

Integrative Studies Planning Committee¹

Final Report

14 December 2004

Introduction

MSU's Integrative Studies program offers a distinctive approach to liberal general education, drawing on many faculty and graduate students from most departments of the core colleges to offer liberal general education experiences to nearly all undergraduates. Members of the Integrative Studies Planning committee have met since May 2004 to review the work of, and the challenges facing, the three centers for Integrative Studies at MSU. The committee's charge was to develop a set of proposed options for increased centralization consistent with the Provost's charge in *Realizing the Vision*, as well as to develop ideas for strengthening Integrative Studies at MSU.

Presuming that our charge was to gather and scrutinize data concerning Integrative Studies, we have reviewed extensive reports and materials on the design and implementation of IS, the scale and complexity of current and recent operations, faculty and departmental participation, student satisfaction measures (SIRS), and center budget histories. We have proactively invited and subsequently heard from units outside of the core colleges on their perspectives; we have gathered faculty impressions and assessments about IS courses; we have met with deans, associate deans, and department chairs to discuss both their concerns about IS and the strategies they have used to facilitate faculty commitment to and participation in IS. We have also reviewed material on how peer institutions organize general liberal education requirements for undergraduates. We held a public forum to hear from faculty and students who wanted to respond to an initial draft of the report. Most faculty who participated were faculty who teach in ISGS. Subsequently, we invited chairs from key departments associated with the other centers to come to our regular meetings to broaden the input. Several raised important concerns.

It is clear that the Integrative Studies centers have accomplished much, working increasingly cooperatively across the three centers and winning national recognition for their activities. MSU has been relatively successful in achieving large-scale inclusion of many research faculty in most core departments into the teaching of liberal general education courses. Among the strengths of the current program are the considerable departmental and faculty buy-ins (about 220 faculty assignments occur annually) that have been built up incrementally over a 12- year period. The program works relatively efficiently and predictably on a huge scale -- roughly 133,841 student credit hours during 2003-04. Our existing model has also proven moderately flexible and responsive to demands for academic improvement, curricular change, and expanded course choices. It has incorporated faculty authority and oversight in curriculum and curriculum change, and has developed -- through outside grant support -- critical capacity and some experience to assess student-learning outcomes. Universities that struggle with the limitations of a distribution model for general education regularly inquire about IS at MSU. Recently, the Carnegie Foundation/AAC&U initiative, *Integrative Learning: Opportunities to Connect*, selected MSU as one of ten colleges and universities to participate in its national effort to highlight and strengthen integrative studies as an approach to liberal learning in higher education.

Despite these significant accomplishments, we think that the program can be improved in significant ways. Indeed, we believe that one strength of the IS has been the directors' consistent

¹ A list of committee members can be found in Appendix A.

commitment to eliciting and responding to criticism from students, graduate teaching assistants, faculty who teach in IS, other faculty, and administrators. Together and individually, the centers face serious challenges in providing a high quality undergraduate general education. In particular, they must deal with human, financial, and material resource scarcity in a constrained budget environment that is unlikely to improve dramatically in the near future. Among the possible improvements, we identified the following that deserve consideration:

1. Broadened participation by faculty inside and from outside the core colleges who share liberal general education goals in the design and delivery of courses;
2. Better mobilization of advising resources to encourage MSU students to be more intentional and affirmative about liberal learning;
3. Reforms to highlight and enhance the program and its flexibility, including new kinds of courses, and new delivery models of courses;
4. A strengthening of the internationalization of the curriculum (which has already begun), including better and earlier connections with study abroad at MSU; and
5. More flexible choices for students.

In order to realize these goals, MSU should conduct new experiments in course delivery models, enhance flexibility in work between the departments and centers (including proactively creating cross-listed courses that meet IS goals), and seek better or more creative integration of instructional technology and distance learning initiatives.

We begin this report by briefly describing what Integrative Studies is at Michigan State, as well as recent work that has focused on its improvement. We then lay out the challenges and problems faced by Integrative Studies. We then describe four models of centralization that we have considered, along with commentary about their associated potential and problems. The committee notes that more work is required to be sure that MSU is on the right track, in a realistic way, to providing for our undergraduate students' general education needs. We conclude with a discussion of fruitful next steps.

What Is Integrative Studies?

Integrative Studies is an essential part of the general education of undergraduates at Michigan State University. Integrative Studies introduces students to perennial problems and big ideas, as well as to specialized ways of knowing. Through Integrative Studies, students become more knowledgeable about the natural and social worlds and the forms of inquiry basic to such study. They become more aware of the role of the sciences, social sciences, arts, and humanities in making sense of the world. They become more empowered by mastery of important knowledge, skills, and abilities, and more responsible and committed to important civic values in a global context.

Integrative Studies takes many forms at MSU, both within and across the three centers. This is not surprising. As the Association of American Colleges and Universities, in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2004, March) notes:

Integrative learning comes in many varieties:² connecting skills and knowledge from multiple sources and experiences; applying theory to practice in various settings; utilizing diverse and even contradictory points of view; and, understanding issues and positions contextually.

² While some speak of “integrative learning,” at MSU the centers focus on “integrative studies.” This larger umbrella term allows for the possibility that some courses ask students to participate in integrative learning activities, while others might simply present students with integrative or interdisciplinary materials.

In sum, integrative studies is a method of organizing and presenting knowledge for the purpose of describing, analyzing and explaining problems that have significance for the totality of the human condition. At present, the goals of Integrative Studies include assisting students to

- Become more familiar with the ways of knowing in the arts and humanities, the biological and physical sciences, and the social sciences.
- Develop a range of intellectual abilities, including critical thinking, logical argument, appropriate uses of evidence and interpretation of varied kinds of information (quantitative, qualitative, text, image).
- Become more knowledgeable about other times, places, and cultures as well as key ideas and issues in human experience.
- Learn more about the role of scientific method in developing a more objective understanding of the natural and social worlds.
- Appreciate the role of knowledge, and of values and ethics in understanding human behavior and solving social problems.
- Recognize the responsibilities and opportunities associated with citizenship in a democratic society and an increasingly interconnected, interdependent world.³

Conceptualizing such a curriculum is not simple and the three centers of Integrative Studies at MSU bring these goals to life in varied ways. This variability is due, in part, to the fact that integration occurs differently in the social sciences and arts and humanities than in the sciences at MSU. In the social sciences and arts and humanities, emphasis is on multidisciplinary or interdisciplinarity. Such learning (and teaching) presumes not that students need first to become disciplinarians in order then to integrate learning, but rather that subject matter can be approached in integrative, creative ways for general learners. As the AAC&U and Carnegie Foundation (2004, March) elaborate:

Integrative learning goes beyond academic boundaries. Indeed, integrative experiences often occur as learners address real world problems, unscripted and sufficiently broad to require multiple areas of knowledge and multiple modes of inquiry, offering multiple solutions and benefiting from multiple perspectives.

In the sciences, on the other hand, the emphasis is more on integrative learning, not on inter- or multidisciplinary. In particular, ISGS focuses on helping students learn appropriate and effective reasoning and on citizens' understanding of the role and value of science and scientific methods. Integrative concepts in science include evolution, the idea of cause and effect, and understanding that much of the world can be described as natural systems that function according to rules scientists discover and refine (AAAS, 1990). Integration in this view requires the ability to express arguments mathematically, use patterns in data to construct evidence-based arguments, use established theories to make logical deductions, and/or apply models to describe systems. CISGS courses help students learn what science is, scientific theories and facts, the historical development and social impact of those scientific facts and theories, and why scientific understanding is necessary for all citizens.

Crucial challenges in Integrative Studies in the arts, humanities, and social sciences include determining how multidisciplinary course should be and what mode or level of integration to apply. In the arts and humanities, course proposals are assessed on how much faculty have expanded the scope of their courses beyond singular disciplinary boundaries since a central goal of these courses is to introduce students to multiple ways of knowing. Students often read documents as texts and also in their contexts; they are asked to make meaning of information generally and in political, historical, and cultural contexts.

³ There is continued discussion in and across the centers about further refining these goals and adding to them, including developing goals for critical aesthetic appreciation and ability in music and art.

In the social sciences, Integrative Studies takes another form, and several hierarchical modes of integration are considered: (1) juxtaposition, (2) overlay, and (3) synthesis. Juxtaposition and overlay are *mechanistic* modes of integration of knowledge designed to enhance explanation based on a dominant disciplinary perspective by incorporating relevant complementary knowledge from other disciplines. Integrative courses that rely primarily on juxtaposition and overlay are multidisciplinary in character and usually use one anchor discipline to hold the content together. The third mode -- synthetic integration -- implies a more systemic coordination of disciplinary components, or an interdisciplinary mode. Here, integration is more organic and thematic; the design of a course in an interdisciplinary synthetic mode focuses on a problem that requires study and analysis. It does not have to be anchored in any particular discipline.

The committee found this range of interpretations of integrative studies -- both within and across the centers -- intriguing. Our sense is that one significant challenge faced by IS is the sense on the part of some faculty that what constitutes "integrative studies" is overly narrow. While the directors continue to manage the (sometimes) tension between being flexible about offerings and fidelity to the goals of integrative studies, the committee found considerable flexibility in all three centers, and -- more importantly -- a willingness on the part of all center directors to continue working toward maximizing flexibility (for faculty and students) while keeping true to IS goals. Next steps might include learning more about how the faculty as a whole understand the full range of forms that IS currently takes, as well as how current interpretations (and misinterpretations) affect faculty willingness to or interest in participating in IS.

Recent Work on IS at MSU

Given the fact that Integrative Studies is a requirement for all entering students, IS suffers from predictable problems. Most centrally is the fact that IS courses are mandatory, and that they ask students to study topics that (sometimes) seem disconnected from their (vocational or professional) interests. Additionally, since many students do not understand IS (or the basic principles of liberal education), and because many faculty do not participate in IS, Integrative Studies is the subject of considerable folklore (especially with regards to how narrowly integrative studies is operationally defined across and within centers). As we note in our report's conclusion, we need better cross-University channels of communication and collaboration in support of the improvement and collective understanding of Integrative Studies and of the purposes of a liberal education more generally. In the next section, we describe what we have learned about the challenges of mounting general education at Michigan State. But before describing those challenges, we briefly note some of the accomplishments of the center directors in the last five years.

Increased collaboration. During the past five years, the center directors have met weekly, collaborated on the development of a statement of IS academic goals and purposes, sought both internal and external support for faculty development and for the sharing of best teaching and learning practices, and administered a Hewlett grant that deepened faculty commitment to and understanding of student assessment. They have also expanded summer study (on and off campus) significantly and helped study abroad, working cooperatively with faculty to develop large numbers of IAH and ISS courses. They have provided transfer credit counseling to hundreds of students annually who attend study abroad programs sponsored by other universities.

Hewlett project. Through a grant from the Hewlett Foundation, twenty-four faculty fellows were selected to participate in a multi-year project in developing assessments of student learning in Integrative Studies. Faculty met regularly, reviewed the goals of Integrative Studies, considered the alignment of their course syllabi with those goals, developed assessments of student learning (ranging from essay to multiple choice examinations), and met regularly with outside experts (in measurement and testing, for example) to develop their own technical knowledge of assessment. This built upon two years of an Integrative Studies Institute, where faculty fellows shared best practices and created a beginning community of practitioners in IS.

Student Satisfaction. SIRS data indicate, despite some student complaints about taking "required classes" or "politically correct" classes that reasonably high levels of student satisfaction exist. There has been no student upsurge against general education or Integrative Studies, although center directors are very aware of (and working to respond to) student criticisms, especially of particular courses or specific faculty. IS courses generally garner the same or better SIRS numbers when compared to undergraduate large enrollment courses. (See Appendix E for summaries of IS SIRS for the past few years in each center.)

