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SUMMARY

This subcommittee was charged with examining the relationship between departments and interdisciplinary studies at Carleton, with the goals of identifying mechanisms to ease the tensions and strains that often characterize this relationship, and recommending mechanisms to enhance and nurture interdisciplinary work. Two key problems make it difficult for interdisciplinary study to take root and thrive at Carleton. First, programs depend on departments to provide courses, and rely on the goodwill and commitment of individual faculty. But goodwill does not equal obligation, and expectations about curricular and faculty commitments are ambiguous and sometimes conflicting. Second, the quality of communication between departments and concentrations varies enormously, and is often inadequate. Programs too often are confronted with surprises about staffing and course schedules. With competing demands for faculty time and ambiguous departmental and faculty obligations, interdisciplinary programs find it difficult to create and maintain a strong intellectual focus, and to provide a coherent and high-quality experience for students.

To address these issues, the College needs to strengthen coordination and communication within programs and concentrations as well as between programs and departments, clarify and regularize the allocation of resources (especially faculty commitments), and provide a stronger intellectual space for interdisciplinary study at Carleton. Our principal recommendations are:

1. The College should designate an Associate Dean whose central charge is to oversee and enhance interdisciplinary studies at Carleton.
2. In order to clarify and regularize the departmental course obligations to programs and concentrations, the College should institute a system in which:
   (1) programs and concentrations are allocated FTE, which they control;
   (2) departmental responsibilities and commitments to interdisciplinary studies are recognized in a “memorandum of understanding” with programs or concentrations, of sufficiently long duration to permit rational planning; and
   (3) the number of targeted faculty appointments with primary appointment in a program or concentration and secondary appointment in a department are increased.
3. Programs and concentrations should be brought into the process for hiring new faculty in a timely and effective manner.
4. In order to enhance the intellectual focus and student experience in interdisciplinary studies, the College should:
   • insofar as possible, provide a physical space for interdisciplinary studies programs;
   • continue to facilitate faculty seminars and colloquia in programs and concentrations, and provide support to build on these activities;
   • promote increased dialogue across programs and concentrations; and
   • encourage programs and concentrations to provide mechanisms for creating a shared intellectual community that brings together students as well as faculty.
5. Interdisciplinary programs and concentrations should be reviewed regularly, and procedures should be set in place by which concentrations or programs could be dropped from the curriculum.
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Background

The Twenty-first Century Committee report recommended that the College “reassess, and perhaps restructure, the current curricular organization of the College, including departments, interdisciplinary programs, majors, concentrations, area studies, and special majors.” This subcommittee was charged with examining the relationship between departments and interdisciplinary studies at Carleton, with the goal of identifying mechanisms to ease the tensions and strains that often characterize this relationship.

The educational philosophy of the College explicitly recognizes the complementarity of a strong disciplinary grounding and interdisciplinary study in meeting the goals of a liberal education. The Statement of Purpose in our Catalog states,

The disciplines provide rigor and depth of training, an opportunity to test oneself against a body of knowledge and a repertory of skills that educated women and men have built, over time, into major structures of intellectual inquiry. Interdisciplinary programs not only encourage the application of these skills to questions too complex and subtle to be approached through any one discipline, but also reflect the open textured, dynamic character of the disciplines themselves.

Interdisciplinary work has become increasingly important in academia and intellectual discourse. This dynamism is reflected in shifting disciplinary definitions and in the explosion of work occurring at the boundaries of disciplines. These areas of intersection and intellectual ferment have clearly demonstrated how looking at an issue or topic from multiple disciplinary perspectives enriches our understanding and enhances our ability to make useful choices in policy.

Recognizing the important role of interdisciplinary study in a liberal education, Carleton has encouraged a variety of interdisciplinary opportunities. Carleton has for decades offered majors in several Area Studies. Since 1983, the College has offered interdisciplinary concentrations, envisioned as “interdisciplinary integrated programs” that “supplement and strengthen the work [that students] carry out in their majors.” Beginning with only a handful of such concentrations and concentrators, by 1998-1999, the number of concentrations offered had grown to fifteen, and the number of concentrators to 99. In addition to these formal programs of integrated study, the College offers students interdisciplinary study opportunities ranging from regularly offered courses in Integrated General Studies to special courses, like the newly instituted “Triad”
courses. Outside of the formal curriculum, faculty engage in interdisciplinary seminars, which provide a conduit for faculty development and often result in curricular innovations.

