

The Third R in Literacy

Randall M. Richardson

William G. McCallum

The conventional meaning of the word literate (able to read and write) leaves the third of the three Rs on its own, a separation that is reflected in the traditional curriculum: reading and writing are taught together, and mathematics is taught as a separate subject. The first question to ask in considering quantitative literacy and the curriculum is: Why can't we leave it that way? What is new in the world that prompts us to incorporate mathematics into the definition of literacy, or believe that mathematics must now be spread across the curriculum, rather than contained in dedicated courses? This question is answered persuasively in the opening section of *The Case for Quantitative Literacy* (Steen, 2001): what is new in the world is the pervasiveness of quantitative information and the necessity of acting on it. Thus the list of things a literate person must be able to read and write has greatly expanded to include the many forms in which quantitative information is represented in everyday life: graphs, charts, tables, maps, diagrams, and algorithms.

Furthermore, acting on quantitative information requires more than the basic level of comprehension that comes from listening to a story or looking at a picture; it requires the ability to extract the relevant pieces from a possibly confusing abundance of data and perform appropriate mathematical operations and reasoning on those pieces. The explosion in both amount and variety of quantitative information, and the necessity of using it in daily decisions, make the need for quantitative literacy both new and urgent.

In considering how the school and college curriculum can lead students to achieve quantitative literacy, it is crucial to keep in mind two aspects of quantitative literacy which are captured in a definition of conventional literacy put forth by UNESCO (Fox & Powell, 1991):

A literate is a person who, with understanding, can both read and write a short simple statement on his everyday life.

This definition says that simply being able to read and write is not enough for literacy: understanding and engagement with context ("everyday life") are also required. The same applies to quantitative literacy, and we might well adopt the modified definition:

A quantitatively literate person is a person who, with understanding, can both read and represent quantitative information arising in his or her everyday life.

Although it might seem unnecessary to mention the criteria of understanding and context explicitly, the fact is that in the traditional curriculum neither goes without saying. Therefore, we start by considering how each might be applied in judging new curricula.

The role of understanding

The ability to perform some of the basic operations of mathematics is necessary for quantitative literacy, but even the ability to perform many of them is not sufficient. Anyone who has taught mathematics, or who has taught a subject requiring the mathematics students have learned in previous courses, is aware of this fact; they encounter students who are technically capable but unable to make reasonable decisions about which techniques to apply and how to apply them. Mathematicians and their colleagues in other departments share frustration at the fragility of what students learn in their mathematics classes. We hesitate to call literate a person who reads haltingly, picking out words one at a time with no appearance of understanding what is being read; yet too many of the students leaving mathematics courses use mathematics haltingly if at all—too many appear to be lacking in conceptual understanding.

We make a distinction here between conceptual understanding and formal mathematical understanding. The latter refers to an ability to formulate precise mathematical arguments that are universal in the sense that they work for all numbers or all polynomials. Conceptual understanding is understanding of a less formal nature, more like what mathematicians sometimes call intuitive understanding. It refers to an ability to recognize underlying concepts in a variety of different representations and applications. For example, a student who understands the concept of rate knows that the velocity of a moving object, the slope of its position graph, and the coefficient of t in a formula giving its position as a function of time t , are all manifestations of the same underlying concept, and knows how to translate between them.

Even though recent efforts to reform mathematics education have paid attention to conceptual understanding, it is often neglected in mathematics classes. Sometimes this is the result of drifting curricula, which, in the absence of firm guidance, gravitate inevitably towards convenient arrangements between teacher and student, and teacher and parent in the K-12 environment, that concentrate mostly on the correct performance of procedures. At other times it is a consequence of conscious decisions by curriculum designers who believe in division of labor between mathematics classes, which provide technical skills, and classes in mathematically intensive disciplines, which provide context and understanding. It is worth listening to the voices of teachers in those disciplines: The Mathematical Association of America recently conducted a series of

workshops with faculty from such disciplines as part of a project to develop recommendations for the mathematics curriculum for the first two years of post-secondary education. Again and again the authors of these workshop reports—engineers, physicists, biologists, chemists, computer scientists, statisticians, and mathematicians—explicitly mentioned *understanding* as a key ingredient of the mathematics curriculum, and they made it clear that they thought that it was a proper role of mathematics classes to teach it :

Physics

Students need conceptual understanding first, and some comfort in using basic skills; then a deeper approach and more sophisticated skills become meaningful.

