

Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies  
FINAL COURSE EVALUATION  
Spring 2015

**Course:** WGS.700: Gender, Race, and the Complexities of Science and Technology

**Instructors:** Peter Taylor and Kim Surkan

**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 have. If I was doing this course again, I would structure the cases better because I would know more about how to write them. I wish there were examples to look at ahead of time which would have helped to structure my own cases.
- I feel like the final project allowed me to produce something that would be useful for future classes. I was very pleased with the final project. I didn't know what to expect from this class, so I never had a specific set of goals other than figuring out what was going on.
- My personal goals weren't as concretely defined. So one thing to do differently would have been to make those more concrete. In a more abstract sense, I "achieved" a more complex view of the field of STS and how it links with gender and race. I "achieved" a better understanding of the PBL process and how feminist pedagogy works. What would I do differently? I would be less busy during this semester so I could ask more and more questions in this course, read more, engage more with the teachers and my colleagues.
- I don't think I performed to the level that I'm capable of in this course. For one, I took on too many classes and had too many other responsibilities to really feel comfortable engaging with this learning/teaching method that is radically different from anything I've experienced before. I wish I would have taken this course my first semester in graduate school because I think I would have had a much richer experience, not only in this course, but in my entire graduate career.
- I believe I achieved the goals I had for this course. I engaged with information unfamiliar to me and positively contributed to the class while expanding my knowledge. Having a stronger background in science may have been helpful, but I'm not sure it would have changed my approach.
- In brief, yes - I got what I wanted out of this course. If I were to take this course again, I would do a better job integrating the course content with my areas of interest in my PhD program, not because the experimentation with other areas was bad (far from it!) but because of the shortage of time to do my research.
- I did achieve my personal goals but I think this was largely due to the fact that I had a clear idea of what I wanted to accomplish early on in the semester. I faced obstacles in finding literature to connect to my work to. The professors were

forthcoming in offering suggestions but the course itself provided very little formal guidance in assignments, readings, or structure.

- This course was surprisingly useful in achieving my goals for it - more so than I thought! I thought this course would provide more fundamentals in the STS literature - and it kind of did, but not really but so what, I can get that from a syllabus for an STS survey course online. I was also hoping to use it to explore an area I was interested in. This course provided an amazing opportunity to do that, I'm so glad I took it. The instructors were very helpful in guiding to appropriate resources.

I think the way this course played out was perfect, and I don't think I'd do much differently. I felt fine with the pacing.

Time was an obstacle, and not quite being clear on what was going on at first. There's a learning curve on the PBL method. Also, I think I could have engaged more strongly with students from diverse background earlier. I was more comfortable (as I think we all were) with students with similar backgrounds to me - but in the end, the diversity was a huge strength of this course.

- I feel like what I've ended up achieving in this class is a little different than what I thought I would achieve at the outset. I think entering the course, I thought I would come out with some sort of finished project proposal. Instead, I feel like I've come out with a rich set of resources, beginnings of ideas, and an interdisciplinary community (though I think this last bit was part of my personal goals), and I'm very happy with this outcome. Not sure what I would have done differently if I were to go through it all again -- it evolved so organically, so really hard to say. Scarcity of time was probably the largest obstacle for me.
- I found that this course demanded more from me than I had expected to give, although that is in part because I made it more demanding as the semester went on. If I were to do it again, I'm not sure how much I would change beyond making sure to have a better idea of what the product for each case was supposed to look like, so that I could curb my ambitions in order to better deal with the time allotted for each project. This course came about during a strange semester, when I'm reconsidering my career path (wondering if I might be better suited to a more interdisciplinary field) and while this has enabled me to dig in to the new material this course has made available (I did not know STS existed as its own sub-discipline) it also mean that I spent more time exploring things at a broad, cursory level before getting into the details.

