

## Report of the Provost's Committee on ID Studies

February 24, 2013

Committee Members: Michael Dougher (chair), Plamen Atanassov, Gregory Cajete, Christos Christodoulou, Abhaya Datye, Michel Disco, Philip Ganderton, Frank Kessel, Kate Krause, Kevin Malloy, Jamal Martin, Bruce Milne, Manuel Montoya, Mary Anne Newhall, Kymberly Pinder, Tiffany Lee, Johannes Van Reenen, Margaret Werner-Washburne, and Amy Wohlert.

### Background

Although there is now ample and convincing evidence of the supplemental value of ID<sup>1</sup> (ID) approaches to the solution of important social, scientific, and technical problems, there is general consensus among faculty and administrators that there are significant organizational obstacles to the creation and maintenance of ID study programs<sup>2 3</sup> at UNM. In particular, there are no articulated procedures and policies available to faculty who wish to establish ID study programs, and even when faculty find ways to get such programs established, they find little administrative support for their funding, management, evaluation, or integration with existing departments, schools, and colleges.

Given the proliferation and demonstrated success of ID study programs<sup>4</sup> at universities across the country and the acknowledgment of institutional barriers to these programs here at UNM, Provost Chaouki Abdallah charged Senior Associate Vice Provost Michael Dougher with the task of forming a broadly representative faculty committee to generate a document outlining possible models by which ID programs could be proposed, evaluated, funded, and managed at UNM<sup>5</sup>. Early in the process, the committee (membership listed above) agreed to divide the report into five sections, each of which addresses related but separate critical issues regarding the establishment of ID study programs. Based on expressed interest and expertise, each committee member was assigned to one of five subcommittees, each of which drafted one of the five sections:

---

<sup>1</sup> The term interdisciplinary will be used throughout this report as an umbrella term meant to include interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, and cross-disciplinary activities as well.

<sup>2</sup> Some ID programs are intimately tied to Research Centers, but academic programs are the sole focus of this report. The creation and maintenance of Research Centers was addressed in a previous report authored by the Office of the Vice President for Research and the Faculty Senate Research Policy Committee.

<sup>3</sup> The term ID program in this report refers to interdisciplinary programs that include faculty from two or more colleges. There are several ID programs currently at UNM that reside within a single college (e.g., Chicano, Hispano, Mexicano Studies, Sustainability Studies, Women's Studies), and we are not advocating any change in their organizational or administrative structure at this time, although the procedures and policies proposed may well be adapted to such programs.

<sup>4</sup> Nothing in this report should be interpreted as minimizing the importance and value of disciplinary expertise. Interdisciplinarity is not a substitute for disciplinary expertise; rather it relies and expands upon it. As such, there is an additional burden on ID scholars in that they must, in order to succeed, acquire expertise in more than one discipline. The challenge for universities interested in promoting interdisciplinarity then is to find ways to support and encourage scholars who pursue this difficult but potentially fertile path.

Rationale for ID programs, Types of ID Management Models and Recommendations for Which Would Work Best at UNM, Proposal of a Specific Management Model, A Proposed Funding Model, and Procedures for Hiring, and Evaluating, and Promoting ID Faculty. All drafts were circulated among the whole committee before the committee chair drafted an integrated report that was further reviewed by the full committee. This report is the result of that process.

## **Executive Summary**

### **Rationale for Interdisciplinary Programs and Common Obstacles (see Section 1 for a full discussion)**

- Summary of Drivers:
  1. Solving/Understanding Complex Global Issues
  2. Positive Impact on Diversity and Area Studies
  3. Critical for Competing for the Best Students and Innovative New Faculty
  4. Internationalization Requires Interdisciplinarity
  5. Critical for Successful Research Funding
  6. Responsive to Workforce Needs
- Summary of Common Institutional Obstacles
  1. Rigid organizational structure and administration silos
  2. Inflexible course and degree requirements that inhibit approval of new courses
  3. Department/discipline-centric hiring and promotion guidelines
  3. Inadequate funding and ongoing support for ID programs at all levels
  4. Marginality of ID research, teaching, service, advising, and mentoring

### **An Entrepreneurial Model for the Active Management of ID Programs at UNM (see Sections 2 and 3)**

1. Creation of Provost Interdisciplinary Programs Committee (IPC) consisting of an Associate Provost, Dean of OGS, Dean of HC/UC, a member of the Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee, the appropriate Associate Deans of involved colleges, and selected chairs from involved departments.
2. IDC receives and evaluates ID program proposals and makes recommendations regarding program approval, funding levels, funding sources, and time course for implementing and evaluating programs
3. ID programs as “Academic Startups”. Faculty generate proposals for review by Provost IDC. Proposals specify program’s rationale, mission, metrics, time-specific objectives, Executive Board membership, participating faculty and staffing, contingencies for teach-out, budgets, incorporation of existing academic affairs structures, development time-line and overall academic planning.
4. If approved, a Performance Contract between the Provost’s Office and the ID Program is generated that specifies an incubation phase, qualitative and quantitative goals and target dates, and commits UNM to corresponding negotiated support levels

6. Associate Provost convenes an annual review by the Executive Board that results in updating the performance contract and a continuation or update of the incubation plan. Evaluations serves as basis for decisions about program maturation.
7. ID programs need an academic home and an administrative support network. It is proposed here that undergraduate ID programs be housed in University College (UC) and graduate programs be housed in the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS). OGS should become a college with degree granting authority.

