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Executive Summary
This report presents the recommendations of the Summer 2010 Interdisciplinary Implementation Team. The team was commissioned by the Dean and Faculty Council and tasked broadly with defining the educational goals of interdisciplinarity, reviewing existing interdisciplinary practices at Allegheny and at other institutions, and suggesting ways to strengthen interdisciplinary programs as part of the Combinations 2020 Strategic Plan. We recognized early in our deliberations that interdisciplinary efforts are already widespread at Allegheny, but that the creation and maintenance of these efforts often places undue burdens on individual faculty members. We also identified significant structural and curricular barriers to interdisciplinary programs that will need to be addressed if we are to succeed in creating conditions for interdisciplinarity to thrive at the College. Our primary recommendations are to:

1. Appoint a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs to serve as de facto Program Chair for existing interdisciplinary programs and work to implement many of the other recommendations contained in this report.
2. Eliminate the current distribution requirement (two courses in the third division).
3. Eliminate the divisional requirement for the major and minor in favor of an approved major/minor combination list.
4. Create a process for tenured faculty to redefine themselves as joint between a traditional department and an interdisciplinary program.
5. Establish named professorships and teaching fellowships to support interdisciplinary work.
6. Hire additional faculty in interdisciplinary areas.
7. Revise tenure and promotion guidelines to better evaluate interdisciplinary work.
8. Allocate financial resources and physical space to better support interdisciplinary programs.
9. Enhance the visibility of interdisciplinary programs and courses through changes to the college Catalogue and relevant web pages.

Rather than propose specific interdisciplinary programs, these recommendations are designed to create conditions for faculty innovation in program and course development. Immediate priority should be given to the appointment of a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs and a discussion of the proposed changes to our curricular requirements.

Introduction: the Interdisciplinary Implementation Team
Allegheny College’s Strategic Plan, Combinations 2020, envisions a key, strategic link between continued “strength of [the] disciplinary majors” and a deepening and extension of interdisciplinary teaching and learning. The plan roots this call in “the need in today’s society to connect, synthesize, and transfer knowledge” (Combinations 2020, pg. 4).
In response to the Strategic Plan, the Dean and Faculty Council established an Interdisciplinary Implementation Team of faculty to meet in the summer of 2010 and consider interdisciplinary work at Allegheny. The team was charged to do the following:
I. Define the educational goals of interdisciplinarity;
II. Consider existing interdisciplinary practices at Allegheny, identify barriers to those practices, and review interdisciplinary work at other institutions for ideas on how to foster interdisciplinary work at Allegheny;
III. Propose ways of strengthening and extending interdisciplinarity at Allegheny;
IV. Suggest means of assessing these initiatives and making continued progress over the Strategic Plan’s ten-year span.

In this report, we will address each of the listed areas in turn in the sections that follow.

We began our work by reviewing recent scholarship on the elements of successful interdisciplinary programs (see for example, Klein, 2010 and Teagle Foundation, 2006). Next, we surveyed model institutions (including large universities and small colleges) and our comparison and GLCA schools (see Appendix A). We found two broad and intertwined components of interdisciplinarity: philosophical and structural. Philosophically, institutions of higher education with successful interdisciplinary programs evince a commitment to interdisciplinarity among all constituencies, including students, faculty, and administration. Structurally, this commitment is backed with the resources and infrastructure needed for interdisciplinary efforts to succeed.

Although the language of the Strategic Plan focuses on developing new programs, our research led us to focus more on ways to strengthen existing efforts at interdisciplinarity at Allegheny. We see this as a necessary first step towards creating an environment in which new interdisciplinary programs can develop and flourish.

I. Interdisciplinarity and the Liberal Arts: Educational Value

Interdisciplinarity is core to the liberal arts mission: “Interdisciplinary activity is embedded in an educational framework that advocates a broad, integrative curriculum. … This emphasis speaks to the original impetus for a liberal arts education: to develop an individual capacity to discover universal ideas that give meaning to the world” (Holley, 2009, p. 11). Embodied in this often cited liberal educational mission is the goal that our students acquire the ability to apply values and critical thinking in order to make better choices in the face of complexity and ambiguity. Interdisciplinary work is uniquely situated to help our students attain this goal. In addition, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approaches are needed to confront the complex and thorny challenges facing society in the 21st Century. Environmental sustainability is a good example: an effective understanding of what sustainability means, why it matters, and how it might be achieved requires an integration of methods and perspectives from the natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities.

Focusing on pedagogy, the Teagle Foundation White Paper (2006) on interdisciplinary education at liberal arts institutions combines elements from various definitions and proposes a “working definition for interdisciplinary education as ‘a mode of curriculum design and instruction in which individual faculty or teams identify, evaluate, and integrate information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of knowledge to advance students’ capacity to understand issues, address problems, appraise
explanations, and create new approaches and solutions that extend beyond the scope of a single
discipline or area of instruction” (p. 3). The Teagle definition makes sense to us. It
acknowledges common features of various approaches in a way that we can draw upon in
understanding, strengthening and extending interdisciplinarity at Allegheny. In particular it
emphasizes:

- A focus on **integration as both synthesis and collaboration** (in research, teaching, and
curricular design);
- A focus on **process** (as faculty and students interact across traditional disciplinary lines);
- An assumption that **interdisciplinary understanding is an important route to
cognitive advancement** (given the oft-cited complexity and interconnection of the
societal problems and intellectual questions that academia is called upon to address).

