

# Resources and Training Materials for Educators

www.deliberations.org

This section features a variety of resources for teaching deliberation developed in the course of our project at Duke University. Much of it comes from a presentation at the *Institute on College Student Values* in Tallahassee, Florida on February 5, 2000 and from a *Writing Fellows Workshop* at Duke University on August 16, 2000. These materials offer an overview of the art of deliberation and the links between teaching ethics and teaching skills of good writing and argument, as well as practical lessons for course design and classroom practice.

## Part One: Why Teach Deliberation?

### 1. COMMON FEATURES OF STUDENT WRITING THAT NEED WORK:

- **Avoiding Engagement with Moral Disagreement**

Moral Relativism (“*It’s just my/your opinion*”)

Avoiding Claims (“*Just the facts*”; “*A says X; B says Y*”)

- **Cross-Fire-Style Debate**

Win at all costs

Trivialize Opposing Arguments

Failure to Acknowledge Nuance or Complexity

- **Avoiding Discernment**

Failure to Examine Issues in Depth

Rushing to Unearned Conclusions

## 2. FEATURES OF DELIBERATIVE WRITING

- *Careful construction of nuanced and reasoned claims*
- *Recognition of a range of opposing arguments*
- *Recognition of opposing claims and willingness to treat opposing claims with fairness and respect*
- *Willingness to make appropriate qualifications or concessions*
- *Ability to contextualize and differentiate claims; a sense of history and/or disciplinary complexity in the treatment of disagreements*
- *Acknowledgment of intellectual debts; scrupulous citation practices*
- *Ability to establish the relevance or urgency of the issue being discussed*
- *Ability to write in clear, correct, and accessible prose*

# Part Two: Theoretical Sources for Teaching Deliberation

## 1. DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Based on Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson,  
Democracy and Disagreement (Harvard, 1996)

- The ideal of deliberation is argument in a public forum among equal citizens
- Participants in deliberation acknowledge that disagreement is a persistent feature of democracy and that not all disagreements can be resolved
- Participants seek to find fair terms of cooperation and to create an atmosphere of mutual respect
- Participants avoid demonizing others or belittling their moral positions; they practice “civic magnanimity”
- Participants try to discern common ground and seek opportunities for moral accommodation (although this does NOT assume that accommodation is always possible OR desirable)

## 2. DELIBERATION & DISAGREEMENT

Democratic deliberation can be distinguished from, and lies in-between, two other common ways of approaching and negotiating disagreement: bargaining and demonstration.

PROCESS	PRINCIPLE	MOTIVE	ETHOS
Bargaining	Prudence	Self-interest	<i>I'm O.K., you're O.K.</i> "Let's Agree to disagree" Avoidance of Inquiry
Deliberation	Reciprocity	Desire to justify to others	Willingness to persuade and to be persuaded; Commitment to shared inquiry; Provisional Claims
Demonstration	Impartiality	Objectivity/Altruism	<i>I'm right; you're Wrong</i> Commitment to unconditional claims

(this is a modified version of a chart on Gutmann and Thompson, p. 53)

### 3. “INTELLECTUAL FAIRNESS” IN ARGUMENT

*I cannot describe or represent the positions with which I disagree as well as those I endorse ... Indeed, this cognitive and rhetorical asymmetry seems to be an inevitable feature and perhaps inescapable condition of all theoretical debate...*

There is an alternative, however, to sheer polemics or blithely self-privileging asymmetry, though it is not, to my mind, either transcendently guaranteed objectivity or a self-conscious (and, I think, inevitably strained) effort at rigorously symmetrical representation. It is, rather, something more familiar and mundane (though perhaps sublime enough in its way), namely, respect for the general principles and practices of intellectual fairness that are acknowledged in principle, if not always in practice, in the academic, journalistic, and broader intellectual communities to which this book is addressed: at the minimum, accurate citation, representative quotation, nontendentious summary, and forbearance from name-calling and motive-mongering.

