

To: Dean Robin Forman, Emory College of Arts and Sciences

From: Laura Otis, Interdisciplinary Committee Chair

Re: Findings of Interdisciplinary Committee, 2012-13

Introduction

A committee of interdisciplinary scholars working across diverse fields met three times during the 2012-13 academic year to discuss how interdisciplinary work can best be promoted at Emory. The committee also considered how the ILA might be developed into a new kind of forum for interdisciplinary research, scholarship, and teaching. I invited all committee members to serve based on their international reputations as active, innovative scholars and their familiarity with institutions throughout the U. S. and abroad that foster interdisciplinary work. The committee consisted of John Banja (Ethics Center), Arri Eisen (Biology and ILA), Steve Everett (Music), Robyn Fivush (Psychology), Sander Gilman (ILA), David Lynn (Chemistry), Michael Moon (formerly ILA, now English and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies), and Elizabeth Wilson (Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies). In approaching potential committee members, I tried to achieve a balance among scholars from the humanities and the natural and social sciences. I have written this report myself based on our discussions. Some, but not all, of the committee members agree with its recommendations, and only those who do so have chosen to sign. No one has opted to write a minority report. The committee members not signing believe that we didn't have enough time to discuss the broad, professional issues hindering interdisciplinary research; that we needed more time to consider the specifics of a new interdisciplinary research forum at Emory; and/or that our discussions didn't warrant

recommendations this specific. Where possible, I have laid out points of contention while emphasizing the issues on which we agree.

Before preparing this report, I spoke with many members of the ILA who were not on the Interdisciplinary Committee in order to hear their recommendations and perspectives: Angelika Bammer, Kevin Corrigan, Anna Grimshaw, Bobby Paul, Walt Reed, Allen Tullos, Peter Wakefield, Kimberly Wallace-Sanders, and ILA graduate student representatives Joey Orr and Mael Vizcarra. This report does not necessarily reflect the views of these non-committee members, and these individuals from the ILA should not be taken as endorsing its recommendations. I did, however, want to take into consideration the ideas of the people involved before making any recommendations about transforming the ILA.

Although it is challenging to define “interdisciplinary,” committee members agreed that we couldn’t discuss how to promote interdisciplinary research without a shared sense of what it is. We conceive of interdisciplinary work as research whose driving question cannot be answered using the methods and/or knowledge-building principles of a single field. In good interdisciplinary work, a researcher combines the paradigms, tools, and practices of two or more disciplines in a cross-fertilizing process of potential use to all the fields involved. In applying ideas from one field to a problem offered by another, s/he often questions long-held premises about how knowledge should be built. In this work of creative combination, the whole becomes more than the sum of the parts. In 2013, many fields (psychology, neuroscience) are already interdisciplinary and involve a wide range of methods and epistemological assumptions. In our discussions, we focused on valuable research that could not be conducted using the methods and knowledge-building skills of a single field, such as an investigation of how 20 participants’ brains respond to fugues that vary according to a specified pattern.

Foster Grass-Roots, not Top-Down Organization

Committee members agreed that in their experience, interdisciplinary work functions best bottom-up, through grass-roots organization; not top-down, through administrative mandates. The most successful projects often emerge when researchers spontaneously realize that they are pursuing related questions, but with different methods or epistemological approaches. Pre-arranged meetings in which gifted thinkers from multiple fields are brought together and asked to collaborate tend to be less successful and productive.

Disability Studies offers an example of how well grass-roots organization can work. In the past 5-10 years, Emory has become known internationally as a destination for scholars interested in Disability Studies, thanks to the work of Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, Ben Reiss, Sander Gilman, Howard Kushner, and others. Emory is now attracting the top graduate students applying to PhD programs in this emerging field. In this case, faculty members and graduate students from multiple disciplines found one another and started organizing events. A new forum for interdisciplinary research and teaching—a transformed ILA—might foster this kind of self-organizing by freeing faculty and students from some of their duties so that for 2-3 years, they could work together on path-breaking research.