II. **Interdisciplinarity at Allegheny College**

A wide range of interdisciplinary initiatives, from individual courses to major programs, is
already established at Allegheny. This interdisciplinary work has become increasingly vigorous
and diverse, but it has not been central to the College’s academic practice. Rather, it has grown
up at the margins and in the interstices of a curriculum and an institutional structure that are built
around traditional disciplines housed in traditional departments organized into traditional
 divisions. Not surprisingly, although interdisciplinary work has complemented traditional
teaching and learning, these initiatives have increasingly run up against the limits of what is
possible within our current curriculum and organizational structure. Equally important,
interdisciplinary work at Allegheny often comes at a particular cost to those faculty most actively
involved in these efforts.

Interdisciplinary efforts at Allegheny can be found at the level of departments, programs and
courses. Interdisciplinary majors in International Studies, Women’s Studies, Neuroscience and
Biochemistry have recently been established or extended. Other majors such as Environmental
Science, Environmental Studies, and Communication are inherently interdisciplinary in their
approach. Interdisciplinary minor programs – Art and the Environment, Asian Studies, VESA –
are also flourishing, and Allegheny lists fourteen such interdisciplinary minors in the 2009-10
Catalogue. In addition, the Catalogue descriptions of Dance and Movement Studies and Geology
note their interdisciplinary nature. Some other departments, Physics for example, offer students
the possibility of interdisciplinary work within the major.

Interdisciplinary programs and courses have proven popular with students. For the past five
years, over a quarter of each year’s graduates have completed an interdisciplinary major, and
roughly a fifth typically complete an interdisciplinary minor. Enrollments in INTDS and
crosslisted courses have also been healthy. (See Appendix B for supporting data.)
A full inventory of interdisciplinary work at Allegheny must include not only majors, minors,
and substantive initiatives such as the yearly theme, it must also recognize a wide range of
smaller-scale teaching and learning interactions and professional development. For example, we
note cross-departmental team teaching; faculty inviting colleagues from another discipline to
bring their expertise to a class meeting; shared, multi-course assignments asking students from
each class to address an aspect of a case problem while taking into account the dimension
explored by the others; students from different majors within a class bringing the perspectives of
their own disciplines to bear on common course materials; and faculty developing
interdisciplinary research and teaching projects.

Faculty actively pursue – and receive – some support for this kind of interdisciplinary teaching
and research development. For example, out of the six recently funded GLCA New Direction
Initiative Projects, three involve faculty members from different disciplines developing
interdisciplinary courses or projects, the other three projects involve individual faculty members
extending their research out of their current discipline into other disciplines. In addition, seven of
the nine teaching initiatives in 2009-10 funded through the Dean’s Office (e.g., Demmler
Awards) were interdisciplinary in nature.

As faculty’s engagement with interdisciplinary efforts has increased, however, the barriers
presented by our current curriculum and organizational structures have become increasingly
apparent. In terms of curriculum, a major limitation is imposed by the fact that our distribution
requirements are expressed in terms of “number of courses in a division.” This requirement
means that every course must either be assigned to a single division – a categorization that is
arbitrary or misleading for many interdisciplinary courses – or else fails to satisfy the
distribution requirement and so “does not count” in the eyes of students.

The structural barriers are perhaps less obvious but more pervasive. Our administrative processes
work almost entirely through departments. Budget requests, space allocation, course changes,
staffing decisions, evaluation of faculty, even dissemination of information – all are channeled
through the departmental structure. Established interdisciplinary majors like Women’s Studies or
Biochemistry have a “place at the table” (literally in the case of the monthly Department Chairs
meetings), but most interdisciplinary minors do not. Even the interdisciplinary majors struggle to
staff their courses and offer a consistent program because the affiliated faculty are housed in
traditional departments and are called upon first to staff departmental courses (including FS
courses, which are themselves allocated through departments). Cross-listing courses between a
department and an interdisciplinary program would alleviate the problem, but our ability to
cross-list courses is again limited by the curricular expectation that all courses be assigned to a
single division.

The effect of these structural barriers is that faculty involved in interdisciplinary work must
continually struggle to get the resources they need, to have their contributions recognized, and to
make interdisciplinary initiatives visible to students and faculty. The workload cost to these
faculty is significant. Adding more faculty who are affiliated with a specific interdisciplinary
program could alleviate the burden, but adding faculty is itself problematic because decisions
about hiring, tenure, and promotion are made primarily by departments. Thus, adding new
expertise needed to strengthen an interdisciplinary major or minor depends on the willingness
and ability of an appropriate department to add such a new person. Candidates considering
appointment must accept that evaluation and promotion, and collegial interaction more generally,
will be centered in the department and not the interdisciplinary program.

At present, Allegheny enjoys considerable faculty enthusiasm for and commitment to
interdisciplinary work but also suffers from structural limitations on bringing that work more
fully into our collective intellectual and institutional life. In the sections that follow, we make specific recommendations aimed at reducing the current barriers to interdisciplinary work and fostering interdisciplinary initiatives at Allegheny.