Barbara Herrnstein Smith, Belief & Resistance: Dynamics of Contemporary Intellectual Controversy (Harvard University Press, 1996)

#### 4. RECENT WORK IN RHETORIC ON EARLY SOPHISTS

##### Stasis theory:

- *Helps students differentiate among conjectural, definitional, qualitative, and procedural concerns, in order to clarify “what’s at issue” for various parties to the disagreement*
- *Helps students understand how various parties’ sense of the issue is contingent upon their various moral, ideological, and cultural beliefs and affinities*
- *Method first used in classical rhetoric for discerning the nature of disagreements regarding issues with uncertain outcomes*
- *Provides teachable method for enacting deliberative inquiry*

## 5. A PROVISIONAL SUMMARY OF DELIBERATION

- *provides a method (or perhaps an attitude or disposition) to opening inquiry*
  - *dialogic in nature*
  - *useful in the face of recalcitrant, complex, or incommensurable disagreements (which by nature call for more sophisticated, supple, subtle, and sustained forms of mutual inquiry and negotiation)*
- *aims for partial (and provisional) agreements rather than final resolution (able to expect disagreement and to keep it alive)*
- *seeks unanticipated agreements*
- *thrives in an environment of sustained discourse and work--takes time, slow evolution rather than quick results*
- *requires scrupulous attention to reasons and an effort to seek mutually-justifiable reasons*
- *obliges participants to render explicit the bases of judgment*

## 6. TWO CONCEPTS OF ETHICAL CLAIMS

We often ask our students to identify the "moral or ethical issues" at stake in an argument. But there are two distinct ways in which a deliberative approach looks at, and aims to help students look at, ethics and its relationship to rhetoric.

**First**, we want to help students discern, evaluate, and formulate **moral claims** -- that is, claims about what is right, good, just, virtuous, etc.

You may want to ask students to brainstorm some examples of moral claims (e.g.: "A flat tax is unjust." "Lying is wrong" "She has a lot of integrity") It might be particularly helpful to distinguish between moral and (arguably) nonmoral uses of the same term, like "good": a good pizza, a good person, a good nap, etc. Think also about the distinctions between moral and aesthetic forms of evaluation ("a good novel" "a good person").

**Second**, we want to help students recognize the **moral dimensions of all claim-making**. All kinds of claims, including claims that are not explicitly about moral matters, can be evaluated as fair or unfair, responsible or irresponsible, productive or not of public deliberation, etc.

Take the statement: "Research into cloning will lead to dangerous results. It is an attempt by scientists to play God and it is wrong!"

This is a **moral claim** in the sense noted above because it claims that something is morally wrong.

But we are also concerned about how other kinds of claims being made in this statement -- a prediction about the effects of allowing cloning research to continue, a description of the aims of this research or the motivations behind it, are examples of claimmaking which can be evaluated as fair, responsible, productive of public deliberation, etc. We ask students to evaluate how the claim is being supported, the use of the commonplace "playing God," the clear employment of pathos in the way the statement is framed, etc.

"Product X will make you sexy and wealthy."

This is not a moral claim in the first sense but certainly can be evaluated as fair/unfair, responsible/irresponsible, etc.

"I support bilingual education because America has for too long stood for assimilation, and assimilation is cultural genocide."

Here again, there are specifically moral claims being made about bilingual education and about American history. But there are also other kinds of claims being made -- about the purposes and effects of bilingual education, the meaning of assimilation, etc. -- which can be evaluated as fair or unfair, accurate or distorting, responsible or irresponsible, etc.

## 7. DELIBERATION & ETHICAL COMMUNITY

There are many kinds of communities, and people can (and typically do) belong to many communities simultaneously. For instance, gangs, cliques, clubs, churches, unions, professional associations, social movements, neighborhoods, towns, and nations are all different kinds of communities. Communities may be formal or informal, large or small, voluntary or involuntary. All communities are characterized by some shared beliefs and practices, but these may be more or less explicit and may play a greater or lesser role in members' lives.

