

## **Interdisciplinary Programs Working Group Report January 31, 2014**

### **Overview**

This committee was constituted by Dean Conley in fall 2013 to study the “history, missions, funding, staffing, and governance structures of the interdisciplinary programs in Arts and Sciences.” The committee is chaired by Joel Schwartz and includes Josh Burk, Martin Gallivan, Leisa Meyer, John Riofrio, and Sarah Stafford.

After preliminary discussions, the committee conducted two surveys: an electronic survey of department chairs asking them to comment on their experience serving interdisciplinary majors, and managing joint appointments and adjunct buy-out arrangements with interdisciplinary programs (see Appendix A); and interviews with the directors of each of the undergraduate programs in Arts and Sciences, which we have compiled into program profiles with a standardized format (see Appendix B). For a list of interdisciplinary majors, and the corresponding Registrar abbreviations, see Appendix B.

### **Committee recommendations are in bold.**

There is no question that the number of interdisciplinary majors has grown dramatically over the past 20 years. In 1993-1994 there were 135 interdisciplinary undergraduate baccalaureate degrees at William & Mary; that number increased to 385 by 2010-11, the single largest number of interdisciplinary graduates in the College’s history (see Appendix C). This amounts to a growth of 285% over this period, far larger than the growth in the size of the student body over the same years. Now about one-quarter of all of our students have an interdisciplinary major, although many, of course, also have second majors in departments.

The number of interdisciplinary minors is much smaller, peaking at 80 in 2010-11. This includes five minor-only programs, Biochemistry, Community Studies, Public Health, Judaic Studies, and Marine Science. Since the College allows students to declare at most two degrees (i.e., two majors, or a major and a minor, but not three degrees in any combination), there is often a trade-off for students between the choice to major or minor. For example, the double major requirement for ENSP majors no doubt suppresses the number of minors in Marine Science. (ENSP is the only program that requires a double major.)

While the numbers of interdisciplinary majors has grown dramatically, the number of programs has not. Similarly, it is extremely rare for interdisciplinary programs to be eliminated (the last one was Urban Studies, in 1990). It is far more common for programs to evolve over time in response to shifts in student and faculty interests. This evolution can be quite substantial, like the transformation over the years of Comparative Literature to Literary and Cultural Studies to (soon) Film and Media Studies. It can result from a merger, which happened when Black Studies and African Studies unified to become Africana Studies, and when Middle East Studies and Asian Studies joined to become Asian and Middle East Studies. Or, it can result from an expansion of scope, as when Women’s Studies recently became Gender, Sexuality, and Women’s Studies. It is, finally, quite common for programs to adopt small or large modifications of their requirements from time to time, even when their titles remain the same.

While most programs have seen at least some evolution, no truly new interdisciplinary majors have been created in the past 20 years. There are 16 undergraduate interdisciplinary majors today and there were 16 in 1994. The minor-only programs listed above, in contrast, are all new in recent years.

Finally, William & Mary has had an option for students to design their own interdisciplinary major since the 1970s. Self-designed majors range across the curriculum, and the number has fluctuated over time between mid-single digits to mid-double digits. This number saw an unprecedented spike to 28 in 2011-12 brought about almost completely by a steep increase in self-designed Public Health majors. Joel Schwartz convened an interdisciplinary committee to study how best to meet the student demand for degrees in Public Health and this group created a minor that began in 2012-13. Since that time the number of students seeking to self-design majors in Public Health has fallen dramatically. Moreover, Kinesiology and Health Sciences is now considering a Public Health track within its major, a development that would further reduce the demand for self-designed majors in this field.

### **Analysis of the Challenges that Interdisciplinary Programs Confront**

The committee did individual interview-based studies of each undergraduate interdisciplinary program. These studies examined the programs' histories, curricula, governance structures, and resources (including general funding, teaching resources, and office support). We concluded by asking programs to identify the top 1-3 challenges that they face. Information that we collected in this process was supplemented by committee members drawing on their personal experiences.

There are certainly patterns in the challenges that programs face, but it is unlikely that the same remedies will work in all cases. Programs have quite different histories, missions, resources, and relationships with closely related departments, and these factors will all necessarily play a significant role when programs attempt to address challenges. For example, consider the great differences between Neuroscience, which has no joint-appointed faculty and no courses of its own, and Linguistics, which has 5 fully dedicated faculty and a curriculum made up almost completely of dedicated Linguistics courses. For some challenges it might be possible to talk about "best practices" for interdisciplinary programs, but in many others the best this committee can do is identify a tool kit from which programs can draw as suits their circumstances.

#### **1. Governance**

Every interdisciplinary program has a director; the minor in Marine Science has 2 co-directors, one from Arts and Sciences and one from VIMS, and the minor in Public Health has 3 co-directors, one each from Kinesiology, Biology, and Sociology. Some programs, like Med-Ren, have almost no governance structure "beneath" the director, while others have policies that specify a range of more or less well-defined governance roles.

Programs with smaller numbers of majors often leave all of the student advising to the director, while others have procedures for spreading the advising around. Our two programs with the largest number of majors, Neuroscience and International Relations, have NTE faculty that have primary, but not exclusive, responsibility for advising. Some programs provide small stipends to faculty who perform specific duties – for example, ENSP recruits individual faculty who have

primary responsibility for advising, maintaining the program's website, and development. Some programs have a specific procedure for identifying its "faculty." For example, once each year the Neuroscience program identifies its "faculty affiliates" and forwards this list to the dean for formal appointment; others in effect equate their "faculties" with the coalitions of the willing that show up for meetings. Finally, some programs also have executive committees that are formally appointed each year.

Program directors have demanding jobs: this was certainly a theme we heard regularly from the directors themselves. As we have seen, in many programs, all of the advising, scheduling, etc. falls on the director; also, while some directors have administrative support (for example, Africana Studies and GSWS share an office administrator, as do the IR and Global Studies programs), many do not, except for the baseline support that the Charles Center often provides.

**The risk of program director burn-out is significant, and the committee urges programs to look for strategies for easing the pressures on directors. The new system for compensating chairs and directors that has been instituted by the dean should have the effect of increasing compensation for directors, including a provision for course releases. In addition, we strongly urge programs to develop strategies for distributing the work. For some programs this may mean establishing an executive committee, and for larger programs it might mean appointing faculty to specific support roles (the ENSP model). The "affiliates" model, if it is implemented in a way that establishes clear expectations, is particularly attractive because it can help define and build a community of colleagues at the same time that it provides a mechanism for specifying faculty who have program responsibilities.**

## **2. Curriculum**

A few interdisciplinary programs have curricula that are structured (required courses, prerequisites, etc.) as tightly as the most structured departmental majors, while others have very flexible requirements and rely on advising to help students find an organized path through the degree. Several programs -- for instance, LCST, GSWS, and ENSP -- make use of purpose-built interdisciplinary courses designed specifically to meet core objectives within their degree programs. Others -- for example, Neuroscience -- have highly structured degrees that are completely made up of department-based courses. The IR faculty has concluded that a single core course is sufficient to give the degree an interdisciplinary grounding and personality, while the Global Studies majors (Asian and Middle East Studies, European Studies, Latin American Studies, and Russian Post-Soviet Studies) have all adopted a common format that includes interdisciplinary courses at both the foundation and capstone levels.