Life Sciences

*Throughout these recommendations, the definition of **mastery** of a mathematical concept recognizes the importance of both conceptual understanding at the level of definition and understanding in terms of use/implementation/computation.*

Chemical Engineering

... the “solution” to a math problem is often in the understanding of the behavior of the process described by the mathematics, rather than the specific closed form (or numerical) result.

Civil Engineering

Introductory math content should focus on developing a sound understanding of key fundamental concepts and their relevance to applied problems.

Business

Mathematics Departments can help prepare business students by stressing conceptual understanding of quantitative reasoning and enhancing critical thinking skills.

Statistics

Focus on conceptual understanding of key ideas of calculus and linear algebra, including function, derivative, integral, approximation, and transformation.

See

http://academic.bowdoin.edu/faculty/B/barker/dissemination/Curriculum_Foundations/

for the reports. What is striking about these reports is that so many Science, Math, Engineering, and Technology (SMET) disciplines feel the need to explicitly request conceptual understanding from mathematics courses preparing their students. All the more must we worry about the state of conceptual understanding in students who are not preparing for SMET disciplines, but simply need quantitative literacy as a basic life skill.

Thus, our first criterion:

A curriculum for quantitative literacy must go beyond the basic ability to “read and write” mathematics and develop conceptual understanding.

The role of context

The UNESCO definition specifies that a literate can read and write a “statement on his everyday life”. The term “everyday life” is open to interpretation: everyday life in the examples above from SMET disciplines might include chemical reactions in a laboratory. The vast majority of students, however, are not headed for SMET careers. For most people, everyday life might include telephone rate plans, nutrition information on packages, or the relative risks of a serious car accident versus being struck by lightning, for example. A quantitatively literate person must be able to think mathematically in context. This requires a sort of dual vision, marrying the mathematical meaning of symbols and operations to their contextual meaning, and thinking simultaneously about both. It is considerably more difficult than the ability to perform the underlying mathematical operations, stripped of their contextual meaning. Nor is it sufficient simply to clothe the mathematics in a superficial layer of contextual meaning. The mathematics must be engaged with the context and providing power, not an engine idling in neutral. Too many attempts at teaching mathematics in context amount to little more than teaching students to sit in a car with the engine on, but not in gear. The “everyday life” test provides a measure of engagement; everyday life that moves forward must have an engine that is in gear.

We share two local examples outside of the training for traditional SMET careers. The first is a “math for all citizens” example. One of us (RMR) teaches a freshman-level general education science course for non-science majors. Reading graphs as pictures or graphs as active conveyors of quantitative information is a desired learning outcome for the course. For the past five years we have used, in classes with as many as 325 students, the so-called Keeling CO₂ data set. This data set consists of a nearly continuous 50 year record of monthly atmospheric CO₂ concentration levels at Mauna Loa, Hawaii (Keller, 2000; Keeling and Whorf, 2001; <http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/co2/sio-mlo.htm>). Students, working in groups during a single lecture period, randomly select 15 actual data points from about a six year (100 point) portion of the data set. They plot this subset on an overhead and estimate the slope of the data. Using their slopes, they estimate the number of years it will take for CO₂ concentration to double, an important component of

all climate models of global warming. Because the small sample size of the data is insufficient to accurately reflect both an annual cycle and a long term increase, student estimates of slope and doubling times vary by at least a factor of two. When all overheads are superimposed using an overhead projector, the annual cycle is clearly visible. This exercise, while simple and completed in a single class period, includes basic mathematical operations (slopes, rates, doubling times), issues of data quality and completeness, and a contextual setting arguably one of the most important for the everyday life of the 21st century. The Mauna Loa CO₂ data set is very rich for quantitative literacy instruction. For example, Len Vacher, a geologist at the University of South Florida, uses the same data set to show that errors in estimating slopes from graphs are very common unless the axes of such graphs are understood.