Moral disagreements are present within all communities. They include disagreements over the nature of the community itself, over who its members are, and how they ought to arrange their lives together. Moral conflict is likely to be a prominent feature of public life in democratic communities, because democratic norms of free and equal citizenship (even if they are always imperfectly realized) create a space for people to publicly disagree.

The moral beliefs and practices of a community are difficult to identify with precision because communities change over time and are internally complex. But here are some questions that can help us begin to discern and describe the moral life of a particular community:

1. Who belongs in this community and who is excluded? Whose wishes, interests and hurts matter?
2. How are those who do not belong to this community excluded?
3. Who has voice within the collective life of the community? Do some members have authoritative power and voice, and if so, why and how?
4. How are private and public interests articulated and negotiated within the community?
5. Are certain moral values widely affirmed as core values of the entire community?
6. How well do the practices of the community reflect these explicitly affirmed values? Can other values be discerned in community practices which are in tension with stated values?
7. What place is there for dissenters within the community?
8. What procedures and practices are available for negotiating moral disagreements?
9. What possibilities exist for the reexamination and revision of a community's shared beliefs and practices?
10. What resources (economic wealth, social status, social and cultural ties, educational opportunity or expertise, access to information) are available to various members of the community?

## **8. SHAPING ETHICAL COMMUNITY THROUGH PUBLIC ARGUMENT**

A focus on deliberation enables us to evaluate efforts to shape ethical community through public argument. By this we mean efforts to influence a community's shared moral life, its characteristic moral beliefs and practices and core ideals. "Public argument" is a broad category encompassing oral, written, and other symbolic communication that tries to change ideas about how a community should live. It can include giving a speech, writing a memo, preaching a sermon, lobbying, writing editorials, making a film, going on strike, writing a novel, engaging in conscientious objection, staging a public protest. All of these practices engage in rhetoric. Rhetoric attempts to effect an outcome by understanding: who are the actors in a public argument (e.g., the speaker and his or her audience), as well as, what is the situation in which the actors find themselves.

Of course, people can also change the moral life of their community through force and fraud. They can silence their opposition by killing, imprisoning, or banishing those who disagree with them. They can get their way through deceit or bribery. Or they can pretend to engage in public argument and actually foreclose argument and deliberation. People also bring about changes in ethical community unintentionally. For instance, a scientific discovery may end up challenging the core moral beliefs of a community, a technological innovation may create new sources of wealth and disrupt traditional patterns of power and moral authority, or an epidemic may lead to a labor shortage and then, by encouraging immigration, alter the cultural composition and moral life of a community. By contrast, those engaged in public argument are intentionally participating in, and trying to shape, the moral practices and beliefs of their community.

## 9. MORAL DISAGREEMENT

A moral disagreement is a disagreement over how we ought to live – over what is good, or right, or admirable. Questions to help us identify and assess moral disagreements include:

1. Is this truly a moral disagreement or is it partly or wholly a disagreement due to a lack of understanding of another's position?
2. Does the moral disagreement rest, in whole or in part, on issues of definition?
3. Does the moral disagreement hinge on questions of procedure – on how we should go about seeking a resolution rather than on what that resolution ultimately should be?
4. What kind of practical dilemmas does the disagreement create? For instance, can the parties “agree to disagree” or is this not feasible? If it is not feasible, why not? For instance, is the disagreement intolerable to one or both parties – and if so, why is it intolerable? Or is it the kind of issue that cannot be left unresolved because an authoritative decision must be made by and for the community as a whole? (This is most commonly the case in issues involving public policy or law. We cannot, for instance, simultaneously institute and abolish the death penalty, so disagreements over the morality of capital punishment have to be practically resolved by a community one way or the other. This practical imperative of having to reach a moral judgment in the face of disagreement or ambiguity can also be seen at the level of individuals. We can live with considerable internal moral ambiguity, but there will be situations in which we can't have it both ways. We act, or fail to act, and either way we resolve our moral ambiguity one way or the other.)
5. How deep is the disagreement? That is, are there moral matters upon which the parties agree? Are they more or less fundamental than the issue at hand?

