

All evaluations are anonymous. They will be given to the instructors after they have turned in final grades. A copy will also be kept in the Consortium office files for use only by the Coordinator, Board of Directors, and MIT staff. Student evaluations are very important to the Consortium and instructors; we appreciate your thoughtful responses to the questions.

**Part IA (designed by the course instructors)**

**1. Start with a self-evaluation:** Did you achieve your personal goals? How would you have proceeded differently if you were doing this course again? What have been your major personal obstacles to learning more from this course?

- Yes. I got to do a lot of research on things that were tangential to my M.A. thesis, which was great. If I were doing the course again I hope I would realize earlier how the course was supposed to work and then I would have had more time to go further into my research. Major personal obstacles were time. My M.A. program was one year, so I had a lot of courses and work.
- No, I thought I would gain some insight into STS as a field and develop tools to critically examine the field from a raced classed and gendered perspective. I also did not complete all assignments. How would you have proceeded differently if you were doing this course again? Explicitly say what I think would be useful to me in how the class is run. I had the power to shape the class time, so I should have used it. What have been your major personal obstacles to learning more from this course? Free time, lack of access to school libraries.
- In general, I have achieved my goals. If I could do it again, and if it was given in the first semester, I would have taken it then. That is simply because I had more time during the first semester, and the main obstacle I had was finding the time to do all I needed to do for my presentations.
- I had no plans at the beginning of the course. Now I do (a lot of them!!). With the help of this course, I have achieved one important goal (an integration of my personal and my academic interests), even though I had no idea that was a goal I would be happy to achieve (does this make any sense??). If I was doing this course again, I think I would improvise again. Obstacles to learning from this course..... I don't know
- Had I completed this course at a moment when I am more grown as a person than I am at this moment, I'd be less combative. I appreciate the care and patience with which that combative tendency was met.
- I came into this course with the dual goal to find new sources and interact with individual scholars to help me identify and better understand intersections of gender, race and science and to more clearly develop my critical feminist lens while continuing to move forward on my dissertation. This goal was fulfilled and I am happy with the outcome and excited to incorporate what I have learned into my dissertation...what I got out of the explorations in the course will only make my dissertation better. At first, I felt a lack of connectedness with the material and my fellow students...which I wish could have been addressed pedagogically early in the course somehow...especially the relational aspect with respect to my fellow students. An obstacle is that I now have about 7 or 8 books awaiting reading that are totally relevant and critical to my dissertation that I would not have known about. Lots of work ahead!
- I exceeded my personal goals to be honest. I fear if I had pursued the course differently, I would have reached the place I am now. My major personal obstacles to learning more from the course were more personal than pedagogical. I was dealing with serious illness and the recent loss of my father and a childhood friend (who died within days of one another). Preparing the cases and participating in class discussions were more rather therapeutic - without being asked to talk about anything that was happening personally.
- I don't think I started with a personal goal for the course and was open to new experiences as they came along. The biggest personal obstacle, as I've mentioned before, was lack of background in American History, Science and STS. I wish I had read more about these areas
-

What have you learned about making a workshop format, PBL course stimulating and productive? What would your advice be to prospective students about how to get the most from a course like this?