One of the principal strengths of interdisciplinary work at Carleton is that it is faculty-driven. Interdisciplinary work, whether single courses or formal programs, grows out of and reflects faculty interests and expertise. As such, these programs enjoy the strong support and commitment of their faculty, and benefit from the sense of faculty “ownership.” Perhaps because of this, interdisciplinary study at Carleton, as one faculty member put it, “gives a lot of bang for the buck.” Nearly all the staffing of interdisciplinary committees and participation in program activities is provided on a voluntary basis by faculty, in addition to their responsibilities to departments. Not only does this interdisciplinary work benefit students, it also provides an important source of faculty development—all at very little additional monetary cost to the College.

At the same time, however, the rich diversity of faculty interests can sometimes seem to stimulate a confusing and uncontrolled growth in courses and programs, pulling away from “core” curriculum. And, what the College does not pay for directly in dollars, it pays for in faculty time. There is a sense of increasing tension between departments and interdisciplinary programs, particularly over staffing. Departments may feel unable to meet demand for key courses, and concentrations may find themselves unable to sustain viable curricula. Students worry that they will be unable to complete concentrations because they cannot be certain that core courses will be offered. Individual faculty feel pulled in opposing directions, and their time and energy is stretched thin. In some cases, this has meant there is insufficient time for the “unpaid” work of interdisciplinary committee members in advising students and administering programs, which in turn undermines the quality of the interdisciplinary study experience for students. The strong departmental apparatus that characterizes Carleton’s institutional structure has made it difficult for interdisciplinary work to take root and thrive.

Given these growing tensions, it is not surprising that both the Twenty-first Century Committee and the recent NCA Re-accreditation Team reports called for a reassessment and restructuring of relations between departments and interdisciplinary programs. It is particularly important to think about these issues now, as the College is on the brink of a large turnover in faculty.

To ensure that interdisciplinary study can continue to be a strong and productive part of intellectual life at Carleton, we see the following objectives as fundamental:

- Maintain and enhance the intellectual coherence and quality of interchange within interdisciplinary studies programs and concentrations
- Take advantage of the potential for synergy among the diverse interdisciplinary programs offered by the College, in order to multiply the benefits for student learning and faculty development
- Restructure relations between departments and programs so that they can realize the potential for the mutual reinforcement and intellectual cross-fertilization envisioned in the College’s mission statement, rather than engage in adversarial contests over faculty time
Current Areas of Concern

The subcommittee spoke with students, faculty, and administration about the current relationship between departments and programs, issues and priorities, and possible solutions to perceived problems and areas of concern. We met with department chairs and program coordinators, and held an open forum for students. We spoke individually with several chairs, coordinators, administrators, and students.

Our subcommittee conversations with faculty and students indicated several critical issues that need to be addressed. Concerns raised by both faculty and students indicate that stronger coordination is needed, both College-wide and in individual programs and concentrations. With the growth in concentrations and other interdisciplinary study programs has come a sense, on the part of some, that the curriculum is growing on an ad-hoc basis, rather than by design. Even the subcommittee found the diversity of programs sometimes confusing. Some programs offer majors, some concentrations, some both, and some neither. While in some cases we could infer the reasoning for these differences, in other cases the logic was not immediately apparent. Although a trivial issue, the fact that some programs are led by “coordinators” and others by “directors” symbolically reinforces this sense of confusion.

Most faculty concerns focused on the inevitable tensions and conflicts that arise between programs and departments. Currently, relations between departments and programs are plagued by two key problems. First, programs depend on departments to provide courses, and rely on the goodwill and commitment of individual faculty. But goodwill does not equal obligation, and expectations about curricular and faculty commitments are ambiguous. If we are to maintain strong interdisciplinary programs, the programs need to know what resources, both faculty and budgetary, they have claims on. Second, the quality of communication between departments and concentrations varies enormously, and is often inadequate to non-existent. Programs too often are confronted with surprises about staffing and course schedules. This creates an adversarial atmosphere and wastes time, energy, and goodwill.