Questions to ask about moral deliberation include:

1. How does deliberation differ from bargaining?
2. How does deliberation differ from demonstration?
3. How would you describe moral deliberation in rhetorical terms? What about bargaining? Demonstration?
4. In what ways does each of these three approaches to public argument shape ethical community?
5. When is it appropriate to bargain? Deliberate? Demonstrate?
6. Does deliberation leave room for the expression of strong commitments and passions (for instance, anger)?
7. Are there conditions under which moral deliberation is inappropriate or impossible?
8. Select a particular moral disagreement (for instance, over abortion, capital punishment, affirmative action, the legalization of gay marriage, enforcement of the Honor Code or the alcohol policy). How would you approach this disagreement through bargaining, through deliberation, through demonstration? Which do you think is the morally best or most appropriate

approach, and why? What do these cases reveal about the power and limitations of different approaches to moral disagreement?

## 10. WHAT IS “GOOD ARGUMENT” IN THE ACADEMY?

We scholars are in the business of *making* and *having* arguments. We *make* arguments in our scholarship and *have* arguments with others in our fields. But what are the features of *good* argument -- in both of these senses of “argument”? By what standards do you evaluate whether your colleagues are making or having a good argument? To what extent are these standards discipline-specific and to what extent can they be applied to academic work in general?

In a cross-disciplinary faculty symposium held in April 2002, we asked faculty colleagues to consider these questions and to explore whether there are general norms of excellence, as well as general norms of fairness and civility, in scholarship. Faculty from a range of departments, including Chemistry, Classics, Biology, Philosophy, Political Science, and Women’s Studies reflected on the “state of argument” in their discipline at its best and worst and on how might it be improved.

Here were some of our framing questions:

1. What are the primary features of a “good argument” in your field? What makes an argument advanced by a scholar in your discipline strong, well-grounded, persuasive, rigorous, reasonable, fair?
2. Are there standards of good argument specific to, or especially important to, your discipline?
3. Is there consensus in your field about these standards or are they the subject of contestation? In what scholarly venues (publications, conferences, conversations, etc.) are such standards shaped, tested, or contested?
4. Think about argument in the second sense, of dialogue and debate with other scholars, especially those with whom we disagree. What makes such an argument productive and meaningful, in your view? How do you distinguish between an argument that is (say) probing, lively, challenging, spirited, or significant as opposed to (say) sterile or bland, on the one hand, or reductive, distorting, nasty, or demonizing, on the other? Are there norms of civility and fairness that distinguish “good arguments” from bad ones? If so, what are they? (the enclosed readings offer some models of such norms which you may want to consider)
5. Can you describe a personal experience with a scholarly disagreement (as a witness or participant) that you thought was a model of good argument? Conversely, have you had an especially bad experience that would be instructive to share?
6. How would you characterize the “state of argument” in your discipline? Is it getting better or worse? What is making it better or worse?
7. To what extent do you think scholars are making and having good arguments *across* disciplines? What factors make such arguments possible, or are barriers to them?