- I have learned that it really depends on how engaged the students are and how much they want to participate. My advice would be to explore something you are really interested in and don't worry about meeting the course's "expectations" because there really aren't any specific expectations.
- What have you learned about making a workshop format, PBL course stimulating and productive? I learned that many students are not really asked to study what they find interesting, no strings attached. What would your advice be to prospective students about how to get the most from a course like this? To have a project in mind before entering that they want to explore in front of an audience.
- The very idea that starting with a problem and then beginning to acquire the expertise needed to solve it is, I believe, very productive and also lets each one follow her interests.
- I have learned that pursuing a research work with the personal interests guiding and pushing is a great strategy. My advice would be: whenever you feel lost, hold on to what you think you know and don't hesitate to ask questions to the instructors.
- I would promise them that even though it does not always feel like it, it will in fact be okay.
- A lot, but I still think that in many university disciplines, PBL would still be considered a rather radical pedagogy...even at the graduate level. But trying to incorporate PBL principles and push the envelope would be worthy and fun. I personally would try to mix and meld it more with what I conceive of as feminist pedagogy (like relational interactions and the use of personal experience in a responsible way) and maybe make that connection more transparent if possible. I might play around with cases...what they are, how they are framed, and used...because I really like the concept and think it promoted self directed learning and critical and complex thinking/cognition. To students, I would say it seems you are in control of your learning path...and how you communicate that path to others...which is different than following a prescribed syllabus...and a good way to retrain your addled positivist scholarly brain and access your hidden stores of creativity
- In order for PBL to work, everyone has to pitch in - you can't just sit there and float along, as you might in a lecture course. Plus, you won't get very much out of it. It also seems to me that you'll want to participate - how can you NOT want to share you ideas in the midst of an entire group of folks discussing theirs? I would advise prospective students to put aside their fears that the course would be too much about the science, gender, and race, etc. This is about learning as a process - an experience of encounter and engaging the subject matter in a way that you otherwise would not had the opportunity to do. In the process of learning about these subjects, you'll find a language - a manner of discourse, if you will - to discuss them. Plus, you'll get to work with really talented peers from other graduate programs, and groove on their ideas, as well as work with top notch professors. I just finished a course with Peter Taylor and Anne Fausto-Sterling - not many people have an opportunity to say that, ever, in life.
- I've had seminar classes with a great sense of community and engaging discussion culture, but this class was still very unusual. It took a while to wrap the 'no-lecture' concept around my head. In terms of pedagogy, I kept thinking why aren't more classes designed this way where the student has the autonomy to explore areas of personal interest that are in line with class objectives with scaffolding from instructors (who essentially act as workshop leaders). The answer that came in is, the students chose to apply and actively pursue this course and a particular level of maturity is required to be awarded such autonomy. This model might not be as successful in say a required course at BC - but then again I could be really wrong. It would be interesting to see it play out. For prospective students, it would be nice to get a brief idea of the class pedagogy on day one - just so that students have an idea of what to expect (not being lecture heavy and more individual research-based). Also, if STS could be mentioned somewhere in the description of the class - it could set students on the right path - whether to decide upon taking it or not, or preparing for it by reading some material beforehand.

**2. General evaluation:** How did the course meet or not meet your expectations? How did your attitude to doing the course change through the semester? How do you think the course could be improved? What was special about this course (+positive & -negative)? How does it compare with other courses? What would be your overall recommendation to prospective students?

- I thought it would be much more science and a much heavier workload. I learned that the science that we touched on was understandable by someone with no background in science. I also learned that you could determine how heavy your workload was at different points in the semester. I think the course would be much improved by a more clear syllabus and more introduction to how the course will work at the beginning. I understand the pedagogy behind it, but I felt like I would have gotten more out of it had I realized earlier on what I was doing. The course was great because I got to study things that really interest me. A negative would be the amount of presentations - I have social anxiety and it was hard to do presentations so often. I would also like to see a little more group reading and discussion. I would definitely recommend this course to other WGS students, especially those who feel like their other classes have too much structure and are not interesting.
- Answers to specific questions nested below. All from one respondent.
  - How did the course meet or not meet your expectations? I expected to learn more about STS as a field. I expected to learn to engage critically in STS spaces by bringing attention to race, gender, class, and ableism. This did not happen. I'm not blaming instructors or myself, it just did not happen. The focus of the class was more about pedagogy than anything else.
  - How did your attitude to doing the course change through the semester? I was very excited to be here at first and then it waned as I realized the goals of the course were different from my own goals.
  - How do you think the course could be improved? Assignments have to be communicated more clearly. There is a way to explain that the student has freedom to do whatever they want, and not have that be so confusing. Communicating intent did not come across well.
  - What was special about this course (+positive & -negative)? What is nice about this course is there isn't a lot of pressure making it easy to actually explore what you want without feeling as if you must impress the professors. They were both extremely supportive and I very much appreciated that. They were also very available, which was great.
  - How does it compare with other courses? This course was like many courses I've had, except there was no pressure to actually critically engage with race and gender. There was no pressure to engage with the field of STS. I feel as if I would have benefitted from the professors making sure we learned a few lessons they find important. There was also very little discussion.
  - What would be your overall recommendation to prospective students? I would ask them if they had a specific project in mind they've always wanted to explore, and if they wanted to explore it in front of an audience. If they said yes to either, then I would recommend.
- The course did meet my expectation, though it would have been much better if it was a year-long course, so to spend enough time on each case as well as the final product. This includes devoting more time for discussion and evaluation of each presentation.
- I had no expectations. I was mostly interested by the title and by the fact that a long time admired professional was one of the instructors. My initial metathinking "i am not sure how this course works and what does it mean to do well in it", turned into a complete immersion (no more metathinking about how to do well in the course) and a fantastic experience of self-knowledge and of better knowledge of my own professional background.
- The course met my expectations in that it exposed me to a great number of pedagogical approaches I had not previously considered. I am not certain it has made me into a convert on all of them, but perhaps I will come around later.
- I already said a lot of this in the posts above. I loved the blog but the wiki...not so much! But I agree with Circe that the wiki has enormous value in terms of what it has evolved into. I kept thinking about ways in which the blog work could be expanded and course taker dialogue and even peer review