Some programs that lack purpose-built interdisciplinary courses may prefer this arrangement, but others would prefer to have these courses but just are not able to staff them. **This committee applauds the clear "base adequacy" policy that the Global Studies programs have adopted stating that these programs are only viable if they have truly interdisciplinary courses for students at both the introductory and advanced levels. (Of course, base adequacy will be defined very differently by different programs.) This clear policy statement set in motion a discussion that has resulted in increased funding for Global Studies programs from Arts and Sciences and the Reves Center. Africana Studies and GSWS have also conducted**

**planning exercises that resulted in statements that clarify the elements of a minimally adequate curriculum in their fields. The committee urges other programs to do this, as well.**

### **3. Teaching Resources**

Of course, programs will be able to offer their curricula only if they can secure faculty to teach needed courses. Departments are powerful at William & Mary, as they are at most of the best universities; despite the College's public rhetoric celebrating the virtues of interdisciplinarity, programs often feel like second-class citizens supplicating for resources. Joint appointments, memoranda of understanding, and adjunct "buyouts" can all assist programs in their dealings with departments. But the basic fact that all faculty must have departmental tenure homes makes it clear that the underlying power relationship between departments and programs is asymmetrical.

In response to this concern, the group of external visitors that reviewed most of our interdisciplinary programs in 2011-12 suggested that we should re-think our policy of not allowing programs to be tenure homes. In fact, all but one of these faculty visitors are currently at institutions that permit this practice (the one who is not, from Notre Dame, did not concur with her colleagues in this recommendation). The advantage of allowing programs to serve as tenure homes is that this would help to secure teaching and service resources for programs. It would also let them control searches so that they could hire new colleagues with the precise academic profiles that they prefer. The disadvantage could be that this practice, over time, could "silo" programs by reducing their day-to-day collaborations with faculty from a range of departments. Of course, we could strive for a hybrid model, with program faculties made up of faculty tenured in their programs working side-by-side with department-based faculty.

**The committee acknowledges the points made on both sides of this debate. However, while it might be desirable, under ideal circumstances, to experiment with allowing programs to be tenure homes, this would not be either feasible or desirable in the College's current budget environment. The Arts and Sciences faculty would have to expand by approximately 15% if it wanted to hire one new faculty member with a tenure home in each of our programs – assuming that ALL of these incremental new hires went to programs. However, since the A&S faculty is unlikely to expand significantly in the foreseeable future, programs could become tenure homes only by cannibalizing almost all department retirements, something that is unacceptable on both academic and political grounds. So, on pragmatic, not principled, grounds the committee recommends that Arts and Sciences does not experiment with tenuring in programs until its budget environment significantly changes.**

If this analysis is accepted, programs will have to continue to rely on four tools for securing the faculty that they need: joint appointments; department-wide MOUs; adjunct funding; and NTEs. It is also important for programs to be at the table when key faculty retirements, hires, and leaves are being discussed.

- Joint-appointments provide programs with full "ownership" of half (in most cases) of a faculty member's efforts. We note that this "ownership" is just as robust as it would be

for a faculty member tenured in a program with a joint appointment to a department. Joint-appointment searches can also afford programs significant say in the hiring process, although experience indicates that “equal say” can be difficult to implement in practice. Of course, joint appointments will provide programs with only two courses, and if the academic interests of jointly-appointed faculty members evolve over their careers, they might become less valuable to the program. Programs can also suffer disproportionately when a jointly appointed faculty member goes on leave.

- Joint appointments provide programs with secure resources, but with security comes inflexibility. Another way to secure key course offerings is a department-wide MOU that guarantees teaching resources to a program without pinning this to a particular faculty member. For example, several years ago Dean Strikwerda gave MLL a new position in exchange for a commitment that MLL would release faculty to teach five sections each year for LCST/Film. These five sections are “owned” by the program just as they would be for a joint appointment, but by mutual consent the department and the program can assign a shifting cast of faculty to these courses over time. This approach provides far more year-to-year flexibility than a joint appointment; moreover, there is reduced risk that leaves and retirements of specific faculty should be a significant factor. Of course, this only works because there are several faculty in MLL who can teach LCST/FILM courses. A department-wide MOU would not work between Latin American Studies and Government because Government has only had one Latin Americanist on its faculty.
- The coin of the realm for many interdisciplinary programs, especially those that have purpose-built courses but lack joint appointments, is “buy-out” funding – i.e., the provision of adjunct-level funding to departments so that they can cover the sections that TE colleagues are foregoing in order to teach in programs. This can work well in situations where a pool of adjuncts with the appropriate credentials is available and willing to work for adjunct rates. However, adjuncts, of course, are not available in many fields, and the William & Mary faculty has long expressed legitimate concern about the growth in the number of adjuncts in Arts & Sciences. Moreover, even when adjuncts do a solid job in the classroom, they are less accessible, especially over time, for advising, research supervisions, department service, letters of reference, etc.
- National research has shown that, as a rule, full-time NTE faculty do a far better job than adjuncts. This is especially true if they remain on staff for multiple years, something that will become more common now that Arts & Sciences has adopted a Senior Lecturer option. Full-time NTEs can be a critical resource for programs. For example, the GSWS program has had a series of multi-year NTEs that have all been excellent teachers and colleagues. One advantage of NTEs, of course, is that they typically teach 6 sections per year, in contrast to the two sections that programs usually receive from joint-appointments. Moreover, unlike TE faculty, it is not required that NTEs have a departmental “home,” so they can be expected to dedicate 100% of their efforts to their programs. **The committee believes that the “one NTE” (GSWS) model might be an excellent technique to efficiently help programs that regularly struggle to cover their curricula. These NTEs can teach critical courses in programs or be "traded" on a course-by-course basis to departments to free up TE faculty for**

**interdisciplinary teaching. Of course, this will not be feasible in programs where NTE pools are not adequate or where this would lead to students taking too many courses with the same instructor -- probably because "trading" is not possible.**

The concern that was mentioned by the largest number of programs was their frustration with the process when departments replace retiring faculty or faculty going on leave. **The committee believes that this problem calls for a three-stage solution. First, it is necessary that programs clearly identify the faculty and department-based courses that are critical to their curricula. The "affiliates" model, or some similar way to clearly identify faculty, will be an important part of accomplishing this. Second, programs should enter into explicit MOUs with departments assuring that programs will be at the table when departments make these decisions. Finally, the Arts & Sciences deans should insist that the interests of programs are heard when these decisions are made, and be willing to back up this insistence with the funding needed to give programs the continuity in staffing that they need.**

#### **4. Space**

Several programs mention interdisciplinary space as a high priority on their wish lists. This is understandable: interdisciplinary programs typically wrestle with building a sense of identity and community, and shared space can play a significant role in accomplishing these goals. Since faculty who teach in programs have offices in their home departments, "space" usually means a dedicated seminar room and, perhaps, offices for the program's adjuncts, NTEs, and director. The ideal arrangement would be if this space were proximate to the home departments of most faculty who teach in the program. For example, Public Policy has program space in Morton Hall in close proximity to the faculty who teach their undergraduate and graduate curricula. But this will not be feasible for many programs, and experience tells us that space will be far less useful if it is remote from the offices of key program faculty.

