October 15, 2008

- **The Physical Education Requirement** – the ECC debated whether sufficient credit is given to club sports or whether club sports should be treated like varsity sports in regard to the PE requirement.
  - Representatives from the Rec Center stated that they believed that overall enrollment in PE classes would drop if all club sports were given credit.
  - Representatives from 3 different club sports attended the meeting and shared with the committee their perspectives on the current practice and how it should change.
  - A student ECC representative suggested that since not all club sports involve rigorous physical activity, maybe each sport should annually submit an application to receive credit.
  - A staff ECC representative suggested that the committee decide whether the PE requirement is designed to promote physical activity at Carleton or wellness and health education more broadly.
  - Overall, it was agreed that students should be required to take at least 1 PE class per year and that club sports should be invited to apply for credit.

- **The Language Requirement** – the ECC, along with 3 faculty representatives from various language departments, debated whether to change the language requirement.
  - The language requirement is one of the only elements that the three curricular design teams did not change in their proposals.
  - Dean Ciner pointed out that the language requirement is the only curricular requirement that students can complete before ever even arriving on campus.
  - The student ECC members proposed a new language requirement in which:
    - Every student was required to take a language placement exam or a language exemption exam.
    - Every student, unless language exempt, would have to take one language class.
    - 101 courses would be reserved for students with no prior exposure to a language.
    - 102 courses would be beginning courses for students who have completed 101 or have had previous exposure to a language either at home or in high school.
    - 103/204 or 204/205 courses, depending on the language, would be intermediate courses that could also be completed off-campus.
    - 204/205 would mark the threshold of proficiency for Carleton students.
  - The students hoped that this program would create a more equitable language environment for all students, assuage concerns from students just
beginning a language at Carleton, and create a more uniform language experience for students.

- Overall, the proposal was not accepted. It provoked a good discussion of language of Carleton, but produced no firm results.

October 22, 2008

- **Digital Archiving** – the Library Committee proposed a program for archiving comps and award-winning projects across departments.
  - As it stands, each department has its own method of tracking comps projects and most independently archive those who earn distinction.
  - The Library Committee proposed institutionalizing this process and incorporating all comps projects into a central archive, housed at the library, regardless of distinction.
  - Initially, access to the archive will only be given to faculty and members of the Institutional Research team. This was proposed due to the vastly differing degrees of quality among comps projects as well as copyright limitations.
  - The ECC passed the proposal, recommending the archiving program to the faculty for an upcoming vote.
  - Two stipulations to this recommendation include:
    - (a) Students should be able to view the titles of archived projects;
    - (b) They should be able to apply to the Library Committee to view the entire document.

October 28, 2008

- **The New Face of the RAD** – Paul Ellebrect, Cat McMurtry, and Hannah Weinstein met with Dean Bierman and Dean Ciner to talk about the new face of the RAD requirement.
  - At the October 22, 2008 meeting of the ECC, Dean Bierman passed out a pilot proposal for a student-led intergroup dialogue to the ECC.
  - On October 28, 2008, three students met with the two administrative members of the ECC to discuss a revised proposal for this program.
  - Students at this meeting stressed the importance of making a discussion of difference, power, and privilege a curricular matter. They also felt that such a program should be a mandatory, credited graduation requirement.
  - Dean Bierman and Dean Ciner proposed that a team of faculty and staff (and students, if allowed) visit the University of Michigan during spring term to observe their program in action. Subsequently, the team would attend the Summer 2009 installation of the Multi-University Intergroup Dialogue National Institute for training on how the program is implemented.
  - The team would then return to Carleton and work through the summer and during the school year to adapt the program to the campus’ needs and hopefully run the first pilot during the 2009-2010 academic year.
The ECC and Institutional Research would also oversee and assess the program beginning that same year. The assessment would evaluate both the program’s effectiveness at Carleton as well as whether the ECC should consider alternatives.

If the team were to recommend that the College not proceed with the University of Michigan pilot, they would begin investigation into alternative programs.

The pilot would also include incentives for students to participate in the pilot – this could come as academic credit, work study hours, or the fulfillment of a required activity class (such as a PE class).

• Consolidating the Graduation Requirement Proposals – The three graduation requirement proposals have been consolidated into two – primarily Gross’s and Ondich’s proposals.
  
  o Similarities:
    
    ▪ Students can enter with only 12 pre-matriculation credits.
    ▪ Students must take a freshman seminar course.
    ▪ Students will be required to take 6 credits of both arts theory and arts practice.
      • Arts practice can be creative writing, music, studio art, dance, or theater courses.
    ▪ 6 credits must be earned in the biological or natural sciences.
    ▪ 6 credits must be earned in a formal reasoning course.
      • This focuses on theoretical mathematics, statistics, logic, and the design or analysis or algorithms.
    ▪ 6 credits must be earned in a writing-rich course.
    ▪ Students must pass the writing requirement.
    ▪ Students must take one course that focuses on quantitative reasoning.
    ▪ In a “Global Citizenship” requirement, students must take one course with an international focus and one course with an intercultural domestic focus.
  
  o Differences:
    
    ▪ Gross proposes that 6 credits must be earned in a “Humanistic Inquiry” courses, focusing on the foundations of cultural and intellectual traditions.
      • There has been speculation on the committee whether Carleton currently offers enough courses in this arena to require it of all students.
    ▪ Ondich proposes that 6 credits be earned in a “Society, Culture, and Belief” course that focuses on the human experience around the world.
    ▪ Gross also proposes that students take 6 credits in a social inquiry course that focuses on the variety of disciplinary approaches to the study of individuals and societies.

November 5, 2008
Double-Majors: This week we’ll be discussing, among other things, the future of double majors. Should Carleton offer students the chance to major in more than one field or is that unnecessary credentializing? We ask: what’s the difference between graduating with two majors and graduating with 66 credits in another discipline?