These tensions and conflicting demands can be especially troubling for untenured faculty. For most, the “weight” of interdisciplinary work in third-year and tenure evaluations is unclear. Some junior faculty worry about whether or not they can refuse invitations to participate in programs. On the other hand, some worry that the time they devote to programs may be viewed by senior colleagues as detracting from their departmental duties.

The students that we spoke to value the opportunity and structure that programs provide in looking at issues from different perspectives. They felt that being encouraged (or “forced”) to utilize several disciplinary perspectives in courses and in comps, although sometimes frustrating, gave them a stronger understanding. However, they raised several concerns. Most important was a sense among students that interdisciplinary study curricula were not institutionalized and “guaranteed,” as are departmental curricula. A number of students worried that key courses they need to complete their concentrations will not be offered, preventing them from completing the course of study.
Students also noted that coordination and communication within programs and concentrations varies significantly in both quantity and quality. Some students complained of getting conflicting information about program requirements, and about not having a clear sense of who was “in charge” or even who they should go to in order to get forms signed. One student summarized the frustration that consequently arises by explaining that she decided to major in a department, even though her real interest lies in an interdisciplinary area study, simply because the department “had an office.”

Students also raised several issues about their academic experience within interdisciplinary study programs. Students commented that they could complete an entire program without ever knowing who their colleagues are, or having any shared academic experiences (courses, colloquia, etc.). Although some concentrations/programs have junior colloquia or other required courses that bring their students together, others do not. Some offer several capstone alternatives. In those cases, students may not even come together in the capstone. We think that these student concerns are not simply “social,” but point to a lack of a sense of intellectual community that involves both students and faculty.

To address these issues, we offer the following set of recommendations. These recommendations seek to strengthen coordination and communication, clarify and regularize the allocation of resources (especially faculty commitments), and provide a stronger intellectual space for interdisciplinary study at Carleton.

Our principal recommendations (described in greater detail below) include:

1. The College should designate an Associate Dean whose central charge is to oversee and enhance interdisciplinary studies at Carleton.

2. In order to clarify and regularize the departmental course obligations to programs and concentrations, the College should institute a system in which:
   (1) programs and concentrations are allocated FTE, which they control;
   (2) departmental responsibilities and commitments to interdisciplinary studies are recognized in a “memorandum of understanding” with programs or concentrations, of sufficiently long duration to permit rational planning; and
   (3) the number of targeted faculty appointments with primary appointment in a program or concentration and secondary appointment in a department are increased.

3. Programs and concentrations should be brought into the process for hiring new faculty in a timely and effective manner.

4. In order to enhance the intellectual focus and student experience in interdisciplinary studies, the College should:
   • insofar as possible, provide a physical space for interdisciplinary studies programs;
   • continue to facilitate faculty seminars and colloquia in programs and concentrations, and provide support to build on these activities;
   • promote increased dialogue across programs and concentrations; and
- encourage programs and concentrations to provide mechanisms for creating a shared intellectual community that brings together students as well as faculty.

5. Interdisciplinary programs and concentrations should be reviewed regularly, and procedures should be set in place by which concentrations or programs could be dropped from the curriculum.

Discussion of Recommendations

1. The College should designate an Associate Dean whose central charge is to oversee and enhance interdisciplinary studies at Carleton.

The most important problem facing interdisciplinary studies is the fact that there is no system in place for preventing, mitigating, and resolving the predictable conflicts that arise between programs/concentrations, departments, and other institutional units. These conflicts range from departments not sharing information about hiring and curricula, to the library allocating its acquisitions budget on largely disciplinary lines. Therefore, primary responsibilities of this Associate Dean should include facilitating coordination and communication between programs/concentrations and departments, and mediating conflicts between programs/concentrations and other units of the College. This Associate Dean should also be in charge of reviewing program and concentration resources, to ensure equity in the allocation of course releases for administrative duties, library resources, and so forth.

2. In order to clarify and regularize the departmental course obligations to programs and concentrations, the College should institute a system in which:

   (1) programs and concentrations are allocated FTE, which they control;
   (2) departmental responsibilities and commitments to interdisciplinary studies are recognized in a “memorandum of understanding” with programs or concentrations, of sufficiently long duration to permit rational planning; and
   (3) the number of targeted faculty appointments with primary appointment in a program or concentration and secondary appointment in a department are increased.