#### **Funding of ID Programs (see Section 4)**

- 1: Explicit funding of ID programs is essential to establishing ID on an equal footing with disciplinary studies and traditional departments. If ID is important, it must be funded explicitly and directly.
- 2: Although some ID programs are created via establishment grants with fixed, and ultimately non-renewable, funding sources, the University will have to supplement these funds to establish the Program, and will have to provide some form of subsidy/support to sustain the Program over the long term.
3. Many ID programs will generate revenues as recognized by an RCM budgeting model. They will also account for explicit and implicit costs under RCM.
4. Specific funding recommendations are contingent upon the RCM model that UNM eventually adopts.
5. Existing budgets for ID programs will continue for FY 2014, but additional monies will be allocated for ID programs in subsequent years.
6. Existing budgets will be moved to either UC or OGS as appropriate for FY 2014.

#### **Procedures for hiring, evaluating, and promoting ID program faculty (see Section 5)**

1. The academic demands and expectations of ID faculty will differ from those of faculty hired into traditional academic units.
2. These differences need to be acknowledged and explicated in carefully developed faculty contracts that clearly outline the expectations and bases of evaluation for ID faculty.

#### **Graduate Degrees in Interdisciplinary Studies**

1. Although UC currently offers an undergraduate degree in ID studies, there are no ID degrees at the graduate level.
2. A graduate degree in ID studies should be offered through OGS, and the Dean of OGS should initiate that process.

### **Sections**

**1. Rationale for Interdisciplinary Programs.** ID studies embedded in both undergraduate and graduate education are becoming a vehicle for intellectual and social

transformation at UNM. Such change on this campus is attuned to noteworthy innovation elsewhere. In numerous academic and non-academic settings in the U.S. and, indeed, many other countries, there is reliable and authentic evidence about how engaged and committed scholars work and develop expertise within, across, and beyond individual disciplines. One significant sign of this movement lies in the many major funding agencies – including NIH and NSF -- that now explicitly call for proposals that foreground ID research. Similarly, journals in a wide range of fields issue RFPs for special issues or sections devoted to exploring intellectual and socially relevant questions from the integrated perspective of diverse disciplines. For many fields, the ability to collaborate with those in other disciplines, to integrate information from multiple disciplines, and to apply the most appropriate tools from a range of disciplines is essential to professional success. This movement toward ID education results from the need for sophisticated approaches to difficult research questions, as well as the accelerating pace of change in both society and scholarship. As stated in their 1995 report (p 83) the National Academies argue that the central feature of contemporary life is continuous change, and that higher education must reflect this reality by providing students with the tools to reach across disciplines and adapt to change. In 2004, the National Academies laid the foundation for later reports encouraging ID research by arguing that the complex problems facing society require collaboration among scholars whose expertise cuts across the disciplines, and in their 2010 report (*Rising Above the Gathering Storm, Revisited*) the National Academies argued that “as the primary driver of economic growth and the ‘promising avenue’ for U.S. competitiveness, innovation requires collaboration and benefits from an ID perspective. In the 2012 National Research Council report (*Research Universities and the Future of America: Ten Breakthrough Actions Vital to Our Nation's Prosperity and Security*), the value of the ID perspective associated with master’s education is emphasized, especially the Professional Science Master’s degree, and in 2007 the Council of Graduate Schools (*Graduate Education: The Backbone of American Competitiveness and Innovation*), included ID research and education among the key future directions for graduate education.

In speaking about such educational interactions and innovations across current disciplinary boundaries, we do well to focus on the key phrase, ‘integrative knowledge.’ Interdisciplinarity both signals and involves inquiry that occurs across disciplines, fields, and problem-based areas. As one corollary, education aimed at fostering such inquiry engages in ‘hallmarks of practice’ that seek to balance student-learning outcomes with the possible and, indeed, desirable societal implications and applications of such learning/education. These critical and creative practices in education and research mutually strengthen collaborations and partnerships aimed at producing and transferring knowledge aimed at addressing and helping solve complex social and global problems. That said, we underline that ID study is, by definition, a locus for a range of programmatic innovations rather than one dominant model. Most importantly, by recognizing interdisciplinarity in its various vital forms and matching those with the ‘rhetoric of innovation,’ UNM’s strategic planning in the areas of: (a) *Student success*; (b) *Systemic excellence*; (c) *Healthy communities*; and (d) *Economic and community development*, becomes a process that is more transparent, achievable, and sustainable.

The literature on interdisciplinarity is increasingly large, but there is an emerging consensus on its advantages. An abstracted summary of this literature identifies the following drivers for developing structures that facilitate interdisciplinarity:

1. Solving/Understanding Complex Global Issues:  
The complexity of contemporary issues often requires examination through a variety of disciplinary lenses, with inquiry into many issues being most fruitful as a result of disciplinary intersections. Indeed, ID education perhaps has its strongest rationale for emerging areas of inquiry within which knowledge of a single discipline does not suffice.
2. Positive Impact on Diversity and Area Studies:  
By its nature, interdisciplinarity exposes students to more diverse academic perspectives than traditional discipline-focused programs of study.
3. Critical for Competing for the Best Students and Innovative New Faculty:  
Students drawn to such ID experiences are often exceptionally talented
4. Internationalization Requires Interdisciplinarity:  
The US is beginning to experience serious international competition. ID education and expertise will play a key role in positioning our society for leadership with regard to creativity, innovation, and ingenuity in higher education.
5. Critical for Successful Research Funding:  
Federal and other funding agencies are increasingly funding targeted ID initiatives.
6. Responsive to Workforce Needs:  
Industry needs flexible personnel with the type of creativity and innovation often resultant of ID graduate education.