# Part Three: Practical Resources for Teaching Deliberation

## 1. IDEAS FOR SELECTING COURSE TOPICS

Here are some suggestions for selecting course topics that will help you integrate the theory and practice of deliberation into a writing course:

- Public Disagreement in which urgent or important practical issues are at stake
- Issue has some local or campus relevance; students will have a stake in how it is handled
- Academics have engaged the debate, so students can examine the contribution academic writers can make to understanding and evaluating public disagreements
- Issue can be placed in richer, deeper historical context
- Issue is not clearly resolvable – goes beyond disagreements over fact or over procedures
- Issue has evoked discernible, contrasting, and complex moral claims and arguments

## 2. CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLASSROOM DELIBERATION

One way to incorporate deliberation in the classroom is to create opportunities for students to focus reflectively on their own individual and collective practices of deliberation, in the classroom, on campus, and beyond. Here are three specific ways to strengthen opportunities for reflection in your class:

- I. An **Argument Log** asking students to prepare a "log" over a 3 day period of exchanges they witness or participate in and to evaluate them as instances of moral conflict and of public argument and deliberation. Students might, for example, read selections from Deborah Tannen's *The Argument Culture* or watch excerpts from television shows such as *Crossfire*, *The Bill Maher Show*, or *Jerry Springer* and evaluate the forms of argument they observe. This notebook assignment helps students reflect systematically on the communities to which they belong and the opportunities for deliberation within those communities.
- II. A **Groundrules Project** that would be "built" over the course of the semester. The idea is to get students to collectively devise "groundrules" for good public deliberation. You can introduce the idea when you first discuss the writer's workshop, by asking students to brainstorm rules for the workshop. You can then periodically revisit and revise these rules over the course of the semester, and invite students to invoke them as necessary during classroom discussions.

Ask students: what are our responsibilities to ourselves, to others, to our sources, etc., as participants in public deliberation? You may wish to offer students some sample "groundrules." Examples can be found in Pearce and Littlejohn (see p. 15 as well as their chapter on "Model Projects") Gutmann and Thompson provide material for groundrules in their chapter on Reciprocity – see especially pages 73-91, where they talk about "deliberative disagreement," "civic integrity," "civic magnanimity," and the idea of "moral accommodation."

A Writers Forum (in which students comment on one another's work) provides an especially good opportunity for developing such groundrules or "Rules of Engagement." Though it is important for students to develop these groundrules themselves, here is one example that might help get you started in facilitating the process (based on Guidelines for Group Deliberation developed by VISIONS, Cambridge, MA):

Participate fully; Listen carefully.

Take responsibility for your own learning and for the quality of the class discussion.

It's O.K. to disagree ... it's not O.K. to attack, ridicule, or blame

Be willing to "try on" ideas, arguments, and claims.

Use "I" statements. (Take ownership of your ideas and claims.)

Be willing to criticize and to be criticized.

Celebrate other people's insights.

III. **Personal Reflection Essays** are designed to prompt students to reflect on what, if any, effect the course has had on their own practices of argument.

One model is a **Five-Minute Reflection Paper** administered in the middle of the semester. This is a sheet handed out to them with a single question that they would complete in class and hand in. The question might be something like:

*What tools, if any, has this course given you so far that you think will be helpful to you in your interactions with others? (For instance, your discussions or disagreements with friends, family, classmates, roommates, colleagues at work...)*

Another might be a reflection prompt that students respond to at the beginning of the course, and then return to at the end, where they are invited to examine their own discursive practices, and how they have changed over the course of the semester.

### 3. CAMPUS DEBATES AS A TEACHING RESOURCE

Campus controversies and debates can provide rich material for teaching deliberation. Here is an example that draws on two contrasting controversies at Duke University:

#### A TALE OF TWO DISAGREEMENTS: EXAMINING CAMPUS ISSUES THROUGH A DELIBERATIVE LENS

##### I.

Early in the spring semester of 1999, Duke University's South Asian Students Association (Diya) lobbied the university to create a new Hindi major (an undergraduate major focused on Hindu thought, culture, and language). The *Chronicle*, Duke's student newspaper, offered its support to the initiative. Soon after the editorial ran, a student wrote a letter to the editor opposing the idea. Citing course enrollments, he argued that more Duke students would be interested in the creation of a major in statistics. He then added, "Consider the relative usefulness of each subject: the former is a language spoken in a Third World country overwrought by disease and poverty, while the latter is a science of proven, inestimable value in all branches of industry and science."