Another example is a business mathematics course recently developed at the University of Arizona by a collaboration between the Department of Mathematics (Richard Thompson) and the College of Business and Public Administration (Chris Lamoureux). In this course students use mathematical and technological tools to make business decisions based on realistic (and in some cases real) data sets. In one project, for example, students must decide whether to foreclose on a business loan or work out a new payment schedule. They have available some information about the value of the business, the amount of the loan, and the likely future value if the business is allowed to continue but still fails. They also have some demographic information about the person running the business. Using historical records about success and failure of previous workout arrangements, they make successively more sophisticated calculations of expected value to arrive at their decision. Students are expected to understand both the mathematics and the business context, and make professional oral presentations of their conclusions in which they are expected to express themselves mathematically, with clarity, completeness, and accuracy. A noteworthy feature of this course is the level of involvement of the business college; the impetus to create the course came from the business college, as did the basic ideas for projects, and the visible involvement of the college makes their students take seriously the requirement to understand the mathematics.

Thus, our second criterion:

A curriculum for quantitative literacy must be engaged with a context, be it everyday life, humanities, business, science, engineering, or technology.

Mathematics and Democracy lists elements that might compose quantitative literacy: confidence with mathematics, cultural appreciation, interpreting data, logical thinking, making decisions, mathematics in context, number sense, practical skills, prerequisite knowledge, symbol sense. Many of these elements arise naturally in applying the criteria we have given here, and are, in varying proportions, necessary ingredients of a curriculum for quantitative literacy. The precise proportions depend on the educational

level and background of the students. Symbol sense, for example, is a rich vein in the “everyday life” of students in the physical and social sciences and engineering, but perhaps not as important to students in art or literature. On the other hand, since all citizens are bombarded daily with statistical data and inferences from it, reasoning logically and confidently with data is a crucial component of any curriculum for quantitative literacy.

The odd man out in the list is “cultural appreciation.” In recent years there has been a proliferation of general education courses, taught by mathematics departments, that study such topics as voting schemes, symmetry, and tilings. Although these courses often contain the sort of serious engagement with quantitative information necessary for quantitative literacy, they also sometimes focus more on fostering a general understanding of the uses of mathematics, a sort of math appreciation. While there is certainly a place in the curriculum for math appreciation, we believe there is a distinction to be made between it and quantitative literacy. This is similar to the distinction one might make between the ability to appreciate a great work of art and the ability to make some sketches of one’s own, however rudimentary. The element of engagement is crucial for quantitative literacy.

Who is responsible for teaching quantitative literacy?

This question has both a vertical dimension (in what grades should quantitative literacy be taught?) and a horizontal dimension (in what departments?). Along the first dimension we are faced with the question of whether quantitative literacy is properly a college subject at all. It can be argued that a good K-12 education should be sufficient to lay the foundations of quantitative literacy, and that the proper role of colleges and universities, typically in general education courses, is not to teach it, but to use it.

Whatever the ideal, the reality is that there are well-documented problems with mathematical ability of students in grades K-12; see, for example, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). As a local example of a national issue, each year over 35% of freshman students entering the University of Arizona, which has a four-year Mathematics requirement in high school, place below College Algebra.

Several groups, including mathematics faculty, are working to improve the situation. Mathematics faculty have focused on improving the teaching of mathematics in high schools and reform of courses in mathematics departments in the first two years of college. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) issued standards for K-12 in 1989 (NCTM, 1989) and revised them in 2000 (NCTM, 2000), and many states and localities have endeavored to improve mathematics education either by implementing standards, frameworks, or high stakes tests. At the college level, the National Science Foundation has funded projects to reconsider curricula in pre-calculus, calculus, differential equations, and linear algebra. More recently, the Mathematical Association

of American has initiated an ambitious Curriculum Foundations Project which aims to formulate recommendations for the first two years of college mathematics education; the workshops soliciting the opinions of other disciplines cited earlier in this paper are part of that project.

Are there problems with quantitative literacy that go beyond the scope of these endeavors by mathematics faculty? Would improvements in mathematics education, although apparently difficult to achieve, be sufficient to remedy current deficiencies in the quantitative literacy of our students? Certainly such improvements are necessary: the way mathematics is taught has a lot to do with quantitative literacy. Attempts to change the curriculum, to make room in it earlier for statistics and probability (as recommended by the NCTM), to teach mathematics in context, to pay attention to conceptual understanding in mathematics courses, and to improve the mathematical education of K-12 teachers go some of the way towards the changes that need to be made to improve quantitative literacy.