approaches could be facilitated there in an asynchronous way. Would be cool to experiment. The idea of process reflection writing on the blog began to take a different form for me than perhaps was intended...but I found it useful to use as a place to meta analyze my learning processes in the course and how projects took shape for me and materialized over time...even after I had submitted a case product.

- The course differed from my expectations. I thought there would be more lecture and assigned readings, mixed with student discussion and small group work. Here you really had a chance to be in a classroom where the traditional teacher/student binary is nearly subverted.
- A lot of questions!

**3. Re-read the course description (from the syllabus). Comment on how well the goals expressed there were met and make general and specific suggestions about how these could be better met.**

What can we learn about science and technology—and what can we do with that knowledge? Who are “we” in these questions?—whose knowledge and expertise gets made into public policy, new medicines, topics of cultural and political discourse, science education, and so on? How can expertise and lay knowledge about science and technology be reconciled in a democratic society? How can we make sense of the interactions of living and non-living, humans and non-humans, individual and collectivities in the production of scientific knowledge and technologies?

The course takes these questions as entry points into an ever-growing body of work to which feminist, anti-racist, and other critical analysts and activists have made significant contributions. The course also takes these questions as an invitation to practice challenging the barriers of expertise, gender, race, class, and place that restrict wider access to and understanding of the production of scientific knowledge and technologies. In that spirit, students participate in an innovative, problem-based learning (PBL) approach that allows them to shape their own directions of inquiry and develop their skills as investigators and prospective teachers. At the same time the PBL cases engage students’ critical faculties as they learn about existing analyses of gender, race, and the complexities of science and technology, guided by individualized bibliographies co-constructed with the instructors and by the projects of the other students. Students from all fields and levels of preparation are encouraged to join the course.

- I wish we would have read more foundational texts at the beginning and discussed them before diving into the cases. This would have given more of a background for what we were doing and stimulated discussion and engagement with the subject. We definitely met the expectations about shaping our own directions.
- Too much to comment on, so I will not say anything as this would require a small essay.
- The goals have been met, although I would have appreciated more discussion of who is included or excluded in each use of "we" in scientific research.
- I found the description a bit overwhelming, but thought "if only one of these questions gets discussed in this course, it is worth taking it".
- I am too sleep deprived at this moment to concentrate on this task. Pass.
- Is this what we did? :) yes...in hindsight, this seems to articulate it.
- Looking back on this description - which I remember being a little overwhelming (!) - I am taken by that first sentence. So much packed into a small space, "What can we learn about science and technology - and what can we do with that knowledge?" Seriously, with this course format, there are very few strings of thought that you cannot tease out and analyze - and interrogate, break apart, and put back together again. I also love talking about the binary oppositions that guide the so-called natural order of things ... How a society decides what group will serve as the baseline - the measure against which all other groups must live up to or succeed in order to be considered healthy, or competent, etc. - to be considered a success. The baseline - in the U.S. straight White men - are the ones who "naturally" have the right to decide the difference between what Bourdieu called the orthodox vs. the heterodox, and Donna Haraway called the unmarked vs. the marked. If you missed a chance to visit these notions while taking this course, or while discussing gender, race, and the challenges of technologies and science, then you never attended a single session of this course.
- Answered this in self-evaluation 2