**2. 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 Science can actually intersect with other fields such as history, and English, and Literature.
- I feel this class is very good for people who are very regimented in their research and interests and perhaps don't move out of their field very often. I research very widely and I did before this class, so I was disappointed that there was little time

- to explore subjects deeply. Since my interests were so wide before coming into this class, PBL sometimes felt counterproductive.
- I would advise them to get acquainted with PBL. Not by reading up on it but seeing it in action. I would advise them to think about how this process has helped them to think differently.
  - I really loved being able to hear feedback from students/experts in a wide variety of disciplines. Having a lot of different forums for discussion was really helpful in this regard. There were a lot of different levels of formality that were useful in different ways and I really appreciated being able to talk about different, still coalescing ideas. My advice would be to make sure you can devote as much time to this course as possible, not because it's going to be so difficult that it'll push everything else out of your life, but because you will be able to get that much more out of it.
  - PBLs have shown me how to make workshops both informative and engaging. I would tell future students to be open and honest about their thoughts as it offers more opportunities for discourse.
  - The PBL course is only as stimulating and productive as its participants make it - but when such a course gives people who are imaginative and eager to explore their own things the freedom to do what they please, the results are excellent. I would advise prospective students that this course is as good and as bad as you make it, and that you have exceptional freedom - this course is either a way to explore a lot more or a way to find a whole new angle to your existing interests, and you can bring and take as much from it as you can.
  - Self-direction is important. The course felt very individualized - everyone worked on their own project and there was very little unity.
  - This course is case and PBL based. That means that there are a series of "cases" - you can kind of think of these as broad topics, or general areas, or points of entry into thinking about some area of STS, gender, and race. PBL means you have incredible freedom in choosing how to approach each case, you use a case to explore things that are interesting to you, and yet related to what is being discussed.

PBL is not as mysterious or difficult as it first seems. It is essentially self-directed learning, with a lot of instructor guidance for resources and with the general area broadly defined. For instance, perhaps the case, or general area is the postgenomic era. A PBL approach means that you get to pick out what is interesting about the postgenomic era to you. Is it CRISPR tech? Is it fetal dna? Is it using genomes to try to trace an individual's genealogy, and what that means for our interpretation of our own personal history? Is it the tie-in between this era and the early eugenics era? Maybe it's speculative fiction and new portrayals of gender and race in post-genomic sci fi.

In PBL, you get to figure out how you connect to this broad area, and then chase it down, flesh it out, and present it to your classmates. The instructors help you choose appropriate starting resources, or fill in background STS gaps you have (for instance, they helped me find some fundamental STS fetal dna testing

studies) - but then you direct your own learning experience. It's an incredible amount of freedom, and incredibly useful if you have some areas you'd like to chase down.

Sometimes contributions from the other students are at first hard to understand how they are useful - but over the course, you come to appreciate the diversity that is present in terms of disciplinary strengths, focus, and thinking. It ends up helping you consider new angles in your own work, and become a more unsettled, less rigid learner.

- Experiencing the PBL method, as a student, is in some ways painful. But that discomfort is ultimately useful. I think it does bring into relief what the norms and expectations are in a more traditional learning environment.

I enjoyed the PBLs the most when they were a little longer. More time gave me more space to grapple with both the exploration, and the product creation. My advice to prospective students would be to not worry too much about the ends, and appreciate the means/journey as integral to the class learning objectives (cliche, I know).

- My advice for prospective students would be to come in with some sense of a project worked out before hand, something that could potentially be carried through the different cases and developed accordingly. Although a too rigid focus to one idea can be detrimental to your ability to experiment in a course like this-- and you should take the opportunity to experiment!--have a sense of where you are going will help ease the tension of the first few weeks.

That being said, the most stimulating workshops were often those that gave people the ability to articulate their attempts to work in areas they weren't fully comfortable in and therefore draw on the expertise of the other graduate students. A degree of flexibility is necessary in a course like this, and it should be embraced.

**3. 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?**

- The course did meet my expectations but in many ways the lack of structure wasn't great. I would have liked to know about my progress mid-way through the course. I would have also liked to know whether I was meeting the requirements for each task correctly or not.
- I think this course could be improved with more class dialogue. Conversations on a blog are not the same as conversations in class and I felt that interesting discussion were often cut off.
- I had very different expectations coming in. I expected to read a lot more theory. I ended up reading less and listening more. The course had a far bigger interactive component than I expected. This was a good thing. Presenting your ideas, getting

feedback, giving feedback, I realized, is a very different way of learning, of group-thinking and group-learning. I appreciate that more. I am at a loss to suggest improvements. It seems so organically drawn up that dismantling it would be tricky. I guess I could recommend more reflection time both before and after class for each class, but I think that we already had that. More conversations. But that is dictated by other peoples' workload. It doesn't compare to other courses. There is no comparison. It's a different way of learning/thinking/interacting. I wouldn't say get rid of traditional learning because I love reading 500+ page novels. I love doing research (in humanities). But I would say there should be more courses such as this one that are far more interdisciplinary and incorporate this sort of feminist pedagogy. This was a welcome change. I would wholeheartedly recommend this course.