Quantitative literacy, however, cannot be taught by mathematics teachers alone, not because of deficiencies in the teaching but because quantitative material must be pervasive in all areas of a student's education. Quantitative literacy is not simply a matter of knowing how to do the math, but also requires the ability to wed the math to the context. This ability is learned from seeing and using mathematics regularly in contexts outside the mathematics classroom: in daily life, in chemistry class, in the business world. Thus, quantitative literacy cannot be regarded as the sole responsibility of high school mathematics teachers, nor of college teachers in mathematics departments. It has long been recognized, for example, that writing literacy, left completely in English Composition courses, cannot succeed. Students are quick to recognize a requirement in either area satisfied by a course or two in a single department as a local 'hoop' to be jumped through, and not a global requirement central to their education. Students often behave as if they believe that mathematical ideas are applicable only in mathematics courses, and that they can safely forget what they learned in those courses once they enter the world of their chosen major.

Thus it is the common responsibility both of mathematicians and those in other disciplines to provide students with basic skills and conceptual understanding, and to model the systematic use of mathematics as a way of looking at the world. The pervasiveness of quantitative information, in fact present in the real world outside the school or university, must also be reflected throughout academe. A beautiful example of this pervasiveness is the recent foray into art history by optical scientist Charles Falco and contemporary artist David Hockney. These two have recently challenged traditional art historian interpretations of 15th century art. Using simple optics, they have argued persuasively that a number of important painters of the 15th century, from van Eyck to Bellini, used lenses or mirrors in some of their paintings nearly 200 years earlier than believed possible. They argue that the use of such optical instruments accounts for the sudden surge in the reality of portraits in the 15th century (Hockney and Falco, 2000).

One could easily envision a wonderful application of quantitative literacy in fine arts education if their arguments stand the test of further scrutiny.

A persuasive argument can be made, especially for the “everyday life” case often taught in general education, that the skills component of quantitative literacy is essentially pre-college in nature. What, beyond algebra, geometry, probability and statistics, graphs, and mathematical logic found in pre-college education is foundational to quantitative literacy for everyday life? Looking at the curriculum as a list of topics, however, misses an important point: quantitative literacy is not something that one either knows or does not know. It is hard to argue that pre-college writing education fails to cover the basics of grammar, composition, and voice, for example. Yet it is widely accepted that writing is a skill that improves with practice in a wide variety of settings at the college level. We argue here that quantitative literacy at the college level also requires an across-the-curriculum approach, providing a wide variety of opportunities for practice. The challenges to incorporating quantitative literacy across the curriculum are many, including math anxiety on the part of both faculty and students, lack of administrative understanding and support, and competing pressures for various other literacy requirements, for example. In the next section we discuss a variety of approaches at the college level that have demonstrated success at moving quantitative literacy across the curriculum. A more comprehensive discussion would address how these approaches should be coordinated with efforts to improve K-12 education, an issue we do not feel qualified to address. It is worth pointing out, however, that improving quantitative literacy at the college level would have an important effect on K-12 education for the simple reason that it would influence the mathematical education of K-12 teachers.

Mathematics across the curriculum

The term “mathematics across the curriculum” refers to attempts to incorporate mathematical thinking in courses throughout the university. The following excerpt from the vision statement of the Math Across the Curriculum committee at the University of Arizona expresses the goals:

The purpose of Math Across the Curriculum at the University of Arizona is to help students recognize the utility of mathematics across disciplines and majors and to improve their skills in mathematics. Just as all students should be able to write an essay in any class they take, all students should be able to look at a problem or situation in any class and be able to formulate appropriate mathematical approaches to finding solutions. They should also have the mathematical skills to know how to seek solutions. Particular attention must be paid to such fundamental processes as graphic representation of quantitative data; estimation; basic numeracy (i.e., ability to perform "basic" mathematical operations); and logic, among other mathematical concepts and topics.