While these positive drivers are clearly compelling, it is interesting that a large proportion of the literature on interdisciplinarity focuses on common institutional obstacles to establishing ID study programs in institutions of higher learning. A succinct summary of these barriers is offered in a 2012 “white paper”<sup>6</sup> by Klein and Martin, two of the leading scholars in this area. These barriers, grouped into four general categories, are as follows:

1. Organizational Structure and Administration
  - Rigid one-size-fits-all model of organizational structure
  - Discipline- and department-based silos of budgetary and administrative categories
  - Territoriality and turf battles over budget, ownership of curriculum and research
  - Ambiguous status of ID programs, centers, and institutes
  - Piece-meal approaches to ID programs
  - Lack of experienced leaders
  - Resistance to innovation and risk among university administrators
  - Dispersed infrastructure

---

<sup>6</sup> Klein, J. T. & Martin, P. J. S (2012). Meeting institutional and administrative challenges of Interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Paper presented at the 2011 Conference on Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning, Michigan State University (available on website: [lbc.msu.edu/CITL](http://lbc.msu.edu/CITL)).

- No clear and authoritative reporting lines for ID units
- 2. Procedures and Policies
  - Inflexible guidelines that inhibit approval of new programs and courses
  - Rigid and exclusionary degree requirements
  - Lack of guidelines for ID hiring, tenure, promotion, and compensation
  - Inadequate guidelines for grants management and research collaboration
  - Unfavorable policies for allocation of workload credit in ID teaching
  - Unfavorable institutional policies for sharing indirect cost recovery from external -grants and allocating intellectual property
- 3. Resources and Infrastructure
  - Inadequate funding and ongoing support for ID units
  - Inadequate number of faculty lines for ID study programs and research
  - Restricted access to internal incentives and seed funds for ID research and curriculum development
  - Competition for funds and faculty between departments and ID units
  - Inadequate or no ID student assistantships and fellowships
  - Inadequate space and equipment and inflexible allotments of use
  - Weak or no faculty development system
  - Ignorance of ID literature and resources in national networks
  - Insufficient time for planning and implementing program and project infrastructure
  - Insufficient time to learn the language and culture of another discipline
  - Insufficient time to develop collaborative relationships in team teaching and research
- 4. Recognition and Reward /Incentives
  - Invisibility and marginality of ID research, teaching, service, advising, and mentoring
  - Reliance on volunteerism and work overloads
  - Weak networking channels and communication forums
  - Ineligibility of ID work for awards, honors, incentives, and faculty development programs
  - Lack of support at department, college, and/or university-levels
  - Negative bias against ID work

As is readily apparent, many of these barriers exist at UNM, and although this report does not address each one individually, collectively they drive many of the recommendations contained herein. In the end, establishing a campus environment in which interdisciplinarity is viewed as both a reawakening of a frontier for developing innovative knowledge (beyond ‘core’ and ‘advanced’) *and* as an essential element in addressing significant knowledge gaps, it seems clear that *UNM needs a revised, highly visible, and significantly supported organizational structure for ID programs.*

**2. Types of management models and recommendations for which would work best at UNM.** In considering ID models that would work best at UNM, we examined the range of existing management models at other universities. This review quickly revealed a substantial range of different models. It extends on a continuum from very loosely organized (e.g., proposed and administered by the participating faculty with no central

oversight) to highly structured (e.g., a new school created to house a strategic university ID initiative, with fully dedicated funding, faculty, and staff).<sup>7</sup> Rather than outlining each of the various approaches here, the following is an abstracted set of general guidelines for any organizational arrangement in support of ID programs:

1. Improve interactions and enhance communication among relevant units:  
The Report of the 2005 ID Task Force of the AAU emphasizes the growing importance of interdisciplinarity in the university. It highlights the importance of developing collaboration over competition between units. The organizational response is traditionally to establish centers and institutes to complement the role of departments by conducting ID research. However, since these units do not normally control tenure lines or award degrees they must depend on faculty goodwill for their existence and functioning. Overcoming structural, cultural and political barriers to boundary-crossing work is a lengthy task given the nature of the university as an organization, but it must be done for ID programs to succeed.
2. Minimize administrative burdens:  
Universities are nearly universally organized along college and departmental lines that make working with new structural arrangements that traverse traditional boundaries difficult at best. Implementation issues affecting the establishment of ID programs that must be addressed include budget control, indirect cost recovery and distribution, publication in ID journals, compatibility with college and department strategic plans, promotion and tenure criteria, the value of joint authorship, reporting relationships, space allocations, honoring award agreements in terms of position assignments and restrictions on faculty autonomy
3. Reduce institutional constraints:  
What is needed to make ID units survive are institutional flexibility and “adhocracy” rather than a more rigid hierarchical control.
4. Critical elements for success:  
Institutionalized leadership, physical space, “regular” faculty, financial support, and an internal organization that responds to change and stakeholder feedback. ID programs often require additional resources, such as extra startup time, complex equipment, and extended funding.

