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This course identifies expected and redefined understandings and representations of Maleness and Manhood through physical, psychological, sociological, and philosophical approaches as seen in literature, scholarly writing, and film. Subject matter includes sex, sexuality, sexual orientation, perception, identity, power, politics of manhood, violence, and the use or expectation of male dominance.

**DESCRIBE & EVALUATE HOW COURSE MEETS INTERDISCIPLINARY CRITERIA?**

Our interdisciplinary definition: It describes the content knowledge of the topic as being dimensional: ideological, conceptual and perceptual. From this the professor encourages students to examine the topic of maleness from multiple disciplines. Critical questions for analysis are proposed as well. The multiple disciplines included seem to demonstrate connectedness to the topic—I would be sure to specify the distinct offerings from each discipline. For example, I recommend including a methodology section sot that students understand the various approaches from each discipline. These distinctions are important. Those from STEM fields that serve as guest lecturers should be certain to include the importance of the scientific method, while those in anthropology might emphasize qualitative and longitudinal analyses. Learning Outcomes: Again , the learning outcomes would be quite dependent of student’s knowledge of methodologies employed to understand the topic. While guest lecturers from STEM fields might present empirical and theoretical findings, it is critical that students are able to contrast this from contribution to highly related feels. The risk of over-saturation is always present in an ID course, and clearly identifying where the disciplines differ is a great way to get the most out of learning from an ID course.

How is this Section/Learning Community/Other different from other sections/Learning Communities/Other?: It seems that the literature and film reviewed would challenge students, at different times, to see the presented material from a different lenses. This is what makes the course unique from non-ID sections.

**DESCRIBE & EVALUATE THE INTERDISCIPLINARY STRUCTURE?**

<**Consider:** The ID theme is present at the core of the topic and I think that the guest lecture model works well here since the bulk of the material is literary. Having multiple instructors would take away from the value of a film/text analysis, while guest lectures are more complimentary, offering varied insights into how similar phenomena can be quite difference based on methods employed. This course is clearly in spirit of ID course development here at CityTech.

**DOES COURSE MEET REQUIREMENTS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION?** YES

**STRENGTHS:** The topic should be explored so to understand the larger, societal construction of masculinity. Being housed in the English department seems logical since the bulk of the material is literary, as opposed to empirical or theoretical. It has a unique blend of educational resources, and the questions the course tackles are very critical in nature, and work to promote a more just society (well, at least members of society and their ability to ask great questions).

**WEAKNESSES:** My chief concern is the role played by professors in the STEM field—I would be certain to emphasize how social science constructs knowledge. Feminist philosophies of sciences as well as feminist research methods have played a HUGE role in constructing, deconstructing, and advocating for male(ness) (or abandoning maleness) in our society. Be certain to address how STEM fields generate and apply knowledge differently than those in other fields. Psychologists study many topics related to maleness/masculinity, but not highlighting the hard work of feminist methodologists would be a disservice. If you can’t tell already, this is one of my areas of scholarship and I would be MORE than willing to guest lecture on research methods and feminist theories that have been constructed under a feminist philosophy of science. There is a great degree of dissent in whether or not science is set-up to tackle these types of questions (i.e., regarding maleness), and feminist psychologists have been at the forefront of these arguments. Incorporating this into the course might prove beneficial.

Notes: My former advisor and now colleague was the former editor for the journal Psychology of Men and Masculinity. I am also colleagues with the editor of Sex Roles, and am an active member (and committee co-chair) for APA’s Society for the Psychology of Women as well as the Association for Women in Psychology. I would love, love, love, to be part of this course ☺