Although in 2013 many American universities support interdisciplinarity in name, they fail to support it in practice because of institutional and national traditions that restrict their efforts. First, the classical system of tenure and promotion still demands peer-reviewed publications in acknowledged disciplines with respected academic presses and journals. Second, academic workspaces tend to segregate natural and social scientists and scholars in the humanities, so that unless researchers make a special effort, they rarely eat together or even cross paths. Third,

interdisciplinary scholars who try to create cross-fertilization through dual appointments find that double service loads consume their research time. Any serious commitment to interdisciplinary research will need to consider how to reform the tenure and promotion system so that innovative scholars survive it; how to provide spaces where scholars in vastly different fields (such as cell biology and religion) can meet and talk; and how to let creative scholars work between and among departments without fulfilling all the service expectations of each department involved. One committee member, who has chosen not to sign, believes that Emory should invest its resources by addressing these professional obstacles to interdisciplinary research rather than funding a new forum for collaborative work.

Research conducted in the history of science during the past three decades (such as that of Simon Schaffer and Peter Galison) indicates how greatly material working conditions, such as architectural layouts, scientific instruments, objects of study, and accepted disciplinary methods, have shaped the ways that researchers think about their work. Allegiance to methods often separates scholars investigating related questions far more than commitment to reigning ideas. For researchers deeply absorbed in projects, it is hard to distinguish the two. Genuine commitment to interdisciplinary research must include considerations of how practical working conditions (such as the physical separation of scholars in the sciences and the humanities) affect assumptions about what knowledge is and how it must be built. Only frequent, spontaneous interactions among scholars reveal that no single disciplinary method outshines others in illuminating the path to knowledge.

Places Where Good Interdisciplinary Work Is Done

Committee members discussed systems and institutions within and beyond universities that in their experience foster top-quality interdisciplinary scholarship. At the Santa Fe Institute, physicists, biologists, economists, computer scientists, and creative writers collaborate to study the behavior of complex systems, yielding results relevant to all of their fields (<http://www.santafe.edu/about/>). These scholars include academic researchers on all levels as well as government and industrial researchers, who pursue joint projects for a few months to a few years, then return to their home institutions. At the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (Berlin, Germany), scientists, historians, art historians, sociologists, anthropologists, philosophers, and literary scholars from around the world exchange ideas about the development of knowledge over time (<http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/en/index.html>). This government-funded institute hosts working groups of scholars who collaborate to investigate common themes such as the cultural history of heredity. The largest working groups at the MPI offer two-year postdoctoral positions and host graduate students affiliated with local universities, although the Institute itself does not grant degrees. Neither of these institutions is affiliated with a university, however, so that their funding and administrative structures differ significantly from those available at Emory.

The University of Chicago's workshop system offers a more apt reference point--I will not say model, since it is not perfect and does not fully align with Emory's needs. On a small scale, at little cost to the administration, the university enables the formation of informal interdisciplinary workshops. These workshops come into being when faculty members and students join together to pursue common interests, then dissolve as research questions are reframed and they move on to new projects. All members remain in their home departments, so that the only costs involve funding for colloquia and guest speakers. The advantage of this

system is its capacity for continuous change. No structures are left in place that require ongoing nurturing or active efforts to dissolve them once the research questions that catalyzed the research group have been transformed.

The Need for Flexibility

As a guiding metaphor for institutional support of interdisciplinary research, one of our committee members recommended “networks, not structures.” We believe that dynamic, self-organizing, constantly evolving—but still nurtured—interdisciplinary research groups work better than those fixed by permanent structures. A “hub and spokes” model has also been proposed, but I personally believe the best one is the human brain, whose plasticity allows for the ongoing formation or abandonment of connective pathways according to activity, use, and need. Whatever strategy Emory develops for fostering interdisciplinary research should take into account the ever-changing nature of research questions and problems and the need for investigators to respond by creating and terminating affiliations and collaborations. One committee member points out that the structures offered by departments have benefited some fields, such as Women’s Studies. This is true, and we do not recommend abandoning any thriving departments or disciplines. We would like to propose an alternative means of sustenance for research projects that can’t be conducted within existing departments.

