.
 - Some only test recall of a specific fact.
 - These types of questions send the message to students that if you do not know the answer immediately, you cannot solve the problem.
 - It is impossible to give careful thought to a problem, or use any of the many heuristic strategies helpful in solving problems, when you only have a few minutes to do so. Go figure. 😊
- Due to the often very short class periods and to the need to include as many topics and concepts as possible, traditional assessments, especially tests and quizzes, often ask superficial, procedural questions that require quick, unreflective responses.
 - Traditional assessments ask “how, when, and where” questions but rarely ask “why.”
 - Many traditional assessments mimic the questions asked in homework and are often taken straight from the textbook.
 - Often very little attention is given to the design of assessment items; for example, the types of responses the questions will elicit, whether the questions have multiple points of entry, and what the questions will afford the instructor in terms of insights into student understanding.
- Short answer and essay exams take a long time to grade.
- Essay exams are often hard to grade objectively and reliably.
- Good questions are challenging to construct.

Alternative Assessments
(Journals, Collaborative Testing, Student Writing, Portfolios, Observations, Using Open-Ended Problems, Self-Assessment)

Sources:

Courts, P.L., & McInerney, K.H. (1993). Assessment in higher education: Politics, Pedagogy, and Portfolios. Westport, CT: Praeger. Ch. 3-4.

Crouch, M.K., & Fontaine, S.I. Student portfolios as an assessment tool. Ch.17.

Weimer, M. (1990). Improving College Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Ch. 4.

1. Examples (Journals, Collaborative Testing, Student Writing, Portfolios, Observations, Using Open-Ended Problems, Self-Assessment)

- Instead of disjointed tests that measure at most measure low-level knowledge acquisition, many authorities suggest using assessment measures that emphasize the interconnections, coherence, and understanding among skills, concepts, and procedures, as well as among knowledge, abilities, and dispositions.
- Although these things *can* be measured using traditional assessments, they rarely are.

2. Purposes

- Alternative assessments have multiple purposes.
 - Some examples include providing students with additional opportunities to learn, using assessments to guide future instruction, providing students with feedback intended to enhance learning, emphasizing what is important, and, like traditional assessments, alternative assessments can be used to evaluate students and assign grades.

3. Content, Skills, and Attitudes Addressed

All three.

4. Strengths

- The major strength of alternative assessments is the amount of information that can be gathered about student understanding, especially when students are required to explain, describe, or justify their answers.
 - Requiring students to provide more than just an answer provides an opportunity for increased insight into student understanding.
 - Students, too, learn more when they are required to explain, describe, or support their thinking.
- These explanations can then encourage instructors to use alternative assessments formatively, which means the results of the assessment are used to adapt teaching to meet students' needs.
 - In other words, the results of the assessments guide instruction with the goal of enhancing learning.
 - Alternative assessments can also provide opportunities for enhanced and continued learning of the students, especially when they allow for communication between students.
- Alternative assessments provide instructors with a broader, more genuine picture of student learning.
 - They allow us to assess our students' ability to reason and analyze, apply their knowledge to novel situations, demonstrate their understanding of connections between concepts, and communicate their understanding to us, as well as to their peers, in multiple ways.

5. Weaknesses

- Alternative assessments generally take more time than traditional assessments, both in their design and in their evaluation. In some cases, the time required exceeds the benefits, especially in large lecture classes where the number of students is just too great to successfully implement such assessments.
- Another weakness is the knowledge required to successfully design alternative assessments. It is much easier to take a problem or question from a textbook than to design a question that allows for multiple points of entry, assesses higher order thinking, is cognitively complex, and elicits answers that provide insight into student understanding.

Alternative ways to assess students are discussed below:

1. Journals

- Journals can provide a major resource for finding out what students think.
 - They can be a daily record of problem solving activities, descriptions of solutions to problems as though one were describing to someone else how it was done, or descriptions of what they have learned.
 - They can act as an outlet for students' feelings, attitudes, and beliefs, giving teachers greater insight into their students.
 - They can be used to frame reasons and motivations for learning new content.
 - They can "monitor metacognitive behavior by having students write about mathematical concepts they understand or do not understand."
 - They can provide students with the opportunity to write in the language of the discipline in an informal way, which can act as a precursor to writing more formally.
- Journals also can be used to increase student reflection, which is a critical component in successful problem-solving.
 - Writing reflections often solidify understandings through the process of putting into words exactly what students are thinking.
 - This habit of reflection "has the power to boost the silent and mechanistic approach to assessment into an active, vivid discourse between teachers and students."
 - When students regularly write in journals they often come to value the act of reflecting on their work—what they have been learning, what is difficult or challenging for them, and how they can use previous learning challenges to advance their learning.
 - Reflection allows students to become aware of those behaviors that facilitate and inhibit their learning.
 - Journals also inform the teacher in regards to what knowledge/understanding his or her students took from the instruction given them.