- I was not expecting this kind of course at all. I think students should be made more aware of the different kind(s) of pedagogical strategies and devices that are going to be used. Not to say that it's not a useful or even enjoyable format, it is certainly both of those, but students should have a better idea of what they're getting into. I would have liked to see more of a theoretical base for each case. I think the common reading shared among the class was a good idea in theory but not actually discussing the reading and working out how it factors into the case or even your own specific ideas for the case left me wondering how useful it really was. I don't think the shared experience of reading something as a class is really useful unless we hash these ideas out more fully rather than just saying what we found interesting about it. I think the first case could be scrapped entirely and that expanding the second and fourth ones a bit more would be more useful. I didn't really understand anything more about the process after the first case but I think if I'd had a bit more time and feedback I'd have been in a much better position to tackle the rest of the cases.
- The course exceeded my expectations by offering more knowledge moments than I expected or could process in one semester. The most special aspect of the course was the diversity of students and what they brought to each class. It compares very favorably to the courses I've enjoyed the most as a student.
- Perhaps it was the unusually high level of discomfort that came from not being able to link the course to our interests early on, and that was the one thing that should have been settled for a lot of us and really decreased our enjoyment of it. That was the real negative and that's the one thing that can be changed. But it was later, when I figured out how to make the course work for me that I really got to enjoy it the most. Comparing it to other courses is like comparing apples and oranges because this is a radically different pedagogy, but if I ran into prospective students who were eager for something that met their interests and was a little different from the ordinary, I absolutely would recommend it to them.
- The course did not meet my expectations. Since there was very little reading, class discussions were disjointed and not grounded in text, analysis, empirical debates, or theoretical examples. This was very disappointing, as the course did not provide any concrete information. It became frustrating coming to class when everyone was on a different page and we had no common experiences, texts, or projects to share. While I value the independence to work on our own projects, the

class was missing a theoretical framework to ground students and the cases did not seem to build on one another, instead seeming detached and without much context at all.

The course structure was undefined. We never talked about feminist pedagogy until April. This would have been crucial guidance from the beginning of class and instead students were not really sure what was going on or how to approach the materials. Time was lost feeling too confused...

The course could be improved by assigning readings that are empirical and theoretical; by establishing a theoretical framework early on (we never talked about intersectionality or lay vs expert knowledge); by giving some more concrete goals so students have some guidance.

Special about the class was the freedom to discuss issues pertinent to our interests.

Unfortunately I found the course to be unstructured and lacking cohesion overall. While I was greatly assisted by professors as far as finding literature, the course syllabus itself featured hardly any reading. There was very little guidance about how to complete assignments and for the most part I was unclear about the expectations throughout the duration of the class.

- This course at first did not meet, and then exceeded my expectations. I was frustrated by a perceived lack of clarity (and the syllabus/blog format, which frankly is not the most accessible in the world). Then as I stuck with it and began to learn a lot through the cases, I really appreciated the space this course provides. I would not have been able to do this on my own this semester, I would not have put the time into it for one. Also, I think this course provides the perfect amount of structure to support interesting pedagogy like this.
- This course gives a lot of freedom, and I'm glad I'm taking it at this point in my graduate career. I mean this in reference to my intellectual development, but also my course load. I think if I had taken this class while trying to take many other "traditional" classes, I would have let those demands come first. The freedom was at times frustrating, but ultimately rewarding. Some reassurance from the instructors that I wasn't "doing it wrong" might have been helpful. The instructors are fantastic resources, but more structured one on one discussion on individual learning goals (in addition to the very helpful ones on case content) could be useful. Overall, I would certainly recommend this course to students who are interested in the subject matter, and who are excited to open up new spaces for exploration. Reflecting on when this would fit in their program plans might be useful though. I could see this class being very stressful (though not unrewarding!) at certain points in graduate education. Final note: I ended up learning and thinking a lot more about pedagogy in this class than I thought I was going to, and I've really appreciated this aspect of the course! This wasn't advertised as a teaching class, but the cases really got me thinking deeply about pedagogy, and got me very excited about teaching.