The ILA in Context

To apply these general principles to Emory, and more specifically to the ILA, one must consider the historical context. One of America’s oldest and best-known interdisciplinary degree-granting programs, the ILA was modeled in the early 1950s after the University of Chicago’s

Committee for Social Thought (<http://socialthought.uchicago.edu/>). This PhD-granting program, about ten years older, emphasized rigorous theoretical and philosophical preparation for the pursuit of research questions that crossed disciplinary lines. Few universities worldwide have had such programs, so that the ILA has made Emory stand out and has attracted creative, non-traditional students. Over the years, as groups of researchers have recognized their intellectual affinities, the ILA has given birth to new programs, some of which have evolved into PhD-granting departments. African American Studies, Art History, Comparative Literature, and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies all emerged from the ILA. Emory's Women's Studies Department is now ranked #1 nationwide. More recently, the ILA has fostered path-breaking research in the digital humanities and has hosted the peer-reviewed internet journal, *Southern Spaces*.

The presence of the ILA has allowed for some unconventional hires that have helped forge links among Emory's programs. In the interest of transparency, I should say that I was brought to Emory as an opportunity hire in 2004 with a position 50% in the English Department and 50% in the ILA. Because my interdisciplinary research on literature and science looked different from most traditional literary scholarship, I had a long journey to a major research university and owe my appointment at Emory to the ILA. In 2006 I withdrew from the ILA because of the extra service involved in a dual appointment and because of the appeal of English's Creative Writing Program. If it were not for the ILA, however, I would not be teaching at Emory.

Since the 1980s, the ILA has suffered some problems involving the balance among the fields its faculty represent. Some disciplines, such as anthropology, seemed overemphasized for a time, and American Studies, an established field, gained increasing strength. With its own tenure-track

faculty and graduate lines, the ILA functioned in many ways as a department, while the faculty lacked the methodological bonds that link scholars in established disciplines.

Transformation of the ILA into a Forum for Interdisciplinary Research, Scholarship, and Teaching

We recommend that the ILA not be eliminated but rethought in light of its history, accomplishments, and potential to invigorate Emory intellectually. For the purposes of this report, I will call the new network to be created the Forum for Interdisciplinary Research, Scholarship, and Teaching (FIRST). I thank committee member David Lynn for suggesting this name. Another member has argued for keeping the name “ILA,” since for 60 years, it has earned respect inside and outside of Emory. I favor a change, however, because whatever the new research forum is called, its name needs to reflect its true functions. In recent years, the ILA has worked more like a department than a graduate institute, offering undergraduate as well as graduate courses. The research conducted in the new forum would include and extend beyond the traditional liberal arts, featuring work in the applied sciences and emerging fields of knowledge.

To succeed, FIRST will need to be an elite forum whose reputation reaches across Emory’s schools and appeals to scholars worldwide. It should attract faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students planning cutting-edge research projects that they cannot conduct with the methods and paradigms available in their home departments. At best it would function as a university nexus rather than a College network, with funding that might come from the Provost’s as well as the College’s budget. It should be a testing ground where individual scholars and

groups of researchers can conduct high-risk, path-breaking studies that can generate new programs, departments, and fields of knowledge.

Although FIRST would be a flexible, dynamic network, in Gertrude Stein's words, there has to be a "there there." As an appendix, you will find Sander Gilman's and Bobby Paul's proposal for transforming the ILA. While our committee does not endorse it point for point, our recommendations align with it to some degree. We suggest that 3-4 core faculty lines be assigned to the program and that these faculty members be active, internationally respected interdisciplinary researchers and experienced administrators representing a variety of combined disciplinary fields. These core faculty would take turns directing FIRST in alternating 3-year terms. As an alternative, senior faculty members across Emory might apply for the directorship, laying out competing visions for research and programming during their three-year tenures. Like Emory's highly successful NBB program (which grants undergraduate but not graduate degrees) and CMBC (which sponsors innovative graduate and undergraduate teaching, hosts colloquia, and grants certificates but not degrees), FIRST should also have an extensive network of affiliated faculty that extends across Emory's schools. These faculty members would be available to participate in research projects and exchange ideas with those scholars hosted by FIRST.