III. Supporting Interdisciplinary Work

The recommendations in this section are directed at strengthening and supporting our current interdisciplinary initiatives. They are designed to create a scaffolding on which interdisciplinary programs can build. These recommendations are grounded in our research into other institutions and Allegheny’s practices, and they incorporate a number of understandings about the nature of interdisciplinary work and the kind of environment in which it thrives:

- Interdisciplinary work must be intentional. “Exposing” students to multiple disciplines is not enough – they need our help in learning to integrate and synthesize information.
- We cannot simply add on to what we do now unless additional resources are secured. Our current resources – especially faculty time and energy – are limited, and our current structures are likewise limited in the scope they provide for interdisciplinary work to develop. Nor do we advocate weakening the strength of our traditional departments in order to enhance interdisciplinarity – such an approach would be shortsighted and counterproductive. A combination of revising our existing structures and attracting additional resources will be needed to succeed.
- Programs are most successful when they draw on faculty creativity and entrepreneurship that are supported by institutional resources. Building programs gradually and intentionally will lead to stronger and more sustainable programs that are part of the fabric of the institution.
- Our recommendations are interconnected and reinforce each other. In particular, acting on the first recommendation to appoint a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs is essential to implementing the others successfully.

Because of its centrality to the success of the other recommendations, we begin with a discussion of our recommendation to appoint a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs. We then present our other recommendations relating to alleviating curricular and structural constraints, allocating and attracting resources, and increasing the visibility of interdisciplinary work.

1. Appoint a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs

To oversee the implementation of the Interdisciplinary Implementation Team’s recommendations and to foster interdisciplinary work at Allegheny, we recommend that a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs be appointed from the faculty and provided with an appropriate level of course release and administrative support. The Director’s primary responsibilities are spelled out elsewhere (see Appendix C), but one of the most important will be to function as the de facto Program Chair for those interdisciplinary programs (i.e. minors) that are not already part of existing structures. As Chair, the Director would attend Chairs meetings, have a dedicated budget, and otherwise function within our institutional structures in the same way as do other Program Chairs.
We envision that the Director’s initial activities will be:

- to conduct a campus-wide inventory of interdisciplinary programs and initiatives at Allegheny (especially those not visible in data such as course enrollments or numbers of majors);
- to solicit input from faculty regarding their attitudes toward interdisciplinary work and interest in pursuing interdisciplinary teaching and research;
- to develop a plan to review and implement the recommendations of this report in collaboration with committees, the administration, and faculty;
- identify additional initiatives or projects that will help support and foster interdisciplinary work at Allegheny.

To support this position, we suggest that, at least initially, the college seek external grant or donor funding.

2. Revise Curricular Requirements

Allegheny’s curriculum was designed to provide breadth in students’ educational program by 1) requiring a major and minor in different divisions and 2) requiring two courses in the division least represented in the major and minor. In Section II above, we noted that this curricular structure places arbitrary constraints on our ability to offer interdisciplinary courses.

More significantly, our existing curriculum often fails in its goal of ensuring breadth in students’ educations. Too often, students postpone taking courses in the “third division” until late in their academic careers, take these courses Credit/No Credit, and treat them as a “box to be checked” rather than an opportunity to enrich their understanding. Students can also take major/minor combinations that actually represent a relatively narrow range of perspectives and methods. The lines between divisions have blurred, and it has become possible for a student to complete a major and minor in “different” divisions that represent a narrower focus than taking a different minor within the “same” division might have provided.

We suggest that the time has come to revise this requirement. Specifically, we recommend to the Curriculum Committee and the Allegheny faculty that we:

a) **Eliminate the current distribution requirement (two courses in the third division);**

b) **Eliminate the divisional requirement for the major and minor in favor of an approved “white list” of approved major/minor combinations designed to ensure breadth.**

In addition, we remind the faculty that the FS program was originally designed to be interdisciplinary, and we recommend that the FS Director

c) **Help faculty identify ways to incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives in FS course design.**
3. **Restructure Faculty Appointment and Review Processes**

Faculty time and energy are the primary constraint on the College’s strategic goal to develop new interdisciplinary programs. Other constraints include funding, physical space, and departmental staffing needs. Below, we make recommendations related both to where resources should be allocated and *how* they should be allocated, i.e., the structures and processes that govern how decisions about resource allocation are made.

a) **Create a process that allows tenured faculty to redefine themselves as joint between traditional and interdisciplinary programs**

Over time, faculty teaching interests change, often in interdisciplinary directions. Yet the departmental affiliations of faculty remain the same, frozen at the point of hire. Kenyon College has recently redefined the appointments of some senior faculty as joint between their home department and an interdisciplinary program. We propose that Allegheny College create a process by which faculty can request a redefinition of their appointments and associated teaching responsibilities. In some cases, a faculty member may teach essentially the same courses as before with cross-listing between two programs; in other cases, redefining an appointment might require the hiring of additional faculty to cover some departmental courses previously taught by the faculty member.

b) **Establish named professorships and faculty teaching fellowships that support interdisciplinary work, including a fourth Divisional Chair in Interdisciplinary Studies**