*Since what students learn may not coincide with what a teacher thought they would learn, journals offer a means for informing the teacher of any discrepancies between what was intended and what students learned.

Strengths:

- * Allow in-depth insight into student knowledge and understanding, student strengths and weaknesses, as well as student beliefs and attitudes.
- Entries can be read quickly and responded to briefly.
- Reading journal entries is often more fun than reading other student writing, hence it gets faculty more interested.
- They become “another text” for class: responses to entries and issues begin to generate further dialogue not possible in the time constraints of class periods or office hours.
- Journals can be done on computers.

Weaknesses:

- Time-consuming, not only for students to write but especially for instructors to read.
- Teacher should keep one too in order to learn how it works.

2. Collaborative Testing

- Not only is sharing ideas conducive to greater understanding but it also reduces anxiety in testing situations.
- Research has shown that collaborative test taking promotes continued learning.
 - One of the standards from NCTM’s *Assessment Standard for School Mathematics* (1995) states that assessment should enhance learning, and learning involves being able to reason and communicate. “Even a small amount of collaboration may influence a students’ understanding and performance” (Webb, 1995, p. 247).
 - According to Webb (1995), developing new understanding by building on other students’ ideas is a form of learning, as well as is giving explanations that encourage the explainer to justify statements, recognize misconceptions, reevaluate thinking, and clarify thoughts.
 - Every one of these aspects of collaborative testing has great potential for increasing student learning, especially for those students who are not served by traditional assessment practices.
- Many ways of implementing collaborative testing exist. We have named and will highlight a few that have been successfully implemented in college classrooms.

a. Random Selection

- One collaborative testing technique has all students take a test in small groups, each completing his or her own test.
 - One test is then randomly chosen from the group to be graded with the understanding that all students will receive the same grade.
 - The benefit of this approach is that it encourages students to work together, to be aware of what others are doing, and to make sure all their group members genuinely understand the problems and solutions, as anyone’s test could be the one scored.

Strengths:

- Requires the instructor to grade only one third of the normal number of tests.

Weaknesses:

- Competitive students may be less than thrilled to be dependent upon the work of others and may require some guidance in working collaboratively.

b. Individual Clarification

- Another technique has all group members solve one problem together and write a single solution.
 - They then individually answer questions about the group solution and solve two similar problems—a problem that is parallel to the group problem and one that extends it (Kroll, Masingila, & Mau, 1996). This affords the opportunity for an individual score to be calculated, as well as a group score.
- A variation on this bases each student’s grade on the sum of the group score and the average of the individual scores, resulting in the same grade for each group member (Raymond, 1994).
 - This encourages students to commit to the learning of their group members, making sure that everyone truly understands the problems and solutions, as each group member’s score is dependent upon the learning of everyone else.
- Another variation on the grading of this includes additional points if all group members score above a certain criteria.
 - Therefore, on the individual portion of the test, everyone’s score increases if all group members reach the required level.
 - This changes the dependency upon others for each student’s score to a commitment to the learning of all group members, creating a “one for all and all for one” kind of climate.

Strengths:

- Students have the benefit of learning while taking the group portion of the test while maintaining a level of individual accountability.
- Research shows that groups outperform individuals and that students respond positively to group exams.

Weaknesses:

- Fewer concepts can be tested, as the three questions are parallel in structure.

c. Group Take-Home

- Yet another version is the group take-home exam (Brunner, 1999).
 - Group members are given 7–10 days to complete the exam, hand in one solution signed by all, and all receive the same grade.
 - We have found in situations like this that having group members anonymously grade all other members, including themselves, is a means for determining whether everyone contributed equally.
- A variation on this is the group oral take-home exam (Crannell, 1999).
 - In this situation, the written work that is handed in is only used to clarify points; otherwise, the students are graded entirely on their understanding of the material as they present it.
 - This also allows students to learn from their mistakes, to the extent that “they get feedback even as they present their results, and since they have debated the results with their teammates, they care about the answer” (Crannell, 1999, p. 144).

Strengths:

- The longer time frame allows for high level, conceptual problems on the test and students can learn a great deal when researching the answers to such problems.