**In the near future Government, Economics, and Public Policy will be moving to Tyler Hall and the committee believes that the space that will be made available in Morton might serve as a home for an "interdisciplinary center" for an appropriate group of programs. For example, Africana Studies and GSWS are already in Morton; would there be synergies if the Global Studies Programs and LCST joined them in a new interdisciplinary center that included shared seminar rooms and office support?**

#### **5. Course access for interdisciplinary majors**

As a general principle, most faculty seem to agree that if we are going to have interdisciplinary majors, we should not throw up any unnecessary barriers to course enrollment for interdisciplinary students. But there is no question that these students often have had significant problems getting into the courses that they need.

Some departments, for instance, establish course registration filters that restrict courses to their own majors, often overlooking the fact that there may be interdisciplinary students that need these courses as much as their majors do. Many departments do not put major restrictions on their courses: in these cases, interdisciplinary majors compete for seats on a level playing field with department majors. In cases where departments impose major restrictions, there are at least

two methods to give interdisciplinary students access to the courses they need, cross-listing and giving them the same access as departmental majors in the registration software.

Some programs find that cross-listing is the best method for achieving their goals. These include securing seats in courses for their majors, advertising courses that have relevant interdisciplinary content, and helping to establish visibility and legitimacy for interdisciplinary majors within these courses. **The committee recommends policies and practices that will facilitate cross-listing. First, the Arts and Sciences deans should work with the Registrar to streamline the technical elements of cross-listings, and especially the capacity of Banner to accommodate cross-listing arrangements. Second, we encourage programs and departments to communicate on a regular basis so that they can understand and address the cross-listing needs of programs. We recommend that program directors meet with department chairs of relevant departments in the first two weeks of each semester to exchange information and plan for cross-listings --as well as for upcoming hires, SSRL replacements, and any other topics that could impact department/program coordination.**

Some of our biggest programs – e.g., Neuroscience and International Relations – secure access for their majors by signing memoranda of understanding with the relevant departments that give these programs’ majors the same access to specific required courses as department majors. For example, Neuroscience majors have exactly the same access in the registration software to Biology 345, Neurobiology, as Biology majors. Their access is no “better” – i.e., like Biology majors, they must fulfill all prerequisites and enroll on a first-come, first-served basis. But it’s also no “worse” – they compete for seats on a level playing field with Biology students. ENSP is taking steps this term to secure similar MOUs with appropriate departments. **It has been the experience of programs that departments are willing to negotiate these course-specific agreements, and that, once implemented, they eliminate regular negotiations over the allocation of seats. This committee encourages programs to pursue these agreements wherever possible.**

The one group of interdisciplinary students for whom it is not easy to apply this approach is self-designed majors. All Neuroscience majors need Psychology 313, so it is possible for the registrar to award major access to this course globally to all Neuroscience majors. But while there could be one or two students with self-designed majors who need this course, the vast majority do not, and everyone agrees that it would be inappropriate to give students major access to courses that aren’t required in their unique majors. **We have recently had several conversations with the Registrar’s Office about this situation and it looks like one remedy could be for the Charles Center to enter "instructor overrides" course-by-course for students with self-designed majors. This could be a feasible solution for self-designed majors.** An "instructor override," in contrast to a "course override," only removes the major restriction, it does not, for instance, raise the course ceiling.

The number of self-designed majors is so small that this practice will have only a minimal impact on course enrollments. While there has been a spike in the last couple years in the total number of self-designed majors, a long-term average is about 15 self-designed majors each year. These majors are spread all across the curriculum, from the sciences to the performing arts, and there would rarely be more than two or three students that need any specific course. Note: we

asked departments if they would accept a system like this for self-designed majors and found little objection.

### **Interdisciplinary Faculty Evaluation**

**Teaching --** The perceived impact of interdisciplinary teaching on the tenure, promotion, and merit reviews varies from faculty member to faculty member. Some faculty believe that their departments respect and acknowledge their interdisciplinary teaching, while others feel like it is not acknowledged, or even that it is punished. The joint appointment process allows the College to take explicit steps to prevent misunderstandings or unfairness. However, many faculty who teach sections for interdisciplinary programs currently do so without the protection of formal enabling documents of any kind. How will their interdisciplinary course evaluations be evaluated and weighed in merit reviews, or when they are being considered for tenure and promotion?

**The Merit System Review Committee that met in 2012-13 recommended that the Dean of the Faculty establish a standard, A&S-wide policy that spells out how departments should take the interdisciplinary teaching of faculty who do not have joint appointments into account in their evaluations for merit, tenure, and promotion. This policy could include required memoranda from appropriate program directors providing comparative/interpretive guidance. This committee endorses this recommendation.**

**Research --** Memoranda of Understanding that enable joint appointments can also specify research expectations for faculty working in interdisciplinary areas. For example, an MOU for a faculty member jointly appointed in English and LCST might say that the expectation is that about half of the faculty member's publications will be in literature journals and about half in film studies journals. It is our experience that it is not uncommon for the research specialties of faculty to evolve somewhat over their careers, and that when this happens, even faculty who do not have joint appointments are typically treated with considerable flexibility by their departments.

**The committee recommends a flexible but alert approach to this situation. If faculty feel like their interdisciplinary research is adequately recognized and rewarded by their departments, the best course probably is to maintain communication with their departments and avoid formalistic approaches. However, if faculty are moving to substantially new interdisciplinary research areas and/or if they are concerned about whether their new research will be recognized and awarded by their home departments, faculty and their chairs should negotiate a formal MOU on this subject. It would be appropriate to involve the dean in these negotiations to make sure that the high value that the College places on interdisciplinary work is respected.**

**Service –** Service expectations, like expectations in the areas of teaching and research, can often be handled with good communication and informal arrangements. But it is clear that departments and programs do not fully appreciate the cumulative impact on faculty of requests to serve on curriculum committees, search committees, and so on. As with teaching and research, the only alternative when informal approaches fail is to specify service responsibilities in an MOU. However, it remains easier said than done to (for example) divide a faculty member's

service responsibilities in half, so good communication remains critical, even for faculty with MOUs. For example, it is not possible for a faculty member to be a “half member” of two search committees, one in a department and one in a program, in the same year. So if a faculty member is serving on a search committee in a department, it is reasonable to excuse him or her from serving on a search committee in a program in the same year, even if that results in a one-year deviation from a 50-50 service expectation.

# Appendix A

## Survey of Department Chairs

The Interdisciplinary Studies Working Group has been asked to examine all interdisciplinary programs, their histories, best practices, and challenges in order to report on their role in the curriculum and on the extent to which these programs are well-supported. We, of course, understand that interdisciplinary programs have a major impact on departments and this survey asks you to provide some specific comments on this subject. Thank you for taking a few minutes to answer these questions.