Curricular innovations. In addition to steady improvement of student satisfaction ratings, all centers have engaged in extensive discussion of curriculum and sponsored faculty-led curricular changes. While there remain some pockets of faculty who believe that IS directors act as obstacles to innovative and expansive approaches to IS, the committee found little evidence for this belief. All three centers have worked hard to expand offerings, be more inclusive of faculty interests, and respond to specific college and department concerns.

In CISAH, for example, where IAH 201 (*The U.S. and the World*) was the one-size-fit all, gateway course, there is now an elaborated menu, with new alternative IAH "A" courses, including several regionally-focused courses, including IAH 202 (*Europe and the World*), IAH 203 (*Latin America and the World*), and IAH 204 (*Asia and the World*). Other new courses include several thematically-focused courses: IAH 206 (*Self, Society, and Technology*), IAH 207 (*Literature, Cultures, and Identities*), IAH 208 (*Music and Culture*), and (soon) IAH 209 (*Art, Visual, and Culture*). During the 2004-05 academic year, new versions of IAH 201 and many of the alternative IAH "A" courses will be introduced. Curriculum change remains steady on the IAH "B" side as well, with new versions of courses introduced every year. The CISAH Advisory committee reviews 15-20 course proposals annually, for courses to be taught on and off campus (including study abroad).

As one means for enhancing ISS teaching and attracting new faculty to teach in ISS, the CISSS has experimented with an expansion model by accepting proposals from interested professors to teach selected ISS courses as "hyphenated expansions," allowing social science faculty and faculty from related units to incorporate relevant themes and problems within the rubric of current ISS courses. The objective of the hyphenated expansion is to address issues of contemporary relevance that are related to faculty research and teaching interests. The most popular ISS course to attract such expansions has been ISS 315 (*Global Diversity and Interdependence*). So far, there have been five hyphenated expansions of 315 that have been taught by faculty from a variety of units:

- *A Social Capital Approach* (Agricultural Economics)
- *Cyberspace, Technology and Society* (Geography and URP)
- *The Rise and Decline of the Keynesian Welfare State* (Social Work)
- *Globalization* (Geography)
- *Global Issues in Peace and Justice* (Anthropology)

The advantages of the hyphenated expansion model is that it affords experimentation with new themes and contents for a trial period after which the merits and longevity of the expansion can be assessed.

CISSS has expanded in other ways as well. In connection with the Honors ISP program, CISSS has experimented with ISS substitutes from and cross-listings with departmental courses. In consultation with department chairs in Social Science, CISSS made a careful selection of departmental courses that satisfy the essence of general and liberal education as stipulated by the CRUE report, and use these courses as substitutes for ISS courses or as cross-listings with similar ISS courses. This was also intended to serve as a trial balloon to strategize ISS transitions into departmental offerings. So far, CISSS has experimented with this model in a limited fashion and on an ad-hoc basis in connection with the Academic Scholars Program (ASP)

for the Honors College. This approach has a tremendous potential for enhancing the general education curriculum in the social sciences if it is done carefully and in good faith. Most importantly, it avoids the haphazardness and random hits by undergraduates of any introductory course that fits their schedule. Carefully chosen substitutes and/or cross-listings would meet the objective of an integrated general education requirement, especially if the selected courses can make some adjustments in view of the fact that they are now fulfilling a general education requirement.⁴ The list of social science courses that were selected as substitutes for the ASP are the following:

ANP 201:	<i>Sociocultural Diversity</i>
EC 201:	<i>Introduction to Microeconomics</i>
GEO 204:	<i>World Geography</i>
PLS 170:	<i>Introduction to Political Philosophy</i>
PLS 342:	<i>Comparative Political Economy</i>
SOC 315:	<i>Family and Society</i>

Finally, there have also been changes in CISGS. For one, there was a change from a 2-hour, 1-credit lab to a 3-hour, 2-credit lab/recitation in 1999. At the same time, ISB202L and 204L were combined into one ISB biology lab, ISB208L. The rationale behind the change was that lecture topics were so diverse in ISB202 and 204 that the lectures provided no consistent background for lab. Beginning in the fall of 2004, most ISP/ISB lab/recitations followed a new format that involved 2 hours in class and 1 hour arranged. Academic considerations behind the change include the sense that 3 hours is a long time for a non-major lab, students were often completing labs in 2 hours, and students were coming to lab unprepared.⁵ Over time, staff have found significant resources, including LON CAPA and other online resources that provide excellent opportunities to develop effective pre-class instruction. In concert with this change, ISP205L (*Visions of the Universe* lab/recitation) meets mostly in the planetarium, a change that allows our students the advantage of a valuable and exciting MSU resource. In addition, ISP 213H (*Navigating the Universe*), was added to the curriculum in Fall 2002. ISP217 and 217L (*Water and the Environment*) were added to the curriculum in Fall 2003, as was, ISP221 (*Earth Systems: Energy*). In Fall 2004, ISP203L and ISB208L were redesigned to focus on problem-based learning where students use scientific methods to answer real world problems. Beginning in the fall of 2005, *Geology of the Human Environment* (ISP203) will be split into two courses, ISP 203A (*Understanding Earth: Global Change*) and ISP203B (*Understanding Earth: Natural Hazards and the Environment*) to allow for more in-depth and meaningful explorations of the content.

Challenges and Problems in Integrative Studies

The committee spent some time trying to analyze the apparent challenges facing Integrative Studies at MSU. It is important to be as precise about this as possible to help determine the extent to which these are (1) university versus college challenges, (2) general education versus undergraduate education challenges, (3) real challenges at all, and (4) whether the challenges that do exist might be addressed effectively or at least partially by administrative and organizational reforms. Articulating and locating problems turned out to be a more difficult task than we initially anticipated. One lesson that we learned early on was that the Integrative Studies centers are not monolithic: While they share many common functions, philosophies, and strategies, the three centers vary in how directors and faculty conceptualize and enact "integrative studies" (see above), in their policies concerning undergraduate requirements, and in the very different institutional and professional situations each confronts. It is notable that many of these differences are cultural and disciplinary in character.

⁴ Several colleagues noted that these courses (as well as other ISS) courses have served as ways to recruit new majors to departments as well.

⁵ The change was also driven, in part, by financial considerations. Under the new format, TAs teach 3 sections, rather than 2.

Despite the significant differences, the committee members articulated a set of core challenges faced by all three centers. While the centers vary in how successful they have been in grappling with these challenges, the committee recognizes these challenges as part of mounting an ambitious, University-wide general education program:

1. Availability of adequate numbers of teaching assistants assigned to IS courses;
2. Availability of sufficient staff support for assessment, technology, advising, integration with study abroad;
3. Agreement on the key goals of Integrative Studies across the University;
4. Student understanding of the purposes and role of IS courses;
5. Faculty understanding of the purposes and role of IS courses;
6. Oversight by central administration of budget, operations, data, and reports in Integrative Studies;
7. Coordination with UUD/Advising, Admissions/AOP;
8. Flexible options for cross-listed departmental courses as meeting goals and criteria;
9. Variation in range of abilities and needs of entering students.

This is not an exhaustive list, nor do the three existing centers experience the specific challenges in the same way. Each center has its own character; each experiences the challenges in different ways. Integrative Studies in General Science, for example -- which operates on the smallest scale and teaches in large classes -- appears to experience the challenges in smallest degree or not at all. Integrative Studies in the Arts and Humanities experiences these challenges in the deepest sense. This cross-center variability heightens the importance of developing strategies for the improvement that allow us to build on the centers' collective and individual strengths while also being sensitive to and attending to their intellectual/disciplinary and organizational differences.

At least as interesting as the common agreement on the broad nature of some existing challenges is the fact that there are some challenges that are not faced by all three centers -- significant issues for one or two, which are non-issues for the third, including:

1. Availability of sufficient faculty committed to teaching IS courses, including lack of agreement by faculty and by department chairs on faculty responsibility for IS;
2. Cutting of recurring and nonrecurring Center funds needed for programmatic development;
3. Lack of control of TA funds;
4. Lack of independent resources needed to strengthen and build programs;
5. Lack of equitable sharing of responsibility among departments and faculty for IS;
6. Use of IS (and departmental) generated resources to offset college expenses;
7. Inadequate accounting and transparency to assure departments and faculty receive benefits for SCH credits;
8. Inadequate recognition for faculty excellence, creativity, and commitment to IS;
9. Class size and conditions threatening quality IS program delivery and quality student learning; and
10. Massive scale of operations, complicating adequate IS program staffing and quality delivery

These differences are significant and underscore a warning against wholesale merging without regard to what works and what does not within the current system. Here, a "Hippocratic Oath" to do no harm should be a guide to future administrative changes.

General Thoughts on Future Directions

It was our general agreement that the primary purposes of any reorganization in Integrative Studies ought to be to assist the core colleges and departments to better meet their responsibilities of carrying out a vital university function: offering first rate general education

opportunities to MSU students. This includes articulating effectively the goals of liberal general education to MSU students (including the value of independent thinking and learning, and the knowledge, skills, and habits of mind required for independent thinking and learning). It was also our general agreement that the academic goals and purposes developed and approved by the centers (see Appendix B) in recent years are a good start to specifying key IS learning outcomes.

As noted, the challenges faced in delivering Integrative Studies experiences to students differ in degree and character across the three centers. The centers vary in the scale of their operations, the support they can expect, their conceptual approaches to integrative studies, and their college (and departmental) environments. For example, Integrative Studies in the Sciences is shaped by a national professional discourse about the general education that scientists have an obligation to nurture in the U.S. citizenry. This version of “integrative studies” focuses on the appropriate general education of the average citizen who must understand science in order to participate in our democracy. In ISS and IAH, integrative studies focuses much more on the integration of disciplinary perspectives and approaches to thematic or problem-oriented subject matter. This leads to quite different curricular options for students.

With this in mind, we are concerned about the difficulties structural change (i.e., centralization) may create for relations between IS and departments and faculty. We are also concerned about the impact of centralization on specific centers, for the effects of any single action may be uneven and differential. An incentive in one center might very well act as a disincentive in another. For example, Integrative Studies in General Sciences has little trouble attracting wide faculty support sufficient to perform the mission; Integrative Studies in the Social Sciences, in contrast, has considerable trouble encouraging and sustaining the participation of faculty in several key departments. A strategy that might encourage or even mandate faculty participation in the social sciences might not be appropriate in the sciences where faculty already presume that they ought to be participating in undergraduate general education.

Our work is complicated, in addition, by uncertainty about more general university restructuring and college reorganization. Integrative Studies relies on friendly articulation with departments and faculties, and it is conceivable that reorganization might dismantle such friendly articulations as well as or as easily as create new ones. We do not wish to jeopardize these relations where they work well, that is, where departments and faculty are satisfied that they are making a reasonable contribution, and where curriculum development and assessment of student learning outcomes are advancing. We also do not wish to jeopardize the opportunity IS presents to many faculty to make creative contributions that are different from those they make in their home departments. Many IS faculty participants told us that teaching courses in the centers offers opportunities to contribute creatively to general education at MSU and sometimes to do things they otherwise would not be able to do. They enjoy this opportunity. Other faculty (in the core and professional colleges) expressed enthusiasm for participating in IS for similar reasons. Further, many courses that are offered, while interdisciplinary and broad, are inspired by individual faculty member’s own scholarship and research passions. Any reorganization should take care not to harm the crucial human resource of faculty commitment.