Various departments on campus have endowed chairs, and the College awards Divisional Chairs in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. Yet interdisciplinary work is not explicitly recognized on Allegheny’s campus in this way. Another way to reward and encourage innovation (and one which does not necessarily contain the research and publication expectation usually integrated into endowed professorships) is to fund faculty teaching fellowships which offer course release and/or other forms of faculty development support and which recognize innovative teaching and learning on campus. We therefore propose that the Office of Development and Alumni Affairs seek out opportunities to solicit endowed funds to support professorships in interdisciplinary areas. We further propose that the College add a fourth “Divisional” Chair in Interdisciplinary Studies and that the College seek ways to fund a faculty teaching fellowship program.

c) **Hire additional faculty in interdisciplinary areas**

Ultimately, increasing the number and strength of interdisciplinary programs will require hiring additional faculty to staff them. This can be accomplished both by revising the departmental search process to bring attention to interdisciplinary possibilities when reviewing candidates and, as funding allows, establishing permanent, tenure-track positions in interdisciplinary programs.

d) **Revise the tenure and promotion guidelines to better evaluate and recognize interdisciplinary work**
For most faculty, their home department plays a central role in the evaluation and tenure process. The FRC looks to departments to provide the disciplinary context for evaluating scholarly quality and productivity. This model disadvantages faculty whose work is largely interdisciplinary. Because it requires a greater range of perspectives, models, and methods, progress in interdisciplinary scholarship tends to come more slowly than does work in well-established disciplines. Such scholarship also tends to be disseminated in new journals and other venues that have not acquired the established reputations of disciplinary journals. Some departmental colleagues may feel unqualified to mentor or evaluate the work of a colleague whose research extends outside traditional disciplinary boundaries; others may even be unsympathetic to work of this kind. For untenured faculty whose work includes a significant interdisciplinary component, a “pseudo-department” composed of senior faculty in affiliated areas (in addition to or instead of a traditional department) could support the faculty member in establishing a viable program of scholarship and add valuable perspective in the tenure review process (Kenyon College uses such a “pseudo-department” structure for interdisciplinary faculty). We urge Faculty Council to take up this issue and to propose appropriate revisions to the tenure and promotion guidelines to the faculty.

4. Allocate Support to Interdisciplinary Programs

a) Designate an adequate budget to support interdisciplinary work
   We propose that the Director of Interdisciplinary Programs be given a designated budget to support interdisciplinary initiatives and development

b) Create physical “homes” for interdisciplinary programs
   Space is a visible marker of the legitimacy of a program and a measure of the support of the institution for it. In addition, physical proximity to other faculty engaged in similar work fosters creativity and collegiality. We recognize that space is at a premium on campus; this makes it all the more important to take care that interdisciplinary work is not squeezed in around the edges.

c) Recognize the role of interdisciplinary programs in scheduling courses
   Creating clear and consistent expectations about how many departmental vs. interdisciplinary courses are to be taught by faculty affiliated with interdisciplinary programs would go a long way towards stabilizing the curricula of those programs.

5. Enhance the Visibility of Interdisciplinary Programs and Courses.

Despite the interest in interdisciplinary studies at Allegheny, these programs suffer from a lack of visibility and inconsistent treatment in College materials. Currently, our Catalogue and website present an array of differently organized options for interdisciplinary programs, some with specific pages and clear guidelines and some with neither. This means that prospective students, current students, and faculty advisors are ill served by the information as it is currently presented. Yet visibility without further investment in the stability of our programs will not serve our goals. We anticipate that a combination of additional visibility and stability will attract additional faculty and students and will ease the burden on those faculty already so invested.
Specifically, we recommend that the College:

a) **Craft individual Catalogue pages for each interdisciplinary minor**
   Currently, most interdisciplinary minors are lumped together under the “Interdisciplinary Programs” heading in the *Catalogue*. We propose that each of these programs develop copy for a stand-alone page to be submitted to the Curriculum Committee and hence to the Faculty for approval. The page should include a list of affiliated faculty (a term that would require a more precise definition than it currently possesses), a program mission statement, and a description of the minor requirements, including core courses.

b) **Create a clearer and more consistent presence for interdisciplinary studies on the College's website.**
   Pages for interdisciplinary programs vary greatly in detail and appeal, are not always current, and are variously under the control of the institution, departments, and individual faculty. In short, the web presence for interdisciplinarity at Allegheny College is a mess. We propose that the College work to unify and streamline its web presence with respect to interdisciplinary programs. It may be that the Technology Taskforce will make similar recommendations, as the problems apply to the entire Allegheny web presence, not just to interdisciplinary programs.

c) **Highlight opportunities for and examples of interdisciplinary faculty-student research and collaboration.**
   Rather than propose ideas for specific types or forms of programs, it is our hope that the recommendations listed above will create the conditions for increased faculty innovation in the area of interdisciplinary program development. Allegheny’s already rich offering of interdisciplinary courses, minors, and majors is a testament to faculty entrepreneurship in this area. However, we suspect that our progress in interdisciplinary program development could be even greater were it not for the structural, curricular and resource barriers already mentioned.