Weaknesses:

- Unless answers are given orally, it is very difficult to determine if all group members contributed equally or what each group member knows individually.

d. Group Retake

- Another example uses a group retake (Roberts, 1999; Vockell, 1994).
 - After taking an individual test, everyone retakes the same test in groups, using the retake as yet another an opportunity for immediate feedback.
 - In addition, since they just invested a good deal of time thinking about the problems individually, students are able to gain a much deeper understanding of the material.

Strengths:

- Students get immediate feedback and develop greater understanding.

Weaknesses:

- The number of tests doubles, thus doubling the time necessary for testing and grading.

e. Individual Retake

- A final example switches the order of the previous variation.
 - Students take a test collaboratively and then are required to retake a similar, but different, test individually.
 - This again encourages students to thoroughly understand the group's answers, as they will be required to display further evidence of their understanding on an individual posttest.

Strengths:

- The collaborative portion of the testing acts as an opportunity for learning, while the individual component allows for individual accountability.

Limitations:

- The number of tests doubles, thus doubling the time necessary for testing and grading.

3. Student Writing

- Student writing can be a very effective way to get information about student understanding in a very short amount of time.
 - This information can be used immediately to adjust teaching in the effort of increasing student understanding.
 - Many ways of using student writing exist. I will highlight a few that have been successfully implemented in college classrooms.

a. Weekly Question

- Students are required to hand in questions regarding that week's reading at the beginning of each week. They can be as simple as questions that clarify or questions that ask for full explanations of connections.

- This technique forces students to engage the readings and come to class better prepared.
- It also informs the teacher of incomplete understandings and areas of confusion.
- A broader version of this does not restrict the questions to being from the readings.
 - They could also be from homework, in class, or general questions.
 - It is important in this case to make a note that they are not to be procedural questions, such as “How do you do number 5?” but that they are to help the student clarify a concept.

Strengths:

- A great deal of information can be communicated through a question and this can quickly be used to adjust instruction accordingly.
- Shifts ownership of whose questions structure class and encourages purposeful reading of texts.

Weaknesses:

- Unless students read the text very carefully, they may not know what their questions are until they really get into the material.

b. One-Minute Paper

- Another technique is called the one-minute paper (even though you probably will need about four minutes) (Bressoud, 1999).
 - In the last three minutes of class, students are asked to write the answers to two questions: 1) What was the most important point made in class today? and, 2) What unanswered question do you still have?
 - The teacher can have the responses be anonymous or signed, depending if he or she thinks the students will be hesitant to write honest questions or if the teacher desires information on individual students.

Strengths:

- Great deal of information can be communicated through the answers to these two simple questions and this can be used to adjust instruction accordingly.

Weaknesses:

- Frequently it is difficult to give up the last three minutes, as often we are trying to point out one last thing before class is over.

c. Five Points

- A variation on this theme is to have students name five significant points that were made in class (Bressoud, 1999).
 - This can be especially useful in determining the range of understanding and perceptions of classroom events.
 - Not only does the teacher keep abreast of where the students are in their understanding, this method serves as a means for keeping attendance up when students are required to include their names.

Strengths:

- Allows instructors to quickly determine whether or not the students were attending to the real important points in the lesson.

Weaknesses:

- Students may not be able to list even one main point if they are feeling lost or confused about the material.

d. Daily Question

- Another way to use writing is to begin class with a writing task (Miller, 1999).
 - Prompts can be distributed immediately to students as they enter class or be displayed at the front of the room.
 - The goal is to offer the students a non-threatening way to write about their understanding—or lack thereof—of the content or current concepts they are learning.
 - Again, they should elicit students' conceptual understanding of a topic as opposed to reciting formulas or performing routine computations.

Strengths:

- Allows instructors to quickly assess the understanding of their students.

Weaknesses:

- May take up more time than you may like, as students often need a fair amount of time to answer the question.

e. Homework Reflections

- Homework can also be used as the site for writing.
 - Have students write what they are thinking on their homework as they are solving problems can be very enlightening both for them and for the teacher.
 - Invite students to include emotions and frustrations in their writing, such as expressing their frustration when they are stuck; this can act as a vent, possibly opening the student up to new ideas of how to move forward and get unstuck (Mason, Burton, & Stacey, 1985).
- Notes can be questions, personal responses, connections to other classes, critiques, or queries to the teacher.
 - Reader's notes can be used as a basis for class discussions.

Strengths:

- Often helps students to answer problems and clues the instructor into the questions that students may have.
- Reader's notes can amplify and reinforce the notion that reading assignments require active and thoughtful interpretation and response, not cognitive photocopying.
- These can be required for every assigned reading, affirming the expectation that responsible reading is valued and necessary.