In addition, committee members are aware that IS has resources that, amidst scarcity, other units covet for competing purposes that may be equally important and legitimate, including building and sustaining excellence in graduate education and sustaining strength in departmental majors. We must aggressively guard against competition between graduate education and general education.⁶ Graduate students are an essential ingredient in the University’s research and

⁶ One problem that the committee struggled with was the fact that there is uneven commitment to undergraduate education at MSU. While it is politically incorrect to publicly state that undergraduate education is not a priority, committee members and some colleagues who came to speak with us talked about their own frustrations with the uneven commitment to undergraduate education among some faculty and within some departments/units. Knowing this, it was difficult to know when to be open-minded about a criticism leveled at IS and when to wonder whether

teaching missions. As a university, we need to attend to doctoral students' needs as apprentice researchers. But graduate students are also a source of energy and enthusiasm when mixed with undergraduates. Indeed, since many doctoral students will enter higher education, developing knowledge, skill, and commitment to general education is an important part of their doctoral education. For those doctoral students entering higher education, we need to nurture their teaching and research/scholarly identities equally. But too often teaching (especially general education teaching) and research are seen as in tension in our University. This is especially true in the disciplines where outside support from research projects are limited. For those departments, monies for graduate teaching assistantships are important recruitment devices for prospective and enrolled students, and they are used to support both the teaching and scholarly dimensions of doctoral students' experiences. Tensions readily arise between the demands of both. This is a stress on both the students and the system that demands careful attention.⁷

Finally, we are also acutely aware that, as we speak about structure, we often run up against other matters about which we have not been charged, including the under-funding of general education at MSU, the shrinking or only slowly expanding size of the faculty assigned to it (compared with student numbers), and the channeling of students into what are most often very large classes. Integrative Studies/general education will not improve unless these matters -- matters that go well beyond structural issues -- are addressed as well.

Given these complexities, the committee considered a range of alternatives related to other ongoing discussions. If current discussions about college reorganization generate a single LS&A college, a single center will probably follow. We think such a college structure is unlikely and did not spend substantial time envisioning a single center. We believe a single center and single director will confront serious challenges overcoming cultural differences between the sciences, on one hand, and the social sciences and arts and humanities, on the other, and we worry this would be a hopeless, potentially destructive mission.

If current discussions about college reorganization generate a merger or federation of the colleges of social science and arts and humanities (something like Option IV in the recent report), major change in IS will still be required -- probably a single center of Integrative Studies for Arts, Humanities, & Social Sciences. That center would account for more than two thirds of the overall budget, four fifths of the total faculty assignments, and two thirds of the IS requirement. Cooperating twin-tower centers -- one in the General Sciences, and one in the Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences -- might be doable, and would be worth exploring. There might not be need for further centralization if this latter center could be configured appropriately and creatively.

If more complex (and inherently fractured) structural changes occur among colleges, that is, if the status quo prevails, which includes the split off from Arts and Letters of History to Social Science, and of Music toward independent status, if there is an increase of smaller unit reorganizations (which will, in turn, multiply the collegiate and departmental pieces with which IS, and most particularly, IAH, will need to articulate and coordinate), there may be additional reasons for change.

said criticism was, instead, a convenient excuse. No one wanted to accuse units or faculty of being uncommitted; neither did anyone want to ignore the harsh reality that we are not -- as a faculty -- equally committed to high quality general education or undergraduate education. In the end, the committee decided to take all criticism at face value; after all, understanding voiced concerns can only help improve IS. But we did so without being naïve about the fact that not all criticisms of IS are "created equally." Dealing with the uneven commitment to general education will be an important part of the future work, for no reconceptualization or reorganization of IS will be able to resolve those tensions.

⁷ One common misconception is that the Integrative Studies centers siphon monies for doctoral students from departments. This seems not to be the case; the monies for doctoral students primarily reside in the departments, which requires center director and department to negotiate for graduate assistants to teach in IS.

The committee concluded that, in the end, some degree of centralization with increased funding commends itself, regardless of the amount of collegiate and department reorganization. The committee was divided on this question: A majority believes that the act of centralizing coordination and enhancing program visibility, as well as strengthening authority and regularizing oversight may produce positive results. A minority -- consisting of the scientists -- disagrees. We describe the specifics of these positions in the next section.

At the same time, however, centralization also worries all committee members, sufficient to give us collective pause. Centralization poses several dangers. Increased centralization without increased funding would be disastrous, siphoning off scarce resources from the instructional core to support additional layers of bureaucracy. Likewise, simply redirecting funds to a centralized center from the core colleges and/or the professional colleges would be equally disastrous and might considerably reduce support for centralization. Moreover, if a new form of centralization is improperly designed and implemented, it may unhitch IS from the intimate, cooperative, and dynamic relations with departments and faculty on which IS currently depends to thrive. It may also push for standardization, which could undercut the unique disciplinary and interdisciplinary identities of each center. The passion and commitment to teach at a general education level -- students who may or may not major in your department -- cannot be "mandated" from above. These commitments must be nurtured and supported, given incentive, recognized, and rewarded. On this, we all agreed.

In the section that follows, we lay out four models of centralization that were considered by the committee.

Models of Centralization

We have developed and discussed four differing models of centralization. These models are differentiated based on the degree of centralization (from light to heavy), the functions to be centralized, and the nature of the relations envisioned among the parts of the structure of Integrative Studies at MSU. Our committee is divided between a majority that favors B and a minority that favors A. The minority that favors A consists of faculty in the College of Natural Science and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Option A. This model of centralization addresses the need to better communicate the goals and purposes, strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of IS among all stakeholders. It emphasizes that the core strength of IS is in the relationships between the centers and participating departments and faculty in the colleges. It seeks to do little that might jeopardize those relationships. It also emphasizes the differential challenges faced by IS in the different colleges, as well as significant variations in purpose. Nonetheless, this model stresses that more university-wide coordination and strengthening of IS might occur if there were to be created, in addition to a Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (which possesses a wide university portfolio), an executive committee for IS, including core college representation, IS directors and representatives of faculty teaching in the IS program, and faculty representing colleges and departments that are typically consumers of IS-educated students (i.e., the professional schools). Total membership would be 15 or so, and would be specifically designed to cross boundaries -- to enhance the visibility of IS within departments and colleges where support might be forthcoming and potential IS teachers might emerge, to increase the quality of communication, and to catalyze needed improvements and innovation.⁸

⁸ Such an executive committee might have membership like the committee that wrote this report. Our committee consisted of both insiders and outsiders. The mix led to a healthy balance between respect for and skepticism of IS (see Appendix A). This executive committee is not unlike the CRUE report recommendation that there be a "new standing committee or council on undergraduate education charged with the governance and oversight of the entire undergraduate experience" (CRUE, 1988, p. 8).

The executive committee would be a connective link tying the upper administration (the Provost Office, especially VPUE), college administrations (deans), IS (the centers, especially the directors), the faculty, and other colleges. Its task would involve setting broad policy goals for Integrative Studies and advising the VPUE annually about IS, as well as informing colleagues and units about the programs and challenges involved in IS. The conversation about IS and general education on campus is thus more concretely and widely rooted, ostensibly better informed. The committee would also advise core college deans on matters of IS importance. The committee is not conceived as a curriculum committee. Integrative Studies centers, with faculty advisory committees, would continue to exist in the core colleges, and would -- along with their respective college curriculum committees -- approve and review courses, decide on faculty and GA awards, select annual award winners, and undertake curriculum changes. The executive committee would be chaired by one of the IS center directors, perhaps for a specified term, perhaps on a rotating basis. Option A simply adds this coordinating executive committee to the present arrangement.

Assistant Provost/VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education
 Executive Committee of IS
 Directors, College Centers
 Administrative Assistant, Clerical Staff, and Specialized Staff

Because Option A does little to change existing circumstances in the centers and leaves advocacy and decision-making in the hands of the IS center directors and college deans, several committee members from the CNS and CANR felt that this is the best proposal. They see this option as the lightest layer of additional administration and the one that leaves key decisions closest to where they have been. Moreover, college-based directors are in the best position to know what students may gain from their courses and support the faculty interested in pursuing new initiatives. Given the fact that Integrative Studies currently works well in the sciences, for those committee members, this is the option that does the least harm. The natural scientists' preference for this option is not meant to suggest that they do not believe that there is significant room for improvement and reform within IS. They simply believe that that reform will be best undertaken within this organizational arrangement.

Other committee members felt that this was not an adequate solution. The majority feels that IS needs special advocacy and attention because, unlike colleges and departments, it is not a home to regular faculty appointments and resources. A slightly more ambitious centralization plan, one that uses centralization to push for improvements and to leverage support by collective action and to add ancillary services needed by all the centers was favored by the rest of the committee (see Option B). These committee members worried that an executive committee would be merely a talking group, a weak "articles of confederation" experiment, and would not provide the leadership and advocacy required for general education at MSU. One concern about Option A was that it does not adequately address some current realities, most importantly the fact that there has been a continued "adding on" of goals and obligations to the IS mission, including contributing to the University's expanded commitment to study abroad, serving as a resource for the assessment of student learning outcomes, and educating students about liberal education before they arrive in IS classes.

Option B. A second model of centralization seeks to build on momentum toward a more unified program created by growing cooperation among recent directors and assisted by the recent Integrative Studies Institutes and the follow-up Hewlett grant and initiative called *Assessing Student Outcomes in Integrative Studies: MSU's General Education Program*. In addition to improving communication (as in Option A, which it incorporates), it seeks to secure more general fund dollars, highlight the program's visibility, add specialized services available to the centers, and offer centers vital resources to seed and sponsor innovation. This model envisions a central IS director who will report to the Assistant Provost and VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education, who is supported by an administrative assistant. In addition, the

director is supported by specialized staff for several functions, including developing and administering assessments, enhancing the uses of instructional technology, liaising with study abroad, writing grants, and (possibly) advising. The central director and entire IS program would have significant funding (a program budget provided centrally) to assess student learning outcomes, seed and support new faculty initiatives, and offer incentives to departments and faculty to move in new directions. The director would be an advocate and a voice for Integrative Studies/general education in the university. In this model, each IS center would continue to have a director in the respective colleges (as well as substantial center budgets), or perhaps in relation to several colleges; and these would operate in coordination with the directions collaboratively set by the central director, the co-directors, the advisory board or executive committee (as described in Option A), as well as by the key college deans. Curriculum would continue to be developed, as in A, through the centers, advisory committees, and college curriculum committees.

As already noted, this model conceptualizes centralization largely in terms of heightening the program's visibility, centralizing ancillary resources efficiently to assist the program to thrive and develop (minimizing cost duplication), and centrally sponsoring and funding change, innovation, growth, and improvement along university or program-sanctioned directions. The center could sponsor faculty fellows and curriculum development and change. It could have some small number of (additional) GAships to support such change (most GAships would remain in the colleges and departments). The center could be the site of special course offerings by Hannah Fellows and by others recruited for the purpose and perhaps even thematic upper level offerings developed across the IS centers. The director would meet regularly with college center directors, who would be associate directors of the program, and -- in collaboration with those directors -- the director would set priorities for program change and improvement (subject to executive committee approval). This, we think, formalizes the possibility of program-wide mission, goals, and direction, and offers some structural support to creating program-wide faculty development and community. It locates clearer lines of responsibility for advocating for liberal general education in the University (to the Provost, students and their parents, deans, faculty, and advisors), and it creates a fund to help improve offerings and to keep the entire program dynamic and changing, increasingly flexible, and ever responsive to changing needs of students and the University.

We would recommend also careful scrutiny and oversight by the Assistant Provost/VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education of college budget allocations to the centers, patterns of faculty deployment and assignment, and class sizes and teaching conditions. Over and over, the committee heard that the basic conditions of teaching were a central challenge faced by faculty -- especially faculty who participate in ISS and IAH. The committee felt that this model of centralization might help each individual center find the resources and develop the strategies it will take to create optimum working conditions and investment in general education at MSU. It would be the Assistant Provost's responsibility to mobilize the authority of the Provost's Office on behalf of setting overall budget goals and sustaining sufficient resources to field vital general education offerings in the colleges. It would be the Assistant Provost's responsibility also to coordinate with deans in generating changes in course delivery and model to achieve efficiencies in keeping with budget realities. Any budget required for the creation of this additional director or centralized model should come from the Office of the Provost.