Various approaches to implementing math across the curriculum have been tried. We consider six approaches here: collaboration between math and other faculty, gateway testing, intensive instructional support, workshops for non-math faculty, quantitative reasoning requirements, and individual initiative by non-math faculty. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list of all possible approaches or all approaches that have been tried, but rather an illustration of the range of possibilities that exist.

“Friendly Conspiracies” between mathematicians and others

Collaboration between mathematics faculty and faculty from other departments is one powerful approach. This could involve a sort of pact between mathematicians and others: mathematicians will add more context to their courses, others will add more mathematical concepts to theirs. Deborah Hughes Hallett writes of the need for “friendly conspiracies” between mathematicians and other departments to make sure this happens (Hughes Hallett, 2001). The Business Mathematics course developed at the University of Arizona is an example of such a conspiracy: students know that the problems they are studying in the mathematics course will come up again in their business courses, because they know that the course was developed with significant input from the business college. Team-teaching arrangements between mathematics and other departments are another example of this collaborative approach.

One cautionary note to such collaborations is illustrated by a survey at the University of Arizona, conducted by the Math Across the Curriculum group, of 35 faculty in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. These 35 faculty were all involved in teaching one of the 25 largest General Education courses on campus. The survey, completed by almost 33% of the group, included some telling results. More than half responded positively to the question, “Does any course you teach include any mathematical or quantitative elements?” The most common elements included statistics, slopes and rates, analysis of experimental outcomes, graphs, formal reasoning, and decision theory. The group was also asked, “Would you be willing to integrate some mathematical elements into your courses?” Again, more than half responded positively, although the response was cautious. For example, even among the positive responses were, “I don’t see this as central to the usefulness of the course. Emphasis on the math might actually distract students from the more important (in this course!) learning,” and, “I would be reluctant to assign stats-heavy reading, as most students do not seem to pay close attention to such materials.” The faculty responding negatively were split about evenly between “The course doesn’t seem compatible with the addition of mathematical content” and “My background in mathematics is insufficient.” This highlights some of the challenges inherent in establishing these “friendly conspiracies”.

Gateway testing in courses outside mathematics

University of Nevada, Reno. The core of this approach is a set of mathematics competency tests in courses across the university, based on a model described in Bauman

& Martin (1995). The mathematics covered by the tests is required for success in the course, and is no more than the students can reasonably be expected to have already learned. The main purpose of the tests is to inform instructors and students. Students may retake a test until they pass (a passing grade is 80%). The initial test is held in class during the first week of classes, in order to make clear that the test is an integral part of the course; after that, a separate office, the Math Center, handles grading and retesting, in order to make it feasible for instructors to use the system. The Math Center also provides tutors who go over a failed exam with the student and help them correct mistakes. Courses that have been involved with this program at one time include Agricultural Economics, Anthropology, Art, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, English, Environmental Studies, Geography, Geology, Mathematics Core Courses, Nutrition, Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Psychology, Recreation, Physical Education and Dance (RPED), Sociology, and Western Traditions.

Mathematics instructional support

Dartmouth College. The Center for Mathematics Education functions as a sort of laboratory support office for the Mathematics Department, analogous to such services available in other science departments. It houses equipment for use in mathematics classrooms, books, videos, and prepared laboratory activities. Some of these materials come from Mathematics across the Curriculum courses at Dartmouth. It also provides consulting, classroom visitation, and videotaping services, and runs a departmental Teaching Seminar during the summer. The Center works in collaboration with similar offices in other departments and supports courses in other departments that “feature mathematics as a key component.” It reviews materials that come out of the university’s Mathematics Across the Curriculum Courses and makes those which are suitable for K-12 available to teachers. It also “facilitates links between K-12 teachers and college professors for conversation and collaboration across levels and disciplines.”

Workshops for faculty outside mathematics

Many disciplines, admittedly most commonly among the SMET disciplines, have come to recognize the importance of quantitative literacy as we have defined it. Some have organized workshops, often nationally, to explore quantitative literacy. One group that has facilitated such workshops is Project Kaleidoscope (PKAL), an informal national alliance working to build strong learning environments for undergraduate students in mathematics, engineering and the various fields of science. One PKAL workshop, entitled, “Building the Quantitative Skills of Non-Majors and Majors in Earth and Planetary Science Courses” was held in January 1999 at the College of William and Mary. The workshop brought together over 30 earth and planetary science faculty from research intensive, four-year, and two-year schools to work on such questions as:

- 1) Which quantitative skills are important in our curriculum, and at what levels?