We envision a process whereby faculty are provided with the time, administrative support, and collaborative settings to discuss and develop genuinely interdisciplinary courses and programs for our students. Our recommendations are intended to remove the barriers and impediments to such work. We believe that the result of this process will be the strengthening of existing interdisciplinary offerings, and the development of new courses and programs that meet the highest standards for rigor and quality.

IV. **Program Development**

The development of new academic programs begins with faculty and student interest. For these first impulses to lead to the creation of strong programs, faculty first need resources and encouragement to experiment and create new courses and pedagogical approaches. If and when these activities result in the creation of a new program, the faculty must evaluate the program’s academic rigor and value to the institution. Once a program has been created, regular assessment assures that it continues to meet its goals. The recommendations below focus first on the process for developing interdisciplinary programs and then on mechanisms to assess existing programs.
1. **New initiatives.**

We recommend that faculty be supported in new interdisciplinary initiatives through:

a) **Support of faculty projects and collaboration during the summer**

b) **Encouragement and support of pedagogical strategies** such as team-teaching, “clusters” of related classes in different areas related to a common theme, and “mega-classes” in which two courses meet together on an ad-hoc basis to explore a topic together.

c) **Support of faculty professional development** (workshops, conferences, visits to peer institutions known for their strength in interdisciplinary pedagogy).

d) **Creation of mechanisms to enhance faculty communication about interdisciplinary work** so that others can profit from the example of the entrepreneurial few

We recognize that professional development and summer work require resources, so we also recommend:

e) **Grant-seeking coordinated by the Director of Interdisciplinary Programs** and directed towards attracting support for faculty initiatives.

2. **Establishment and Assessment of Programs.**

Faculty entrepreneurship and increasing student interest in an interdisciplinary area can develop from work in specific classes to the proposal of new minor programs. To date, the addition of new programs has tended to be **ad hoc** – each time, the same questions get asked, and given the turnover of faculty on the Curriculum Committee, sometimes the same investigative process gets repeated time and time again.

To ensure the academic viability of new programs and address the continuing concerns of some faculty about the rigor and value of interdisciplinary work, the College needs a clearer process for evaluating and adding new programs. Therefore, we propose that the Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the Director of Interdisciplinary Programs,

a) **Develop guidelines for the proposal and creation of interdisciplinary programs.** (DePauw has successfully instituted such guidelines; see Appendix D).

In addition, there needs to be regular and on-going review and assessment of interdisciplinary minor programs to ensure that they remain viable and continue to meet their goals. Currently, a clear process exists for departments and interdisciplinary major programs to complete periodic self-studies to assess program successes and challenges,
b) **Conduct a streamlined self-study process for each interdisciplinary minor** to be completed every five years by the program director and a committee of affiliated faculty, with assistance from the Director of Interdisciplinary Programs. Such a streamlined self-study might include:

- A discussion of the college learning goals applicable to the minor program and the ways in which the minor seeks to accomplish those goals;
- A review of course offerings and course enrollments in the minor program over the past 5 years and how those courses contribute to the minor program;
- A discussion of course staffing and the role of faculty affiliated with the minor program including any important new hires or losses and the implications of those staffing changes.
- An overall evaluation of the current status of the minor program within the Allegheny curriculum;
- Recommendations for the minor program based on the evidence presented in the self study and the resources that would be needed to effectively implement each recommendation.

Finally, the College should assess the overall contribution of interdisciplinary work to the education of Allegheny students. We began Section I of this report with a discussion of the centrality of integrative thinking to the liberal arts. As we foster increased interdisciplinary work throughout the curriculum, we need to pay attention to whether our students are developing the synthetic and creative modes of thinking that we intend. To do this, clear outcomes must be developed and linked to clear strategies for determining if those outcomes are realized, or else assessment becomes a meaningless exercise. In addition, the College already collects data about our students that relates to the goals of interdisciplinary work, and we feel strongly that the proliferation of assessment tools and instruments should be avoided in our attempt to determine if students are meeting our learning goals. In addition, we feel that limiting the scope of assessment will make the project meaningful and feasible with current resources. Therefore, we recommend that the Assessment Committee:

- **develop one or two clearly defined research questions linked to specific learning outcomes which can be addressed using instruments already administered** to our students such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and the senior project.

**V. Conclusion**

The recommendations contained in this report are designed to put in place the conditions we feel are necessary to allow interdisciplinarity to truly thrive at Allegheny and to create an environment where students “connect, synthesize, and transfer knowledge” as articulated in the Strategic Plan. Not all of the changes we discuss will happen at once, nor should they. However, the sooner the appropriate bodies in our governance structure can address the above
recommendations and bring them, where appropriate, to the full faculty for discussion and debate, the sooner we can enrich interdisciplinary work at Allegheny.

At the outset, we recommend that the highest priority be placed on the recommendations to appoint a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs (III.1) and to revise our curricular requirements (III.2). We urge Faculty Council and the Dean to review the draft job description for the Director (Appendix C), to discuss the appropriate levels of administrative and other support for this position, and to select a Director. Once in place, the Director can work with Council, the Dean, and the appropriate faculty and college committees to address many of the other recommendations in this report. In addition, we suggest that the Curriculum Committee immediately begin a discussion of our recommendations to eliminate our current distribution requirement and to replace the divisional requirement for a major and minor with an approved major/minor combination list.