Based on these guidelines, we abstracted a set of general recommendations for implementing a management and funding structure for ID programs at UNM:

1. The origination of ID programs should be from a group of faculty that jointly engages in an academic enterprise outside their traditional (structured) discipline to pursue educational and research goals that cannot be fulfilled in the existing structure of departmentalized UNM schools/colleges. This “grass-roots” feature is central to ID programs and cannot be replaced by a centralized mandate or implementation of such programs. UNM administration on every level should engage in recognizing, promoting, and evaluating such initiatives.
2. It is important to secure responsible participation of the units (colleges and schools) and their explicit support for the ID programs. As a result we

---

<sup>7</sup> A full review of these various approaches can be found in Vengroff and Léger (2012). Approaches to Managing and Sustaining ID Programs at Comprehensive Learning Centered Universities. [ksuweb.kennesaw.edu/~rvengrof/pubs/pub-quebec-elections.pdf](http://ksuweb.kennesaw.edu/~rvengrof/pubs/pub-quebec-elections.pdf)

recommend that the Deans of the most invested schools/colleges be a part of the governing Executive Board of each ID program. The deans are to ensure that faculty time is vested and acknowledged appropriately by department chairs. They should make participation and evaluation of the faculty contribution to ID programs “department neutral”.

4. It is important for ID programs to have a “home”, and we recommend that University College and OGS serve as the home of undergraduate and graduate ID programs, respectively. Accordingly, the Deans of these units should play primary roles on the Executive Board.
5. Centralized coordination of ID programs is essential. This includes the promotion of new programs and the sun setting of programs that exhaust their momentum or have transformed into a departmental structure, having achieved quasi-disciplinary level. This calls for leadership from the Office of the Provost and likely requires the appointment of an associate provost or other direct provost report to coordinate ID programs.
6. As we move toward a new budget model that is likely to require more fine-grained assessment of programs, ID programs will be particularly challenged to demonstrate their contribution to the mission of the university and their value in achieving the objectives of the participating schools and colleges. Most ID programs have relatively little bureaucratic and administrative structure or expertise to draw on for their basic operations and even fewer resources to assist in the adoption of sophisticated new agendas of qualitative and quantitative evaluation. Therefore, a more structured management model is desirable. However, it is the opinion of this group that UNM will be best served by maintaining as much flexibility as possible in the model, in order to respect the culture of existing ID programs, keep new costs as low as possible, and encourage the “bottom-up” generation of new programs.

**3. A Specific Proposal: An Entrepreneurial Model for the Active Management of ID Programs.** The entrepreneurial model proposed here has the flexibility to accommodate a wide variety of programs and program goals coupled with the rigor of establishing performance expectations and evaluating outcomes. This model combines the authority of the Provost’s Office to sanction the management and governance of ID programs with the existing culture of faculty innovation and initiative in the creation and operation of ID programs. As already mentioned, we suggest that a vice- or associate-provost position be considered to coordinate this overall process. The reasons are as follows:

1. Decisions about resource allocation are required, therefore accountability is required. It is essential that promised resources be delivered when agreed-upon conditions are met.
2. Given the well-documented challenges RCM financial systems impose on ID activities (see below), incorporating a specific, provost-controlled subvention for ID programs from the beginning is essential.
3. Arbitration among deans will inevitably be required, and we anticipate this by invoking a provost-level arbiter and convener of governance committees. While the OGS and UC deans may play roles up to and including providing administrative homes for ID programs and chairing governance committees, those



individuals have limited ability to impose arbitration on other deans and may inevitably be seen as “partial” to certain programs.

4. Active Management coordinated by the Provost’s Office will provide exemplar management standards for all ID programs, even those contained within individual schools or colleges. Having academic affairs lead in this effort serves as a way of introducing evaluation more routinely into our existing operations, moving all of campus toward adoption of more vigorous evaluation and assessment practices.

The Entrepreneurial Model for ID Programs proposed here essentially views ID programs as “Academic Startups.” The proposed cycle for these start-up endeavors calls for the Associate Provost for ID Programs (or equivalent leadership position) to work with each existing ID Program Director, and with groups proposing future ID programs, to establish the following elements:

1. An appropriate Executive Board consisting of other (e.g. past and present) program directors, chairs, deans, senior faculty that serve as objective evaluators of the ID program and are capable of making recommendations concerning initiation, funding levels, funding sources, leadership, and termination of ID programs.
2. A defined Incubation Phase during which time the goals and vision of the ID Program are developed and meshed with overall academic planning.
3. An appropriate Performance Contract (or Term Sheet) between the Provost’s Office and the ID Program. This contract specifies the qualitative and quantitative goals and target dates for the ID program and commits UNM to corresponding negotiated support levels.
4. Specification of the ID program’s participating faculty and staffing, incorporation of existing academic affairs structures, etc. The analogy of a startup company first negotiating for incubator space, then negotiating further with angel investors or venture capitalists seems worth developing in order to more fully specify this stage of the model.
5. Contingencies for teach-out or for devolving to a college or department-contained program need to be part of every plan and contract as a multi-year commitment to students is created when a degree program is initiated.
6. For new ID program proposals, the incubation phase plan and the performance contract must be completed before final university-level curricular approval. The Associate Provost convenes an annual Evaluation of Performance by the Executive Board based on the Performance Contract and other information. This results in updating the Performance Contract and a continuation or update of the incubation plan. Explicit evaluation process examples need to be developed. Elements from the APR process, accreditation assessments, and from other sources such as the recent NRC doctoral program review process, can be incorporated in the evaluation plan. For example, the University of Michigan uses seven of the NRC variables (median time to degree, average 6 year completion rates, average number of doctorates awarded per year, proportion of first-year students with full financial support, proportion of graduates with academic plans (faculty positions or post-docs) immediately after leaving the program, proportion

of underrepresented minorities on the faculty, proportion of underrepresented minority students) in their annual data reports for doctoral programs.