- 2) How do we include appropriate quantitative expectations in our courses for non-majors without sending some students running for less quantitative offerings elsewhere on campus?
- 3) How can a department work to build the quantitative skills of its majors?
- 4) Many students, non-majors and majors, bring tremendous fear, or math anxiety, to our courses. What support is necessary to help students understand, use, and enjoy mathematics in our courses?

Such workshops have had a significant impact on how faculty in such non-math disciplines view quantitative literacy, and have provided concrete strategies and “best practices” to help them transform their courses. One example is the development of “Q-Courses” (marine environmental geology and introduction to environmental geology and hydrology) at Bowdoin College by a geology team that grew out of the 1999 PKAL workshop.

Quantitative reasoning requirements

Recognizing that quantitative literacy is often not achieved by their entrance requirements, many colleges have instituted quantitative reasoning requirements that must be satisfied by all graduates. At some institutions, such as Harvard University and the University of Michigan, there is an approved list of courses that satisfy the requirement. An example of a more formal quantitative reasoning requirement is the one at Wellesley College. This consists of a basic skills component, which is satisfied either by passing a quantitative reasoning test or by taking a specific course, and an overlay course component. The topics covered by the test are arithmetic, algebra, graphing, geometry, data analysis, and linearity. Overlay courses are taught within departments, and engage students to use these skills in reasoning about and interpreting data in specific contexts. There are published guidelines for overlay courses, which specify the minimum necessary exposure to data analysis for a course to qualify as an overlay course. For example, such a course must address issues of collecting, representing and summarizing data, and must include a working knowledge of probability, distributions, and sampling. The goals of the overlay requirement are worth quoting for their resonance with the issues of quantitative literacy discussed in this paper.

Literacy. The number of topics, and depth of coverage, should be sufficient to ensure that students have the basic knowledge they need in order to function in real-life situations involving quantitative data.

Authenticity. Students should have experience in using authentic numerical data. The experience should arise naturally in the context of the course and actually advance the work of the course. Only with such experience is the literacy goal likely to be realized.

Applicability. The examples used in an overlay class should be adequate to convince the average student that the methods used in the analysis of data are of general applicability and usefulness.

Understanding. A student's experience with data analysis should not be limited to rote application of some involved statistical procedure. Rather, students should understand enough of what they are doing so that their experience of data analysis is likely to stay with them, at least as a residue of judgment and willingness to enter into similar data analyses in the future.

Practicality. The breadth of topics covered, and the depth of coverage, should be consistent with what an average Wellesley student can realistically absorb in a course that devotes only a part of its time to data analysis.

Good citizen model of concerned non-mathematics faculty

The above approaches all involve either mathematics faculty or administrative units. One should never underestimate the power of non-mathematics faculty or departments acting on their own initiative to improve quantitative literacy. There are many such examples of individual faculty revising courses and curricula simply because it is the right thing to do. Examples include Len Vacher at the University of South Florida, Bill Prothero at the University of California at Santa Barbara, Kim Kastens at Columbia University, Larry Braille and Jon Harbour at Purdue University, and Alexandra Moore at Cornell University. These faculty may take advantage of some of the approaches listed above, but often are essentially crusaders for quantitative literacy working in the trenches. They may attend workshops, or seek NSF funding, for example, but often proceed with little interaction with mathematics faculty or administrative support. In fact, they may even be hampered by administrations that depend on student credit hours as the coin of the realm, or student evaluations that can tend to favor less quantitatively challenging courses. Given the strong evidence of success of such independent initiative, we cannot but wonder at how much more effective such efforts could be with the full involvement and cooperation of mathematics faculty and college or university administrations. We argue that one critical component of quantitative literacy across the curriculum must be the support and nurturing of such initiative. As one example of administrative support, we cite the reform of the promotion and tenure system in the College of Science at the University of Arizona, for faculty whose primary scholarly contribution is in the area of mathematics and science education. This reform was recognized by the NSF with one of just ten Recognition Awards for the Integration of Research and Education (Report on Research, 1997).