Other recommendations that should be acted on sooner rather than later include:

- A reemphasis of interdisciplinary perspectives in FS course design.
- A discussion of ways for faculty to redefine their positions as joint between a traditional department and an interdisciplinary program.
- Creation of separate Catalogue pages and a stronger web presence for already existing interdisciplinary programs.

Beginning with the recommendations above will improve coordination, collaboration, and visibility for interdisciplinary initiatives and begin to address the various structural barriers that have hampered such work in the past. Our hope is that these actions will create space in our collective lives where faculty creativity and energy can more easily generate new pedagogies and courses. These activities will enrich the intellectual life of the College, and some will in time lead naturally to the establishment or reinvigoration of robust interdisciplinary programs as imagined in the Strategic Plan.
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Appendix A: Peer Schools and Other Institutions Surveyed

In order to get a sense of how we currently stand in terms of interdisciplinary studies, members of the Implementation Team surveyed a variety of peer institutions. To this GLCA-based list, we added a number of additional schools which appear in the literature as good examples of interdisciplinary studies. Initially, we surveyed the websites of the chosen schools and reported back to the group. We then determined which schools deserved a closer look and we went back to the websites and in most cases called and spoke to administrators or faculty involved in interdisciplinary work.

Ian Binnington
Wabash College, IN – http://www.wabash.edu/
College of Wooster, OH – http://www.wooster.edu/
University of Alberta – http://www.ualberta.ca/
Beloit College, WI – http://www.beloit.edu/

From among this group, we chose the College of Wooster for a more detailed inquiry.

Alice Deckert
University of Chicago – http://www.uchicago.edu/
Webster University – http://www.webster.edu/
Kenyon College – http://www.kenyon.edu/
Oberlin College – http://www.oberlin.edu/
Ohio Wesleyan College – http://www.owu.edu/

From this group, we chose Kenyon College for a more detailed inquiry.

Deb Dickey
Northwestern University – http://www.weinberg.northwestern.edu/
http://www.weinberg.northwestern.edu/advising/degree/distro/interdisciplinary.html
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign - http://www.las.uiuc.edu/
Evergreen State College – http://www.evergreen.edu/
http://www.evergreen.edu/about/curriculumoverview.htm
University of Washington - http://www.washington.edu/
Brown University – http://www.brown.edu/

From this group, we chose Evergreen State College for a more detailed inquiry.

Don Goldstein
Arizona State University – http://newcollege.asu.edu/
Wheaton College MA – http://wheatoncollege.edu/academics/the-wheaton-curriculum/
Grinnell College – http://www.grinnell.edu/
University of Minnesota – http://academic.umn.edu/provost/interdisc/team.html
Portland State University – http://www.pdx.edu/unst/
From this group, we chose Grinnell College for a more detailed inquiry.

Jennifer Hellwarth
Columbia University-- http://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/programs
Albion College-- http://www.albion.edu/academics/majors-minors-concentrations
Dennison University-- http://www.denison.edu/academics/departments/
Duke University— http://www.interdisciplinary.duke.edu/

From this group, we did a more detailed inquiry of Dennison University

Vesta Silva
Carnegie Mellon University: http://www.cmu.edu/academics/interdisciplinary-programs.shtml
Hampshire College: http://www.hampshire.edu/academics/611.htm
Earlham College: http://www.earlham.edu/curriculumguide/academics/genedintro.html
Hope College: http://www.hope.edu/academic/gened/inter/
Kalamazoo College: http://www.kzoo.edu/college/?p=kplan

None of these models seemed to fit Allegheny’s goals and interests.
Appendix B: Interdisciplinarity in the Allegheny Curriculum

I. Majors and Minors

A. Interdisciplinary Majors

The *Catalogue* lists the following interdisciplinary majors:

- International Studies
- Neuroscience
- Women’s Studies

Several other majors require significant interdisciplinary work:

- Biochemistry
- Communication
- Environmental Science
- Environmental Studies
- Geology (including Environmental Geology)

Finally, student-designed majors include work from multiple departments and are interdisciplinary in nature.

Table 1 (appended) shows the number of graduates completing an interdisciplinary major in each of the last five years. The total number of students completing any interdisciplinary major is also shown along with the total number of graduates and the percentage of graduates who completed an interdisciplinary major.

B. Interdisciplinary Minors

The *Catalogue* lists the following interdisciplinary minors:

- American Studies
- Art and the Environment
- Asian Studies
- Black Studies
- Chinese Studies
- Classical Studies
- French Studies

---

1 2009-10 edition, p. 7
2 2009-10 edition, p. 7
Confusingly, the Catalogue lists Women’s Studies among the “Interdisciplinary Majors” but classifies it as a “Departmental Minor.” In Table 2 below, we treat Women’s Studies as an interdisciplinary minor.

Table 2 also lists three additional minors that include significant interdisciplinary work:

- Communication
- Dance and Movement Studies
- Geology

Student-designed minors are not necessarily interdisciplinary and therefore are not included in our count of interdisciplinary minors.

Note that the following interdisciplinary majors offer no minor: Biochemistry, Environmental Science, Environmental Studies, International Studies, and Neuroscience.