In order for FIRST to keep pace with fast-changing research questions, we suggest that it host teams of scholars (both graduate students and faculty) for terms of 1-5 years, ideally for 2-3 years, depending on the needs of the research projects and the willingness of the investigators' home departments to release them from their usual responsibilities. FIRST sponsorship need not involve a physical move, but FIRST scholars would come together and interact regularly in designated spaces for teaching, workshops, presentations, and lunches. Before accepting

applications, the director(s) and planners should decide on the maximum capacity of the forum, perhaps adding one group per year and building toward a maximum capacity of no more than 4-6 research groups working simultaneously, depending on group size. Temporary hosting by FIRST should be an honor awarded only to the most creative, innovative research projects. To attract the brightest researchers, FIRST might offer incentives such as a reduced teaching load (to be arranged on a case by case basis with the faculty member's home department) and FIRST-specific top-off fellowships (in addition to any already held, such as Woodruffs or EGDF's) for graduate students. So that the selection of FIRST guests is unbiased and reflects the judgment of respected scholars in the fields involved, we strongly recommend that the reviewers of the research proposals come from outside of Emory, and that the applications include the names of external scholars qualified to evaluate the proposals.

Teams of researchers composed of faculty and/or students might apply to investigate research questions that they can address better together than separately. For example, researchers from Psychology and English might investigate narrative, or scholars from Film Studies and Neuroscience might investigate visual imagery. We don't recommend that the entire FIRST adopt year-by-year themes, such as "Space" or "Language," since this would discourage applications and undermine the grass-roots approach. For intellectual reasons—as well as reasons of survival—FIRST needs to remain flexible and adaptable to new paradigms and methodological developments in all the fields it nourishes. One committee member familiar with the University of Chicago's PhD-granting Committee system noted that Chicago's system suffered because its designers did not lay out ways for Committees to close when research questions changed and their usefulness came to an end. Interdisciplinary, collaborative research

groups need to follow an organic lifespan, with the ability to form, work at maximum capacity until they achieve their goals, and then dissolve when their time has passed.

Out of fairness, I should mention that one ILA faculty member and the two student representatives with whom I spoke argued hard for the retention of permanent graduate student lines. Their strongest argument, in my opinion, is that one cannot do good interdisciplinary research on a whim; one needs rigorous training in more than one discipline, plus a strong background in critical and cultural theory that analyzes approaches to combining disciplines. This is the philosophy of Chicago's Committee on Social Thought, but I do not completely agree with it. As an informed and responsible researcher, one needs to master the methods and operating principles of the disciplines in which one is working, but one can learn to combine them creatively by thinking and learning on one's own and interacting with scholars from multiple fields.

With its dynamic structure, FIRST would bear a certain resemblance to the Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry, which hosts one-year doctoral and faculty fellowships for Emory scholars and one-year postdocs for scholars outside of Emory. FIRST would differ from the FCHI, however, in that the research Forum would allow teams of scholars from the sciences and humanities to pursue projects for periods of more than a year, whereas FCHI fellows interact while pursuing individual, one-year projects. FIRST would also integrate graduate and undergraduate training, offering courses closely related to ongoing collaborative projects. Most significantly, the research conducted there would not be limited to the humanities. FIRST would aim to attract researchers from the natural and social sciences and from all of Emory's Schools.

Our committee discussed the special circumstances of laboratory scientists as applicants, since the work of running labs and applying for grants to sustain them continues 365 days per year. No

active researcher in the natural sciences could step back from his or her laboratory responsibilities and physically move to FIRST in order to engage in an interdisciplinary project. To appeal to scientists—crucial to FIRST’s success—the forum would have to allow collaborations with laboratory researchers that did not require physical moves. We also recommend that FIRST recruit theoretical scientists not running “wet” labs, plus scientifically informed historians and philosophers of science.

Teaching at the Center for Interdisciplinary Research

Under the auspices of FIRST, guests would teach a reduced number of cutting-edge, interdisciplinary graduate and/or undergraduate courses closely related to their research projects. So that the spirit of collaborative research can carry over into teaching, graduate and undergraduate courses offered by FIRST should be team-taught when possible. Since FIRST would be funded largely or wholly by the College, it would need to contribute meaningfully to the intellectual life of Emory’s undergraduates. As an appendix, I have attached Arri Eisen’s and Peter Wakefield’s proposal detailing how a new FIRST might use current resources to offer undergraduate teaching. It suggests ways in which a new center such as FIRST might coordinate a program of cutting-edge interdisciplinary courses offered not just by FIRST guest scholars but by those from the FCHI and James Weldon Johnson Institute. Such a program might be run by a Faculty Director chosen from among the FIRST core faculty and a FIRST staff person charged with administering undergraduate matters. While the committee doesn’t endorse Eisen’s and Wakefield’s proposal unreservedly, we believe that it has merit and deserves a close look. It has been prepared by two of the faculty members who have worked the hardest to nurture and run Emory’s valuable IDS program.