Assistant Provost/VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education
 Director of University Integrative Studies, Executive Committee
 Administrative Assistant and Specialized Staff for Services
 Directors of College Centers – Advisory Committee
 Administrative Assistants and Clerical Staff

This is the option that garnered the majority's support, in part because it presumes that everything in option A is essential, but not sufficient for the support and improvement of Integrative Studies. This option was considered (by the committee majority) as preferable because it goes beyond Option A, specifically in addressing some core challenges: constrained budgets, clear communication of IS goals, garnering of additional resources for the improvement

of teaching conditions, the need for consistent advocacy for IS, as well as offering some guarantees that some monies generated by IS get put back in IS. A majority of the committee also favors the return of (shared) monies (with departments) generated through study abroad initiatives and summer LE offerings to this central program to seed new initiatives and course and faculty development, with attentiveness to equitable treatment among the centers, and participating departments and faculty.⁹

The committee has discussed whether this director should be a full time director or should be one of the center directors with an additional role, perhaps on a rotating basis. A majority of the committee favors a full time director, although there is considerable opinion that such director should emerge from long-term MSU faculty experience, including experience in IS. A minority of the committee worried about the complications added by yet another layer of administration to an already challenging institutional and educational agenda.

Faculty in CNS and CANR who teach in IS were unanimous in their opposition to model B. The natural scientist minority believes that reorganization is premature for several reasons. First, differing views and even disagreements regarding IS goals repeatedly arose in our discussions. This suggests that there exist fundamentally differing visions of this program. These differences appear to be at the level of core values and approaches; those who favor A believe that it is high time to sort these issues out. In our conclusion, the committee unanimously suggests recommended next steps that involve a discussion of these important matters of values and practices within IS. Such a discussion should result in either a re-dedication to a more crisply defined existing program, or dedication to a modified version. In any case, such an affirmation based on a broad faculty discussion would surely inform the structure of IS. Hence, the minority believes, that discussion should take place prior to administrative structural changes; to do otherwise is to put the cart before the horse. Extending this argument, the minority believes that merging now is premature because the college reorganization surely is relevant to how IS is supported and delivered. And Option A would focus the needed discussion and could begin to do so while the college reorganization discussion continues to evolve.

A second reason for the natural scientist minority concern is that Option B, done correctly, would require a significant amount of new funding, which is seen as unlikely in the current situation of the University. Another cost of financial stress is that there are insufficient teaching assistants available in IS and faculty worry about teaching conditions, given the size of classes and availability or non-availability of assistance. Faculty opposed to Option B worry about the potential threat of siphoning off already-dedicated resources, which are already too few, to yet another layer of the bureaucracy. Finally, Option B names a single spokesperson for IS. Given the considerable variation in goals, purposes, and faculty ethos across centers, there is some concern about whether one person can understand and represent the varied perspectives of the different centers and their associated faculty and disciplines on general education and integrative studies. Some committee members worried that it would be difficult to find someone with the broad academic background and cross-department and –college perspective to fill the position and a daunting challenge to anyone who starts afresh to learn. It is the strongly held belief of the CNS and CANR minority that the deans are likely to always be the best advocates for general science education, its strengths, differences from IAH and ISS, and its connections to scientific faculty and departments.

That said, some CNS committee members said that they would not oppose Option B if the director of IS was one of the center directors, serving on a rotating basis. This would not only reduce costs; through the intimate and on-going collaborative work of the center directors do -- meeting weekly, overseeing faculty and course development, and seeking grants together -- the

⁹ The concern here is that monies generated by IAH through expanded summer offerings off campus and study abroad have never been available to help strengthen general education. The College of Arts and Letters has claimed them for other purposes.

current center directors are more likely to understand and respect the differences in the approaches to general education that exist in different college centers.

Option C. A third model goes further and emphasizes, in addition to improved communication, heightened visibility, specialized services, seed and support resources, enhanced coordination, and control and more centralized budget authority. This model provides more powerful direction from the top, a charge, to the deans and colleges, and accompanying practices and processes to report, review, scrutinize, and assess that the university function – general liberal education -- is being properly attended, is thriving, and is producing salutary outcomes. Similarly it provides more powerful action from the top to require the recognition and rewarding of participating faculty.

This vision emphasizes the central operation as a place not merely to give strengthened vision and direction to and heightened prominence and services to the program, but as a locale that would more emphatically direct the program in cooperation with the deans and colleges. It does not eliminate college-sited centers but envisions a stronger role for the center director, or director together with Assistant Provost, to plan, oversee, coordinate, and hold accountable other parties to the delivery of the university program. This center would have enhanced responsibility to set program directions and review courses for quality control as well as integrate assessment and technology in courses and improve advising.

More would be done centrally in this scenario; less would be done locally, so long as sufficient local knowledge were incorporated to adjust program directions to two or three different sets of college realities. This center would work with departments and faculty (through the associate directors in the college centers) to mount the academic schedule, and special faculty fellows might also offer highly visible university-wide courses. The director would meet regularly with associate directors and be in charge of setting the priorities for change and improvement across the program as a whole; the director and Assistant Provost, together with the deans, would set and monitor budget goals and efficiency goals for the program.

This option tends to move authority from the core colleges and college centers to the program center and Provost's Office, and creates more of a command and control relationship with colleges and departments. It locates more responsibility in the Provost's Office for advocating for general education and suggests more close scrutiny and direction of budgeting, quality control issues, and the like. It tips the weight toward the university-wide program, establishing authority and oversight as well administrative, technical, and financial supports centrally. However, it continues to depend on budget allocated to the colleges and on good will and cooperation in departments and among faculty to generate courses and use resources currently designated for general education for this purpose in the future.

Assistant Provost/VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education
 Director of University Integrative Studies, Advisory Committee
 Administrative Assistant and Specialized Staff
 Directors (Associate Directors) of College Centers & Advisory Committee
 Administrative Assistant and Clerical Staff

Because this option puts more decision-making in the hands of authorities removed from intimate connection with the curricular arrangements and relationships with departments and faculty, the committee did not find much support for this option. Some committee members feel that there is sufficient central authority already present in the Provost's Office to more effectively direct, oversee, and scrutinize; while others believe that any central authority exercised in this way will more likely interfere with than improve the IS program's quality.

Option D. A fourth and most radical option sees centralization as the consolidation of the entire program in the central operation. In this vision, general funds money could be removed from the core colleges and apportioned out in some ratio to colleges and departments based on

faculty participation in general education, the college centers and directors and associated staff could be eliminated, and the program center would plan, mount, and oversee all course provision and new course development. All functions would be centralized -- direction of the program, academic scheduling, planning and innovation, course development, and budget -- and perhaps even the executive committee could serve as a curriculum committee, providing pilot permission to mount new courses, and shepherding permanent course approvals forward. The center budget would be enlarged.

General funds money could be apportioned in something like this: If all MSU faculty are thought to share the burden of general education, and if we were to think of general education as including, beyond IS, also introductory writing, introductory mathematics, introductory computer science, and introductory courses in all the varied disciplines, plus introductory courses in the languages, then perhaps a figure could be imagined concerning what proportion of faculty compensation ideally goes to teaching general education. We would need to give due thought to who has opportunities to teach general education, to differentials in class sizes tied to learning goals, and to other considerations. A similar proportion of faculty assignments to such teaching could be monitored and decisions on annual allocations to the colleges and departments might be made based on how well (or poorly) departments contribute to achieving this ideal proportion. Or, as an alternative, the budget could be allocated through the program center, and colleges and departments be given access to such budget based on agreements to provide courses and faculty assignments and graduate assistant assignments. This would obviously be the most cumbersome and difficult form of centralization and would more than risk good relations with colleges, departments, and faculty. It would breed considerable resentment and hard feeling among the faculty who have invested considerable time in Integrative Studies and general education.

Assistant Provost/VP and Dean for Undergraduate Education
 Director of Integrative Studies Program, Executive and Curriculum Committee
 Associate Director or Directors
 Administrative Assistant, Clerical Staff, and Specialized Staff

No one on the committee was in favor of Option D. This extreme version of centralization -- in the sense of common and uniform direction for all three core subject matter areas -- threatens to de-emphasize the concrete cultural and academic differences that characterize intellectual activities in different areas of liberal general education, differences that reflect genuine epistemological and disciplinary variations. Above all else, Integrative Studies is an educational enterprise, and its academic soul needs to be nurtured and assisted, not endangered, by organizational structures.

Discussion and Next Steps

As already noted, the majority of committee members favored Option B; the minority, consisting of the natural scientists, favored Option A. The view is that Option C is likely to be administratively cumbersome, awkward, and too expensive in budget-constrained times; Option D requires too much organizational change and would likely disrupt relations with departments and faculty excessively, particularly if the timetable is rapid. More worrisome is the fact that it might undercut or discourage faculty commitment to general education.

With specific reference to the challenges discussed above, the committee feels that Options A and B may

1. help encourage sufficient faculty and teaching assistants committed to teaching IS courses;
2. build agreement on the Integrative Studies goals more broadly across campus;
3. gain more agreement by faculty and by department chairs on faculty responsibility for IS;

4. assist in improving recognition for faculty excellence, creativity, and commitment to IS; and
5. enhance the flexibility for developing and listing departmental courses that meet IS goals and criteria.

The modestly centralized director proposed in Option B, working largely as a university-wide advocate with some additional staff for teaching technology, obtaining grants, coordinating with study abroad, and coordinating advising support, may well help in improving the knowledge of students and faculty on the purposes and role of IS courses, ensuring innovation and responsiveness to concerns that arise in other colleges and units, and in focusing attention by central administration for enhanced oversight and budget review for the three centers in the context of constantly occurring changes in college level priorities and challenges. This advocacy may also be helpful in reducing the temptation for colleges to draw off IS resources for other purposes in tight budgetary times.

We think it important to point out that neither Option A or B is expected to improve the palpable pressure for increased class sizes and diminished teaching conditions that already threatens the quality of IS program delivery. To that end, some of the most threatening issues remain, independent of whatever degree of centralization emerges. The massive size of IS operations, given available faculty and GAs, is an undeniable challenge that should be addressed by the cross-college executive committee proposed in Options A and B. Additional resources are needed to perform general education at MSU, no matter its organizational structure. The committee should also seek to address the difficult question of equitable sharing of responsibility among departments and faculty for Integrative Studies, especially in those colleges where it remains a question.

The committee met with a broad cross-section of the academic community. Perhaps not surprisingly, most concerns are not about centralization. Rather, colleagues (deans, students, faculty, department chairs) concerns are about the content and mission of Integrative Studies, how to create the conditions for high quality teaching and learning, and how to enhance participation and understanding of IS by students and faculty alike. The committee considers these questions "good news." However, since the charge to this committee was to consider organizational -- not substantive -- issues, committee members have felt some degree of frustration, as well as an increased appetite for getting on with the important business at hand: a discussion of the substance of IS and how to ensure the best conditions for its delivery. In fact, the focus on centralization has obstructed such work, for training attention on the organization of Integrative Studies implies that its essence is primarily an academic and bureaucratic scheduling task rooted in efficiency considerations (making the trains run on time) rather than an academic, pedagogical, and curricular task rooted in concerns of teaching and learning (aiding student learning and growth).

The committee unanimously agrees that it is time to work on issues of curriculum reform and development, informed by a reassessment of the core principles of general education at MSU.

To this end, we suggest the following as highlights for the next steps.

1. *What is "Integrative Studies" in 2005 at MSU?*

The report from the Committee to Review Undergraduate Education (CRUE) is now 16 years old. Many MSU faculty (both those currently involved in IS, or who could be involved) are not as aware of the goals of IS as they might be. Indeed, a crisper characterization of Integrative Studies (in terms of the shared and varied cross-center characteristics) has yet to be accomplished. This suggests that it is a subject worthy of new consideration. While the directors made considerable progress on this during the Hewlett work, that was only a beginning. And a

significant challenge, then, is to carefully articulate the goals of general education at MSU in a manner that serves the current faculty and the current student body in the current environment.