7. A decision about *Maturation* of the ID program should be a goal of this process. Whether the ID program is eventually wound down, gets incorporated into an existing program, evolves into another ID program with new leadership, or becomes a new department or school is analogous to the exit strategy for a startup company. These issues must be addressed in the annual revision of the contract and plan.

This model should be adapted to both existing and new ID programs. Existing programs can develop the required plans and contracts in exchange for continuing support, and new programs can do so as a requirement for curricular approval. The overall process can eventually be formalized by developing initial guidelines and checklists for the steps and elements of the process. However, we expect that many of the negotiations will be highly individualized and complex and vary depending on the nature of the program and the entities involved.

On-going involvement from faculty governance is expected. For example, the Faculty Senate (FS) curriculum committee might place a representative on the Board for an ID program. This could be a similar to the FS curriculum committee representative at all APR meetings.

We must think clearly about RCM implications and participate actively in the design of UNM's RCM model in order to allow the active management model to succeed. Resources actually being at stake are the key to effective evaluation.

**4. A Proposed Funding Model for ID Programs.** The following three principles guide the discussion of funding ID programs at UNM:

- 1: Explicit funding of ID programs is essential to establishing ID on an equal footing with disciplinary studies and traditional departments. If ID is important it must be funded explicitly.
- 2: Many ID programs are created via an establishment grant with a fixed, and ultimately non-renewable, funding source. The university may have to supplement these funds to establish the Program, and will have to provide some form of subsidy/support to sustain the Program over the long term.
3. Many ID programs will generate revenues as recognized by an RCM budgeting model. They will also account for explicit and implicit costs under RCM.

To gain a sense of the funding levels and needs of the existing ID programs, the committee surveyed existing ID program directors. The data, presented in Table 1, show that currently existing ID programs at UNM are chronically underfunded, and many exist by combining resources that are otherwise accounted-for in separate units across campus. Faculty are borrowed, and some faculty teach in ID programs as uncompensated overloads. Staff are often borrowed from departments, and many programs have no official "space." Funding a Program means funding its activities. A program needs resources to provide instruction, do research and serve the university and community.

Table 1.

	Native American Studies	Interdisciplinary Film & Digital Media Program	Water Resources	OSE	NSMS
<b>1. Courses offered by program #</b>	22 - 24/year	25/year	3/year	29/year	21/year
<b>1a. Number of credit hours generated (average over 5 years)</b>	1500	2039		440/year	1070/year
<b>1b. Number of students enrolled per class</b>	13-18/course	10-70/course	12 - 15/course		8-37/course
<b>1c. Total students enrolled in courses over 5 years</b>	275 students	3355	615		1195
<b>2. Who teaches these courses?</b>	3 are NAS	Faculty other depts		Affiliated faculty	Affiliated faculty
<b>2a. Full appointments?</b>	3 full time	No	3		No
<b>2b. Joint appointments?</b>	3 joint	No			No
<b>2c. Adjuncts?</b>	2 adjuncts	No			No
<b>2d. Appointed in another department/program?</b>	5 to other	Yes	Yes		Yes
<b>2e. Are these courses recognized as part of regular work load?</b>	Yes	Yes & No		Yes	Yes & No
<b>2f. Teaching assistantships?</b>	2 adjuncts	Yes			Yes
<b>2g. How supported?</b>	I & G funds	I & G funds, endowment funds	I & G funds, Brookshire, Chermak		2 A&S awarded excellence fellowships
<b>3. How many staff?</b>	1	6	1	1	1
<b>3a. Full time?</b>	1	4	1		1
<b>3b. Part time?</b>		2		1	
<b>4. Facilities</b>	Office space	Computer space, production space, recording space, equipment	Office, computer pod, library	Use CHTM, P&A, ECE Labs, Classrooms	Use CMEM, ME, MTTC, & Classrooms
<b>4a. How supported?</b>		I & G funds			CMEM supported, course fee

<b>5. Funding Based on FY13 Budget)</b>	\$302,630 (I&G) and \$27,884 (EU allocation)	\$248,918 (I&G) and \$76,204 (EU allocation)	\$107,522 (I&G)	\$16,974 (currently provided by SOE as an allocation)	\$40,142 (currently provided by A&S and SOE as an allocation)
<b>5a. Course fee revenue?</b>	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
<b>5b. Amount of course fee annually?</b>	\$300/year				\$3500/Approx
<b>6. GA/TA support?</b>	No	Yes	No	Yes	Some
				P&A, ECE supported	2 A&S Excellence fellowships
<b>7. Budget</b>			107K		None
<b>7a. Does budget cover staff, student, and faculty?</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Other funds from ITV and extended university	Other funds from course fees and endowment	I & G funds, Brookshire, Chermak	15.6K + program advisor .05FTE	Funds from grants previously made up shortfall. These grants have ended.
<b>8. Funding needs</b>	500K		150K	291.5K	170K
<b>8a. Staff</b>		Add 1.5FTE to tech positions @ grade 10 AND Make program manager (grade 13) 1.0 from .6. ADD Admin asst. and Fiscal Services Tech	30K		60K I & G to cover Program Manager at 1.0 FTE and Web designer at .125 FTE
<b>8b. Faculty</b>	400K	Add SAC and course release for new Assoc. Director @ .3 FTE AND add I & G funding to support additional sections	71K		25K I & G to cover SAC and .5 of summer for Director and Assoc. Director
<b>8c. Faculty support, seminars, travel etc.</b>	30K	Add two FTE	14K		

<b>8d. GA/TA</b>	30K/2	Add I & G to cover 100% of TA, currently 75% is endowment covered	25K		60K TA's	2
<b>8e. Operating</b>	40K	Add I & G funding to sup, ADD additional maintenance for buildings	10K		25K Travel, office supplies, retreat, seminar, grad students events, short courses, recruitment, etc.	