**Part IB (Items identified by GCWS)**

**4. Comment on any of the following items you have not already covered above.**

### Size of the class?

- Good
- Fine
- Just about right
- perfect!
- loved it
- Great...bigger would have been a challenge
- It was perfect!
- It was a good size

### Classroom dynamics, discussions, and interactions

- Dynamics were great. I felt very comfortable with everyone in the class, and that made presenting a little easier. I sometimes felt frustrated by the discussions because we spent a lot of time doing discussions with the cards that weren't really about any specific thing, and I felt that time could have been more valuably spent discussing texts, theory, or our presentations.
- Again, I want to stress that the professors were wonderful, kind, encouraging and available. I really, really, appreciated that.
- Classroom dynamics was very supportive.
- I would have loved more interaction amongst classmates. Even though it was a bit difficult to talk in the first classes, I would have appreciated some activities or ice-breaking exercise (perhaps asking/telling about professional backgrounds, personal interests).
- Plus deltas: I think this is the pedagogical strategy I am resisting most. Things I like about it include: keeping people engaged with one another's presentations and work, and facilitating comments and suggestions; it is incredibly time efficient. Where my resistance stems from: I'm not sure I give my best feedback five seconds after witnessing something. Sometimes sleeping on it, or digesting it makes for something better. There was certainly feedback I put on plus/deltas that the next day I thought may have been a misread on my part. The problem is, any of the alternatives that would work for me would be more labor intensive and demand more time. So the present model helps with that. I dunno.
- Our in class interactions were more individual presentation driven and I sort of missed actual dialogue and discussion that could potentially been fostered in this group of 7 plus 2 instructors in a meaningful way...
- The dynamics were incredible - I loved coming to class to see the people and the instructors, and to hear what they had to say about a given topic. Plus, it was such a comfort to know that I could share a thought or a product, and get such thoughtful feedback from my peers, Peter, and Ann. There is nothing so heartening and empowering than to know your thoughts are being heard, appreciated, and supported. I remember a presentation where one of my colleagues in class quoted something I said - which amazed me. Sometimes you can take a course and wonder if people are ever really listening to anything you have to say - or just biding their time until they can start talking again. Nothing having a thought like ever in this class was a wonderful departure.
- I feel like I didn't get to hear enough from the other participants in class - don't know if it was because of time shortage but I would have liked more discussion, especially considering such a rich eclectic mix of backgrounds we had. Rather than doing PBL during class, if the initial work was done before coming to class and we could use class time for open discussion. The moderation of discussion could have been done better too - I understand that good discussions do travel on their own trajectories but a few went way off (like one where we ended up talking about mothers)

### Assignments, including presentations: Helpful for your learning? Number? Difficulty?

- The assignments were helpful for the most part, but I felt like we could have done fewer or shorter presentations. Perhaps a rotating format in which some people present for one part of the case, etc.? The written assignments were not difficult, though they did require a lot of thinking about how to structure them and what exactly they were supposed to be. They ended up being helpful, but clarification earlier on would have been great.