Table 2 shows the number of graduates completing an interdisciplinary minor in each of the last five years. The total number of students completing any interdisciplinary minor is also shown along with the total number of graduates and the percentage of graduates who completed an interdisciplinary minor.

C. Double Majors

Another measure of the extent of interdisciplinary work by Allegheny students is the number of students who complete two majors and whose senior thesis combines work in the two major fields. Table 3 shows the number of students completing a “DOUBL” senior project in each of the last five years.

II. Interdisciplinary Courses

Though we recognize that courses offered within a department may include significant interdisciplinary content, such courses are not recognizable in the college database. Therefore, the data below are restricted to:

- Courses with the Interdisciplinary Studies (“INTDS”) course designation, and
- Courses crosslisted between two departments.

The enrollments in courses in the above two categories are presented in Tables 4 and 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdisciplinary majors listed on p. 7 of 2009-10 Catalogue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-designed majors:</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other majors with significant interdisciplinary content:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All ID majors</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total graduates</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% grads w/ ID major</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** “Geology” also includes Environmental Geology. The sum of the individual interdisciplinary majors exceeds the “All ID majors” value in some years because students occasionally double-major in two interdisciplinary fields. The values for 2010 include students who have not yet graduated but are expected to do so by the end of August, 2010.
Table 2. Number of Graduates Completing Interdisciplinary Minors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdisciplinary minors listed on p. 7 of 2009-10 Catalogue:</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art and the Environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American and Caribbean Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval and Renaissance Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Health and Society</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, Ethics and Social Action</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other minors with significant interdisciplinary content:</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance and Movement Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| All ID minors                                                | 90   | 88   | 116  | 98   | 77   |
|**Total graduates**                                           | 430  | 367  | 538  | 489  | 465  |
| **% grads w/ ID minor**                                       | **20.9** | **24.0** | **21.6** | **20.0** | **16.6** |

Notes: The sum of the individual interdisciplinary minors exceeds the “All ID minors” value in some years because students occasionally double-minor in two interdisciplinary fields. The values for 2010 include students who have not yet graduated but are expected to do so by the end of August, 2010.
Table 3. Number of Students Completing a “Double” Senior Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year senior project completed</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Enrollments in Courses Designated INTDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Academic Year Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*160</td>
<td>Intro Values/Ethics/Social Act</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*180</td>
<td>Medieval &amp; Renaissance Studies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*190</td>
<td>Teaching English Lang Learners</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*201</td>
<td>Serv Learn: Theory/Practice I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*202</td>
<td>Serv Learn: Theory/Practice II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*207</td>
<td>Human Sexual Identity</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*210</td>
<td>Introduction to Black Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*220</td>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*301</td>
<td>Envision Environmental Futures</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*306</td>
<td>Cultural Construction/Sexuality</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*310</td>
<td>Neuro of Music Comprehension</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*312</td>
<td>Neuroscience of Dance/Movement</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*313</td>
<td>Neuro of Language/Communicatn</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*320</td>
<td>Science/Transform Amer Life</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*540</td>
<td>Personal and Community Health</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*550</td>
<td>Sem: Science, Health &amp; Society</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTDS*560</td>
<td>VESA Capstone Seminar</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total enrollments in INTDS courses 148 122 87 90 125

Notes: Independent Studies are not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Numbers</th>
<th>Course Title(s)</th>
<th>2005-6</th>
<th>2006-7</th>
<th>2007-8</th>
<th>2008-9</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIO/ ENVSC*335</td>
<td>Conservation Biology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO/ ENVSC*342</td>
<td>Toxicology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO/ ENVSC*344</td>
<td>Stream Ecology</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO/ ENVSC*346</td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO/ ENVSC*490</td>
<td>Restoration Ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM/ PHYS*445</td>
<td>Current Topics/Physical Chem</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMRT<em>450/ INTDS</em>306*</td>
<td>Media &amp; Identity/Constr. Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL<em>390/ WOMST</em>200</td>
<td>Literary/Feminist Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL<em>550/ WOMST</em>580</td>
<td>19th Century Southern Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL<em>554/ WOMST</em>580</td>
<td>20th Century Southern Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL/ POLSC*391</td>
<td>Politics and Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL/ WOMST*313</td>
<td>Toni Morrison/Feminist Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVSC/ GEO*330</td>
<td>Climate Change: Past &amp; Future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVSC/POLS*347</td>
<td>Env Regulation and the State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVSC/ POLSC*431</td>
<td>Global Environmental Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVSC/ RELST*360</td>
<td>Religion and Ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL/ RELST*212</td>
<td>Problem of the Self:East/West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL/ RELST*227</td>
<td>Religion/Challenge Modernity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL/ RELST*590</td>
<td>Junior Group Tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSC<em>272/ WOMST</em>325</td>
<td>Globalization and Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSC/ WOMST*490</td>
<td>Global Feminisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSC/ WOMST*585</td>
<td>Seminar:International Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH/ RELST*475</td>
<td>Psychology and Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total enrollments in crosslisted courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*INTDS is also included in Table 4 (INTDS courses).
Appendix C: Director of Interdisciplinary Studies – Job Description

Description of the Position -
The primary objective of this position is to support and coordinate interdisciplinary work at Allegheny College. The Director will initially develop a plan to review and implement the recommendations of this report in collaboration with committees, the administration, and faculty. In the long term, the Director will function as the de facto Program Chair for those interdisciplinary programs (i.e. minors) that are not already part of existing structures and will be responsible for on-going faculty development programs aimed at coordinating interdisciplinary efforts on campus and ensuring that faculty members engaged or embarking on interdisciplinary work are able to build on each other’s success and avoid common pitfalls. The Director will be supported by a full-time secretarial position and will have dedicated office space in a central location.