Conclusions and challenges

We have argued that conceptual understanding and an everyday life component are two aspects of quantitative literacy deserving special attention. The ability to adapt mathematical ideas to new contexts is a key component of quantitative literacy. The everyday life component of quantitative literacy argues forcefully for engagement of faculty across the curriculum. Quantitative literacy thus must be the responsibility of teachers in all disciplines, and cannot be isolated in mathematics departments.

We have illustrated curricular approaches to quantitative literacy at the college or university level that range from “friendly conspiracies” between mathematics and other faculty to administrative structures and requirements to initiative by individual non-mathematics faculty. All have success stories as well as war stories, both of which serve as models for how we can work to improve quantitative literacy.

We end with two challenges. First, it is clear that much work remains to be done to improve quantitative literacy. The approaches we have illustrated must only be the start of continued and sustained efforts on the parts of faculty and institutions. There must be significant institutional change to achieve the sort of pervasive use of mathematical ideas that we think essential in teaching quantitative literacy. Neither administratively imposed solutions, nor grassroots movements, will succeed alone; initiatives solely from within mathematics departments or solely from without are bound to fail. The first challenge, therefore, is to cross the boundaries that separate disciplines and levels of administration. Administrators of university-wide requirements must talk to faculty teaching on the ground; pioneers in the classroom must talk to each other and to administrators; departments of mathematics must collaborate with other departments.

Second, we must not lose sight of the fact that our goal is student learning. It is far too easy in the heat of battle over establishing quantitative literacy requirements, setting up support centers, or revising our individual courses, to forget that the student must be the focus of our efforts. The question of “what works best” must be answered in terms of student learning. In order to do this, we must establish clearly defined student learning outcomes in quantitative literacy. We must be able to develop measures for these outcomes as part of an ongoing assessment program. Key to the success of such an assessment program is feedback into the way we are teaching quantitative literacy. Without such formative assessment, debates on how to improve quantitative literacy will be driven by anecdotal experience and the force of individual personality. Students deserve better.

We welcome the national focus on quantitative literacy, and are hopeful that the kinds of approaches described here may serve as models for others.

Acknowledgments: the authors wish to thank H. Len Vacher and Stephen Maurer for very constructive reviews of a preliminary version of this manuscript.

References

Bauman, Steven F. and Martin, William O. "Assessing the Quantitative Skills of College Juniors," *The College Mathematics Journal*, 26 (1995).

Curriculum Foundations Project, MAA. Reports available at http://academic.bowdoin.edu/faculty/B/barker/dissemination/Curriculum_Foundations/

Dartmouth College MATC website:
http://www.dartmouth.edu/~matc/math_edu/statement.html

Fox, J. and Powell, J. *A Literate World*, Paris, France: UNESCO-IBE, 1991.

Hockney, David and Falco, Charles M. "Optical insights into Renaissance art." *Optics and Photonics News*, 11:7 (2000) 52–59.

Hughes Hallett, Deborah, *Achieving Numeracy: the Challenge of Implementation*. In (Steen, 2001).

Keeling, C.D. and T.P. Whorf, "Atmospheric CO₂ records from sites in the SIO air sampling network", in *Trends: A Compendium of Data on Global Change*, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tenn., U.S.A. 2001. See also <http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/trends/co2/sio-mlo.htm> and <http://cdiac.esd.ornl.gov/ftp/maunaloa-co2/maunaloa.co2>

Keller, Edward A., *Environmental Geology*, Eighth Edition, Prentice Hall, 2000.

NCTM. *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 258p., 1989.

NCTM. *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 402p., 2000.

Project Kaleidoscope website: <http://www.pkal.org/>

Steen, Lynn Arthur (ed.), *Mathematics and Democracy: The Case for Quantitative Literacy*. The National Council on Education and the Disciplines, 2001.

Third International Mathematics and Science Study, <http://nces.ed.gov/timss/>

University of Arizona, “Integrating Research and Education”, *Report on Research*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 28p, 1998.

University of Nevada, Reno MAC website: <http://www.unr.edu/mathcenter/mac/>.

Wellesley College QR website: <http://www.wellesley.edu/QR/home>.