- I would have liked more structured assignments and way less presentations.
- I usually needed to read the assignment three or four times before starting my work, and then a few more times during my work on each case. But I'm not sure that's a problem.
- The preparation and execution of presentations have been very helpful. I missed more time for discussion of presentations. I would have liked to dedicate more time to receive feedback and to comment in more detail my classmates' works. Perhaps the final presentations should be shorter (30mins max), and have more time for discussion, and even a round of peer-review process, so each one gets feedback and also has time to think and analyze others' work.
- Symbiotic surveillance: The blog and blogging requirements are interesting in their free-floatingness. I am not sure how I feel about the way both sides (student and teacher) are monitoring each other. I don't know if you checked in with students who weren't doing annotated bibliographies or reflections; or if those students just got left behind. I wonder if the request "Please let us know if we haven't given you feedback" works to continue to dismantle a power dynamic between students and professors, or if it means that on top of doing the assignments, I have the additional task of making sure you have noticed that I have done them? Perhaps, not mutually exclusive.
- Not in love with Werskey as a "case"...made me question what exactly is meant by case. 3 cases seems like a good number though for the duration of a semester
- The presentation aspect was terrifying for me at first. Absolutely terrifying. I come from a communications background, and had run a communications department for years. But I was the person writing copy that other people said, the chick crawling around the floor plugging things in, the person who designed things last minute when the contractor didn't meet his/her deadline. I had done some lectures, taught some workshops, and conducted focus groups in the past - but had been looking forward to graduate school as a way to escape that ... (This is a ludicrous thing to think now that I write that down; but I had harbored notions of a life in a closed room, analyzing data and writing reports.) The first presentation was fine, the second one kind of a nightmare, because people were visiting and I was feeling rather ill. And then something happened ... I looked forward to sharing my ideas - and really got ramped up about the ideas of delivering that information in unique ways that went beyond the "text and a picture on each slide" Power Point. The way the course products were set up allowed me a great deal of freedom, so I created Power Point slides that emulated animations, and experimented with the use of recorded and live commentary. I also felt free to discuss things that concern me on a daily basis - which meant being able to create a case that talked about HIV prevention with gay Black men that necessitated open discussion about sex. I had feared a little that the my peers would balk, even inwardly, to the talk - but they seemed actively engaged and even shared their own experiences. Again - very exciting. I have taken my experiences here back to Harvard and recently gave a 1 minute debate presentation using the "animated" PowerPoint slide with which I was experimenting ... It worked so well, the other debate team had to take a moment to recover! So the number of presentations was just right - and they were as difficult or complex as you wanted to make them based on the amount of research and type of product you wanted to present.
- The presentations were great - especially hearing from classmates and their take on topics that stemmed from the same starting point. I would have appreciated some more detailed description of what is expected out of the 'product'.

#### Instructors:

clarity and organization

openness to a variety of approaches to the material

instructors working together as a team

interaction with students outside of class time

feedback on assignments and presentations

- The instructors were very open to working as a team and being in touch with us to guide us. I would have liked more clarity about the syllabus and assignments. I also would have liked more clarity about how to get an "OK," when you should get the OK, and which assignments had an implicit OK (the presentations, mostly). One thing that did bother me was inattention to time. We often went over time during presentations and at the end of class, which was frustrating because we all have to commute and

have a lot of other things going on.

- The organization was very haphazard. The assignments were rarely clear.
- I found the instructor both supportive and genuinely interested in what I was doing.
- I didn't meet with them or ask them many questions, because I thought it was not appropriate to demand too much attention given I am an auditor. Now I regret a little bit. They gave me very interesting suggestions and after every one of my presentations, I got some comment that made me (i) improve and/or (ii) feel great about what i was doing.
- I think the biggest struggle I have had throughout this class goes back to a point Kate made during the evaluation, which is about the respecting of student's time and syllabus. I do hear you, Peter, when you say that we won't remember anything from you taking it up in the first week, and that's probably right, but that syllabus is both unwieldy and impenetrable. Also, I wonder if providing some kind of narration would be useful. Or, perhaps, even just an articulation regarding what you think it production about us getting lost.
- All good...just sometimes the wiki was annoying. Really liked the peer commentary process on the final products at the end
- I think I touched on this with my previous comments.
- Mentioned above

What (if anything) did you gain anything in this course that you would not have been able to get at your home institution?