The Need for Social Workspace

To thrive, FIRST will need not just a few core faculty and guest researchers doing top-quality interdisciplinary work, but at least two full-time administrative staff members and a space that promotes social interactions. Both Lorraine Daston, Director of the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, and Gerd Gigerenzer, Director of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, emphasize the crucial role of informal discussions in stimulating interdisciplinary scholarship. The place where FIRST is housed should provide some private space for the director and core faculty, but more importantly a seminar room, a lounge, a space to share meals and snacks, and informal hallway seating where people can discuss their projects and consider the ways they're connected. Ideally, the architecture should maximize chance encounters while allowing researchers to withdraw to read or write when needed. 21st-century research calls for a socially engaged rather than a monastic approach. For this reason, programming for workshops, guest speakers, and occasional communal meals, teas, and snacks would be a good investment. I learned about the value of afternoon tea not in a country house, but in a neurology department. The interactions that occur there can lead to new experiments and projects.

Conclusion: Avoid the Woes of the General Section

Gabriel García Márquez offers a nightmare vision of what to avoid in a forum for interdisciplinary research and teaching. In *Love in the Time of Cholera*, he depicts the failed General Section of a Colombian riverboat company:

Last of all was the confusing General Section, its name alone suggesting the vagueness of its functions, where problems that had not been solved elsewhere in the company went to

die an ignominious death. There sat Leona Cassiani, lost behind a student's desk surrounded by corn stacked for shipping and unresolved papers, on the day that Uncle Leo XII himself went to see what the devil he could think of to make the General Section good for something. After three hours of questions, theoretical assumptions, and concrete evidence, with all the employees in the middle of the room, he returned to his office tormented by the certainty that instead of a solution to so many problems, he had found just the opposite: new and different problems with no solution. . . . In reality the General Section did not exist: it was the dumping ground for annoying but minor problems that the other sections wanted to get rid of. As a consequence, the solution was to eliminate the General Section and return the problems to the sections where they had originated, to be solved there. (Gabriel García Márquez, *Love in the Time of Cholera*, trans. Edith Grossman, New York: Penguin, 1988, pp. 184-85)

García Márquez describes the deterioration of a fictional business rather than an academic structure, so that this comparison has limits. At the same time, his portrait suggests quite well what causes interdisciplinary centers to fail. I do not want to imply through this comparison that programs for interdisciplinary research and teaching should not exist. On the contrary, they can yield ideas that enrich a whole university as long as they're regarded as entities in their own right, requiring long-term vision and planning, rather than places to deposit elements that don't belong anywhere else. A stone soup approach to interdisciplinary research and teaching will not work.

Our committee members didn't agree on all issues, but our concordance on this one was near-absolute: interdisciplinary work needs to operate bottom-up rather than top-down, driven by the constantly evolving ideas of the people conducting the research rather than any plan to bring

scholars together for a set purpose. A grass-roots, bottom-up approach driven by researchers' needs will probably also be more cost effective. In the interest of Emory's intellectual and financial health, the university deserves the best possible support for interdisciplinary teaching and research.

Signed:

John Banja

Arri Eisen

Steve Everett

Sander Gilman

David Lynn

Laura Otis

Committee Members not Signing:

Robyn Fivush

Michael Moon

Elizabeth Wilson

Appendix 1.

A Program of Individualized Interdisciplinarity: a proposal

"Education of heart and mind"—the Dalai Lama

Emory has the goal of achieving eminence in undergraduate interdisciplinary study that builds on existing successes of the ILA undergraduate program (including IDS and AMST). We imagine a structure for individualized interdisciplinary studies and for innovative interdisciplinary teaching at the undergraduate level. The following proposal capitalizes on current infrastructure, staff, programming, initiatives, and other strengths across the College and University to enrich the undergraduate experience, by making such opportunities transparent and coherent to students.