Some questions raised about IS concern the University-wide commitment to an integrative studies approach to general education. Some critics wondered why we don't replace IS with a distribution system. The charge of this committee was not to question the CRUE report, and hence we focused more on issues of centralization than on whether this model of general education is appropriate. The literature on general education, however, suggests that distribution requirements come with serious limitations, ranging from curricular incoherence, problems with assessing what students learn, and issues of efficiency and scale AACU, 2002; Boyer, 1998, Conant, 1963). Thus, we do not recommend deconstructing Integrative Studies. Instead, we recommend pushing IS to a new level, in part by experimenting with creating hybrids. While remaining committed to Integrative Studies -- in all of its varied interpretations (more clearly and "crisply" understood) -- the centers should take advantage of faculty enthusiasm for re-imagining and extending the potential of IS at MSU. Our recommendation is to work on creating a system that maximizes the educative potential of the IS curriculum, that is as flexible as possible in delivering that curriculum, while maintaining fidelity to the "integrative" goals.

2. Can the goals of Integrative Studies be met at MSU?

While serving as the stimulus to the creation of the current IS structure, much has changed since the time of CRUE: the student body has gotten significantly larger, the faculty body has significantly changed, and resources have not kept up with the demands of the original mandates. It is time to reassess those original ideas and goals in order to see whether they are as fresh today as they were then, and importantly, whether they can be accomplished with the same degree of completeness as was envisioned in the 1980s. For example, can the requirements of writing in the IS curriculum conceivably be accomplished in a foreseeable future of large lecture classes and declining resources? Has the need for improved quantitative literacy been adequately folded into the curriculum? Or should these goals be reassessed, given budgetary realities? These questions are particularly relevant now that task forces have worked to re-articulate the University's views on both of those general education domains. In fact, an important next step would involve looking at general education more holistically, and combining the efforts of the committees on quantitative literacy, writing, and Integrative Studies.

Some committee members are also concerned about and interested in exploring the effects of incoming student capabilities on the potential of IS. For example, does the continuing practice of not specifying entrance requirements at MSU serve the institution, its programs or -- eventually -- the students?

The committee learned a great deal about policies and practices that Colleges and departments use to enable Integrative Studies. For instance, all faculty in Anthropology have a commitment to teach one IS course each year. The department, thus, does not have a hierarchical system of those who teach general education and those who do not. Similarly, natural scientists understand that part of their professional identity entails educating citizens. Not all faculty are expected to teach in ISP/ISB. However, a large number do and feel it is important. Future deliberations ought to include collecting more information about policies and practices that might be used or adapted by other departments and colleges as they find ways to participate in and expand IS.

3. What is the best curricular model for the future of IS at MSU?

The committee is now exploring ideas in those domains, raising the question: What should the next generation of IS look like? Alternatives, enhancements, significant and marginal, are easy to imagine. What is worth preserving? What is worth creating? How can we expand and make more flexible courses? What content and capacities should be addressed in the curricular choices available to students that currently is not addressed? In addition to curricular

improvements, the committee is considering issues of communication: How can we build understanding across the University about IS's goals and options? How can we help faculty locate their interests in IS? How can we better advise students as to the reasons why they are asked to take IS courses and what the range of their options is?

One idea the committee has informally discussed is the idea of more flexible course provision, permitting departments cooperating with the centers and with the IS program to propose cross-listed courses that could serve the purposes of general education. They would need to be approved by faculty curriculum committees in general education (i.e., in Integrative Studies), as meeting specific general education goals, but there seems great interest in pursuing this direction. It is believed that more participants would step forth, more courses and seats would be available, and more flexibility would be introduced into the existing system. It is also believed that this could fit with on-going discussions connected with the North Central States Accreditation and efforts to internationalize the MSU curriculum and strengthen what is described as "the global capacities" of MSU students.

The committee has also briefly discussed the idea of exempting specific student constituencies from IS for specific reasons, on the model of current students who major in the sciences or engineering. (Students who intend to major in a natural science are not required to take the Integrative Studies in that field but rather substitute science courses for IS-science courses.) The committee is strongly divided on this question, primarily because what constitutes "integrative studies" varies so much between the sciences and the arts, humanities, and social science, and because it worries about the impact of such a decision on the breadth or narrowness of some undergraduate majors in the social sciences or arts and humanities. This conversation needs to continue.

The committee is also interested in some ideas presented by the committee on New Directions in IAH, which reported last spring, including:

1. musical and artistic literacy as goals of general education in the arts and humanities, including both skills of performance and of critical appreciation;
2. expanded Integrative Studies-based study abroad programs, early in student careers;
3. expanded opportunities for civic engagement/civic inquiry in Integrative Studies; and
4. expanded, flexible modes of course delivery, including two-credit course modules.

That committee, it should be said, continued to affirm the importance of providing significant opportunities to write in IAH courses as part of the university-wide writing program, and there could be more writing in ISS courses as well if teaching conditions were improved.

4. *How can we improve communication and collaboration with students and faculty across the University?*

The committee is very interested in the creation of an advisory council or executive committee of faculty and administrators across the University. There is clearly a great deal of interest in general education, and IS needs to find ways to tap into that potential and enthusiasm. In what ways, for instance, might IS develop relationships with faculty in the professional schools who have interests and backgrounds aligned with the commitments of IS? How might we develop lines of communication to enhance faculty understanding of IS? For example, many engineering and business faculty have expressed an interest in having additional IS courses that address issues of globalization or of ethics and professional practice. Faculty in the social sciences and some who teach in arts and humanities address such issues in their classes (recall, for example, the myriad elaborations of ISS 315, *Global Diversity and Interdependence*, see page 5). How might we take advantage of these emerging and overlapping interests to both enhance the curriculum of IS courses and to make sure that faculty and students have good information about what is actually taught in IS?

In Closing

The Integrative Studies program represents an important part of all MSU students' undergraduate education. The three centers have made considerable efforts to develop a more coherent, well-conceptualized program of study that responds to student and faculty interests. We stand firmly behind a recommendation to do no harm. We do not, however, suggest that there is no room for improvement. As is always the case with curriculum, there is much to improve. While organizational considerations are crucial, the committee believes that organizational questions should flow from curricular deliberations. Curriculum and communication, innovation, collaboration, teaching conditions, and new and expanded methods of delivery – these are core substantive concerns that the committee believes constitute the next steps for the improvement and support of Integrative Studies and general education at MSU.

We invite individual comment and questions by e-mail (for example to the committee Chair, Norman Graham at grahamn@msu.edu) or by visiting the public forum component of the *Realizing the Vision* website.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Charles. (1993) Prescribing the Life of the Mind. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2004) A Statement on Integrative Learning.

Bloom, Alan. (1987). The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students. NY: Simon and Schuster.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities. NY: State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (2002). Reinventing Undergraduate Education: Three Year After the Boyer Report. NY: State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Association of American College and Universities (2004) Integrative Learning: Opportunities to Connect,

Cohen, Jeremy, and Eric R. White. (2004) "Creating Shared Student Responsibility for General Education," Peer Review. Fall.

Conant, James Bryant. (1963). The Education of American Teachers. NY: McGraw-Hill.

The Council to Review Undergraduate Education (CRUE). Opportunities for Renewal. (1988) Final Report. Michigan State University. May 20. <http://oldsite.msu.edu/dig/CRUE/goalprin.html>

Cronin, William. (1998) "Only Connect: The Goals of a Liberal Education," American Scholar (Autumn): 73-80.

Honors University Task Force. (2000) Educating Undergraduates in a Public Honors Research University in the Twenty First Century.

Freedman, James O. (1996) "Science and Liberal Learning," in Idealism and Liberal Education, 77-81.

Jacoby, Russell. (1994) Dogmatic Wisdom: How the Education and Cultural Wars have Mised America. NY: Doubleday.

Katz, Stanley N. (1995) "Possibilities for Remaking Liberal Education at the Century's End, " in The Condition of American Liberal Education, ed., by Robert Orrill.

Kerr, Clark. (1963, 1995) The Uses of the University. Cambridge,MA: Harvard University Press.

Menand, Louis. (1997) "Re-imagining Liberal Education," in Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America, ed. Robert Orrill.

Martha Nussbaum. (1997) Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Orrill, Robert, ed. (1995) The Condition of American Liberal Education. NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Orrill, Robert, ed. (1997) Education and Democracy: Re-imagining Liberal Learning in America. NY: College Entrance Examination Board.

Prestel, David. (2004) Report of the Commission on New Directions in IAH Final -April 1. College of Arts and Letters, Michigan State University.

Ramaley, Judith and Andrea Leakes. (2002). Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College, Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU).

Ryan, Alan. (1998) Liberal Anxieties and Liberal Education. NY: Hill and Wang.

Waltzer, Ken. (2004) "Models of Liberal General Education: Some Reflections – And Where are We in the CIC?" April 23.

Waltzer, Ken. (2000) "Liberal General Education at Michigan State University – Integrative Studies". Paper presented at "General Education Models: Pros & Cons of General Education Strategies". Council of Colleges of Arts and Sciences --Toronto, Canada, Nov. 9.

Zastrow, Claus von, with Helen Janc. (2004) Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools. Council for Basic Education.

APPENDIX A**INTEGRATIVE STUDIES PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

- Graham, Norm:** James Madison College (Chair)
- Barber, Alison:** Broad College of Business (until sabbatical beginning in mid-August)
- Beattie, Peter:** Arts & Letters - History
- Benham, Maenette:** Education - Educational Administration
- Bratzel, John:** Arts & Letters - WRAC
- Brock, Chip (Raymond):** Natural Science - Physics-Astronomy
- Dokter, Christina:** Council of Graduate Students
- Hamm, Michael:** Agriculture and Natural Resources – CANR
- Hancock, Jessica:** ASMSU – UG student majoring in International Relations
- Hausinger, Robert:** Natural Science - Microbiology
- Lillie, Janet:** Communication Arts & Sciences
- Mehretu, Assefa:** Social Science - Integrative Studies for Social Science
- Morgan, Mindy:** Social Science - Anthropology
- Posner, Alan:** Social Science - Political Science
- Rathke, Michael:** Natural Science - Chemistry
- Sibley, Duncan:** Natural Science - Integrative Studies/Science
- Sullivan, Mark:** Arts & Letters - School of Music
- Waltzer, Ken:** Arts & Letters - Integrative Studies/Arts & Humanities
- Weber, Daniel:** ASMSU – UG student majoring in Lyman Briggs School
- Wilson, Suzanne:** Education - Teacher Education

APPENDIX B: GOALS OF INTEGRATIVE STUDIES

Courses in Integrative Studies help students to:

1. become more familiar with the ways of knowing characteristic of intellectual activities in the arts and humanities, biological and physical sciences, and social sciences;
2. grow in a range of intellectual abilities, including critical thinking, logical argument, appropriate uses of evidence, and interpretation of varied kinds of information (quantitative, qualitative, text, and image);
3. expand their knowledge about other times, places, and cultures, as well as about key ideas and issues in human experience;
4. learn about the role of scientific methods in understanding the natural and social worlds;
5. appreciate the role of knowledge, values, and ethics in understanding human behavior and solving social problems; and
6. recognize some responsibilities and opportunities associated with citizenship in a democratic society and in an increasingly inter-connected world.