- Yes, this course allowed me to really explore my interests in a way that most of my courses at my home institution did not. I also learned a completely new way of learning and interacting with a class that I feel was very valuable.
- ...
- I've been introduced both to science criticism and the way(s) it could be done as well as to many different pedagogical tools
- i am not sure. I should go into details. I think my status as a visiting scholar here makes me very sensitive to my experiences here and highly willing to make the most of them. Besides that, and on a completely different note, peter and anne are here, not in my home institution! ;)
- You know, I said that I thought about leaving, and I did, quite a few times, and I would vent to people about my frustrations and they would tell me "It might be time to call bust." However, the other thing that I would tell people about this class was how very much I needed it and needed to come here. To some extent, just being allowed to have these thoughts outside of my home institution is a productive end in itself. But, there was also something so very important and stimulating about this space that allowed me to be a version of me I cannot be at "home."
- I'm particularly excited about readings the works of Dorothy Smith next and believe that her methodological approach of institutional ethnography, might be a strong epistemological and personal match for my research. I don't think I would have been introduced to her in a way that compelled me to go deeper into her work in time..and I think her work will be critical frame for my dissertation
- I got to talk hear discussions about race, gender, and its intersections with science and technology outside the world of public health. Don't get me wrong, I love public health. But coming to MIT every Thursday evening to hear from my classmates in the history of science, feminist studies, religious studies, and so was a welcome break. I think (hope) I offered them insight that they normally wouldn't have either.

- The ability to interact with some great people from different field that I would probably not get to otherwise. Also, stepping out of my psychology/education/management shoes and into philosophy/history of science/mental health counseling/religious studies - to experience content in a different light when I'm so used to seeing things one way. Also, this experience broke down some barriers between the strong (perceived) walls of hard science and (softer?) social sciences. It also gave me the vocabulary to explain how both these sciences bleed into each other (and win a few arguments with my 'hard science' roommate)

Would you take another consortium seminar? Why or why not?

- Yes, if I were not graduating. A lot of the topics for next year look very interesting. They are more specific and relevant to my interests than a lot of classes at my home institution.
- Yes. I like learning, I like being in classrooms. I always, always, think it is a priority to investigate issues from a feminist perspective, and consortium seminars, I'm assuming, take this same priority in feminist inquiry.
- I would if I have the chance. I believe I still have much to learn regarding these issue, and it is very helpful for my research
- yes. I am very curious to see how other courses in this consortium work.
- Yes. Because this was such a lovely experience.
- Yes...considering it actually. This consortium offers a weath of resources and knowledge, and bright scholars
- Most definitely - because of the diversity of ideas and subject matters that you get to discuss ... and with such diverse range of people.
- I'm open to consortium seminar as a concept, and certainly like exchange of ideas outside of my home institute. As they say, you see your world in a clearer light when you step out of it. The walls of MIT were intimidating at first, being there as a woman of color - it had an emotional impact on me as well (something that I was made aware of while discussing the experience with my thesis advisor). The ability to 'fit in' in different spaces has not reached me yet, but I imagine that multiple exposures to a consortium type environment would be helpful in moving towards that direction.

## **Gender, Race, and the Complexities of Science and Technology Course evaluation**

### **Part II (designed by course instructors)**

Write out neatly a synthetic statement (1 or 2 paragraphs) evaluating this course. (You might build on/build in your comments from the other pages.) Please make comments both to help the instructors develop the course in the future and to enable some third party (e.g., GCWS or potential students) appreciate the course's strengths and weaknesses. (Imagine a reader who may not have time to wade through the items on the other pages.)