**\*1. What is your department?**

**\*2. How many of your department's courses are regularly taken by students to fulfill requirements in interdisciplinary majors? Comments?**

**\*3. Do interdisciplinary majors take these as departmental courses or as cross-listed courses? Comments?**

- Departmental Courses
- Cross-listed courses

Comments

**\*4. How many of your faculty teach courses outside your department for interdisciplinary programs? Comments?**

**\*5. Are some or all of these courses also cross-listed with your department? Comments?**

**\*6. . How many of your faculty take on significant service responsibilities for interdisciplinary programs? (advising, participation on executive or search committees, etc.). Please describe how easy or difficult it is for faculty to do service in more than one unit.**

**\*7. How many of your faculty have formal joint appointments or MOUs spelling out their responsibilities in interdisciplinary programs? To what extent do these documents work effectively to clarify faculty responsibilities?**

**\*8. Do students with interdisciplinary majors that include one or more courses in your department have difficulty getting into the courses in your department that they need? Why or why not?**

**9. There are about a dozen self-designed interdisciplinary majors every year, spread over the humanities, social sciences, and sciences. Would your department object if the Registrar treated them just like your own majors when they enrolled in courses in your department that are required in their majors? (In other words, they would be required to have all appropriate prerequisites, they would be admitted on a first-come, first-served basis, etc. – just like your own majors?)**

# Appendix B

## Profiles of Interdisciplinary Programs

American Studies (AMST) -- Profile Forthcoming  
Asian and Middle Eastern Studies (AMES)  
Environmental Science and Policy (ENSP)  
European Studies (EURS)  
Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies (GSWS)  
International Relations (INRL)  
Latin American Studies (LAS)  
Linguistics (LING)  
Medieval and Renaissance Studies (MREN)  
Neuroscience (NSCI)  
Public Policy (PUBP)  
Russian and Post-Soviet Studies (RPSS)

## **Asian and Middle Eastern Studies**

### **1) Year program began:**

The program has its historical roots in two separate programs (East Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies) but was more recently combined, as AMES, in the year 2012.

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies and also offers four distinct Minors (Comparative and Diaspora Studies, East Asian Studies, South Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies)

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Over the course of its combined history AMES has, on average, conferred roughly 20 degrees per year.

### **4) Current Director:**

Co-Directors: Kevin Vose (Religious Studies) and Chitralekha Zutshi (History)

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

Directors typically serve three year terms.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

Governance structure consists of two Co-Directors and a group of approximately 30 affiliated faculty. It also has an executive committee that consists of the two co-directors and three additional faculty, one from each of the three primary areas in AMES (East Asian, South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies). Most governance decisions are taken up in the general meetings that are monthly and well-attended. Occasionally smaller decisions, such as the wording of job postings, will be taken up by the executive committee and then brought forward to the AMES faculty.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

The AMES major requires students to choose one of two possible tracks: East Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies. In addition, all students, regardless of the track they choose, take seven credits of "core" material: AMES 250: Critical Issues in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies (3 credits), AMES 492 (Senior Capstone Research in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies (1 credit) and a single 3 credit elective course "outside of the region of concentration." The remaining 30 credits are achieved through coursework in the track selected.

## **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

AMES relies heavily on voluntary faculty participation. Faculty's courses are surveyed for the upcoming semester and a list of approved courses is drawn up and inserted on AMES' website.

AMES' funding comes from three primary sources: it receives, annually, \$2000 from A&S and an additional \$3000 from the Reeves Center. It also receives approximately \$30,000/year from the Critchfield Endowment. That money is divided roughly in half with one part going to fund student language study and the other half going towards faculty initiated programming and conference travel).

## **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. Moving forward, AMES' biggest concern is the program's future once the Mellon funding runs out. Because the curriculum requires both the core course and the capstone research component, AMES' concern is to ensure that the Dean's office will continue to provide the funding support once the Mellon funding period is over.

2. there is also some concern about eventually finding a tenure-track hire whose expertise would be general enough to teach the AMES core course on their own thus eliminating the need to co-teach the course as it is currently done.

## **Environmental Science and Policy**

### **1) Year program began:**

The Environmental Science and Policy (ENSP) program started in 2004.

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

ENSP is a secondary major (students must declare a primary major in a core discipline) with two tracks, Science (BS) or Policy (BA). The track (BS or BA) is determined by the student's primary major.

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

ENSP's enrollment has steadily increased over the past decade: between the two tracks, ENSP has gone from 47 majors and 29 degrees conferred in 2004 to more than 65 majors and 35 degrees conferred in 2013.

### **4) Current Director:**

Andrew Fisher (History) is the current director and the fourth since the program started.

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

About every three years. Terms for Directors have historically been around 3 years.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

ENSP has an executive committee composed of representatives from each area of A&S and all the professional schools. Executive committee members are chosen on a volunteer basis and generally serve for three years, with the option to "re-up" at the end of that time. Last year, ENSP also initiated a faculty affiliate program with four positions (Executive Committee Chair, Communications, Development, Events) to provide an incentive for increased faculty participation in governance as the four affiliates each receive a \$500 annual stipend. Faculty affiliates are also volunteers and report semi-annually to the director. They can step down or be replaced by the director at the end of each academic year.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

ENSP has a core curriculum that includes a required introductory course (ENSP 101), annual seminars tied to a lecture series (ENSP 250), and capstone classes (ENSP 440, ENSP 490, ENSP 498). There are also numerous elective courses, largely taught by retired TE faculty and other NTE instructors, that are listed only as ENSP. The rest of the required courses for the major are drawn from other departments, particularly Biology, Geology, Economics, Government, and Sociology. Participation from the Humanities is more episodic (something that ENSP would like to change by adding an Environmental Humanities track), but there are generally regular

offerings in Anthropology, Art and Art History, English, History, Philosophy, and MLL that count toward the major. Business faculty also contribute classes occasionally.

## **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

ENSP has one joint appointment (Rob Hicks in Economics) and departmental MOUs with Economics, Government, Philosophy, and Sociology that guarantee a certain number of courses per year and some consultation in hiring decisions. Providing the necessary courses for our majors is a perennial challenge.

ENSP shares an administrative assistant with the Keck Lab, which also serves as an informal headquarters of sorts for the program (as it lacks space of its own). The program receives its base budget and adjunct funding from A&S. It also has some private money in two accounts, one of which has been used to help fund speakers and other miscellaneous expenses related to the curriculum. The larger account is set aside for faculty-student research collaborations, including summer research scholarships. In 2008, ENSP received a Mellon grant to sponsor two postdoctoral fellows each year on a rotating basis (two-year appointments that alternate among the Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). Unfortunately, the endowment has not generated sufficient returns to make the program self-sustaining, and A&S has not consistently honored its pledge to provide matching funds and pick up the costs of the program.

## **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

The three biggest challenges facing the program are:

1. Achieving financial stability through consistent College funding and pursuit of external funding.
2. Stabilizing and broadening our curriculum; as an interdisciplinary program, ENSP is very vulnerable to faculty turnover, leave schedules, etc. The addition of new faculty lines, particularly in environmental humanities and a climate scientist in Geology, would be of great benefit to ENSP.
3. Recruiting and retaining faculty from across the areas/schools to teach courses and perform administrative duties.

## **European Studies**

### **1) Year program began:**

~1999

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA in European Studies and also offers a minor.

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Over the past four years European Studies averages roughly 11 majors per year.

### **4) Current Director:**

Bruce Campbell (Modern Languages and Literatures)

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

Directors typically serve three year terms.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

European Studies has a curriculum faculty advisory committee that oversees the major plans of all the students who wish to major in ES. With regards to governance, in European Studies the collective faculty affiliate have had a say in governance via decision making regarding the use of funds, programming, and hiring for the Mellon-sponsored faculty-fellow program.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

European Studies' curriculum is a "menu" type major that requires students to design a course of study by fulfilling requirements in eleven categories of course options as well as a single core course designated as EURS 201 and a EURS-designated senior-level capstone course. The course options come from a list populated by courses in a number of different departments including History, Art History, Classics, and Government (to name but a few). Modern Languages and Literatures provides a significant portion of the courses that count towards the European Studies major. European Studies courses are not generally cross-listed but instead are courses, in home departments, that count towards the concentration. In this arrangement, European Studies does not require departments to save seats for ES majors except in the case of high demand courses, but it does require the program director to keep close tabs on which courses are being offered in a particular semester.