- The course was definitely unlike any other I've taken in my graduate experience. Although not discussion based, it did encourage dialogue, and an intellectual openness that is too often wanting. My two suggestions for improvement would be to give some time for students to discuss the shared reading, if only to help them feel a sense of mastery that might make the independent work easier and to develop connections between students, and to make it possible for students to collaborate beyond feedback. If there ever was a course where group work could produce something interesting, it is this

**4. 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 don't believe that the professors even explained what PBL is and how to do it. We kind of just learned that on our own throughout the course. It would have been great to know how to do it during one of our first classes. Perhaps a lecture on what PBL is and how to do it, would have been great.
- I would refer back to my previous comment. I suppose my expectation was that this would be a more guided course, and, for me, I needed a more guided course. I certainly learned from the presentations by my classmates, particularly those in science fields. But actually doing the work for the presentations felt rushed and very surface. I wanted to have more time to dig into these subjects, which is what I thought the course was for.
- I definitely was able to question whose knowledge counts. Who are the experts and why. I was able to participate in PBL and make my own inquiries and see how I could be a better teacher.

- I thought the course did a fantastic job meeting these goals. The diversity of student interests and experiences made it almost impossible to do otherwise.
- Well met; no additional comments.
- I think that the goals stated above were met to some extent or the other, but what really mattered was that we were able to take those goals and interpret them in our own way and decide what parts of those goals we would focus on, relevant to our interests, and then decide how to bring those out. We succeeded there, no doubt.
- The majority of the class was student presentations on each case; presentation were both "drafts" and "revisions" in addition to final products. This felt very redundant and like it took way too much time as opposed to learning about empirical or theoretical topics related to the above course description. Because students went in so many different directions due to the lack of clear guidance around what a product should be and because there was so little text or common theoretical framework embedded in the course, it often seemed like there was no shared language or approaches taken.

It would be important to offer students clearer goals, directions, and shared readings/assignments so students are on the same page. I do not feel like I mastered as much new knowledge related to STS as I had hoped or expected, nor did I learn how PBL could make me a better researcher or scholar.

- Very well met. At times the presentations of some students seemed to range a bit off topic - the course relies heavily on student contribution, so if someone is not invested, it can be a bit of a drag, but overall - excellent course.
- I think the course (magically almost) did address most of these goals. It was hard to see it while it was happening sometimes, but reflecting now, it's great to see how our work in different cases speak to these questions. Would it be useful to have a mini-version of what we've done in the last session at the end of each case, to help students reflect and process?
- The course description does a good job of giving the reader a sense of the course thematic, but should prioritize the PBL approach, which is perhaps more important than the STS framework described in the first half of the paragraph.

**5. Comment on any of the following items you have not already covered above. Size of the class?**

- Just fine
- The class size was fine. It was great to meet people from so many different schools.
- Size of class was good.
- Perfect
- Very good size. Any larger would have made discussions difficult.
- Like baby bear's porridge (or conditions for life on a planet orbiting in the habitable zone around a star where water is liquid) - just right.
- Ok
- Size pretty good, maybe actually a little large (11-13?).



- Thought the class was a good size. If it were smaller, I could see more time being devoted to each person's work. I would have loved to participate in longer sessions facilitated by my peers.
- Fine, although given the amount of and importance of presentations a smaller class would allow for more feedback and discussion.

#### **6. Classroom dynamics, discussions, and interactions?**

- Great especially because everyone was coming from a different profession and field of study.
- As I stated previously, I would have enjoyed more interactions. I learned more from my classmates than at any other point in this class, so it was sometimes frustrating to have so little chance to interact in the class.
- Good. The dreaded alarm clock actually was nice in limiting those who talk too much.
- The classroom dynamic was really warm, supportive, and inviting.
- I would have liked a bit more conversation on the blog. Maybe a central question that we responded to weekly where we could read and comment on the thoughts of others.
- I don't think I'll ever run into a class this fantastic anywhere else!
- I enjoyed the Plus/Delta exercises during our presentations.
- The formalized methods of discussion (round robin shares, this card thing where you take a card to speak) at times felt stilted or constrained. I do think more free discussion at the beginning would be helpful to start to ease past the disciplinary boundaries that are present.
- Very welcoming, respectful, engaging atmosphere!
- Because the course encouraged dialogue instead of discussion, I got the sense that some students didn't quite know how to contribute. Because people were often timid to speak beyond their expertise, it often felt like only two or three students would respond to each presentation. Again, perhaps a smaller class--or group feedback?--would help.