- This course was definitely a valuable experience. I was able to explore topics that interested me, choose my direction of inquiry, and learn to adapt to an entirely new style of teaching and learning. Overall I think this was one of the most useful courses I have taken in graduate school. It taught me how to think in a different way, and I was able to apply that to my other courses. This course could be improved, in my opinion, in a few logistical ways. I think more clarity in the syllabus, about assignments, and about the course overall would retain students and help with confusion at the beginning. I also think that a little more structure would be useful; there could be a few assigned readings per case and time set aside for class discussion on a theoretical level. I also think that paying more attention to time and leaving more time to discuss other students' work would be very valuable.
- This course is from someone who wants to work on a specific project they have in mind. For example, a syllabus, or a grant proposal, etc... Any type of project they think would benefit from an audience hearing it. The professors and students are here to review and listen to your proposal. This is not a course about canonical STS essays, and it is not about learning from professor's lectures. This is a class based on student presentations. The professors are very welcoming, knowledgeable, and available.
- This course has been an opportunity for me to acquire important methodological and pedagogical tools that could be used in my research. In a way, I believe I was able to acquire different "technologies" to do "science" better. I was also able to present my research to a supportive and helpful audience, as well as to learn much from other people presentation. The assortment of different researchers who constituted this course, and their own expertise and interest in their work, is no less than amazing.
- I am very grateful to the instructors and the classmates for this experience. The provocative cases, the freedom to let my own interests to guide the questions, and the conversations and presentations in class have triggered, without me being completely aware, an action-seeking wanting that I have been silencing throughout my career. Peter has made some comments to me that have made me rethink my goals as a professional and as a person, and have made me make peace with some internal contradictions between academic career and personal satisfaction. It is certainly a learning experience very different from any other I have had. I am not sure if this course would work for someone who is not already a passionate researcher. It seems it worked for my classmates as much as for me, but not sure if because we were already socially concerned researchers and passionate about learning and improving. Or perhaps we learned a bit of that in these four months!
- Pass. I am using this space for something else. I wish I could show this part of the evaluation to the other students in the class, and if one of the professors who reads this would be willing to post it to the blog anonymously, I would like that very much: I learned so very much from you. And while I do mean facilitated by divergent areas of interest and expertise, and while I do mean because I think everyone in the room is both bright and has something interesting to say, I think what I mean even more from those two things is I learned so much for you about 'how to be in a classroom.' There were students who just radiated a kindness that was warm, comforting, and infectious. There were students who took their time to sit contemplatively in silence and there were talkers. There were students who were brave, and who performed it through vulnerability and through listening to their gut and forming and intervention. There were students who were just so very creative in their approaches to their projects and how they saw them, and they made these objects/artifacts/creations that were not only interesting, but beautiful, but captivating. There were students who struggled with who they were/are openly, and there were students who unabashedly and unapologetically didn't know how to be anything/anyone else. There were students who spearheaded and students who struggled. Many of us were many of these things at once, including the 'contradicting points.' I mean all of these things at compliments. I say all of them with admiration. I am grateful to everyone in the room. Thank you.
- See response for self evaluation 2...it really fits here

- In order for PBL to work, everyone has to pitch in - you can't just sit there and float along, as you might in a lecture course. Plus, you won't get very much out of it. It also seems to me that you'll want to participate - how can you NOT want to share you ideas in the midst of an entire group of folks discussing theirs? I would advise prospective students to put aside their fears that the course would be too much about the science, gender, and race, etc. This is about learning as a process - an experience of encounter and engaging the subject matter in a way that you otherwise would not had the opportunity to do. In the process of learning about these subjects, you'll find a language - a manner of discourse, if you will - to discuss them. Plus, you'll get to work with really talented peers from other graduate programs, and groove on their ideas, as well as work with top notch professors. I just finished a course with Peter Taylor and Anne Fausto-Sterling - not many people have an opportunity to say that, ever, in life.
- Strengths: PBL, KAQ, autonomy to explore individual interests, interaction with fellow classmates from eclectic backgrounds, blended learning environment of online and in-class sessions, flexibility of instructors, interesting reading material. Weaknesses: Both the self-evaluations had questions about 'meeting class expectations'. However, the 'expectations' were not clear to me before or during class. More structure on assignments and expectations is required. Discussion among students in person - I know that blog posts are encouraged for processing and engagement given limited class time, but having some class time for discussion, processing and exchanging ideas would be good. Going to different locations to find information - blog, wiki page, following several links to find one thing was uncomfortable and confusing.