## **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

European Studies has an MOU with A&S which provides the bulk of program funding. A&S funding pays for the program director's stipend and course buy-out, adjunct funding and also program funding. ES currently has a four year Mellon grant which provides adjunct funds, faculty development funds, as well as funds for "high impact teaching" (including an annual student/faculty conference with a research experience associated with the senior seminar in European Studies).

## **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. One of the issues EURS faces is not having any control over ensuring that necessary courses are taught on a consistent basis. Often, when a EURS faculty affiliate goes on leave, there are no guarantees that the department's replacement will teach the necessary EURS courses.

2. The second issue is trying to ensure that the program benefits in the long term by the addition of a TE faculty hire whose explicit disciplinary identity is linked to European Studies. EURS would like to see the Mellon-funded faculty fellow position be converted to a tenure track line once the Mellon term is finished.

## **Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies (formerly Women's Studies)**

### **1) Year program began:**

1991 (as Women's Studies Program)

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA Interdisciplinary Studies – GSWS (formerly WMST)

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

GSWS graduated its first major in 1996. There has been a gradual growth over the years. GSWS has graduated, on average, about a dozen majors over the past 10 years. Except minor fluctuations, there is no clear trend.

GSWS serves the undergraduate student body more broadly. Enrollments in GSWS courses have been very healthy. Since 2003 GSWS course enrollments each year have ranged from 323 to 521, averaging 411 students per year.

### **4) Current Director:**

Gul Ozyegin

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

About every three years

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

The Program has a number of standing committees, and others may be appointed on an ad hoc basis as necessary. Unless otherwise specified any tenured, tenure-eligible, or specified term appointed faculty are eligible for membership on Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies committees.

#### **A. PRINCIPAL COMMITTEES: COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

##### **1. GENDER, SEXUALITY, AND WOMEN'S STUDIES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (GSWSEC):**

Is an Arts and Sciences committee, chaired by the Director of GSWS and composed of: GSWS core faculty, two GSWS students (undergraduate or graduate), as well as four "invited" members – three from Arts and Sciences (3), and one "at large" member who would come from one of the

Schools (Law, Education, VIMS, and Business). Three-year terms with overlapping membership. This committee is a policy making body whose functions include oversight on curricular matters, personnel matters, and program operations and direct decision making involvement in these areas. Thus, the Executive Committee operates similarly to a department's full faculty. The GSWSEC is also responsible for appointing members to the Curriculum, Personnel, Outreach, and Prizes committees (see below).

## **2. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (PC):**

The Personnel Committee is advisory to the Program Director on all matters of procedure or policy not explicitly covered by other committees. Members of the PC are elected annually by a majority vote of the GSWSEC. The program director also serves on the PC, *ex officio*. The PC elects its own chair. The PC forwards annual merit evaluations to the director in a manner consistent with the College's, the A&S's, and the Program's Joint Appointment Policies, and with the faculty member's Joint Appointment Memo of Understanding (JAMOU). The tenured members of the Personnel Committee make recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure and conduct post-tenure reviews.

## **3. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (CC):**

Approves all course proposals and revisions of the curriculum. Membership is rotating and appointed, composed of a chair from the core GSWS faculty, 3-5 members from both GSWS and other Arts & Sciences departments or programs, and an undergraduate GSWS student (usually a major). The chair of the CC report regularly to the GSWSEC concerning the CC's activities.

## **4. AWARDS AND PRIZES COMMITTEE:**

Membership is rotating and appointed, composed of interested faculty members from departments and programs across the College. Chooses the Dean's Prize for Student Research on Women and the Carol Woody Summer Internship awards.

### **Also Note:**

Development of Program initiatives as well as all our curriculum planning and development is by design and Program policy a collaborative effort on the part of the GSWS core faculty, affiliated faculty, and any other interested faculty members and students (graduate and undergraduate) from all across the College. These efforts are formalized in several ways, including serving on GSWS committees, and GSWS Annual Planning Meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to bring together all interested faculty members and students from anywhere in the College in a collaborative, "workshop" environment in order to identify Program goals, means of achieving them, and timelines in areas such as curriculum needs, faculty development, outreach, new initiatives for Program vision and goals, and any issues that may have arisen in the past year that are likely to impact the Program or require its involvement.

## **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

Majors and minors take a structured series of courses starting at the introductory level with GSWS 205, "Introduction to Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies," which includes an activist component, followed by six or seven courses distributed between courses in the humanities, the social sciences and interdisciplinary studies. Every major also takes a course in feminist theory, and a capstone research experience (a senior seminar, internship, senior Honors thesis, or independent study). We also offer freshman seminars.

GSWS builds its curriculum in two ways. Each year, our three jointly-appointed faculty and our visiting assistant professor offer approximately eleven courses (including multiple sections of GSWS 205) that originate in GSWS; and graduate teaching instructors or adjuncts offer an additional 3 or 4 courses (including GSWS 205). We also offer approximately 40 cross-listed courses per year, most frequently with Africana Studies, English, History, and Sociology, and occasionally with American Studies, Anthropology, Art History, Classical Studies, Economics, Kinesiology, Literary and Cultural Studies, Modern Languages and Literatures, Religious Studies, and Theater.

## **8) Program's resources**

### **– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

Our three permanent full-time core faculty members all hold joint-appointments (currently including English and Sociology), so all our work involves designing courses and mentoring students in both GSWS and at least one other discipline. GSWS annually employs 1 to 3 graduate students from American Studies, History, and Anthropology as teaching fellows. These instructors are each responsible for teaching a section of and participating in the coordination of our Introduction to Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies course (GSWS 205).

### **– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

GSWS shares an Academic Coordinator with Africana Studies. Seventy-five percent of the Coordinator's time is dedicated to GSWS.

Charles Center Teaching Fellows--CCTF (formerly Mellon Fellows): Each spring we hire 6 TAs to be teaching assistants in 205s to assist students with their activism projects. Each CCTF is awarded a \$500 stipend. Charles Center provides funding for three CCTFs. The Gove Endowment funds the other three CCTFs.

## Private Sources

**Carol Woody Internship** awards are funded by donations from alumna Carol Woody and available for academically distinguished students interested in women's issues. The award is intended to offer a "real world" experience as preparation for professional career and/or post graduate opportunities. The Program not only manages the funds but works closely with Carol Woody to ensure the success of this initiative and to keep her informed about the benefits accrued by students.

**The annual GSWS Braithwaite Lecture** is named for Minnie Braithwaite, who attempted to attend classes at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, well before William and Mary was a co-ed campus. This lecture series is funded by the Gove Endowment.