The letter-writer's characterization of India evoked strong protest from students and faculty. A week later, another student weighed in on the issue. Quoting William Henry III, he wrote, "Some cultures ... are more worth of study ... It is scarcely the same thing to put a man on the moon as to put a bone in your nose." He argued that Western values were "superior to the values of a primitive, impoverished country like India," and that "to the extent that ... the arts and sciences, industry and education ... exist in India they exist only as the legacy of British colonialism."

That evening, three students came to the second letter writer's room and threatened him. One said, "why didn't you say this to my face .. why don't you come out here." Both students received hundreds of emails from students upset by their statements, and several letters to the editor accused the two of being racist. An anonymous email sent to the first student warned, "if we ever see you out of your room, .. we will beat you within one inch of your life ... We will find you, and when we do, you could only wish that you had never learned to write.."

Campus police launched an investigation into the anonymous email. The two students issued a national press release detailing the threats against them and demanding more forceful action from the university. By semester's end, the controversy had prompted columns in major newspapers and angry letters from around the world.

##### II.

In March 1998, Duke officially adopted a Code of Conduct outlining minimum working conditions for manufacturers of Duke-licensed products. The Code was the outcome of six months of close collaboration between university administrators and a group called Students against Sweatshops (SAS). Since it was the first such code in the country to include detailed provisions for monitoring manufacturers, it garnered extensive national publicity and effusive praise from Labor Secretary Alexis Herman.

In the following months, SAS joined with other student groups across the country in urging the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC), which serves as the licensing agent for 170 universities, to adopt the same

code. In December 1998, the CLC issued a draft code that closely resembled Duke's but did not require public disclosure of factory locations to licensees. CLC requested schools to sign the code within sixty days.

SAS called on Duke President Nan Keohane to refuse to sign the code because of its weaker monitoring provisions. They began an extensive letter-writing and editorial campaign and earned endorsements from the Duke *Chronicle* and the Duke Student Government. When it became clear that President Keohane was leaning toward signing the code, SAS organized a campus protest. On a bitterly cold December day, 75 protesters wearing *Reject Sellout Code* buttons and chanting "Principles, Not Politics!" confronted the president. SAS founder Tico Almeida argued that without public disclosure of factory locations, the code lacked credibility. "If you sign this code," he said, "sweatshops will continue to exist." He then held a megaphone for the President to respond. Keohane acknowledged the code's weaknesses, but argued that the code was a good "first step" and that a stronger code was not politically feasible. "This is a political judgment call," she said, "For Duke to back out now would make the best the enemy of the good."

Shortly before the signing deadline, the president confirmed that she had decided to sign the code. Disappointed SAS activists marched in to occupy the administration building and confronted the president, who was ill and about to leave on a business trip. "I can't talk," she said, "but I can listen." Almeida criticized what he called Keohane's "lack of leadership" and added, "We appreciate your meeting with us. And we understand that there are times to compromise. But this code is too flawed." Keohane responded, "I'm not lacking in courage, and I'm not lacking in agreement with your principles. But a flawed code is better than no code."

Administration officials decided to let the students stay in the building overnight, allowing them to dash home for sleeping bags and food before locking the doors. "I admire your commitment, and I trust you to keep this place as it should be," the Executive Vice President told them, "and no alcohol." The next morning, a Saturday, senior administrators returned and, after hours of bargaining, the two sides worked out a compromise in which Duke would sign the code but publicly commit to pushing the CLC to strengthen it. If the university cannot convince the CLC to strengthen its code within 12 months, it will withdraw from the group and develop a new licensing arrangement with full-disclosure standards.

The 31 hour sit-in ended with smiles and cheers. Sara Jewett, one of the organizers, noted, "I feel we've just written a new page in history."