Responsibilities of the Position -
The Director will have a nine-month faculty contract that is two-thirds administrative and one-third teaching and will report to the Dean of the College. The Director will be appointed from among the tenured faculty and commit to the position for a four-year renewable term. The specific duties of the Director will change over time and may require a full-time administrative contract for the first year.

Year one:
- conduct a campus-wide inventory of interdisciplinary programs and initiatives at Allegheny (especially those not visible in data such as course enrollments or numbers of majors);
- solicit input from faculty regarding their attitudes toward interdisciplinary work and interest in pursuing interdisciplinary teaching and research;
- develop a plan to review and implement the recommendations of this report in collaboration with committees, the administration, and faculty;
- identify additional initiatives or projects that will help support and foster interdisciplinary work at Allegheny.

Beyond year one:
- Act as de facto department chair for those interdisciplinary programs (i.e. minors) that are not already part of existing structures by attending Chair’s meetings, maintaining the budget for those programs and otherwise function inside our institutional structures as a Program Chair.
- Design faculty development opportunities aimed at connecting faculty with similar interests and helping faculty interested in participating in interdisciplinary work connect with faculty who are successfully engaged in similar projects;
- Work with individual faculty interested in team teaching, designing course clusters or mega-classes and other innovative approaches to interdisciplinary pedagogy;
- Work with faculty who seek to infuse interdisciplinary concepts and approaches into the core sequence of FS 101 / FS 102 / FS 201 / and junior seminar;
• Serve as the point person for evaluation of existing programs and the development of new interdisciplinary programs;
• Ensure that the web, catalog and literature presence of interdisciplinary efforts continues to be current.

**Position Qualifications**

• Tenured member of the faculty;
• Demonstrated interest and expertise in interdisciplinary work at the program, course and/or research level;
• May not be the chair of a department or program.
Appendix D: Interdisciplinary Lessons Learned

Strong models of interdisciplinarity enjoy broad-based campus support. Colleges offering such models: 1) acknowledge the typical obstacles to interdisciplinary programs (for example, suspicion that the promotion of ID initiatives will come at the expense of departmental resources, and fear that faculty participating in ID initiatives will not be recognized/rewarded and their ID efforts will be loaded onto already full schedules), and 2) institute practices to overcome such barriers (Stone, et al.). The following “best practices” are distilled from the large body of recent scholarship on interdisciplinarity as well as the Interdisciplinary Implementation Team’s survey of selected institutions of higher learning (see Appendix A for the survey sample).

1. **Recognition of the wide range of ID activities** (programs, courses, stand alone innovation) – DePauw, Dickinson, Grinnell, Wooster (AAU)
2. **An identifiable administrative structure** (Archibald, Augsburg, et al., Stone, et al.) including:
   a. A carefully selected centralized director (AAU, Augsburg, et al.) who is granted dedicated time and administrative support - Grinnell
   b. A stable network of faculty (e.g., a steering committee, or an internal advisory board) (Stone, et al.)
3. **Representation in college governance and a voice in policies and procedures** (Klein)
4. **A visible and secure location in the organizational structure of a campus** (Klein)
   a. Named professorships / faculty teaching fellowships
   b. Catalogue and course descriptions
      Courses are cross listed and/or clearly designated as specific ID programs (for example, BLST -- Black Studies) – Denison, Grinnell, Kenyon
      i. Absence of program course prefix is related to the lack of ID programs’ control over their own curricula, and to problems disseminating information to students (Archibald)
   c. Website presence
   d. Participation in campus-wide communication systems to facilitate collaborative contacts/partnerships and coordination of ID efforts (Archibald)
5. **A stable core of required ID courses** (Klein)
   a. Successful interdisciplinary programs have required core courses in place. These curricula are stable, and highlight integration (theory, methods, etc. relevant to the ID focus). (cf. Augsburg, et al., 2009, p. 247)
   a. A core faculty with full-time appointments located entirely or partly within a program. (Klein)
   b. “When faculty from other units are involved, the program’s leader has leverage to obtain their participation and a formal affiliation or joint appointment” (Klein, 2010, p. 106).
   c. Allowing tenured faculty to redefine their positions as joint appointments – Kenyon
   d. Support for ID areas are included in the faculty hiring and review processes (Stone, et al.)
7. **Adequate financial resources and control of budget** (Klein)

8. **Dedicated organizational and physical space and equipment**
   These offer institutional legitimacy and facilitate contact among individuals who might otherwise be spread across campus (Archibald, Holley, Klein)

9. **Appropriate criteria for evaluation and assessment of ID faculty and programs** – Kenyon, (Klein)

10. **Equal access to the institutional reward system and incentives** (Klein)

11. **Gradual implementation**
   ID initiatives are not added on top of existing academic programs – Evergreen State College, Grinnell (Stone, et al.)
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