### 9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?

1. To gain greater ability to frame our curriculum design with an interdisciplinary focus and pedagogy. We need **another** full-time instructor (NTE, permanent faculty member) with training and Ph.D in a GSWS Interdisciplinary Program to enrich interdisciplinarity and to provide students with access to cutting-edge interdisciplinary approach and research.
2. In order to have the advantage of holding more control over the coherence and modest expansion of our curriculum, we need a new (jointly appointed) tenure track position shared with a department, a position that devotes ½ time to GSWS (in addition to hiring a replacement for Gray position).
3. To establish team-taught **required** Feminist Research Methods course for all majors and minors.
4. To pursue team-teaching as a strategy of interdisciplinarity.
5. To create a Graduate Certificate Program: This certificate program will allow graduate students in departments/programs to develop/ complete expertise in GSWS in the context of an organized program that would complement their home degree program requirements. Such a certificate program would further foster (and formalize) our relations with graduate students and programs, while contributing intellectual vitality and engagement of GSWS.

## **International Relations**

### **1) Year program began:**

The International Relations (IR) program started in 1987. It was originally housed in the Reves Center and was not administered by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences but by the Reves Center Staff and or a Faculty Fellow who was on leave. In 2006, IR (along with Global Studies) moved from Reves to A&S.

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

The IR Program is an undergraduate only program and students graduate with a BA.

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

In terms of scale, the IR Program is currently the largest interdisciplinary major in A&S and is usually one of the six largest majors overall. Last year (2013) the IR major graduated 89 majors. The size of the program actually peaked in the mid 2000s with more than 100 graduates a year for several years. When the curriculum was re-designed, the number of graduating seniors dropped to around 60 in 2007-08, but has been climbing ever since. This year (2014), IR will graduate over 90 students.

### **4) Current Director:**

The current Director is Mike Tierney

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

5+ years.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

The IR Program currently has a Director and an Associate Director. The Associate Director also serves as the Director of Advising and ends up serving as the Advisor of Record for about half of all IR majors. The Director and Associate Director are appointed by the Dean of A&S. The IR Program does not have a "faculty affiliates" program. The IR Major does not make personnel decisions unless it has to hire a new Administrative Assistant. The Administrative Assistant for IR serves the IR Program and the multiple different Global Studies Concentrations.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

IR started as a small interdisciplinary program with a laundry list of courses borrowed from a variety of departments. Students originally pieced together different courses that were "foreign" and took enough to call it a major. Then in the 1990s the IR program developed "tracks," which had a particular regional or functional focus. Thus, a student could major in IR with a concentration in East Asia or a concentration in International Political Economy. In the 2000s the IR program got rid of its tracks and developed a curriculum with a small number of core courses

and many elective options. In 2006 the IR Program completely re-designed its curriculum so that it included a large number of core courses, a language proficiency, a research methods proficiency, and a capstone writing course. The IR major is now the most complex major on campus. Given the prerequisite courses required for some of the core course, IR students are structured to a much greater degree than other majors.

The vast majority of IR courses are offered by other departments. The three primary departments are Government, Economics, and History. However, IR majors do rely heavily on Modern Languages in order to fulfill the language proficiency. Other departments (Anthropology, Business, Sociology, Religion, Psych) offer elective courses. The IR Major requires one purpose built course -- International Relations in Disciplinary Perspective (INRL 300), which is supposed to be taken during a student's sophomore year. This course is taught through contributions from Government, Econ, and History.

### **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

The Program receives an M&O budget every year from the Dean's Office. Since 2007 the Program has received a supplement for programming from the Reves Center. There is very little private money since the IR Program is young and because most IR majors prior to 2007 thought of their institutional home as the Reves Center. Currently, the IR Program has no endowed accounts.

The IR Program has an MOU with Government, Econ, and History where those departments promise to provide a certain number of required courses for IR and promise to provide one faculty member per year to help teach in the INRL 300 course.

### **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

The primary challenge for IR is need for more TE faculty lines in Government and Economics. TE faculty are here for the long run and they are able to engage IR majors in their research projects. NTEs are not research active and adjuncts come and go.

The second challenge is offering enough courses for our students. Internationally-oriented courses tend to fill the fastest in contributing departments and often have wait lists. Our third most pressing challenge is attracting private money in order to provide the Director with more flexibility when it comes to offering courses or buying out faculty.

## **Latin American Studies**

### **1) Year program began:**

~1994

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA in Latin American Studies as well as a minor in LAS.

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Historically, Latin American Studies has conferred approximately 5-7 degrees per year with some fluctuation, higher or lower, during its existence as a program.

### **4) Current Director:**

Susan Webster (Art and Art History)

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

Until recently, the position of director rotated yearly. However, in 2009 the position was changed to involve a longer-term commitment in order to provide the program with more continuity.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

LAS' governance structure consists of the Director and a core group of faculty that attends regularly scheduled meetings and makes collective decisions regarding curriculum, funding, programming etc. LAS' core faculty is a group of affiliate faculty, listed on the website, whose research interests emphasize engagement with Latin American and who regularly teach courses about Latin America. There is a single TE position in Latin American Studies that is a joint appointment with Africana Studies and History (History is the home department).

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

The revised curriculum moves the major requirements from a menu-style approach to a student-driven multidisciplinary schemata. Interdisciplinarity is enhanced by the co-taught core course, which emphasizes interdisciplinary analytical skills as well as cross-disciplinary thematic foci. The new curriculum includes two "core" courses, one being either History 131 or 132 (both are chronological surveys of Latin American History) and LAS 350: Latin American Cultures, Politics, and Societies. In addition, students are required to select two disciplinary "sub-concentrations" that will guide their course of study. Students must take nine credits (equivalent to 3 courses) in each of the selected sub-concentrations. Choices for sub concentrations include: Anthropology, Art History, Economics, Government, Hispanic Studies, History, and Sociology. The actual content of the major fluctuates depending on what courses are being offered when.

## **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

LAS' funding comes from two primary sources: A&S gives \$1000/year and Reeves gives another \$1500. The Mellon grant also provides funding for professional development, and will fund the LAS post-doc that is shared with Africana Studies. The five-year Mellon grant money also helps fund the Director's stipend, support for the Teaching Projects and May Seminars and funds the buy-out necessary to staff LAS 350, one of two core courses.

## **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. Among the most pressing issues for Latin American Studies is the impending completion of the Mellon funding; the direct result of which may put into jeopardy the consistent staffing of LAS 350. As a team-taught course that draws from two disciplines taught in conjunction, the LAS major requires two buy-outs for LAS 350 per year.

2. In addition, the staffing of HIST 131 and 132 has been an issue, particularly when History faculty who teach the course go on leave. Like other interdisciplinary programs, the lack of input regarding the course offerings of contributing departments continues to be a serious issue that often jeopardizes students' ability to take core classes.

## **Linguistics**

### **1) Year program began:**

1973

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA Interdisciplinary Studies - Linguistics

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Gradual growth to about 10 per year in 2005; steady growth since then to ~30 per year with an increase in the number of minors.

### **4) Current Director:**

Ann Reed

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

About every three years.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

The current administrative structure only includes a Director. The program is currently working on personnel policies, which may include an executive or personnel committee.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

The program has a core set of courses and electives from a few other departments.

### **8) Program's resources**

– **Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

– **other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

There are 3 joint appointments (one TE, 2 NTE) and they are currently searching for a second TE. The joint appointments have English as the home department. The other 3 full-time TE linguistics instructors are full members of the English department.

Office support and funding through the English Department, with supplemental funding from the Charles Center.