Staffing issues are the most immediate problem that programs and concentrations face. We considered various alternatives for clarifying and institutionalizing faculty resource issues. Our discussions were guided by the recognition that programs and concentrations have diverse curricula needs, and departments and individual faculty contribute to interdisciplinary study in diverse ways. We also recognize the need for flexibility, especially as individual faculty interests grow and change.

Although somewhat arbitrary, courses in interdisciplinary programs can be seen as falling into three categories:
I. Interdisciplinary courses that serve only the program or concentration, but not a department (e.g., Introduction to American Studies, or some capstone seminars). Often, though not always, these courses are team-taught.

II. Courses that are core to the concentration or program, but also serve a department (e.g., Political Science 221, Latin American Politics—a core course in Latin American Studies and an elective course in Political Science). Often, though not always, these courses are cross-listed.

III. Additional courses that serve as electives in a program or concentration, and that (usually) also serve departmental needs.

The subcommittee discussed a variety of mechanisms to clarify and regularize the curricular resources of programs and concentrations. Approaches used at some colleges seemed too rigid for Carleton’s curriculum (e.g., a rule that all departments contribute 1/6 of their courses to interdisciplinary work). Other approaches did not seem sufficiently regularized to meet program needs (e.g., a rule that all faculty have the right to teach one course a year in interdisciplinary programs). Because of the diversity of situations, we concluded that several mechanisms would be necessary to both provide clarity and flexibility in curricula.

The first of these mechanisms is to assign a specific FTE allocation to each interdisciplinary program, that the program would control. The allocation of FTE to programs and concentrations would assure their ability to meet basic curricular needs, particularly where needed courses do not also contribute to departmental curricula (Group I, above). For example, one course of the FTE could be “swapped” to a department in exchange for the release of a faculty member from departmental obligations, so that he or she could participate in a team-taught concentration course. The department could then use this FTE to cover a needed course within its own curriculum. Or, a program or concentration might use a portion of the FTE to insure coverage of core course(s) that would otherwise not be offered by the department(s) in question.

The primary advantages of allocating FTE to programs and concentrations is that it would give them some control over the allocation of their basic curricular resources, and would enable them to make rational decisions about the use of those resources. It would also give programs a stronger position in their negotiations with departments.

The disadvantage of this approach is that the FTE must come from somewhere. The College does not foresee an increase in FTE. Since currently nearly all FTE reside in departments, that means that the FTE allocated to programs will reduce the FTE allocated to departments. In many cases, this would simply regularize existing informal expectations (and, therefore, also give departments a clearer picture of how many FTE are exclusively “theirs”). However, we need to recognize that implementing this plan is not cost-free, and the most important cost will be the time and effort necessary to negotiate, regularize, and re-allocate FTE.

We do not expect that programs will be allocated sufficient FTE to cover virtually all the courses they currently include in their curriculum. We expect that the FTE allocation would be used primarily to cover courses that count only toward the program (and not a department) and
perhaps some core courses that would not otherwise be offered in the relevant department. Expectations about faculty and departmental obligations to teach other courses, particularly those of central importance to programs (Group II, above), should also be clarified and regularized. Specifically, written “memoranda of understanding” should specify expectations for FTE allocation to these courses. These memoranda of understanding should cover periods that are long enough to permit reasonable planning, but limited enough to allow for flexibility. A period of three years should meet these goals.

In order for this approach to be workable, we suggest the following:

1. Departments should be able to “carry over” and accumulate courses allocated to them in FTE swaps with programs from one year to the next, in order to make it possible for them to hire a one-term FTE replacement rather than relying exclusively on one-course replacements. While it is possible to hire faculty to teach one course in some situations, it is not always possible or desirable to do so. If a department foresees that it will be under-staffed in the following year, carrying over the swapped FTE could make it possible for them to release a faculty member to teach in the program, absorb the course reduction one year and hire a one-term replacement for the next. This would be a significant advantage in some cases.

2. The Associate Dean charged with interdisciplinary studies would need to play an active role in coordinating these swaps, but decisions about the use of the FTE should reside in the programs.

3. The amount of FTE allocated to programs would be re-evaluated at appropriate intervals (program reviews, turnover in faculty), and would be subject to re-allocation by the same mechanisms as departmental FTE. We expect that the new ECC Faculty Subcommittee that will advise the Dean of the College will play an advisory role in this process, just as in other curricular matters.