Those resources include faculty, staff, student financial support (esp. graduate students,) and facilities.

**Faculty** - “Borrowing” faculty places severe limits on the flexibility with which the University as a whole can best utilize this resource. Faculty are to a large degree autonomous, and many are best utilized within the standard disciplinary framework of departments. They teach courses in their discipline's core; they do basic, core, research. They have no desire to teach with others, contribute to interdisciplinary courses, nor collaborate on research, or work with other researchers outside their discipline. But there are other faculty who would be better employed in an environment that allows and encourages ID programs. Tradition and history have assigned ownership and entitlements to departments. The way to better employ all faculty is to give ID programs the same status as departments, and allow faculty the flexibility to distribute their workload across all those activities, in any venue, that maximizes their contribution to the institution as a whole, not one particular department.

**Staff** – ID programs must have the funding to provide the staffing and administrative support at a level appropriate to their activities. Some programs will be larger than some departments, yet departments will receive disproportionate staff support while the ID programs will be under-staffed. This is inefficient. At the same time, more effective use of staff can be achieved by sharing staff across smaller programs. Even if programs are thematically disparate, many UNM administrative functions are common.

**Student Aid** – Not all graduate students (and undergraduates doing research) can be supported by research grants, although this is a desirable objective. The institution must provide some support for students, either with stipends, or tuition, or both. Paying students tuition is a net cost to the institution, as it represents a real opportunity cost,

although it is seen as revenue. Student support should be part of the ID program budget and funded through grants, tuition capture, and I&G allocation.

**Facilities** – Programs need a physical place to exist, despite increases in “virtual schools” at some institutions. But physical space can be shared to better utilize the resource.

While many ID programs can be formed with a finite-term grant, the challenge is to transition from establishment funding via grant to sustainable funding from the institution. The institution may also have to provide resources initially, in the form of cost share. Over the long term, funding must not only be adequate, it must be stable. But stability does not mean forever. ID budgets should be reviewed based on performance (considered elsewhere in this report,) however Directors and those involved in the Program should have a reasonable expectation of funding levels, and be given sufficient warning of funding cutbacks if, and when, they occur. This requirement again reinforces the need to establish ID programs with an academic and financial standing comparable to departments.

**Implications of RCM** - With UNM's adoption of a Responsibility Center Management (RCM) budget model, the funding of ID programs raises some specific and particular issues. Although the literature reviewing RCM does not reveal any notably detrimental impacts on ID programs, neither is there any evidence that they have fared especially well under RCM.

ID programs can be expensive as they often involve team teaching, expensive faculty, low student-faculty ratios, outside visitors requiring honoraria, and hosting special events. While all these activities are part of the normal departmental operations, they tend to be concentrated in ID programs. To the extent this is true, they will have relatively higher costs compared to revenues under RCM than would a standard department.

With regard to revenues, ID programs are more likely to have multiple sources of attributable revenue: courses only offered by the Program, courses cross-listed with other Programs or Departments, courses that Program students can take for credit, but offered by other Programs or Departments. This will increase the administrative overhead to negotiate revenue attribution to ID programs under RCM. RCM may also create an incentive for ID programs to create their own, duplicative, courses in order to ensure instructional revenue credit.

While the traditional departmental structure remains, RCM may discourage faculty from teaching in ID programs because their home department would prefer they “work and earn” in their home discipline. Faculty could be torn between serving their departmental homes and their ID program preferences without an explicit structure that assigns faculty responsibilities, costs and revenues between home departments and ID programs.

Throughout the literature reviewing RCM in higher education, competition (over resources rather than intellectual) between responsibility centers (revenue generators) is a recurring theme. One of the greatest threats under RCM is the emergence of a “turf war”

designed to capture tuition and formula revenues, and ID programs would not be absolved from playing this game. In particular, special and separate funding of ID programs could increase the sense of competition between these and traditional departments for both revenues and the explicit allocation of costs. If ID programs are funded by a central “subvention fund” or generally funded through a tax on Revenue Centers (Departments or Colleges,) ID programs may be seen as privileged.

In the end, more definitive information about when and how UNM will adopt RCM before specific funding recommendations for ID programs can be made. In the meantime, we recommend that Academic Affairs set aside an amount, at least equal to that already being allocated to existing ID programs, to be used to support these activities throughout the university. The Provost's ID Committee would seem the appropriate body to review programs periodically and make fund allocation decisions. Initially programs would be held harmless to any changes wrought by RCM, but ultimately programs in total could be funded by whatever “RCM formula” funds they earn, augmented by a subvention funded by a central tax levied on revenue generating units, much in the way that all central services will be funded through a tax (a net revenue tax is the preferred, incentive-based method.)

The survey data presented in Table 1 suggests that current programs are under-funded. Consequently, we recommend that, going forward, additional funds be allocated to support ID programs. The amount of funding to be allocated would be jointly determined by existing budget realities and requests from the Provost’s ID Committee, according to their established procedures for reviewing and supporting program proposals.