Weaknesses:

- Grading homework takes long enough without a narrative attached.

f. True-False-Explain

- Another way to use homework is to design the questions in a true-false-explain format (Barnett, 1999).
 - Barnett suggests writing questions that address the most important aspects of the concept and that are most likely to be misunderstood.
 - Give students two to four statements on the same concept, with the requirement that they have to not only determine whether they are true or false, but also defend that position, clarifies relationships among elements within a concept.

Strengths:

- Regular use of these types of questions can provide a teacher with instructional feedback, as well as serve as a mechanism to encourage student reflection on concepts.

Limitations:

- Time-intensive to write multiple questions of this sort, to answer these types of questions, and even more time-consuming to read through and grade.

4. Portfolios

- In general, portfolios, also called performance assessments, consist of a collection of student work over time.
 - They might include work such as “tests, worksheets, notes from a journal, descriptions of investigations, and solutions for problems—any written work that exemplifies the student’s . . . activities” (Badger, 1996, p. 44).
 - Often students select which of these samples are included and sometimes are required to include a cover sheet of some sort stating the main topics, what was learned, why specific items were chosen for inclusion, evidence of progress, and areas of needed work (Alper, Fendel, Fraser, & Resek, 1993).
- Can be a number of pieces produced over a semester.
- Portfolios highlight the performance of the learner in a particular area.
- Purpose is to help learners become integral and conscious participants in their learning processes, encourage them to recognize both individual responsibility and ownership within that process.
- They let teachers examine the learning process (and performance outcomes) from the point of view of the learner (what is actually occurring) rather than from some distanced point of view that is reflected in course objectives and syllabi (what is supposed to occur or what we sometimes pretend is actually occurring).

Strengths:

- Gives a more complete picture of what a student knows and encourages teachers to focus on the connections inherent in a subject when it is viewed over time.
- If placed in chronological order, can show students’ development or demonstrate accomplishments.
- Can be used in diverse types of courses (technical writing, biology, business communication and math).
- If done over the semester, a portfolio can be used to help students move beyond making surface changes to affecting the way they think about and produce writing.

- Because they require some metacognitive work, students must be self-reflective about their writing; they can look longitudinally at their writing, begin to recognize change, and grow in their knowledge of who they are as writers.
- Collaboration is often involved: students can take advantage of first drafts and peer reviews to more effectively evaluate the growth of their own skills.
- Students can work in small groups to examine and discuss one another's portfolio entries.
- Assembling a finished portfolio lets both teacher and student see the pieces included from a dual perspective.
 - On the one hand, they can view the development of skills through drafts of papers and their revisions; on the other, they can see and measure the finished pieces that represent the student's level of success.
- A portfolio embodies a set of consistent elements and assumptions about teaching and learning, while it is adaptable to many different kinds of classes, programs and schools
- Portfolios can help students discover whether students understand what the teacher is teaching.

Weaknesses:

- Very time-consuming to pour through even one student's portfolio, let alone 30 or 300.
- Require buy-in from instructors; they have to believe in it, or they won't put in the effort necessary for them to be successful.
- Time consuming: in some programs, certain faculty may need a lot of training as to how to go about the process; workshops may need to be established to help faculty understand the nature of the writing process and ways in which they might constructively use writing to help their students learn better.
- Need to limit and explicitly articulate exactly what you want to assess through the portfolios.

5. Observations

- Direct observation is one of the best ways to evaluate students' thinking processes while solving problems.
 - According to Lester (1996, p. 4) "observing and questioning students while they are engaged in mathematics activities can yield invaluable information not only about their skill, but also about their thinking processes, their attitudes, and their beliefs."
 - Although a paper and pencil test provides some insight into student knowledge, it does not offer the opportunity for the "aha" moments to be witnessed; the teacher cannot see where connections were made solely by marks made on the student's paper.
- Observations can be done while circulating around the room, taking nothing away from the process of teaching and, in fact, making the evaluation process part of learning.
 - This integration of assessment and instruction is the only way to meaningfully assess higher order thinking according to some authors (e.g., Badger, 1996; Kulm, 1994; McMullen, 1993; Nagasaki & Becker, 1993; Zessoules & Gardner, 1991).
 - They can also be done when students visit during office hours.

Strengths:

- A remarkable amount of understanding/information can be gleaned from a relatively small amount of time spent attending to individual students.

Limitations:

- Few instructors have the freedom to circulate around the classroom observing their students at work—the time taken away from teaching important content may seem to be too great a sacrifice.