4. Implementation of this recommendation will be complex. It will require an inventory of current practice and needs; and much negotiation. We expect that it will also require active participation of the Dean’s office and most likely consultation with the ECC Curriculum Subcommittee. As a first step toward this process, we recommend that it be made clear, in writing, to all concerned parties, what existing responsibilities various individuals and departments have to programs.

Finally, targeted faculty appointments, with primary appointment in an interdisciplinary programs or concentrations and secondary appointment in a department, have many advantages. Such appointments help to institutionalize programs/concentrations, give them an intellectual focus, and provide strong advocacy for them. They also, obviously, help guarantee a certain level of staffing in the program. The College should look for ways to increase the number of these appointments.

3. Programs and concentrations should be brought into the process for hiring new faculty in a timely and effective manner.

When departments hire new faculty in positions that are covered by a “Memorandum of Understanding” (or in positions that would normally contribute to programs/ concentrations or
that are expected to contribute to those programs), there needs to be early and close consultation between the department and the program. In particular:

- Coordinators of relevant programs should be included in early discussions to define the position, while there is opportunity to negotiate expectations.
- There should be close consultation in the drafting of the job description.
- Program coordinators should have an opportunity to review job candidate files before candidates are invited to campus.
- The role of the program/concentration in the 3rd year review and tenure review of participating faculty should be detailed at this point as well, and communicated in writing to all concerned parties.
- To insure that this communication occurs—and to help in shaping a new culture of communication—there should be a form detailing these steps in the hiring process, with appropriate sign-offs by relevant coordinators and department chairs. This form would be filed with the Dean (or Associate Dean) at some appropriate point in the hiring process. This would be analogous to the sign-off form currently used to track participation in Third-Year and Tenure reviews.

4. In order to enhance the intellectual focus and student experience in interdisciplinary studies, the College should:

- provide a physical space for interdisciplinary studies programs;
- continue to facilitate faculty seminars and colloquia in programs and concentrations, and provide support to build on these activities;
- promote increased dialogue across programs and concentrations; and
- encourage programs and concentrations to provide mechanisms for creating a shared intellectual community that brings together students as well as faculty.

Concentrations and programs need support to become a place. In some cases this means physical space, in other cases it means support for creating an intellectual space. This is difficult enough for departments; it is much more difficult for interdisciplinary programs, whose members do not ordinarily meet and interact in the common physical space of the department lounge or secretary’s office. Physical space is an important component of this. However, if programs are to be strong, the faculty need an intellectual focus and interchange. One place where this sort of interaction now happens is in team-teaching. Faculty seminars also facilitate this kind of intellectual community. We endorse the college’s support for these seminars and hope that funds will continue to be made available for them. But building on these seminars and sustaining the momentum during the academic year requires more faculty time than we typically have available. The College could encourage program faculty to build on seminars by helping make available more time for sustained activities (on-going colloquia, continued discussion or reading groups, etc.). One mechanism to help provide this time would be the implementation of something like “targeted committee releases” for some faculty involved in program activities aimed at strengthening intellectual focus in their program. This would be analogous to targeted course releases, but with the goal of minimizing committee burdens for participating faculty so that they could devote more time to these intellectual community-building activities.
These same mechanisms should be used to promote dialogue across programs and concentrations, and, where appropriate, greater coordination and collaboration among them. The conversation among Area Studies programs initiated by Dean McKinsey this winter, in response to the Starr Grant, provided a valuable impetus for this cross-program collaboration. The College should build on this momentum.

Programs and concentrations also need to pay attention to the quality of intellectual community for their students. There is currently great diversity in the structure of curricula and activities provided for students, and this diversity is important. But students value the opportunity to have some common academic experience early in their concentration/program, even if that is just a one-credit colloquium that meets every few weeks, or organized discussions following guest lectures. Programs should be encouraged to find appropriate ways to provide this intellectual community sufficiently early in the concentrator's experience so that he or she can build upon it.

5. **Interdisciplinary programs and concentrations should be reviewed regularly, and procedures should be set in place by which concentrations or programs could be dropped from the curriculum.**

In order to maintain and strengthen the quality of work in interdisciplinary study programs, it is essential that they be subject to regular review, just as are other entities within the College.