**5. Procedures for hiring, evaluating, and promoting ID program faculty.** During our full committee meetings it became apparent that faculty have various and differing views of ID studies. For example, science and engineering faculty have a significantly different view of what ID research is based on their experience than faculty from area studies, social sciences and the humanities. As an example, some members of the committee were more focused on the more specific objective of developing an administrative structure for ID programs, while others were more interested in advancing interdisciplinarity as an academic endeavor in its own right and its role as a vehicle for promoting social transformation and social justice. Such diversity of opinion is inherently healthy but also requires the development of creative and flexible policies to accommodate the various faculty and programmatic areas that would potentially be a part of an ID program. The development of a policy in this case would necessarily have to be “tailored” to each individual faculty member who elects to be part of the Program. Members of P & T committees in these instances will have to be selected from throughout the University as well as the tenured faculty within the proposed Program. Committee members in each case would have to have an understanding of the candidate’s research, teaching and service in order to make a fair assessment of the candidate’s work. Extensive planning on the “front end” will be required of the Directors of ID Programs to tailor the P & T policy and process to the candidates within their programs. The process will also require *carefully developed “contracts”* beyond the *template* University / College Letter of Appointment that clearly outline the work the faculty will do in the ID Program. These

contracts would form a basis for faculty evaluation and would be visited each year in a candidate's P & T timeline. This also gives deans, directors and faculty needed flexibility in contract negotiations.

**Issues to consider:**

1. Tenure lines in existing disciplines, in ID programs or both?
 

ID programs thrive when there is a combination of ID tenure lines and tenure lines in existing disciplines. ID programs may choose to have their own faculty, for example, representing each of the major schools, disciplines, or departments at UNM. Associated faculty may also be brought in, who may teach cross-listed courses but have an official designation as an associated faculty member in the ID program. In this regard, a system that utilizes contracts (an entrepreneurial model consistent with our philosophy of having a rhizomatic system) would require that every faculty member within the system create an agenda for teaching research, and service that would serve as the basis for tenure lines within the ID program.

  - 1a. Permanent faculty in ID programs must organize activities that deal with interdisciplinarity as its own academic form. For this reason, service (creating lectures, dialogues, and symposia), must be part of the commitment of an ID faculty member.
  - 1b. ID programs should serve as an institutional leader in promoting intellectual diversity. Tenure lines should be considered within an ID program if and when administrators determine that a department or field of study could expand its possibilities through an ID program.
  - 1c. UNM's ID programs (Colleges) should serve as the institutional hub for "social justice" or "studies" programs. These programs fulfill an essential mission of UNM, serving both large numbers of students and constituent communities in ways that traditional disciplines and departments cannot. Their status and ability to collaborate would be greatly enhanced by the ID structure proposed in this document.
  - 1d. ID tenured faculty should create a community of practice. There is always a need to evaluate the status of interdisciplinarity institutionally. Many institutions have an ability to do and promote ID work but they are not necessarily promoting the status of interdisciplinarity (as its own institutional category) within the academy. For example, an ID program may hold lecture series, dialogues, and symposia on issues that relate to many or all departments at UNM. For example, in 2008, Emory held a dialogue series on Death, where philosophers, biologists, engineers, physicists and social workers (to name a few) were invited to have a discussion on the nature of death, how we define it, and how it influences our lives and our way of thinking. While the physicists explored how entropy is viewed as a form of death, social workers who performed body counts during the Rwandan genocides discussed the ways that accounting and cultural burial practices manifest as a result of large-scale atrocity. In the end, the ID program issued a proceeding that archived the discussions, emphasizing the way that differing approaches and ideas revolved around a central-higher order question that had university-wide relevance.



- 1e. An ID program comprised solely of associated faculty is difficult to administer. Furthermore, it does not guarantee that faculty be encouraged to produce work that defends the status of interdisciplinarity within the academy. Service to an ID program must account for the ambassadorial qualities needed to make collaboration possible.
  
2. Criteria for evaluating ID research and teaching contribution.
  - 2a. Faculty in ID programs must construct a “research agenda” as part of being associated, affiliated, or tenured in an ID program. Under this “research agenda,” a faculty member may select an association with an appropriate research agenda (i.e. a department or set of departments). Upon selecting a disciplinary “point of reference,” faculty must produce research that aligns with a disciplinary agenda but also publishes in a manner with an ID agenda. For example, a faculty member may choose to identify with a sociology agenda, and may then publish 3 articles in association within the prescribed sociology publication guidelines. Another 3 articles may be published broadly, in a manner consistent with the “research agenda” established by the faculty member.
  - 2b. Faculty should be encouraged to publish in journals that register as ID research journals, specifically interested in research that studies the status of ID in the academy.
  - 2c. Faculty should also construct a “teaching agenda,” following the same guidelines followed by their research agenda. For example, a faculty member may wish to teach a “history of intellectual thought” course, but it should be located or connected to an identified disciplinary rubric. This will allow administrators and prospective students to know and understand where an instructor’s general level of expertise lies.
  - 2d. Faculty should be encouraged to publish on the pedagogy associated with teaching ID programs as part of their research agenda.
  - 2e. Service should be considered a component of tenure and promotion. If, for example, an ID tenured faculty member produces a major symposium that has a significant ID contribution to the academy, it should be considered in tenure and promotion. If an associated faculty member creates a significant institutional relationship between a discipline, school, or college and the ID program, that also should be considered for tenure and promotion in their discipline.
  