#### **7. Assignments, including presentations: Helpful for your learning? Number?**

##### **Difficulty?**

- Assignments were reasonable and well-paced except at times I didn't know what was expected.
- For really researching a new area I felt that there were too many PBLs and too little time. My research often felt very surface just because there was so much material that I didn't have time to do anything with. Since I was already reading and researching pretty widely before the class the presentations were less helpful than I expected they would be. I also felt the mini-PBL would have been better spent having an open discussion.
- Presentations were a new way of learning. 4 is a good number. They were challenging in that their freedom made me dig deeper, higher, wider, crazier.
- Other than tinkering with the case number/length of each case I think the written assignments and presentations were more than reasonable in both number and

difficulty. I think there were a few too many participation items. I didn't really think the course reflections were that useful. Although I didn't realize this until it was too late, I really liked how there was the option to substitute discussion with others on the blog for these items.

- Assignments are great. The presentations are very helpful in making the explorations by other students more tangible.
- Confusing at first, especially when I didn't figure out how to integrate my interests and knowledge with this course. They were much less troublesome later on and a lot more constructive.
- Too many presentations, especially in draft form. This felt like a waste of class time.
- Good - pacing pretty good,
- The assignments were very helpful. The pacing is a little intense. Perhaps reducing the number of cases, but allowing more time for them, would address this. Then there could be room for both "draft product" presentations (getting early feedback from the whole class), and "final product" presentations, as opposed to doing the revision part just online.
- The assignments were mostly helpful, and the presentations encouraged me to think in ways that I normally avoid--I come from a discipline where slideshows are rare. That being said, I do wish there were alternative ways of organizing the early work, if only because the product and the presentation were so different.

**8. 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

- Professor Taylor gets annoyed when you e-mail him more than once. That seems intimidating especially in a class that lacks structure. Because of the lack of structure/clear guidelines, I found myself having to ask questions or navigate and figure it out on my own. But if I sent more than 2 emails, I would get a response to check the syllabus. But, really the reason I am asking the question a second time is 'because it's not clear from the syllabus'
- I never fully felt like I knew what I was supposed to be doing. Perhaps that was the point, but I don't feel like this class really coalesced for me at any point.
- Instructors were both great. Insightful, respectful, and above all else CURIIOUS! The halls of academia are lined with jaded professors! Who sadly think they know everything and are just not interested in student work, they can't even pretend to be interested in student work! But both professors here were humble and curious! Very very nice!
- Professor Surkan was fantastic!
- Great instruction. Professors were open and available for anything class-related.
- Superb in terms of knowledge, openness, helpfulness and yes, working together as a team.
- Both professors were readily available and open to students exploring a variety of issues and taking a number of approaches. \* I truly appreciate the efforts of the professors and their creativity, forthcomingness, and availability. \*

- The syllabus...needs work. I found it ok, it was clear a number of students struggled with it. It's too jumbled. I just looked at it again, and now it seems clearer but that's with 20/20 hindsight - I remember struggling to understand what was going on with it. Not sure how to fix this.

Not a huge fan of Werskey reading. It's long and difficult to access if you don't have background. I feel like a couple of more general readings would be better in some ways (maybe out of STS handbook or something).

We should have longer check-ins about the reading, or an actual little discussion of it and chuck the check-in format. I think a 20 minute discussion of the reading would be more useful than a 15 minute, 1 min each check in. Or maybe, have a blog post for each reading and students are encouraged to post a comment about the reading by an hour before class, and read everyone else's comments, so that everyone has their head thinking about it before they come in. If we're going to do the readings...

- The instructors were very responsive and engaged! Feedback was timely and useful, and I sincerely felt that the instructors were trying to support my learning in ways that would work best for me.
- The feedback I received was generally quite good. Peter tends to explain the course in abstract terms, and I think giving students more concrete examples would be helpful (the example Case 1 and 2 assignments were great and maybe should have been discussed before we started working). Individually, both Peter and Kim were very helpful, and provided me with numerous resources.

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

- The value of this course was that everyone in the course came from a different field of study and it was nice to be able to talk to them and learn from them. All the other students were very engaged in the topics and provided great feedback to learn from.
- I learned to parallel park. No, seriously, I think interacting with people from other backgrounds and schools was the best part of the class.
- Exposure to a lot of different kinds of disciplines.
- The pedagogy. I would never have even known it existed if I hadn't signed up for this course.
- I can't think of something specific, mainly because I'm not sure what all is available at my home institution. There are many courses available to me outside my discipline that I have not looked to take.
- The pedagogy! Knowledge from the class itself - where does anyone find a class like this?!? In terms of learning how to learn or seeing how others think, this course is entirely different from anything else.
- Interdisciplinarity
- Interdisciplinary!!!!!!!
- The interdisciplinarity was unique!