The Program of Individualized Interdisciplinarity (PII) will enhance the current IDS model to facilitate experimental pedagogies and classes that serve students from all majors. PII will cater to qualified, motivated students, who will receive tailored advising and mentoring for student-designed, interdisciplinary major and minors. As a hallmark of PII, students will acquire critical competencies and understanding of disciplinary research and science in line with the QEP theme of Primary Evidence, especially around topics where disciplines overlap, and especially emphasizing, ethical inquiry, public scholarship, and writing as an integral part of learning (the latter a feature of the ILA Writing Lab program that has served over 100-200 students per semester since 2008). PII will be housed in the ILA's Detweiler conference room, with adjoining, dedicated office space¹, where PII students will have many classes, including a research tutorial in the junior year and a senior seminar. In this way, a sense of identity and cohort collegiality will be fostered. Organizationally, PII would fit well in a redesigned ILA, under the ILA director.

PII core courses (experimental 200-level interdisciplinary courses, 300-level theoretical courses, junior research tutorial, and senior seminar) will involve co-teaching and team teaching in collaboration with other units and centers on campus and will especially encourage faculty from different disciplines to craft courses that put disciplines into dialogue. Two or three PII core faculty will teach and coordinate some core classes and will facilitate and coordinate PII classes offered by visiting faculty. As examples of the sort of courses that might be brought under PII:

- Visiting fellows at both the James Weldon Johnson Institute and the Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry regularly offer interdisciplinary courses through IDS/AMST, and PII would continue and expand this model.
- Existing centers whose faculty might coordinate with PII on interdisciplinary, experimental undergraduate courses might include:
 - Program in Science & Society

¹ With minor renovation, the ILA student lounge could give onto the Detweiler Conference Room and be separated by glass walls, symbolizing the connection between the PII office and teaching.

- ORDER (On Recent Discoveries of Emory Researchers)
- Minors in sustainability and development studies (currently administered through IDS)
- QEP on Primary Evidence (including IDS-style first-year seminars)
- Center for Ethics
- Center for Mind, Brain, and Culture
- QuanTM
- The current Citizenship first-year seminar, now in its second year, is taught by a team of 6 faculty from three departments and linked with Turman Citizenship dorm with tie-in to Campus Life programming.
- AMST courses have provided a valuable structure for summer international programs, with an ESL component, linked to Writing Labs; this partnership should develop through PII.
- Innovative classes and pedagogical formats by faculty from across Emory College, cross-listed with faculty home departments, might be incentivized by funding to graduate students who work with those faculty and who need funding in the latter part of their graduate work; such graduate students could then teach core interdisciplinary courses in PII and receive pedagogical support from PII.

Special emphasis would fall on cross-disciplinary foundations (cf. the current IDS 200 Interdisciplinary Foundations model) and primary evidence research, both through textual analysis and lab experiences (cf. IDS 205 Interdisciplinary Science, which carries an SNT tag). Ethical issues in science and medicine, and the role and responsibility of students as intellectuals in the broader society run throughout the curriculum of such courses.

In all PII classes, students will be given special access to visiting intellectuals, opportunities for public presentation of their work, and leadership possibilities in campus initiatives—e.g. undergraduate peer writing instruction, campus life programming, etc. PII courses would come to be seen by students as an exciting venue in which to fulfill GER requirements (e.g. SNT, HAP, and WR), and to put their own courses of study into ethical and social perspective through engagement with contemporary intellectual life.

Drawing on current principles of ILA undergraduate courses, the student experience in any PII course will be defined by a critical perspective on disciplines—how disciplines define evidence differently, evolve historically, contrast with and influence each other.

In addition to such skills included in core PII courses, individualized PII majors and minors will garner from PII strong writing and research skills, the ability to gather and analyze primary evidence relevant to their course of study, and a capstone experience, including a senior seminar that solidifies a cohort of PII majors and minors (the current joint IDS junior (spring semester) research tutorial and (fall) senior seminar provides a proven model).

Appendix 2.

Proposal for the Restructuring of the ILA [by Sander Gilman and Robert Paul]

The following proposal involves neither additional funds nor the reinstatement of any positions or graduate students and adheres to the financial model implied in the recent decision by the deans.

Over its 60-year history, the Graduate Institute of the Liberal Arts has developed a culture that has fostered innovation and has provided a space for scholarship that did not easily fit into the methodological and conceptual frameworks in the disciplines of the moment. By sheltering faculty and students whose intellectual aspirations were unable to be housed elsewhere, the ILA incubated many of the programs and departments that make Emory's wider intellectual community distinctive today.