Goals of Integrative Studies-General Science

There are two main aspects of ISP/ISB courses that foster the development of the students' integrative knowledge. First, they provide the student with a firm understanding of the scientific mode of inquiry; a powerful method of intellectual analysis that may be applied to answering a very broad spectrum of questions concerning the world in which we live. In modern society, science and technology impact daily lives at work and home in many ways. Productive citizens must expect to work in their professions and communities with scientists. Whereas these citizens need not be expert scientists, they will need the basic scientific literacy fostered by Integrative Studies-General Science courses to understand and negotiate these impacts. Second, by providing more emphasis on the social and historical implications of science than normal introductory science courses, students can recognize the relationships between natural science, social science and arts and humanities. With this in mind, Integrative Studies Physical and Biological Science courses (ISP/ISB) consider the following four goals for students' learning:

- 1) ways in which science investigates and draws conclusions. For example, scientists are asking and answering questions about global climate change and genetic modification that will affect how we live in the future.
- 2) results of this mode of enquiry, using selected examples. Theories such as Natural Selection and Plate Tectonics have changed the way we view relationships between humans and the natural world.
- 3) the social impact of science in its historical context. The impact of science on our lives is not new, but the intensity and extent of the impacts is accelerating. Through understanding science and its impacts in the past, we are better able to appreciate and meet future challenges.
- 4) kinds of questions science can and cannot answer. Scientific methods have proved to be incredibly powerful ways of knowing. However, science clearly cannot answer all questions and an educated citizen in the new millennium faces the challenge of understanding those questions that fall outside the scope of scientific investigation.

ISP/ISB courses are thematic in nature. They do not cover the whole of science, or even the whole of one discipline in one course. Instead, they provide the framework for exploring the four goals listed above.

Specific objectives that should be included in every course include:

- 1) Students should be able to recognize the roles of hypotheses and theories in solving problems. This is best accomplished with specific examples. Students should be able to think critically about issues that cross boundaries of individual scientific disciplines. For example, students might use basic chemistry to understand osmosis, then apply this to how organisms gain or lose water.

- 2) Students should be able to discuss the historical and social contexts that influenced the development of one or more major scientific ideas. For example, Darwin's theory of Natural Selection became a part of an on-going debate about the age of the Earth as well as Karl Marx's views on materialism.

- 3) Students should be able to recognize limits of scientific knowledge in addressing questions. For example, genetically modified crops may be used to relieve environmental degradation associated with some agricultural activities, but social and political forces presently constrain use of genetically modified foods.

Center for Integrative Studies in the Arts and Humanities

Academic Purposes and Goals

Integrative Studies at MSU seeks to assist students to become more familiar with the ways of knowing that characterize the arts and humanities, the biological and physical sciences, and the social sciences. Integrative Studies seeks to assist students to grow in a range of intellectual abilities, including critical thinking, logical argument, appropriate uses of evidence, and varied modes of interpretation, and to strengthen (and grow confident in) their communication abilities .

Integrative studies courses encourage students to become more knowledgeable about other times, places, and cultures as well as key ideas and issues in human experience. They encourage understanding of the scientific method and varied methods of interpretation in knowing the natural and social world. They also encourage appreciation of the role of knowledge, values, and ethics in understanding human behavior and solving social problems. Finally, they seek to help students recognize some of the responsibilities and opportunities associated with citizenship in a democratic society and with life in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world.

IAH Curriculum

CISAH has responsibility for integrative studies education in the arts and humanities. Study in literature, history, religion, philosophy, and language assists students to assess their sense of self, the ethical consequences of their actions, and their place in the world historically, culturally, and linguistically. Study in the humanities fosters and elevates awareness of these fundamental aspects of our lives. Performance and the study of the fine arts extend these understandings to appreciation of the myriad forms of human expression and helps heighten levels of aesthetic sensitivity, creativity, and insight. The IAH curriculum supports these kinds of study.

Principles and Criteria for CIS AH Courses

- a. Each course includes an emphasis on student writing.
- b. Course materials are situated historically.
- c. Each course reflects in its organization and materials the cultural diversity of the world in which we live.
- d. Each course employs significant texts (defined broadly to include belletristic literature, non-fiction, historical documents, the visual arts, music, dance, theater, architecture and the artifacts of material culture).
- e. Texts used in each course reflect the diversity of human experience, across time and racial, ethnic, gender, class, and geographic boundaries.
- f. Each course poses important questions or problems for the arts and humanities.

Study Abroad

IAH courses in MSU study abroad programs should meet the “Principles and Criteria for CIS AH Courses.” They should also take appropriate advantage of the study abroad site for educational purposes, including on-site learning, as well as meet the contact hour requirement for four academic credits.

Center for Integrative Studies (CIS)

College of Social Science

I. The Mission of Integrative Studies in Social Science (ISS)

The role of integrative studies in social science is to synthesize empirical experiences as well as to model future patterns of social relations using an interdisciplinary approach and thereby introduce undergraduates to the challenges and opportunities of a diverse but increasingly interdependent world. Whatever may be the model to introduce social science education to undergraduates, the fundamental objective should be to raise the students' awareness and level of consciousness of the world around them so that they are able to moderate their high-level training for individual success with a feeling of responsibility for the collective good of humanity at various scales of their geographic domain. Within the rubric of such a liberal education, the rationales for interdisciplinary courses are to encapsulate important concepts and data from social science disciplines and bring them to bear on the broadening and deepening of the knowledge base of undergraduates so that they will become creative and critical thinkers, informed and enlightened citizens, and principled decision-makers and leaders.

ISS Course Objectives

1. Set standards and grant social science credentials to students who:
 - * Possess an established level of knowledge of the field.
 - * Recognize that they are part of the subject matter studied, and
 - * Develop thoughtful concepts, judgments, and feelings about the field.
2. Provide interdisciplinary courses that establish a basis for understanding how similar problems can be seen from many academic viewpoints.

3. Promote the study of universal social issues that illustrate basic realities in modern societies.
4. Encourage “good citizenship” by nurturing a student’s understanding of his or her responsibility to and one’s place in the community and greater society. This includes multicultural, international, and national perspectives on human behavior that address the particular challenges and opportunities in a multi-racial American society.
5. Share ideas among different courses at various levels through common themes.
6. Advance the philosophy of science, with emphasis on analysis – understanding behavior, as distinguished from evaluation – not judgment of behavior.

II. Mode of Social Science Integration

A crucial challenge to integrative social science is what mode of integration to apply. Three hierarchical modes of integration are conceivable. They are (1) juxtaposition, (2) overlay, and (3) synthesis. Juxtaposition and overlay are *mechanistic* modes of integration and are designed to enhance the dominant disciplinary content of a course by including relevant complementary knowledge from other disciplines. An example of juxtaposition, which shows the least degree of integration, is to offer a multidisciplinary treatment of a problem like underdevelopment from the viewpoint of an anchor discipline (like political science) with parallel presentations of knowledge from a variety of other complementary disciplines (like economics, anthropology, geography and sociology). In the case of overlay, which is a higher order of integration, a discipline that anchors a particular course uses knowledge from other disciplines as a necessary baseline or background to a disciplinary discourse. An integrative ISS course that relies primarily on juxtaposition and overlay of disciplinary knowledge would be *multidisciplinary* in character and would usually use one anchor discipline to hold it together. The trespassing to other disciplines may range from anecdotal to substantive. Many ISS professors practice variations of these two modes of integration. The third mode - synthetic integration - implies an organic and systemic coordination of disciplinary components. This mode is *interdisciplinary*. The design of a course in an interdisciplinary synthetic mode focuses on a problem that requires study and analysis. It does not have to be anchored in any particular discipline. What is significantly different about the synthetic mode interdisciplinary integration is that the integration is not only organic but also thematic. Knowledge is brought to bear on a problem like underdevelopment from an interdisciplinary perspective in which all knowledge with significance to explain underdevelopment has a potential for being systemically integrated in the discourse.

III. Pedagogical Challenges in IS Courses

There are many pedagogical possibilities to teach ISS courses in the interdisciplinary mode. We are aware that the ability to achieve a high degree of synthetic integration in teaching undergraduates is a function of faculty predilections for the interdisciplinary approach. In most cases, faculty who are assigned to teach such courses are successful in achieving a very high level of integration to the delight of their undergraduates. The integrative studies approach also gives faculty exciting opportunities to search and adapt texts and readings that deal with social issues at local, national and international levels with a multidisciplinary focus. ISS courses also call for a variety of pedagogical experimentation. Toward this end, ISS faculty make use of guest lectures, active learning methods, student panel discussions, debates, role playing, game theories, model symposia, discussion groups, service-learning, and on-line instructional systems.

APPENDIX C: STUDENT CREDIT HOUR PRODUCTION

SCHS by Three Centers of Integrative Studies, AY 1997-2004

	<u>F97/S98</u>	<u>F98/S99</u>	<u>F99/S00</u>	<u>F00/S01</u>	<u>F01/S02</u>	<u>F02/S03</u>	<u>F03/S04</u>
CISAH	20996/21556 42554	21200/22324 43524	19932//21340 41272	18992/20140 39132	19564/21164 40728	19776/22200 41996	20892/23324 44018 sch
CISNS	14387/14027 28419	14408/13952 28355	13698/13993 27697	15,223/17244 32467	15094/17471 32565	16413/18766 35179	19300/16987 36287 sch
CISSS	31196/23764 59960	31816/25408 57229	30192/25852 56049	30940/24872 55729	31016/24784 55800	30628/23480 54108	29688/23848 53536 sch
<u>Total 133,841 schs in 03-04</u>							
<u>12.5% of MSU SCHS in 03-04</u>							

SCHS by Three Centers of Integrative Studies, Summers 1997-2003

	<u>Ss97</u>	<u>Ss98</u>	<u>Ss99</u>	<u>Ss00</u>	<u>Ss01</u>	<u>Ss02</u>	<u>Ss03</u>
CISAH	4912	5684	6324	6436	6716	7088	7048sch
CISNS	1169	824	994	971	1085	1205	1604sch
CISSS	2760	2972	2700	3036	3120	3824	4676sch

APPENDIX D

Centers for Integrative Studies –CISAH, CISGS, CISSS Simplified Budget History, AY 00-01, 01-02, 02-03, 03-04, 04-05

	<u>CIS-Arts & Humanities</u>		<u>CIS- Gen. Science</u>		<u>CIS-Social Science</u>		
	Total	GAs	Total	GAs	Total	GAs / Faculty*	
00-01	\$1,485,170	\$1,077,373 GA	\$1,075,700	\$595,725	\$1,347,025	\$125,000	\$889,411
01-02	\$1,536,836	\$1,106,107	\$1,038,687	\$511,906	\$1,379,633	\$153,056	\$852,637
02-03	\$1,595,210	\$1,118,159	\$ 992,347	\$542,060	\$1,383,558	\$155,783	\$850,750
03-04	\$933,830	\$ 532,518	\$1,079,846	\$579,102	\$1,349,632	\$161,534	\$769,857
04-05	\$1,075,746*	\$ 695,780*	\$847,654	\$485,111	NA	\$155,783	\$759,246
* includes funding for 9 GAships assigned to HST, held in CIS/Arts & Letters							
04-05net	\$910,956	\$530,990	\$847,654	\$485,111	NA	\$155,783	\$759,246

CISAH has been cut 20% in GAships

More than 50% of remaining GAships shifted to depts.

CISGS has been cut 22% in GAs

CISSS has been cut 15% in faculty

CISAH (center) has lost one faculty (of 2.5) down to 1.5

lost .5 CT position of 2.0, down to 1.5

has 1.5 faculty, 1.0 adm asst, 1.5 CT

CISGS (center) has lost two faculty Of (3.0) but gained two academic specialists

lost .75 CT, down to 1.25,

has 1.0 faculty, 2.0 academic specialists, 1.25 CT

CISSS (center) has had two retirements, and 1.5 temporaries (approx. 3.5 FTEs)

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF STUDENT EVALUATIONS

Summary of CISGS SIRS F1999-S2004

The table below is a summary of student responses on 6 SIRS questions for all ISB/ISP course From Fall 1999 through Spring 2004.

3) The instructor is concerned that students learn.

1) strongly agree 2)agree 3) no opinion 4)disagree 5)strongly disagree

5) The instructor shows tolerance and respect for students.

1) strongly agree 2)agree 3) no opinion 4)disagree 5)strongly disagree

8) The course is intellectually challenging.