6. Using Open-Ended Problems

- Open-ended questions can vary from simply asking a student to explain their work to requiring them to formulate hypotheses, identify possible explanations, advance conjectures, create new problems or extend existing problems, and make generalizations.
 - These problems are usually very carefully developed and furnish a context in which each student can rely on his or her own strengths to solve the problems, thereby generating a variety of approaches to the problem to compare and contrast.
 - The ability to incorporate knowledge from a variety of resources such as formal knowledge, previously learned concepts and skills, and general common sense makes open-ended problems valid means for measuring connections between knowledge bases.
- Contain items that encourage further response and allow the respondent to determine the focus of the answer.
- They encourage students to comment about the effect of instruction on them.
- The quality of the question determines the quality of the answer.

Strengths:

- Easily incorporated into many different assessments, such as tests, take-home exams, group projects, and homework.
- Can generate a rich data pool; potential as an idea source.
- Versatile: they can be administered like the formal, end-of-course evaluations are, or they can be used on the spur of the moment.

Weaknesses:

- Difficult and time-consuming to write high-quality open-ended questions that go beyond tacking on a “why” at the end of a question.
- Data collected may not be easily quantifiable.
- Questions often too open, giving students license to comment wherever and however they will.
- Analysis of the comments students write in response to open-ended questions confirms that they need not to offer much input as to alternatives.
- In order to give valuable responses, students need a lot of time to respond thoughtfully; can’t just be in last 2 minutes of class.

7. Self-Assessment

- Self-assessment, an essential component of formative assessment, requires students to monitor their own progress in learning, be active in critically examining their own knowledge, and thus furthers their reflection of their own thinking.
 - To be most effective, the desired goal, evidence about one’s present condition, and some understanding of a way to close the gap between the two, need be made explicit to students.
 - Asking students to assess their own work often alters their perception of themselves as active learners and challenges them to become thoughtful judges of their own work.

- Students can learn a great deal when assessing their own work, especially when they revisit previously difficult problems and see how the concepts inherent in those problems may inform more recent questions (Carroll & Carini, 1991).
- According to Zessoules & Gardner (1991), “as students take on increased responsibility for their own learning and assessment, their growing awareness and ownership of their development enables them to make use of the process of assessment as a tool for learning” (p. 63).
- Students who have the ability to “know how much they know, to judge the quality of this knowledge, and to know what they need to do in order to learn more” (Kenney & Silver, 1993, p. 236) are considered to be powerful learners, a trait highly regarded in any educational system.

Strengths:

- Encourages students to become more committed to, active in, and effective regarding, their learning.

Weaknesses:

- Requires the instructors to be very clear about what the learning goals really are, and explicitly state where they want students to be and how students can actually get there.

Conclusion

“Why do we assess students?” For many of us, we do so because we need to give students a grade. But there are many other reasons for assessing our students. We can assess students because we want to find out what, and to what extent, they have learned what we hoped to have taught them. We can assess students because we want them to know where they stand. We can assess students to give them feedback on their progress. We can assess students to determine how effective our teaching is.

We can use assessment for other purposes as well. We can use assessment to provide additional learning opportunities for students, as in the case of collaborative testing. We can use assessment to guide our teaching, as in the case of formative assessment. We can use assessment to diagnose misconceptions, while observing our students. We can use assessment to find out what questions our students have.

In summary, although assessment is usually thought of in summative terms, many other purposes exist as well—all with the potential for enhancing student learning. Traditional tests can enhance learning when the questions are carefully crafted to expose student understanding and misunderstandings. Alternative assessments can enhance learning by requiring students to communicate the interconnections and coherence among concepts and procedures. Thinking of assessment as a means for enhancing student learning aligns assessment with instruction—with enhancing our teaching. And isn’t that the goal? We teach in order for our students to learn. We can assess students with the goal of increasing that learning.

Supplementary Readings:

- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barnett, J. H. (1999). True or false? Explain! In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 101-103). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Bressoud, D. M. (1999). The one-minute paper. In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 87-88). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.