We propose the following:

1. That the ILA's culture of fostering intellectual innovation and risk-taking be maintained along with its role as the major program incubator in the College. Existing faculty members will be given the choice of remaining full or part time in the ILA and/or forming new programs (American Studies, Cultural History of Medicine, etc.)
2. New 5-year term appointments in the ILA will begin in 2014. These can be in those areas proposed by the College as desirable in creating new interdisciplinary foci or in areas of innovation not yet foreseen.
 - a. These appointments can be made by applications from groups of faculty from multiple departments in the college as well as by individual faculty members whose research and teaching goals are not attainable in their home departments. These appointments will be full time in the ILA without any obligation to the home department for the term of the appointment.
 - b. Teaching, however, will be co-listed in the home department and the ILA. The home department will recognize all interdisciplinary courses and research for promotion and increments following the ILA appointment.
 - c. If the new entity becomes autonomous at the end of 5 years, the faculty lines will be transferred to the new entity. Faculty members will be given the choice of becoming full or part time in the new entity. Part-time status can be with the original disciplinary department or the ILA.
 - d. Each faculty member can either bring their existing graduate students with them for a term appointment or transfer them to the new entity. This does not constitute the reinstatement of the sequestered graduate lines.

3. A core faculty in the ILA will be maintained. It will consist of those faculty whose work cannot be easily accommodated either by newly emerging fields at Emory or by an existing disciplinary department. The existence of a core faculty will ensure continuity in graduate and undergraduate interdisciplinary training and thereby help maintain the ILA's mission of providing a cultural and intellectual context for innovation.
 - a. These core faculty members can be augmented from the term appointments based on the development and interests of the teaching and research of the faculty member.
 - b. This will assure that there would not be an increase in the overall number of faculty lines in the college but would assure continuity for the ILA.
 - c. The existence of core faculty committed to fostering innovative interdisciplinary work will assure that graduate students who join the community as part of working groups also receive the training in interdisciplinary scholarship and pedagogy that will enable them to succeed beyond traditional disciplinary frameworks.
4. Graduate courses in the ILA should always be cross- or co-listed with other entities whether departments or programs. Any cross listing across college lines will be supported by the Deans of BOTH colleges. There will be a Graduate Program coordinator for the ILA.
5. The ILA will house an undergraduate program that provides a home for undergraduate students with serious intellectual engagements that require them to explore spaces beyond disciplinary boundaries. The program will provide core courses that offer interdisciplinary training and create an intellectual community to help sustain students as they pursue their capstone research projects under the supervision of core faculty. Students will complete their major through concentration courses taken in the ILA and in the multiple traditional disciplines that engage a student's particular interests. In addition, the undergraduate program will offer courses that fulfill GERs, introduce students to interdisciplinary thinking and methods, and allow students to apply those methods to real world problems, often through theory/practice learning. These courses may reflect emerging interdisciplinary fields that grow out of the interests of term faculty.
 - a. Through an application process, the undergraduate program will allow graduate students from various disciplines to design and teach courses in their particular areas of interest.
 - b. The existing appointments for the senior lecturers and professors of pedagogy will be maintained in order to guarantee continuity of undergraduate programs.
 - c. There will be at least one staff position dedicated to the undergraduate program under supervision of the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Department Administrator.

Supplementary Proposal for a University-wide Interdisciplinary Ph.D.

Within the restructured ILA, Emory's signature tradition of fostering intellectual innovation and transformative work beyond the boundaries of conventional scholarship could be maintained in an elite interdisciplinary Ph.D. program. In addition to the graduate students in the working groups, each year a select body of new students would be invited to participate in the ILA community under this new mode of interdisciplinary training.

Applicants to all schools in the LGS would be eligible to apply for dual admission to the ILA, where they would be trained in interdisciplinary ideas and methods as a complement to their conventional training in the disciplines. The ILA would thereby continue its historic mission of providing a practical and theoretical context for interdisciplinary work and fostering a scholarly community and culture that supports innovative work by emergent scholars. Ph.D. work that challenges established thinking would be deepened and enhanced by students' simultaneous pursuit of specifically disciplinary training through traditional departments.

Students across LGS would also have the opportunity to apply for the dual degree program at the end of their first year. Core and rotating faculty in the Institute would review the applications and participate in supervising and advising the successful candidates in this revised signature program of the LGS and Emory University.