1) strongly agree 2)agree 3) no opinion 4)disagree 5)strongly disagree

13) The course was well organized

1) strongly agree 2)agree 3) no opinion 4)disagree 5)strongly disagree

19. I would rate this course on a grading scale of 4.0 (very good) to 0.0 (very poor) as follows:

1) 4.0 2) 3.0 3) 2.0 4) 1.0 5) 0.0

20). I would rate this instructor on a grading scale of 4.0 (very good) to 0.0 (very poor) as follows:

1) 4.0 2) 3.0 3) 2.0 4) 1.0 5) 0.0

The numbers in the first row refer to the question numbers above. The numbers in columns under the question numbers are average scores for all lecture classes. The column SUM SCORE is the total for questions 3, 5, 8, 13, 19 and 20. The lower the SUM SCORE, the higher the overall rating.

	3	5	8	13	19	20	SUM SCORE
F99	2.2	2	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4	13.3
S00	2.1	2	1.9	2.3	2.2	2	12.5
F00	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.1	13
S01	2.2	2.2	1.9	2	2.3	2.1	12.7
F01	2.2	1.9	2	2	2.4	2	12.5
S02	2	2	1.9	1.9	2.2	2	12
F02	2.3	2	2	2.2	2.5	2.2	13.2
S03	2.1	2	2	2.1	2.4	2	12.6
F03	1.9	1.9	2	2	2.2	2	12
S04	1.8	1.7	1.9	2	2.1	2	11.5

Center for Integrative Studies in Social Science
College of Social Science

Summary of SIRS Composite Scores – Fall 1999-Spring 2004

The table below presents means of composite profile factors for all ISS courses offered from Fall 1999 through Spring 2004. The rating scale is, as follows:

- 1 = Superior
- 2 = Above Average
- 3 = Average
- 4 = Below Average
- 5 = Inferior

Composite Profile Factors*

Average (Mean) Scores for all Sections

	A	B	C	D	E
	Inst Invlmnt	Stu Intst	S/Ins Int	Demands	Organiz
FS99	1.95	2.47	2.34	2.48	2.26
SS00	1.81	2.32	2.05	2.31	2.12
FS00	2.00	2.57	2.39	2.53	2.38
SS01	1.92	2.39	2.28	2.41	2.18
FS01	1.88	2.41	2.23	2.37	2.21
SS02	1.95	2.47	2.38	2.47	2.27
FS02	1.93	2.33	2.30	2.37	2.22
SS03	1.99	2.48	2.31	2.47	2.34
FS03	2.07	2.53	2.47	2.55	2.37
SS04	1.99	2.45	2.29	2.47	2.32

*Composite Profile Factors

- A Instructor Involvement
- B Student Interest
- C Student Instructor
- D Course Demands
- E Course Organization

Summary of IAH 201 Student Evaluations
 F97- S98, F98-S99, F99-S00, F00-S01, F01-S02
 (Five Year Summary)

(1) Superior; (2) Very Good; (3) Good; (4) Inadequate; (5) Inferior

	<u>F97</u>	<u>S98</u>	<u>F98</u>	<u>S99</u>	<u>F99</u>	<u>S00</u>	<u>F00</u>	<u>S01</u>	<u>F01</u>	<u>S02</u>	
1. Amount you learned in IAH 201?	3.00	2.90	2.79	2.81	2.72	2.76	2.71	2.58	2.76	2.63	
2. Your interest in learning in IAH 201?	3.30	3.17	3.15	3.16	3.12	3.11	3.12	3.04	3.08	3.02	
3. Contribution of readings to your understanding?	2.88	2.81	2.79	2.80	2.73	2.75	2.67	2.63	2.69	2.59	
4. Contribution of class discussions to your understanding?	2.76	2.63	2.53	2.56	2.56	2.51	2.53	2.41	2.58	2.43	
5. Contribution of videos to your understanding	3.64	3.43	3.03	2.98	2.98	3.03	2.95	2.76	2.89	2.82	
6. Contribution of writing assignments to your understanding?	2.89	2.84	2.75	2.78	2.67	2.71	2.70	2.65	2.73	2.63	
7. Contribution of AIE CD-ROM to your understanding?	3.96	3.46	3.44	3.34	3.24	3.26	3.26	3.12	3.11	3.07	
8. Contribution of email to your course experience?	3.31	3.24	3.20	3.19	3.07	3.03	3.07	3.10	3.24	3.16	
9. Contribution of museum visit to your experience?	3.49	3.36	3.40	3.40	3.24	3.34	3.40	3.27	3.59	3.42	
10. How well did instructor know the subject matter?	1.96	1.92	1.86	1.83	1.84	1.81	1.84	1.74	1.89	1.83	
11. How well did instructor lead & stimulate class discussion?	2.29	2.19	2.09	2.06	2.09	2.07	2.10	1.97	2.22	2.08	
12. How helpful to your learning were instructor comments?	2.76	2.67	2.59	2.69	2.58	2.66	2.66	2.50	2.77	2.63	
13. How well did instructor encourage students to express views?	2.14	2.05	1.92	1.92	1.93	1.90	1.90	1.86	2.01	1.92	
14. Overall, how do you rate your instructor's performance?	<u>2.25</u>	<u>2.17</u>	<u>2.05</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>2.09</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>2.11</u>	<u>1.99</u>	<u>2.27</u>	<u>2.16</u>	
15. Extent to which 201 offered integrated approach to arts & humanities?	3.10	2.94	2.87	2.82	2.78	2.82	2.78	2.63	2.78	2.69	
16. Extent 201 challenged you by raising important questions & issues?	3.08	2.96	2.93	2.85	2.83	2.81	2.80	2.69	2.82	2.69	
17. Extent 201 raised sensitive issues about race, class, ethnicity, & gender?	2.71	2.61	2.53	2.50	2.48	2.50	2.47	2.37	2.48	2.40	
18. Extent IAH 201 helped you improve critical thinking skills?	3.28	3.16	3.14	3.10	3.06	3.03	3.05	2.90	3.08	2.96	
19. Extent IAH 201 helped you improve as a writer?	3.28	3.27	3.17	3.21	3.17	3.14	3.15	3.02	3.23	3.07	
20. Extent IAH 201 encouraged you to develop your own thoughts & ideas?	3.00	2.93	2.88	2.82	2.81	2.78	2.78	2.63	2.79	2.71	
21. Extent IAH 201 pushed you to think about U.S. in new or deeper ways?	3.08	2.96	2.91	2.85	2.84	2.82	2.81	2.67	2.83	2.70	
22. Overall, what rating do you give to IAH 201?	<u>3.45</u>	<u>3.29</u>	<u>3.21</u>	<u>3.12</u>	<u>3.10</u>	<u>3.07</u>	<u>3.10</u>	<u>2.92</u>	<u>3.10</u>	<u>2.95</u>	
23. Extent 201 increased appreciation relation between Am past & present?	3.19	3.09	2.99	2.94	2.92	2.96	2.90	2.77	2.88	2.79	
24. Extent 201 helped you see events from new/multiple perspectives?	3.09	3.00	2.93	2.88	2.89	2.86	2.82	2.70	2.80	2.71	
25. Extent IAH 201 helped you appreciate diversity of Am life?	3.04	2.99	2.91	2.89	2.86	2.86	2.84	2.70	2.81	2.70	
26. Extent IAH 201 helped you think critically about America & world?	3.15	3.09	3.04	2.97	2.96	2.93	2.92	2.70	2.88	2.79	
27. Extent increased likelihood you'll take courses/read books in humanities?	3.76	3.61	3.61	3.54	3.51	3.50	3.54	3.35	3.51	3.39	
28. Extent 201 increased likelihood you'll visit museum, gallery, concert?	3.54	3.43	3.46	3.43	3.34	3.41	3.43	3.23	3.46	3.31	
29. What grade do you expect in IAH 201?	3.5-4.0:	47%	46%	50%	46%	55%	50%	51%	53%	53%	51%
	3.0:	36%	36%	35%	36%	33%	34%	35%	33%	33%	34%
30. How many hours per week did you study outside class in 201?	8-10:	8%	7%	8%	7%	9%	8%	8%	9%	9%	
	6-7:	17%	15%	13%	14%	16%	13%	14%	14%	16%	16%
	4-5:	33%	29%	25%	27%	30%	29%	30%	27%	30%	29%
	3 or less:	42%	49%	50%	52%	45%	50%	48%	50%	45%	46%
31. How many hours per week did you study outside class for all your courses?	20+:	35%	30%	34%	27%	34%	29%	32%	28%	29%	30%
	15-19:	28%	29%	27%	25%	27%	26%	26%	26%	28%	28%
	10-14:	23%	25%	24%	25%	24%	25%	24%	25%	25%	24%
	<10:	14%	17%	17%	22%	15%	19%	18%	22%	18%	19%

F97 F98 F98 S99 F99 S00 F00 S01 F01 S02

32. GPA?	3.5-4.0:	18%	20%	21%	18%	20%	22%	25%	23%	29%	22%
	3.0-3.4:	41%	37%	43%	36%	41%	39%	40%	40%	43%	40%
	2.5-2.9:	31%	31%	28%	35%	31%	29%	28%	29%	23%	29%
	1.9-2.4:	9%	11%	7%	10%	7%	10%	6%	8%	5%	8%
	1.8 &<	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	--	--
33. Class level?	1 st	6%	48%	7%	38%	5%	38%	6%	34%	7%	25%
	2 nd	75%	36%	68%	43%	72%	44%	70%	49%	68%	57%
	Upper	19%	16%	25%	19%	23%	18%	23%	18%	25%	19%

Summary of IAH 201 Student Evaluations -- F02 Forward (Post Common Final) 02-03,
03-04

(2) Superior; (2) Very Good; (3) Good; (4) Inadequate; (5) Inferior

Common Final

		<u>S02</u>	<u>F02</u>	<u>S03</u>	<u>F03</u>	<u>S04</u>
34. Amount you learned in IAH 201?		2.63	3.01	2.86	2.82	2.71
35. Your interest in learning in IAH 201?3.04		3.02	3.37	3.36	3.31	3.26
36. Contribution of readings to your understanding?		2.59	2.95	2.86	2.77	2.71
37. Contribution of class discussions to your understanding?		2.43	2.73	2.66	2.57	2.45
38. Contribution of videos to your understanding		2.82	3.21	3.08	3.21	3.02
39. Contribution of writing assignments to your understanding?		2.63	2.96	2.86	2.82	2.74
40. Contribution of AIE CD-ROM to your understanding?		3.07	3.35	3.20	3.11	3.10
41. Contribution of email to your course experience?		3.16	3.29	3.33	3.27	3.24
42. Contribution of museum visit to your experience?		3.42	3.58	3.60	3.47	3.41
43. How well did instructor know the subject matter?		<u>1.83</u>	<u>1.98</u>	<u>1.88</u>	<u>1.86</u>	<u>1.70</u>
44. How well did instructor lead & stimulate class discussion?		2.08	2.28	2.21	2.17	1.98
45. How helpful to your learning were instructor comments?		2.63	2.84	2.74	2.66	2.51
46. How well did instructor encourage students to express views?		1.92	2.13	2.07	2.04	1.94
47. Overall, how do you rate your instructor's performance?		<u>2.16</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>2.27</u>	<u>2.19</u>	<u>2.02</u>
48. Extent to which 201 offered integrated approach to arts & humanities?		2.69	3.00	2.96	2.90	2.81
49. Extent 201 challenged you by raising important questions & issues?		2.69	3.10	2.98	2.95	2.82
50. Extent 201 raised sensitive issues about race, class, ethnicity, & gender?		2.4.0	2.79	2.72	2.69	2.58
51. Extent IAH 201 helped you improve critical thinking skills?		2.96	3.36	3.24	3.19	3.09
52. Extent IAH 201 helped you improve as a writer?		3.07	3.55	3.43	3.27	3.19
53. Extent IAH 201 encouraged you to develop your own thoughts & ideas?		2.71	3.16	3.04	2.99	2.88
54. Extent IAH 201 pushed you to think about U.S. in new or deeper ways?		2.70	3.18	3.07	3.02	2.86
55. Overall, what rating do you give to IAH 201?		<u>2.95</u>	<u>3.58</u>	<u>3.43</u>	<u>3.34</u>	<u>3.23</u>
56. Extent 201 increased appreciation relation between Am past & present?		2.79	3.21	3.10	3.06	2.93
57. Extent 201 helped you see events from new/multiple perspectives?		2.71	3.12	3.02	3.04	2.88
58. Extent IAH 201 helped you appreciate diversity of Am life?		2.70	3.12	3.01	3.00	2.86
59. Extent IAH 201 helped you think critically about America & world?		2.79	3.21	3.10	3.07	3.23
60. Extent increased likelihood you'll take courses/read books in humanities?		3.39	3.83	3.71	3.70	2.93
61. Extent 201 increased likelihood you'll visit museum, gallery, concert?		3.31	3.69	3.60	3.57	2.88
62. What grade do you expect in IAH 201?	3.5-4.0	51%	42%	40%	40%	40%
	3.0	34%	37%	39%	40%	39%
30. How many hours per week did you study outside class in 201?	8-10	9%	10%	9%	9%	10%
	6-7	16%	16%	14%	16%	15%
	4-5	29%	28%	28%	31%	30%
	3 or less	46%	46%	49%	43%	45%