- Brunner, R. (1999). Assessing the learning of female students. In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 149-151). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Crannell, A. (1999). Collaborative oral take-home exams. In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 143-145). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Kroll, D. L., Masingila, J. O., & Mau, S. T. (1996). Grading cooperative problem solving. In National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (Ed.), *Emphasis on assessment* (pp. 50-57). Reston, VA: NCTM.
- Mason, J., Burton, L., & Stacey, K. (1985). *Thinking Mathematically*. Workingham, England: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company Inc.
- Miller, L. D. (1999). Begin mathematics class with writing. In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 79-80). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Raymond, A. M. (1994). Assessment in mathematics education: What are some of the alternatives in alternative assessment? *Contemporary Education*, 66(1), 13-17.
- Roberts, C. (1999). Group activities to evaluate students in mathematics. In B. Gold & S. Z. Keith & W. A. Marion (Eds.), *Assessment practices in undergraduate mathematics* (pp. 137-139). Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Vockell, E. L. (1994). The group retest: A route to effective cooperative learning. *Contemporary Education*, 66(1), 25-27.
- Bergquist, William, Gould, Ronald, and Greenberg, Elinor. Designing Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981, pp. 279-291.
- Hartle, Terry W. "The Growing Interest in Measuring the Educational Achievement of College Students." In Clifford Adelman (ed.), Assessment in American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1986, pp.1-11. (Handout)

Recommended Readings Bibliography

- AAHE, ACPA, & NASPA (1998). *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning*. Washington, DC: Authors.
- Angelo, T. A. (1993). A 'teacher's dozen': Fourteen general, research-based principles for improving higher learning in our classrooms. *AAHE Bulletin*, 45(8), 3-13.
- Association of American Colleges (1991). *The challenge of connected learning*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change*, 27(6), 13-25.
- Bell, D. (1966). *The reforming of general education: The Columbia College experience in its national setting*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Bennet, W. J. (1984). *To reclaim a legacy: A report on the humanities in higher education*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Bergquist, W. H., Gould, R. A., & Greenberg, E. M. (1981). *Designing undergraduate education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Boggs, G. R., & Michael, D. G. (1997). The Palomar college experience. In T. O'Banion (Ed.), *A learning college for the 21st century*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
- Bok, D. (1986). *Higher learning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bok, D. (1990). *Universities and the future of America*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Booth, W. C. (1988). Cultural literacy and liberal learning: An open letter to E. D. Hirsch, Jr. *Change*, 20, 11-25.
- Bouwisma, W. J. (1975). Models of the educated man. *The American Scholar*, 44, 195-212.
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University (1996). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities*. Stony Brook, NY: Stony Brook University.
- Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*. ASHE Reader, pp. 274-300.
- Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Willis, R. (1976). Professional education. In *Higher education in transition* (pp. 76-106). New York, NY: Harper and Row.

- Butler, J. E. (1997). Transforming the curriculum: Teaching about women of color. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (5th ed., pp. x-x). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Butts, R. F. (1939). *The college charts its course*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1990). *Campus life: In search of community*. Princeton, NJ: Author.
- Cheney, L. V. (1989). *50 hours: A core curriculum*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. (1989). Career education: Occupational entry, change, and development. In *The American community college* (pp. 198-228). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Conrad, C. F. (1978). *The undergraduate curriculum: A guide to innovation and reform*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Conrad, C. F. (1980). Initiating and implementing institutional change. In *General education: A guide to resources* (pp. 102-116). Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges Project on General Education Models.
- Conrad, C. F., & Blackburn, R. T. (1985). Program quality in higher education: A review and critique of literature and research. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: A handbook of theory and research* (vol. 1, pp. 283-308). New York, NY: Agathon.
- Conrad, C. F., & Wilson, R. F. (1986). *Academic program review* (ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 5). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Conrad, C. F., & Wyer, J. C. (1980). *Liberal education in transition* (ASHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 3). Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Cortes, C. E. (1991). E. pluribus & unum: The quest for community amid diversity. *Change*, 23, 9-13.
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education: The politics of race and sex on campus*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Ewell, P. (1987). Establishing a campus-based assessment program. In D. F. Halpern (Ed.), *Student outcomes assessment* (New Directions for Higher education, No. 59, pp. 9-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finn, C. E. (1990, June 13). Why can't colleges convey our diverse culture's unifying themes? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, v(x), A40.
- Freire, P. (1985). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Gaff, J. (1980). Avoiding the potholes: Strategies for reforming general education. *Educational Record*, 61, 50-59.

