

## Proposal to Revise Cultural Breadth Requirement July 2013

### PART I: Hamline Plan Designation

1. The current Cultural Breadth designation doesn't have clearly articulated learning outcomes, although the current course proposal form asks faculty to respond to the following open-ended prompts:

In what ways will this course expose students to unfamiliar cultures and to different social positions and help them to engage and appreciate diversity? Specify how in its character as a G, I or L-designated course, or combination thereof, the course will do this.

What skills will students acquire to help them "effectively interact across differences?"

Cultural Breadth courses should include "Reflective Understanding." How will this course-- in its character as a G, I, or L course (or combination thereof)-- increase students' understanding of the concept of "culture" and its problematics, and enhance their awareness of the historical and geographical contingency of cultural norms? In what ways will students' "personal reflection" play a role?

2. There are institutional LOs that should be aligned with this Hamline Plan requirement, especially:

\*work and create understanding across cultural differences locally, nationally, and internationally

3. The current bulletin description for the Cultural Breadth designation reads:

There are three categories of cultural breadth:

Gender, race, age, class, minority ethnic identity, ability, sexual orientation (G)

International issues (I)

Language and culture studies, sign language, study abroad (L)

Students must take a total of three separate cultural breadth courses, from at least two different cultural breadth categories. (Note: If one course covers two cultural breadth categories, it may only be used to satisfy one cultural breadth requirement.)

4. The revised description for the requirement: Please read this section carefully!

Students will take three cultural diversity courses **or** two courses and one approved learning experience (details below).

Classes carrying the cultural diversity designation will meet the following primary learning outcome:

LO 1: students will demonstrate an understanding of systemic inequalities, power differences, and interdependencies of people in a diverse world by engaging in intellectual discourse and reflection about and across differences

*Additionally, faculty teaching cultural diversity courses **must include one or more** of the following learning outcomes in their course:*

LO 2: students will be able to critically reflect on their own and others' social identities (gender, race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, dis/ability, class, etc.), and the factors that shape them;

and/or

LO 3: students will demonstrate knowledge and understanding of diverse cultures, traditions, identities, and histories from multiple perspectives

#### **NOTE**

Regarding the approved learning experience: during academic year 2013-14, a task-force led by the Director of Multicultural and Diversity Initiatives, including the Coordinator of High-Impact Learning Practices and LEAD director, the Director of Off-Campus and International Programs, and interested faculty will develop the specific criteria and process for student application for an approved learning experience that accomplishes LO1 and at least one of the other listed outcomes. Examples may include study abroad, HECUA programs, certain internships, and NCORE participation.

#### PART II

This proposal builds on the work of two previous committees who sought to revise the Cultural Breadth requirement over the last several years and reflects significant faculty input during AY 2012-13. UCC appointed the current task force in June 2012. We reviewed the previous task forces' work and comparator schools' diversity requirements. We circulated and discussed proposal drafts in October, November, and January, each of which reflected changes based on faculty feedback. We also collected and reviewed carefully the written feedback from a large number of faculty ("straw poll data") in November and clicker feedback at the January faculty development conference.

1. The arguments for and benefits of revising the current designation are:
  - a) currently students need to take just two of the three letters offered under cultural breadth (L, G, and I) which means there is great variance in how students fulfill the requirement; b)

currently there are no common learning outcomes, which makes assessment and understanding of common goals and outcomes very difficult; c) we know that for many students, deep understanding of the issues laid out in the learning outcomes comes through high-impact experiences beyond the classroom; many schools today require learning experiences, so our option of using an approved learning experience in place of the third class better aligns with our strategic emphasis on high-impact learning. We anticipate that as the number of approved learning experiences grows we will be in a better position to require a learning experience, rather than offering it as an option.

2. Specific grounding for the proposal: Diversity requirements at other institutions do not typically include language courses (most comparator schools have a separate language requirement in addition to a diversity requirement); having clear learning outcomes for our cultural diversity courses will move us in line with comparator schools. We originally proposed requiring one domestic and one international diversity course as many other schools do, but have concluded that not specifying a focus for each of the three courses will enhance our students' understanding of the interconnectedness of local and global aspects of cultural diversity.

### PART III

1. Barriers: a) since there have been no learning outcomes to date on courses that fulfill this requirement, informing faculty about the new outcomes as well as offering development opportunities for faculty to become more explicit in their cultural diversity classes about how they are approaching the outcomes will be necessary. The Director of Multicultural and Diversity Initiatives will be an important position in providing such educational and developmental opportunities for faculty; b) that there is also the option of an approved learning experience to meet this requirement will entail a special designation on student transcripts that indicates students have completed this requirement. The Director of Multicultural and Diversity Initiatives, in collaboration with the above-described task force, will define the approval process in the transition year.
2. Transition: in order to transition to the revised requirement for Cultural Diversity, the name and description of the requirement will need to be changed in all Hamline literature. Faculty development will need to be implemented ASAP around the new learning outcome(s). In addition, approval protocols for the learning experience will need to be worked out, as noted above in III.1.
3. How will quality control be assured?
  - a. As stated above, the task force envisions several years of faculty development opportunities. We recommend that the Director of Multicultural and Diversity

Initiatives be tasked with developing an assessment plan for all Cultural Diversity courses.

- b. CLOA will work with the Director of Multicultural and Diversity Initiatives to produce an appropriate rubric. The attached Intercultural Knowledge and Competence and Global Learning Value Rubrics will serve as a starting point for developing the Hamline-specific rubrics for assessment purposes.

Having taken the language requirement off the table for this proposal, the costs should be minimal: there will need to be faculty development, and potentially there will be cost with having the Director of Multicultural and Diversity Initiatives becoming the one who signs off on the co-curricular experience.