31. How many hours per week did you study outside class for all your courses?						
	20+	30%	35%	27%	30%	30%
	15-19	28%	25%	24%	28%	26%
	10-14	24%	24%	27%	24%	23%
	<10	19%	17%	22%	17%	21%
32. GPA?						
	3.5-4.0	22%	29%	27%	29%	27%
	3.0-3.4	40%	43%	39%	43%	40%
	3.0-3.5	29%	23%	26%	23%	24%
	2.5-2.9	8%	6%	7%	4%	8%
	1.9-2.4	---	1%	1%	1%	1%
33. Class level?						
	i. 1 st	25%	7%	28%	6%	35%
	2 nd	57%	66%	53%	72%	47%
	Upper	19%	27%	19%	22%	18%

**IAH B Course Student Instructional Ratings -AY 1999-00; 2000-01; 2001-02; 2002-03;
2003-04**
(Five Year Picture)

IAH SIRS --1 Excellent; 2 Very Good; 3 Satisfactory; 4. Unsatisfactory; 5 Inferior

Mean SIRS Ratings for all IAH B Courses

F99-S00 F00-S01 F01-S02 F02-S03 F03-S-04

Course Quality & Organization

1. Clarity of course objectives?	2.34-2.28	2.29-2.31	2.33-2.20	2.24-2.32	2.19-2.36
2. Organization and efficient use of class time?	2.38-2.29	2.36-2.43	2.40-2.34	2.32-2.44	2.29-2.50
3. Contribution of lecture/discussions to your understanding?	2.36-2.26	2.26-2.30	2.35-2.12	2.17-2.25	2.16-2.32
4. Contribution of readings to your understanding?	2.57-2.44	2.51-2.43	2.52-2.27	2.42-2.36	2.38-2.34
5. Contribution of writing assignments to your understanding?	2.43-2.43	2.41-2.44	2.44-2.34	2.40-2.40	2.36-2.43
6. Contribution of TA-led sections to your understanding?	2.14-2.28	2.11-2.12	2.05-2.09	1.99-2.21	2.07-2.09
7. Course success in making meaningful connections across disciplines in the arts and humanities?	2.36-2.28	2.38-2.38	2.41-2.21	2.30-2.33	2.23-2.42
8. Course success exploring the diversity of human experience?	2.23-2.17	2.25-2.24	2.26-2.08	2.14-2.24	2.10-2.30

Instructor Effectiveness

1. Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?	1.47-1.42	1.45-1.46	1.55-1.42	1.44-1.44	1.38-1.49
2. Instructor's preparation for classes?	1.85-1.75	1.81-1.86	1.93-1.79	1.80-1.91	1.73-1.97
3. Instructor's success in communicating clearly?	2.32-2.14	2.21-2.24	2.35-2.08	2.20-2.23	2.07-2.31
4. Instructor's interest in/concern about student learning?	2.25-2.12	2.16-2.16	2.26-1.96	2.04-2.05	1.97-2.17
5. Did instructor provide timely and appropriate feedback?	2.29-2.17	2.29-2.28	2.36-2.06	2.16-2.24	2.06-2.27
6. Was instructor available for help outside class?	2.19-2.11	2.20-2.20	2.23-2.06	2.02-2.09	2.00-2.18
7. Was instructor open to different viewpoints?	2.27-2.17	2.25-2.23	2.20-2.12	2.21-2.25	2.18-2.33
8. Did instructor apply grading policies fairly?	2.23-2.18	2.17-2.22	2.33-2.05	2.14-2.27	2.09-2.21

Overall Summary

1. Overall, how do you rate the quality of the course	2.41-2.31	2.38-2.39	2.47-2.22	2.32-2.42	2.26-2.48
2. How rate course impact on knowledge of subject matter?	2.24-2.21	2.30-2.29	2.34-2.12	2.19-2.27	1.98-2.36
3. How rate the quality of the faculty instructor's performance?	2.18-2.06	2.16-2.16	2.25-2.00	2.06-2.16	2.18-2.23
4. How do you rate the quality of your own work in the course?	2.28-2.02	2.25-2.21	2.28-2.13	2.14-2.23	2.08-2.22
N=	1478-1701	1218-1718	1644-1874	1067-1901	1683-2149
Total SIRS =	3179	2936	3518	2968	3822

IAH New A Course Student Instructional Ratings -AY 2002-03; 2003-04(TwoYears)

IAH SIRS --1 Excellent; 2 Very Good; 3 Satisfactory; 4. Unsatisfactory; 5 Inferior

Mean SIRS Ratings for all IAH New A Courses
F02-S03 F03-S04
202, 206 **202, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8**

Course Quality & Organization

1. Clarity of course objectives?	2.54-2.47	2.57-2.53
2. Organization and efficient use of class time?	2.31-2.51	2.73-2.80
3. Contribution of lecture/discussions to your understanding?	2.49-2.58	2.68-2.65
4. Contribution of readings to your understanding?	2.60-2.67	2.66-2.57
5. Contribution of writing assignments to your understanding?	2.58-2.68	2.69-2.67
6. Contribution of TA-led sections to your understanding?	2.17-2.26	2.14-2.02
7. Course success in making meaningful connections across disciplines in the arts and humanities?	2.63-2.73	2.72-2.58
8. Course success exploring the diversity of human experience?	2.48-2.63	2.52-2.43

Instructor Effectiveness

1. Instructor's knowledge of the subject matter?	1.56-1.71	1.58-1.70
2. Instructor's preparation for classes?	1.57-1.88	2.10-2.14
3. Instructor's success in communicating clearly?	2.23-2.34	2.56-2.73
4. Instructor's interest in/concern about student learning?	2.32-2.34	2.30-2.53
5. Did instructor provide timely and appropriate feedback?	2.31-2.34	2.34-2.48.
6. Was instructor available for help outside class?	2.35-2.31	2.21-2.40.
7. Was instructor open to different viewpoints?	1.90-2.06	2.32-2.41
8. Did instructor apply grading policies fairly?	2.34-2.50	2.54-2.40

Overall Summary

1. Overall, how do you rate the quality of the course	2.67-2.78	2.83-2.76
2. How rate course impact on knowledge of subject matter?	2.68-2.75	2.72-2.56
3. How rate the quality of the faculty instructor's performance?	2.17-2.40	2.48-2.63
4. How do you rate the quality of your own work in the course?	2.42-2.42	2.39-2.28
N=	390-329	721-622
Total SIRS =	719	1343

APPENDIX F: COMMITTEE CHARGE

March 15, 2004

TO: Jon Sticklen, Chairperson
Executive Committee of Academic Council
FROM: Lou Anna K. Simon
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
SUBJECT: Request for Consultation—Merging the Three Separate Integrative Studies
Centers

The initiative in the *Realizing the Vision* blueprint that focuses on strengthening the coherence and organization of the undergraduate experience at Michigan State University builds on the comments received to date about liberal arts and sciences in the 21st century, on considerable faculty effort and momentum currently underway across the University, and on the national dialogue.

In advancing this initiative, a formal proposal is now being made to merge the three, separate, integrative studies centers into one center, jointly reporting to the liberal arts and sciences deans with strong oversight as well by the Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education effective July 1, 2004. Consolidation will yield increased coherence across the areas as well as a strengthened capacity to rethink better ways of balancing department and college and university obligations to our students, a combination of resources, increased visibility of the program, enhanced oversight and review of the program and its courses, more attention to connections among and across colleges, and focused development of new initiatives. Under the leadership of Assistant Provost Youatt, the three existing directors and a group of faculty will work over the summer to identify and move through the most important issues and develop the possibilities of the merged center. A specific proposal on how better to proceed with the blueprint concept of an enduring faculty group for Integrative Studies will be developed based on the work of the review committee.

I note that the formal action to restructure the centers for integrative studies will require approval by the Board of Trustees.

I seek the advice of the Executive Committee of Academic Council as to which University-level governance committees should be consulted regarding this proposal. Assistant Provost June Youatt will be present at the March 16, 2004 meeting of the Committee to discuss this proposal.

c: Members, Executive Committee of Academic Council

Assistant Provost Youatt

Assistant Provost Klomparens

Dean Baba

Dean Leroi

Dean Wilkins

Director Waltzer

Director Sibley

Director Mehretu

APPENDIX G:

LIST OF MEETINGS WITH INTERESTED FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS

- June 16 -- Patrick McConeghy, Acting Dean, College of Arts and Letters
(Chairs and Directors Meeting)
- June 22 -- Meeting with Marietta Baba, Dean, College of Social Science
- August 16 – Presentation to Writing Task Force Retreat
- August 31 – Discussion with Council of Deans
- September 7 – John Hudzik, Dean of International Studies and Programs and
Kathleen Fairfax, Director, Office of Study Abroad, Visit ISPC
- September 14 – Tom Wolfe, Associate Dean, College of Engineering Visits ISPC
- September 21 -- Eunice Foster, Associate Dean and Richard Brandenburg, Assistant
Dean, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources Visit ISPC
- September 21 -- Charles Salmon, Acting Dean, and Janet Lillie, Assistant Dean for
Undergraduate Education, College of Communication Arts and
Sciences, Visit ISPC
- September 27 – Presentation and Q&A with UUD Advisors Conference
- October 14 – Public Forum for Interested Students, Faculty and Administrators
(large attendance by CNS faculty)
- October 26 – Presentation of Progress Report to Academic Council
- November 23 -- Ric Hula, Chair, Department of Political Science and
Lynne Goldstein, Chair, Department of Anthropology, visit ISPC
- December 7 -- Steve Esquith, Chair, Department of Philosophy
Mark Kornbluh, Chair, Department of History
Patrick O'Donnell, Chair, Department of English
Rowena Pecchenino, Chair, Department of Economics
David Prestel, Chair, Department of Linguistics and Languages
All Visit ISPC

Integrative Studies Planning Committee**Draft Final Report****14 December 2004****Table of Contents**

	<u>Page No.</u>
Introduction	1
What Is Integrative Studies?	2
Challenges and Problems in Integrative Studies	6
General Thoughts on Future Directions	7
Models of Centralization	10
Discussion and Next Steps	15
In Closing	18
References	19
Appendices	
A. Integrative Studies Planning Committee Membership	21
B. Goals of Integrative Studies	22
C. Student Credit Hour Production	26
D. Simplified Budget History of the Centers	27
E. Summary of Student Evaluations of IS Courses	28
F. Committee Charge	34
G. List of Meetings with Interested Faculty and Administrators	36