3. How to compensate existing units when faculty participate in ID programs.
  - 3a. Departments that allow their faculty to participate in ID programs should be compensated to cover the costs of quality replacement instructors. Departments should be otherwise incentivized and rewarded for their support of ID programs.
  
4. Faculty/department incentives for participating in ID programs.
  - 4a. Service in an ID program may serve to replace a portion of tenure and promotion requirements in their home departments. For example, if a faculty member publishes in an ID journal, produces an ID symposium in the ID program, or teaches a course in an ID program, this may serve as a “wild card” credit for a tenure or promotion criteria commensurate to their disciplinary requirements.

5. Where do ID faculty go if and when an ID program is sunsetted?

5a. If sunsetted, an ID faculty member may serve the department or departments identified in their tenure and research agendas identified at the time of hiring.

5b. Creation of a university level advocate, likely an Assistant Provost, would be appointed to deal with the execution of a sunset clause, serving as an advocate for graduate students who must complete their work and faculty who will require a transition to another place within the university system.

5c. Creation of a faculty teaching, research, and service agenda should have provided some of the disciplinary involvement needed to make a transition to another home possible and may serve as a means for guiding a transition in the event that it is needed.

6. Workload policy and ID programs.

6a. See 2a-e. These suggestions would cover the development of a curriculum and the development of a workload policy, assuming that joint-appointments are not utilized. If they are, then the faculty contract would have to incorporate those obligations as well.

7. Student issues.

7a. A Director of Graduate Studies position is needed if graduate students become a part of an ID program. The DGS' primary function is to serve as manager and advocate for students.

7b. A graduate student representative within an ID program should be nominated each year, with limited but significant administrative powers to serve as advocate and express the needs of graduate students. This is particularly useful in the event that advocacy issues among faculty unnecessarily burden the effective and reasonable completion of graduate student work.

7c. A set of rules and procedures for 1) the completion of the dissertation or terminal research, 2) the generation of core competencies during coursework, 3) and dispute resolution guidelines with an administrative hierarchy, and 4) professional development requirements must be produced and distributed to students and faculty at the beginning of each academic year.

7d. ID students must be encouraged to have professional development training immediately upon the beginning of their studies. Because ID students are challenged to select a disciplinary rubric in which they can professionalize while also defending and negotiating the role their ID work plays, students must be exposed to resources (workshops, coursework, mentorship) that will help them develop their career opportunities.

7e. Interdisciplinarity also relies on graduate students. As colleagues, students teach each other more than any other part of this process, and that form of solidarity is invaluable. It teaches a sort of institutional and mental agility that would otherwise be directed wholesale into creating good disciplinarians.

7f. ID work has departmental rhetorical forms that are not used by departments elsewhere. For example, the dissertation prospectus for a person explicitly defending interdisciplinarity (institutionally) is totally different from one who has to serve a departmental rubric wholesale. Departments can always be ID, but there is always a

need to provide a venue for the rhetorical forms that defend interdisciplinarity because they have to.

7g. Faculty advisors for ID work must know how to manage projects that, by design, are intended to challenge departmental paradigms. For this reason, a dissertation chair, advisor, or committee member must work within an established set of benchmarks to advocate on behalf of graduate students. For example, several ID programs require a prospectus defense and a dissertation defense. The prospectus defense is used to ensure that committee members are able to work effectively on behalf of students. Otherwise, faculty run the risk of letting departmental agendas render an ID project untenable. Being able to effectively manage graduate students and their work should be an essential part of an effective ID program.

7h. Institutionally, a program should be evaluated by how effectively it can manage students. An ID program should have a small but manageable set of graduate students that can serve as scholars called upon to defend interdisciplinarity. These scholars should be highly selective, must be given adequate support, and must have the intellectual maturity to understand the additional challenges one undertakes when performing ID work in the academy. A good program will have a small but effective grad student population that will further the research agenda of the university while producing innovative and synergetic moments for colleagues within the disciplines.

Issue 8: Admission and relation to disciplines.

8a. Faculty are generally admitted on the basis of quality of research interest, understanding the value of ID teaching, and service to ID agendas. Research for ID work can and should be promoted both within and outside of departmental/disciplinary conditions. In order to adequately review tenure and promotion, ID scholars should be able to construct a narrative for annual evaluations that justifies at any point in their work the choice to assert disciplinary type research or ID type research. ID research could include studies that further the status of interdisciplinarity within the academy (either through mixed-method, review, or pedagogy-oriented publications).

8b. Moving forward, interdisciplinarity must have a lineage of people who know these aforementioned things and who believe it is part of their tradition. Otherwise, it runs the risk of being compromised each time a disciplinary or administrative intervention occurs. People defend interdisciplinarity only when it's urgent for them to do so. Thus, people must be admitted on the condition that they understand and are mature enough to defend and construct the interests inherent in an ID program.

8c. Students must be good, competent disciplinarians while also negotiating the special challenges of investing in ID work. Disciplinary excellence is a good point of orientation for the expansion of a particular ID project.

8d. An ID program may choose to select candidates who are already seeking external support for their research or who understand "fiscal competence" well enough to assist in sustaining graduate research at the ID programmatic level.

### **Additional Requirements**

Although University College currently offers an undergraduate degree in interdisciplinary studies with specific concentrations in various disciplines, there is no comparable degree at the graduate level. For that reason, the Dean of OGS, in consultation with existing ID program directors and the Faculty Senate should initiate the process of implementing a graduate degree in ID studies.