- Gaff, J. G. (1991). *New life for the college curriculum*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gardner, D. E. (1977). Five evaluation frameworks: Implications for decision making in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 48, 571-593.
- Giamatti, A. B. (1988). *A free and ordered space: The real world of the university*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Giroux, H. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grant, G., & Riesman, D. (1978). *The perpetual dream: Reform and experiment in the American college*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Greeno, J. G. (1997). On claims that answer the wrong question. *Educational Researcher*, 26(1), 5-17.
- Hahn, R. (1990). What we talk about when we talk about teaching. *Change*, 22, 45-49.
- Haworth, J. G., & Conrad, C. F. (1990). *Curriculum in transition: Perspectives on the undergraduate experience*. Needham, MA: Ginn Press.
- Hill, P. J. (1991). Multi-culturalism: The crucial philosophical and organizational issues. *Change*, 23(4), 38-47.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Hughes, R. (1992, February 3). The fraying of America. *Time*, 44-49.
- Kanter, S. L., Gamson, Z. F., London, H. B., Arnold, G. B., & Civian, J. T. (1997). *Revitalizing general education in a time of scarcity: A navigational chart for administration and faculty*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kerr, C. (1966). *Uses of the university*. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Kimball, B. (1985). *Orators and philosophers*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Kimball, B. (1988). The historical and cultural dimensions of the recent reports on undergraduate education. *American Journal of Education*, 98, 293-322.
- Kimball, R. (1990). *Tenured radicals: How politics has corrupted higher education*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Kirkwood, R. (1985). The quest for quality in graduate education. *Educational Record*, 66, 4-9.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Levine, A. (1978). *Handbook on undergraduate curriculum*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Levine, L. R. (1996). *The opening of the American mind: Canons, culture, and history*. San Francisco, CA: Beacon.
- Luke, C., & Gore, J. (Eds.). (1992). *Feminisms and critical theory*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- MacCorquodale, P., & Lensink, J. (1991). Integrating women into the curriculum: Multiple motives and mixed emotions. In G. P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.), *Women's higher education in comparative perspective* (pp. x-x). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Magolda, M. B. (1999). *Creating contexts for learning and self-authorship: Constructive-developmental pedagogy*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Marton, F., & Booth, S. (1997). *Learning and awareness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Newman, J. H. (1959). *The idea of a university*. Garden City, NY: Image Books.
- O'Banion, T. (1997). Creating more learning-centered community colleges. Phoenix, AZ: League for Innovation in the Community College.
- Orrill, R. (Ed.) (1997). *Education and democracy: Re-imagining liberal learning in America*. Plano, TX: College Board.
- Oudenhoven, B. (2002). Remediation at the community college: Pressing issues, uncertain solutions. In T. H. Bers & H. D. Calhoun, *Next steps for the community college* (New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 117, pp. 35-44). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Palmer, P. J. (1990). Good teaching: A matter of living the mystery. *Change*, 22(1), 11-16.
- Platt, C. (1998). Civic education and academic culture: Learning to practice what we teach. *Liberal Education*, 84(1), 18-25.
- Posner, G. (2004). *Analyzing the curriculum*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Rhoades, G. (1991). Professional education: Stratifying curricula and perpetuating privilege in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: A handbook of theory and research* (vol. 7, pp. 334-375). New York, NY: Agathon.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Rossides, D. W. (1987). Knee-jerk formalism: The higher education reports. *Journal of Higher Education*, 58, 404-429.
- Rothenberg, P. (1991, April 10). Critics of attempts to democratize the curriculum are waging a campaign to misrepresent the work of responsible professors. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, B1, B3.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1991). *The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Scott, J. W. (1991). The campaign against political correctness: What's really at stake? *Change*, 23, 30-43.
- Spitzberg, I. J., Jr., & Thorndike, V. V. (1992). *Creating community on college campuses*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Stark, J. S., & Lowther, M. (1989). Exploring common ground in liberal and professional education. In R. A. Armour & B. S. Fuhrmann (Eds.), *Integrating liberal learning and professional education* (New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 50, pp. 7-20). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Terenzini, P. (1989). Assessment with open eyes: Pitfalls in studying student outcomes. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60, 644-664.
- Theelin, J. R. (1992). The curriculum crusades and the conservative backlash. *Change*, 24, 17-23.
- Thomas, R. (1962). *The search for a common learning: General education, 1800-1960*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Tierney, W. G. (1992). Building academic communities of difference: Gays, lesbians, and bisexuals on campus. *Change*, 24, 41-46.
- Veblen, T. (1968). *The higher learning in America*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang.
- Wegener, C. (1978). *Liberal education and the modern university*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Whitehead, A. N. (1969). *The aims of education and other essays*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Wilkerson, M. B. (1992). Beyond the graveyard: Engaging faculty involvement. *Change*, 24, 59-63.
- Wolff, R. P. (1969). *The ideal of the university*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Wong, F. F. (1991). Diversity and community: Right objectives and wrong arguments. *Change*, 23, 48-54.