- The interdisciplinary nature of the course as well as the focus on pedagogical experimentation was unique.

**10. Would you take another consortium seminar? Why or why not?**

- Yes, I like the interdisciplinary approach of it
- I would take another consortium seminar, but I don't know that I would take another PBL course.
- Yes. I've never done this kind of interdisciplinary learning. It's frightening and liberating.
- *Left blank*
- I would - to be around students from other universities as well as to engage with knowledge unfamiliar to me.
- It depends on whether or not it fits my interests and whether or not I think it would be useful to me - but if it fits those criteria, I would be glad to join.
- Yes, because my last experience in the consortium was very inspiring and the courses are innovative.
- Yes, quite useful.
- Yes, if I had the time! I worry some consortium seminars require a background that I don't have, but if instructors were open to a diversity of backgrounds, I would be interested.
- Absolutely, if only to again encounter a diverse group of feminist scholars. There are far too few chances from students from the whole Boston area to interact in this way.

**11. 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 great because of the interdisciplinary approach. Additionally, having students from different institutions and different fields of study was great. It was valuable to see how different fields of study can really come together and help to form more wider perspectives that are more inclusive rather than exclusive.
- This class was incredibly helpful at giving me new insights into areas outside my field of study, but the deadlines and pedagogy were frustrating for me personally.
- Thank you professors for being curious about our work and our shared world. The PBL approach and interdisciplinary nature of this course lends itself to openness and curiosity. I hope you keep this aspect fresh and alive.
- *Left blank*
- This course offers a wonderful entry into knowledge concerning how science and technology intersect with race and gender. It revealed increased and hidden barriers to knowledge and safety for minority populations within and because of

science. There is very little I would change about the course except looking at ways to continue the conversation beyond the semester.

- This is a course that is rather disconcerting at first due to its very different pedagogy but which offers students the possibility of a learning experience like none other. Students within this course have the freedom to explore areas related to their interests within the broader framework established by the course in ways that a more conventional course would not allow. The quality of the classroom discussion experience is superb and there is more knowledge to gain from classmates and teachers than in any other course. Whether for a student seeking to explore a different area, or for a student seeking to explore their interests within the area of Gender, Race, Science and Technology in different ways, this course is superb.
- The class was too unstructured and lacked a foundation and overall narrative. The separate cases were detached and not threaded together by any overarching theoretical framework or empirical mode of inquiry. While PBL is an exciting and innovative mode of learning, it was problematic to stay on the same page as other students given the broad range of issues and approaches. The multiple presentations felt tedious and like a waste of precious class time. It was disappointing that there were hardly any readings and I did not feel like I gained theoretical or empirical tools to expand my knowledge about gender, race, and science.
- This course is challenging but worth it. Expect to invest a fair amount of time. This is definitely a course in which you get out of it what you put in. Let yourself play. Explore stuff that is new to you. Push your comfort level (or rather, expect to have it pushed). The course is at times frustrating and part of that is inherent to the pedagogy and how it fits with our "normal" methods, and part of that might be related to the instructors figuring out how to incorporate online learning platforms like the blog and the crazy syllabus.
- Taking this course has been a rewarding experience, though there has certainly been some frustration along the way. What I've taken from the course is not what I expected to at the outset, but I've enjoyed the organic evolution of my own learning objectives. I feel like what I've ended up achieving in this class is a little different than what I thought I would achieve at the outset. I think entering the course, I thought I would come out with some sort of finished project proposal. Instead, I feel like I've come out with a rich set of resources, beginnings of ideas, and an interdisciplinary community (though I think this last bit was part of my personal goals), and I'm very happy with this outcome!
- The course was a unique and wholly positive experience allowing me to engage in work outside my discipline and work with students and scholars whose expertise was very different than my own. Because of this, the moments where our conversations intersected were both productive and illuminating, making me see lines of inquiry I had not thought of before. The PBL approach was both stressful and exciting. While I still think that my work would have benefited from a narrative structure--do the cases build towards case 4, are they individual, etc--I enjoyed doing them.