**9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. Stabilizing faculty (interdisciplinary positions; tenure slots, mentoring NTEs)
2. Need for a "treaty/MOU" with the English Department (things work well because English is supportive of the program).
3. The administrative structure is insufficient given the program growth – this issue is currently being addressed.
4. Space can be an issue. There is sufficient office space, but they are spread out (Blow Hall, Tucker, ISC, Tyler).
5. With regard to tenure, it was mentioned that going through English can be problematic in terms of the personnel committee determining who has sufficient expertise to serve as external reviewers.
6. There was mention about exploring the possibility of receiving some indirect costs from grants received by Linguistics faculty members.

## **Medieval and Renaissance Studies**

### **1) Year program began:**

1987

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA in Interdisciplinary Studies – Medieval and Renaissance Studies, and minor in Interdisciplinary Studies – Medieval and Renaissance Studies

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Low single-digits

### **4) Current Director:**

Monica Potkay, English

### **5) Frequency of director turnover:**

Typically every three years.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

All interested faculty are invited to participate in the governing committee. This semester the director is going to organize the faculty just a bit more formally to share in the work of assessment (PIEs), to generate ideas for invited speakers, to redesign the major, and to work toward making the new intro course eligible for COLL 200. I anticipate that such a committee would include the faculty who already regularly contribute to Med/Ren.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

The program had an interdisciplinary core course about a dozen years ago, and they re-instituted it last year on the recommendation of the program's external. It also has MREN 351 and 352, Special Topics in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance (respectively). We use these only to cross-list departments' special topics courses that are not regularly offered.

### **8) Program's resources**

– **Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

– **other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

It has usually had funds for at least one adjunct-level buy-out. This has been used for a variety of purposes and will now be used for the core course.

The program has received support from the Charles Center for an annual speaker series and for some student-faculty research activities.

**9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

The curriculum has some gaps, in part because they haven't had a broad interdisciplinary core course. To diversify the program, the faculty hope to involve colonial Latin Americanists in Art History, Hispanic Studies, and History, as well as the new medievalist in History. The external program reviewer suggested the creation of a gateway course, in part to recruit majors to the program. The program has implemented this change.

The program has always been more interest and participation from medievalist faculty than renaissance faculty, but there is hope that this could change as the faculty turns over.

Med-Ren would like to offer the opportunity for faculty to team teach, but it currently has no mechanism to make this possible (no MOUs or joint appointments, for instance).

## Neuroscience

### 1) Year program began:

~1993

### 2) Degree(s) awarded:

BS in Neuroscience

### 3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:

There was a large increase in majors when the name of the major changed from biopsychology to neuroscience. We currently graduate ~75 majors per year.

### 4) Current Director:

Josh Burk

### 5) Frequency of Director turnover:

Burk is the third Director since 1997.

### 6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)

There is a Director, Associate Director and Coordinator (NTE who receives a 2-course reduction to devote time to the Neuroscience Program, primarily with advising, updating the website and other administrative responsibilities). Other faculty members are given the title Faculty Affiliates. Personnel actions (e.g., adding new affiliates) are at the discretion of the Director and Associate Director. In personnel activities such as including a letter in a candidate's tenure dossier, the candidate typically approaches the Director and the Director includes a letter describing the candidate's contribution to the Neuroscience Program.

### 7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)

There are only Neuroscience courses to track the writing requirement, for Research in Neuroscience and for honors. All other courses are housed within other departments.

## **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

The Neuroscience Program has an MOU with participating departments so that Neuroscience majors will have equal access to register for courses as majors in the home department and that the Director will be informed about SSRL schedules. Funding for the program comes from the Charles Center.

## **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. The biggest challenge is insuring that key (especially required) courses are taught when faculty are on SSRL or removed from their regular teaching schedule for other reasons.
2. There is a need for office space for the Director and Coordinator, which will help with having "home" and identity for Neuroscience majors.
3. A curricular challenge is making sure that we are not seen as a pre-med major but rather with a focus on Neuroscience. Our curricular structure ("using" courses in other departments) makes it challenging to develop specific tracks that are more focused on Neuroscience.
4. Our development efforts have not been particularly successful.

## **Public Policy**

### **1) Year program began:**

The graduate program in public policy is approximately 25 years old. The undergraduate program predates the graduate program.

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

The Public Policy program offers both an undergraduate degree (a BA in Public Policy) as well as a graduate degree (a Masters in Public Policy).

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

The number of undergraduate public policy majors is currently in the mid- to high-thirties. This is a slight increase from the average number of graduates in the previous decade which was in the high-twenties. The graduate program averages around 22 students per year. The graduate program is a two-year program, but there are joint degrees with Law, Business, VIMS and the Math department which brings the overall number of graduate students in the program to close to 50 a year.

### **4) Current Director:**

Sarah Stafford is the current Director of the Program. She has been in the position since AY2012-2013.

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

Prior to Stafford's directorship there were three other directors serving for a period of five to fourteen years.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

The program has a faculty Director, a permanent Associate Director Elaine McBeth who is a professional staff member, a faculty graduate coordinator (supported by the program not the Dean's office), and a faculty undergraduate coordinator (supported by the program not the Dean's office). Faculty who teach in the graduate program or teach a core class in the undergraduate program are considered to be Faculty Affiliates. The Director may also appoint up to three additional faculty members to be Faculty Affiliates (e.g., faculty who taught in the program for a long time but are not currently teaching in the program) and the Chairs of Economics and Government and the Dean of the Law School are affiliates ex officio. All matters requiring votes are brought to the Faculty Affiliates. The program also has an Executive Committee consisting of the Chairs of Economics and Government and three elected members

who consult with the Director on important issues either that do not require a formal vote by the Faculty Affiliates or which the Director would like additional consultation before bringing to the Faculty Affiliates. The Faculty Affiliates have one elected standing committee, the Personnel Committee, which reviews all request for formal affiliation with the Public Policy program and provides a recommendation to the whole body. Since Public Policy does not have joint appointments, the Personnel Committee does not have any formal role in either tenure or promotion decisions or annual merit reviews.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

The undergraduate curriculum is comprised of four required courses (two in Economics and two in Government), three additional core courses chosen from a menu of classes offered by a variety of different departments, and four elective classes from a large list of courses offered primarily by Economics, Government, and Sociology. All of the required classes are classes that are part of the standard offerings of the various departments. There are no formal arrangement or agreements between Public Policy and any departments regarding course offerings. Informally, both Economics and Government work with Public Policy to ensure that the appropriate classes are available for Public Policy majors. Currently, there is only one Public Policy course for the undergraduates, a one-credit introduction to Public Policy that is taught as an overload.

The graduate curriculum is comprised of nine required courses and the equivalent of seven additional electives. With two exceptions, the courses are all taught solely at the graduate level and are all either Public Policy courses or are cross-listed courses with another graduate program on campus. In particular, all graduate students must take at least two law courses which are taught by the law faculty. The two exceptions are two econometrics classes which are cross-listed with the undergraduate economics program. Public Policy has MOUs with both the Economics and Government departments outlining the number of courses each department must contribute annually to the graduate curriculum. There are no formal agreements between Public Policy and individual faculty members. There are no formal cross-listing agreements or requirements with any of the other graduate programs, but informally there are certain courses that have traditionally been cross-listed with the various programs.

### **8) Program's resources**

**– Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

**– other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

The program receives money from the Dean for graduate tuition waivers and stipend, although unlike most A&S graduate programs, only about a quarter of students receive waivers and the

typical stipend amount is lower than that provided to other graduate programs. The program does have one full time administrator provided by the Dean as well as some departmental M&O funds. The program has a number of endowments as well as annual contributions from its Board of Advisors and alumni of the program. These private funds provide significant additional student support as well as pay for an additional part-time administrative assistant and provide faculty support of those teaching in the program.