Postscript: A year later, the University dropped a number of manufacturers after they failed to comply with requests for full disclosure of manufacturing locations.

#### Questions:

- Compare the way these two disagreements were conducted. How would you describe the differences?
- What happened to these disagreements over time?
- Did the issues get "resolved"? If so, how? If not, why not? (Is it possible to resolve this disagreement, and if so, how?)
- What intellectual and/or ethical virtues and vices did participants in these disagreements exhibit? Did they do things they should not have done? Did they fail to do things they should have done?
- Is it appropriate to express anger in public disagreements? If so, are there limits to appropriate expressions of anger? Should these limits be enforced by the University? Why or why not?
- What lessons would you draw for your own participation in public disagreement and deliberation?

#### 4. RESOURCES FOR TEACHING WRITING AND MORAL DELIBERATION

##### A. Writing Texts

1. Booth, Wayne C. et al. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1995
2. Crowley, Sharon and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetoric for Contemporary Students*. New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon, 1999
3. Fahnestock, Jeanne. "Accommodating Science: The Rhetorical Life of a Scientific Fact." *Written Communication*, 3, 275-296 Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications, 1986
4. Lunsford, Andrea A. and John J. Ruskiewicz. *Everything's An Argument*. Boston MA: Bedford, St. Martin's Press, 1999
5. Maggio, Rosalie. "Writing Guidelines." *Talking About People: A Guide to Fair and Accurate Language*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press, 1997

##### B. Texts on Ethics and Public Disagreement

1. Gutmann, Amy and Dennis Thompson, *Democracy and Disagreement*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 1996
2. Hinman, Lawrence M. *Ethics: A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1994
3. Pearce, W. Barnett and Stephen Littlejohn, *Moral Conflict*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 1997
4. Smith, Lillian. "The Lessons." *Killers of the Dream*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1994
5. Tannen, Deborah, *The Argument Culture: Moving from Debate to Dialogue*. New York, NY: Random House, Inc., 1998
6. *Editorials on File*
7. *Issues and Controversies on File*

##### C. Texts on Race and Racism

1. Begley, Sharon. "Three Is Not Enough: Surprising New lessons from the Controversial Science of Race." *Newsweek*, vol. 125, no. 7, pp. 67ff, 1995.
2. Dalton, Harlon. *Racial Healing: Confronting the Fear Between Blacks and Whites*. New York: Anchor Books, 1996
3. Davidson, Osha Gray. *The Best of Enemies*. New York, NY: Scribner, 1996
4. Fordham, Signithia and John U. Ogbu, "Black Students' School Success: Coping with the 'Burden of Acting White.'" *Urban Review*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 176-205
5. Gregory, Sophronia Scott, "The Hidden Hurdle." *Time*, vol. 139:11 pp. 44-46, March 16, 1992
6. Jacquard, Albert. "An Unscientific Notion." *UNESCO Courier*, March, 1996, pp. 22-25
7. Jordon, Winthrop. "First Impressions." *White Over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812*, pp. 3-43
8. Lee, Mun Wah, *The Color of Fear* (video), Oakland, Ca.: Stir Fry Seminars and Consulting, Inc. 1994
9. McBride, James. *The Color of Water*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books, 1996
10. Rothenberg, Paula S., ed. *Race, Class and Gender in the United States*. New York, NY: St. Martin Press, 1997

- Chapter 1 Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. “Racial Formations
  - Chapter 4. Sethi, Rita Chaudry. “Smells Like Racism”
  - Chapter 5. McIntosh, Peggy. “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack”
11. Shoofs, Mark, “The Stigma Syndrome” *The Village Voice Worldwide*, March 25, 1998, <http://www.villagevoice.com/ink/columns/13schoofs.shtml>
  12. Steele, Claude M., “Thin Ice: Stereotype Threat and Black College Students.” *Atlantic Monthly*, August 19, 1999
  13. Steinhorn, Leonard and Barbara Diggs-Brown. *By The Color of our Skin*. New York, NY: Dutton Books, 1999
  14. Thernstrom, Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom. *America in Black and White*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster 1997