Selected Readings with Annotations

- Conrad, C. F., & Eagan, D. (1990). Master's degree programs in American higher education. In *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. x-x). New York, NY: Agathon.**
AND Conrad, C. F., Haworth, J. G., & Millar, S. (1993). *A silent success: Master's education in the United States*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Trends in Master's Education

1. Proliferation of Master's Programs (includes programs in such new fields as applied anthropology and interdisciplinary programs such as liberal studies)
2. Professionalization (about 90 percent of master's students are enrolled in professional master's programs, including professional programs in the liberal arts)
3. Specialization (e.g., master's of law and taxation)
4. Applied and Experiential Learning (e.g., credit for life experience)
5. Non-Thesis Options
6. Educational Technology (distance delivery and technological innovation)

Innovations in Master's Education

1. Process Innovations (Program Structure and Delivery)
 - a. Instructional technology (media, off-campus delivery, courses via satellite, instructional television)
 - b. External degrees (non-traditional program delivery both on- and off-campus, e.g., weekend instruction)
2. Content Innovations (Program Content)
 - a. New specializations and fields (e.g., environmental studies)
 - b. Experiential learning
 - c. Corporate colleges

- Doll, W. E. Jr. (1993). Curriculum possibilities in a 'post'-future. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 8(4), 277-292.**

He argues that we are now in the midst of a new movement that is Janus-faced, looking backward and forward. "In a post-modern frame the complexity of chaotic order is both natural and beautiful, as shown in those magnificent computer designs of recursive spirals, or in the natural designs of clouds forming, surf breaking, and smoke curling. . . . We find complexity, chaos, and contingency built into this new order." Then, he discusses in depth four qualities of a post-modern curriculum:

1. Indeterminacy (Non-Causality/Linearity): This and non-linearity and a skewed (or ordered) randomness seem to be woven into the fabric of the universe.
2. Self-Organization: "Indeterminacy becomes a meaningful concept only to the degree that self-organization is operable. Without self-organization, indeterminacy does not take on the character of primal soup from which order arises. . . . In terms of curriculum, this means there needs to be just enough perturbation, disturbance, disequilibrium . . . built in so that self-organization will be stimulated. The teacher's role is to present the curriculum in just enough of a challenging, controversial, chaotic manner so that self-organization will be encouraged."
3. Paradox: Self can only be understood in relation to other.
4. Play: Narrative mode of learning.

Four criteria designed to foster a postmodern view:

1. Richness: Depth and Breadth to Encourage Dialogue
2. Recursion: Return, Loop Back
3. Relations: Combinations, Interactions
4. Rigor: Look at Unstated Assumptions

Hunkins, F. P., & Hammill, P. A. (1994). Beyond Tyler and Taba: Reconceptualizing the curriculum process. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69(3), 4-18.

Article traces the legacy of the Bobbitt/Tyler/Taba history of the "curriculum as science view" (Bobbitt) or "technocratic view" (Tyler and Taba) or structural/rational and, in so doing, it elaborates a bit on Tyler and on Taba's seven-step model of curriculum development. Then, the article sketches "postmodern" curriculum development and then focuses on Doll's four criteria designed to foster a postmodern view: richness, recursion, relations, and rigor. Good discussion of Doll. They do not reject old view of Tyler and Taba, but see postmodernism as "transforming" it.

Tierney, W. G. (1989). Cultural politics and the curriculum in postsecondary education. *Journal of Education*, 171(3), 72-88.

First, he wants to extend our understandings of how culture gets expressed in organizations by way of the curriculum. Second, I wish to touch on how the curriculum might be viewed as an empowering agent for students as they become involved in the struggle for democracy. He studied seven institutions and reports on two here.

In the article he first examines a "rational view" and discusses Dressel and Mayhew and Ford and Bergquist. He doesn't like these models. Instead, he says that we must accept that higher education's curriculum is culturally constructed and as a cultural construction it is inherently partisan. And if the curriculum is culturally constructed and partisan, then of necessity we will pay attention to the relationship of the curriculum to knowledge and power.

In the "critical view," attention is focused on how knowledge gets defined and a critical theorists unearths the "invisible curriculum structures which we take for granted." So the critical theorists begins with the premise that the culture of an educational organization has a dominant ideology that gets expressed by way of the curriculum and "uncovers" it.

He highlights Women's College (conflict over ideology) and Entrepreneurial University (ostensibly no ideology).

Lastly, Tierney elaborates on his critical view in which the following questions get asked:

1. How do we define knowledge?
2. How have what we defined as knowledge changed over time?
3. Whose interests have been superseded or ignored by such forms?
4. How do we transmit knowledge?
5. What is the method used to determine what counts for knowledge?
6. Who controls the decision-making?
7. Who participates and who does not in curricular decisions?