**9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

The top challenge for the Public Policy program is the lack of support for the undergraduate major. As noted, there is only one Public Policy course for undergraduates. There are no capstone options in Public Policy nor are there any truly interdisciplinary public policy classes for these students.

## **Russian and Post-Soviet Studies**

### **1) Year program began:**

~1994

### **2) Degree(s) awarded:**

BA in Russian and Post-Soviet Studies, 2 Minors (Russian Language and Literature and Russian and Post-Soviet Studies)

### **3) Patterns in number of degrees awarded:**

Has historically conferred approximately 8 degrees per year.

### **4) Current Director:**

Elena Prokhorova

### **5) Frequency of Director turnover:**

Directors typically serve three year terms.

### **6) What is the program's governance structure? (e.g., How is governing committee selected? Is there a "faculty affiliates" program? Is there an executive committee? What is the structure for personnel decisions/actions?)**

RPSS' governance structure includes a director whose typical term is three years. In addition to the program director, RPSS has a group of approximately ten faculty affiliates and an executive committee constituted by faculty from disciplines distinct from that of the director. This year, for example, the director is from MLL and the two remaining executive committee members are from Government and History. New by-laws were recently instituted in keeping with the larger goals of Global Studies and a Personnel Committee (which is essentially the Executive Committee) was formed in order to hire a faculty fellow for next year.

### **7) Program's curriculum (especially, does it have its own courses or does it draw on courses already offered by departments?)**

Russian and Post-Soviet Studies is a "menu" type major that requires students to design a course of study by fulfilling requirements in eleven lists of course options as well as a linguistic competency in Russian above the 300 level. The vast majority of RPSS courses for the major and the minor come from the Russian Program in Modern Languages and Literatures. However,

the RPSS concentration is also augmented by relevant courses in History and in Government. Like other Global Studies programs, RPSS is particularly dependent on the director who oversees the course of studies of the majors and ensures that they have the proper courses in order to graduate.

### **8) Program's resources**

– **Teaching Resources (Joint appointments? Treaties with departments that assure teaching? Funding for buy-outs?, etc.)**

– **other resources (office support? Funding from the dean?, Charles Center?, private sources for speakers, etc.?)**

Neither History nor Government are required to save seats for potential RPSS majors and RPSS courses are not generally cross-listed.

RPSS' funding comes from two primary sources: it receives, annually, \$1500 from A&S and an additional \$1000 from the Reeves Center.

### **9) What, from the program's perspective, are the top 1-3 biggest challenges that the program faces?**

1. Among RPSS' primary concern is figuring out what happens to the program once the Mellon funding runs out. The incoming faculty fellow will be vital in offering upper level Russian Studies courses (by freeing up both MLL faculty members) and will improve the research components in RSPSS 201 and 491.

2. Other significant concerns are perpetual difficulties in staffing core courses due to faculty leave. RSPSS essentially has one person each in Government and History. Because supporting departments don't have to hire someone who can cover the same courses, when these faculty members go on leave it often leaves gaps in key courses.

3. Finally, like other departments, RPSS has acutely felt the crisis in adequate teaching space. RPSS courses have often been scheduled at very inconvenient times and in spaces not necessarily suited to discussion-based teaching.

# Appendix C

Historical Trends in Interdisciplinary Majors and Minors

**Table 1: Interdisciplinary Degrees Conferred, 1994-2013**

<b>First and Second Interdisciplinary UG majors</b>		<b>1994-95</b>	<b>1999-00</b>	<b>2003-04</b>	<b>2004-05</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
<b>Department/Program</b>	<b>Major</b>												
American Studies	American Studies	3	6	10	16	16	17	13	24	14	16	13	11
Black Studies	*Africana Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	2	2
	Black Studies	0	1	1	5	4	3	1	4	4	--	--	--
Environmental Science and Policy	Environmental Policy Environmental Science	7	16	15	29	21	30	36	28	39	45	33	31
Global Studies	Global Studies - African Studies	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	3	9	1	0	2
	**Global Studies – Asian/Middle Eastern Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	9
	Global Studies - East Asian Studies	10	7	11	13	8	11	9	8	12	7	10	1
	Global Studies - European Studies	0	2	6	5	1	9	6	6	12	11	9	11
	Global Studies - Latin American Studies	4	6	2	2	2	3	1	6	3	8	6	7
	Global Studies - Middle Eastern Studies	2	1	6	6	3	9	12	14	8	23	10	7
	Global Studies - Russian Studies	5	0	3	3	8	7	4	10	8	10	6	5
Interdisciplinary Studies	Interdisciplinary Studies - Self-Designed	8	5	4	8	11	9	13	14	15	19	28	26
International Relations	International Relations	41	38	66	84	76	83	86	103	64	86	82	62
Linguistics	Linguistics	12	11	12	11	23	19	18	17	30	28	19	25
Literary and Cultural Studies	Lit/Cul Film Studies Track	12	7	13	5	6	15	15	8	9	13	14	9
	Literary and Cultural Studies			10	11	10	6	6	9	8	9	7	7
Medieval and Renaissance Studies	Medieval/Renaissance Studies	1	0	1	1	1	1	6	3	4	0	2	1
Neuroscience	Neuroscience	8	31	33	62	71	51	63	69	99	63	75	72
Public Policy	Public Policy	20	11	29	23	36	13	28	28	24	33	29	46
Women's Studies	Women's Studies	2	4	13	11	9	9	10	17	14	13	10	13
<b>Total</b>		<b>135</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>299</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>347</b>

Interdisciplinary Minors		2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Department/Program	Minor										
American Studies	American Studies	1	2	0	1	5	4	0	1	2	3
Biochemistry	Biochemistry	5	14	16	12	15	16	19	28	21	23
Black Studies	*Africana Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	0	0	1
	Black Studies	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	--	--
Community Studies	Community Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	2	2
Environmental Science and Policy	Environmental Science and Policy	1	7	1	5	6	4	11	7	5	12
Film Studies	Film Studies	7	5	4	5	4	6	6	12	5	6
Global Studies	African Studies	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
	East Asian Studies	2	1	2	5	4	4	3	4	4	2
	**Asian/Middle Eastern Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
	Italian Studies	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
	Japanese Studies	3	5	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0
	Latin American Studies	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
	Middle Eastern Studies	3	3	6	7	4	6	1	7	5	4
	Russian Studies	1	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	3	4
Interdisciplinary Studies	Public Health	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
International Relations	International Relations	10	16	10	8	11	2	0	0	0	--
Judaic Studies	Judaic Studies	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0
Linguistics	Linguistics	4	2	6	3	8	8	3	4	6	7
Literary and Cultural Studies	Literary and Cultural Studies	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	1	1	5
Marine Science	Marine Science								3	3	0
Medieval and Renaissance Studies	Medieval/Renaissance Studies	0	0	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	0
Women's Studies	Women's Studies	8	5	4	3	4	5	3	6	2	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>49</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>77</b>

\* Black Studies and African Studies merged into Africana Studies in 2009-10

\*\* East Asian Studies and Middle Eastern Studies merged into East Asian/Middle Eastern Studies in 2012-13