#### **D. Book Length Arguments on Public Controversies**

##### 1. Public Health

Sullum, Jacob. *For Your Own Good*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster 1998

##### 2. Race

Steinhorn, Leonard and Barbara Diggs-Brown. *By The Color of our Skin*. New York, NY: Dutton Books, 1999

##### 3. Technology and Privacy

Brin, David. *The Transparent Society*. Reading, MA.: Addison Wesley, 1998

##### 4. Crime and Punishment

Gilligan, James. *Violence*. New York, NY Random House, Inc., 1996

##### 5. Environmentalism

Ehrlich, Paul R. and Anne H. Ehrlich. *Betrayal of Science and Reason*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1996

##### 6. Celebrity Culture

Gabler, Neal. *Life The Movie*. New York, NY Albert A. Knopf, 1998

## 5. MORAL DELIBERATION PROJECT FEATURES AND LESSONS LEARNED

### Year One:

- 10 Staff from 6 departments specifically chosen and trained for the program
- Course syllabus designed by the entire staff, prior to and during the semester
- Moral Issue: Race
- Deliberate attention to various moral theories
- Book length argument on a local issue
- 4 writing sequences, including one research paper
- extended workshopping of papers in progress in class

### Learnings from Year One:

- A small group should design the syllabus with a complete draft done well before the semester begins
- Need to emphasize that the course is about moral deliberation in general, not a specific issue (e.g., race)
- Students do not need a mini-course in various ethical theories (e.g., Kant)
- New writing instructors had difficulty seeing that writing and moral deliberation are not two different concerns
- Students reacted favorably to writing as a way of navigating difficult moral issues and to centering the course around such issues. They saw it as important.

### Year Two:

- 10 staff specifically chosen for the program
- Syllabus rewritten over the summer by three staff members
- 2 Moral Issues: Genetics and Education Reform
- More explicit attention to public deliberation and moral conflict
- Explicit choice of readings from popular and academic sources
- One semester long assignment sequence
- Research projects begun earlier
- Cross-section groups on common topics
- Public posting and commenting on research projects (local server)
- One-day *Art of Deliberation* conference featuring student panels

### Learnings from Year Two:

- Student groups across sections produced limited results
- Need for a reliable and easy posting and responding system
- A Project Coordinator is essential
- Having two research areas ( e.g., Genetics and Education Reform) made classes seem less cohesive
- Having two research areas increased student choice of research topics and their investment in doing the research
- Course readings from a wide background enabled us to examine various kinds of publics
- An earlier start on research, teaching the writing deliberation skills along the way produced better revisions and final papers

- Making papers public was extremely helpful in learning about deliberation
- Students found the posting of papers on the WWW more daunting than presenting them at a conference

**Year Three:**

- Course design expanded to 86 sections of the course
- Course syllabi designed by several veteran staff members during the spring and used for training new and returning instructors
- Six Moral Issues (taught in different strands): Public Health, Race, Technology and Privacy, Crime, Environmentalism, Celebrity Culture
- Students sign up over the summer for preferred strands of the course
- Book length argument anchored the course
- Semester long assignment sequence
- Public posting and commenting on mid-term position papers
- Publication of *Deliberations* (spring 2000)

**Learnings from Year Three:**

- Support materials (writing text and handouts) must be directly geared towards rhetorical and deliberative skills
- Concerns for deliberation must be explicit in the syllabus, especially for new instructors
- The Classroom should be identified and viewed as a public space by students
- Posting of assignments on a large scale (1,200 students) overwhelmed the University
- Directions from instructors about the postings and responses must be consistent
- Personal investment in the issue by students increases interest.
- Issues which have a local (campus) connection work well
- Student choice of strands increases involvement and produces stronger research