In the case of a concentration or program with dwindling student and faculty interest, a special review could be used as a mechanism for determining if the program should be dropped, or if steps should be taken to reinvigorate it. Signs that a special review may be needed would include persistently low enrollments in the program/concentration, and/or low faculty interest and commitment, as indicated by a chronic inability to staff basic courses or fill the directorship.

**The Issue of Minors**

The proposal to institute minors has implications for the relationship between departments and interdisciplinary study programs. We preface these comments with two observations. First, members of the subcommittee have mixed feelings about minors, and several come from departments that have been strong proponents of minors. Second, the impact of minors on programs would likely differ across departments. Languages are one example where the institution of minors would probably have little impact on interdisciplinary programs. In other areas, the impact would likely be more profound.

There is strong sentiment among subcommittee members that minors would represent a significant shift in the College's educational philosophy. Our mission statement explicitly recognizes the importance of both disciplinary and interdisciplinary study, and the ways in which they mutually reinforce each other. This recognition of the dynamic interplay between disciplinary and interdisciplinary work reflects the direction of academia and intellectual discourse generally. The implementation of minors has the potential to change dramatically the
current philosophy, both symbolically and practically—symbolically, by shifting the emphasis toward disciplines, and practically, by exacerbating contention over scarce resources.

Although the specific requirements for minors are yet to be determined, the impact on faculty resources is likely to be tangible. Faculty and students at Carleton take education and intellectual interchange seriously. Concentrators speak compellingly and rightly of the need for intellectual community in their interdisciplinary course of study. Minors may well come to feel similarly about their experience. Faculty would likely feel some responsibility to students minoring in their departments. This could only exacerbate current conflicts between departments and programs over the allocation of faculty time and energy.

We need to recognize that we have finite resources. We cannot continue to add demands to faculty time and energy, and have all those demands met at the level of quality that we expect here at Carleton. In sum, we must make choices about how we will allocate those finite resources in fulfilling our educational mission.

The subcommittee feels strongly that the vision of a course of study combining disciplinary and interdisciplinary work, as originally articulated when concentrations were instituted, is ideal. That is, the greatest educational benefit can be obtained through a strong disciplinary focus combined with the breadth and subtlety of interdisciplinary study. In most cases, this implies a disciplinary major combined with an interdisciplinary concentration. If we take seriously the College's affirmation of the value of interdisciplinary study, then we should not undercut the already tenuous resources available to that purpose. If minors are instituted, measures should be taken to guarantee adequate faculty and budgetary resources for interdisciplinary programs and concentrations.

**Final Comments**

During the course of our deliberations, we were asked to address several other issues, of a more administrative nature. On these issues, we offer the following recommendations and comments:

1. In order to facilitate medium-range planning, program coordinators should be provided with copies of the 5-year planning forms filed by faculty in their program.

2. We endorse the recent changes to procedures for compiling the course schedule, and recommend that they be continued.

3. Cross-listing of courses and the increasing length of the College catalog has come to be perceived as a problem in some offices. We recognize the need for a manageable and coherent catalog, but also recognize that interdisciplinary programs, because of their diversity, will have varying curricular structures. Cross-listed courses are central to most interdisciplinary programs, and students need to get information about these courses in the catalog as well as the course schedule. We suggest that the Registrar, in consultation with the Dean's office, develop basic guidelines for catalog listings that are coherent and
consistent, and that apply to departments as well as programs. In developing these guidelines, it is important to recognize that courses do need to be cross-listed with their associated programs as well as departments. However, it is sufficient that the course be listed by name, with clear reference made to the location of the full course description. Furthermore, the burden of controlling catalog length should be born equitably. To that end, we suggest that the Registrar set a reasonable limit on the length of course descriptions, to be enforced across the board.

4. In curricular reporting, programs should receive full reports and credit for student enrollments in cross-listed courses, including both students who register for the course under the program name and those who register under the department name.
Appendix A. Interdisciplinary and Special Studies Programs, by course of study offered and number of majors and concentrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>Offers MAJOR</th>
<th>Offers CONC.</th>
<th>Number of MAJORS*</th>
<th>Number of CONCENTRATORS*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African/African America Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Technology Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 special</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French and Francophone Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated General Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary and Cultural Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 special</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Economy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Thought</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 special</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Class of 1999 only