



Teaching Interdisciplinarity

*Bruce Burgett, Cinnamon Hillyard, Ron Krabill,
Sarah Leadley, and Becky Rosenberg*

In the revolutionary process, the leaders cannot utilize the banking method as an interim measure, justified on grounds of expediency, with the intention of *later* behaving in a genuinely revolutionary fashion. They must be revolutionary—that is to say, dialogic—from the outset.

—Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*

There is today a boom in publications that address questions related to interdisciplinary teaching. Produced and archived through the hard work of such scholars as Julie Thompson Klein (1996, 1999, 2004, 2005), William Newell (1994, 1998), Carolyn Haynes (2002), Lisa Lattuca (2001), and Allen Repko (2008), as well as organizations such as the Association for Integrative Studies and the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU), much of this scholarship focuses its attention on how intellectual and curricular divisions among existing disciplinary formations can be overcome. Take as an example of this scholarship Haynes's edited collection *Innovations in Interdisciplinary Teaching* (2002). Composed of individual essays that cover topics ranging from curriculum design to academic advising, the volume as a whole dwells on two antagonistic tendencies within institutions of higher education: a widely held aspiration to develop problem-based pedagogies that cut across disciplinary forms of knowledge production, on the one hand, and a deep awareness of the limitations placed on these cross-cutting aspira-

tions by the disciplinary infrastructure of most colleges and universities, on the other. In Haynes's volume and the literature more generally, these antagonisms produce a series of metaphors for interdisciplinarity that will be familiar to anyone who has ever brushed up against one of these conversations: "connecting," "buttressing," providing "windows," "bridging," "cross-fertilizing," "linking," "crossing the street," and even (in one essay) "eating the whole pie." These types of metaphors are familiar because they reflect a knowledge geography that is shared by many faculty members, academic staff, and students, one that can be mapped through organizational charts made up of separate academic departments, programs, and colleges.

While we have learned much from this literature and have a healthy respect for the challenges of interdisciplinary teaching in otherwise disciplinary environments, our intellectual and institutional starting point is a bit different. We all teach at the Bothell campus of the University of Washington (UW Bothell). Founded in 1990, UW Bothell is a metropolitan university that differs from many institutions—including UW's Seattle campus—in at least three important ways. First, the campus is research intensive but also relatively small and founded with a mission statement that names "interdisciplinary teaching and research" as one of its three defining characteristics.¹ Second, the campus is built to serve "college-age and established adult students," particularly students who are place- and time-bound to the surrounding area through jobs, family responsibilities, and other circumstances. This institutional mission manifests in the campus's commitment to a strong academic support network, including its library, Teaching and Learning Center (in which the Writing Center and Quantitative Skills Center are housed), Media Center, and learning technologies initiatives. Third, the campus has established over time an integrative learning environment in which faculty members and academic staff collaborate across many areas of course design, execution, and assessment. In other words, the campus has developed a culture comfortable with conceiving of academic staff—librarians, writing and Quantitative Skills Center consultants, educational technologists—as integral to the classroom experience itself, rather than simply cocurricular or remedial support for students who choose to utilize them.

There are many lessons to be learned about interdisciplinarity from this unique educational environment, lessons that may be applicable to other departments and colleges that are already interdisciplinary in their mission and orientation or lower-division initiatives such as those focused on writing and quantitative reasoning across the curriculum. The specific lessons we focus on in this article are drawn from our collaborative work on the

development of an upper-division gateway course in the interdisciplinary arts and sciences (IAS) curriculum with which we have all been involved as faculty members and/or academic staff, titled Interdisciplinary Inquiry (BIS 300). Like most gateway courses for interdisciplinary majors and campus- or collegewide lower-division initiatives, Interdisciplinary Inquiry serves many masters. The multiple-section course (ten to twelve sections annually capped at thirty students per section) is intended to introduce incoming students to the resources and educational philosophy of the IAS curriculum and the UW Bothell campus, generate a collaborative learning environment among those students, initiate the preparation of the student's degree portfolio (a project that culminates for the student in the IAS portfolio capstone course and fuels a programwide formative assessment process), provide informal advising for students about the curricular pathways they might pursue in and beyond the program and campus, and generate a collective sense of excitement among the students about IAS, the degrees it offers, and the interdisciplinarity it fosters. The course performs these functions in an academic unit that houses faculty members with backgrounds in fields ranging from performance studies to conservation biology and a curriculum that includes degrees in areas ranging from interdisciplinary arts to community psychology to environmental science.²

Drawing on our twenty-plus years of collective experience with different iterations of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, we address the question of how best to teach interdisciplinarity in this type of educational environment by pursuing three broad lines of inquiry through a detailed discussion of one exemplary section of the course and its collaboratively developed workshops focused on quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and oral presentation. The first line of inquiry concerns processes of collaboration: How should we think about the role of faculty-staff, faculty-faculty, and staff-staff collaboration in institutional contexts where claims to disciplinary specialization and expertise tend to militate against collaborations that do not reproduce conventional hierarchies? The second inquiry concerns pedagogy: How can we model and cultivate this type of collaborative learning practice not only among faculty and staff but also with students by drawing on the backgrounds and competencies of the faculty, staff, and students to build resource-rich learning communities? The third inquiry concerns interdisciplinarity: How should we think about the difference between the question of how one can *become more interdisciplinary* by teaching across existing disciplines and the related question of how one can *teach interdisciplinarity*? What happens, in other words, when we treat the keyword of these conversations as a noun

rather than as an adjective, making questions about teaching interdisciplinarity conceptually equivalent to those that arise in discussions of how to teach literature or chemistry or sociology?

While we do not claim to have definitive answers to these questions, our experiences with the course and its workshops have convinced us that the teaching of interdisciplinarity is best approached not as a compromise between and among various disciplinary formations, but as a problem of its own. In contrast to the multidisciplinary common sense that underwrites much of the research in the field (and reflects the institutional knowledge geographies where much of the data for that research are collected), we focus on how research questions drive inquiry among (inter)disciplines, not the ways in which (inter)disciplines drive and structure research questions.³ This focus explains both our title and our epigraph. Our title shifts the problematic within which discussions of interdisciplinary pedagogy take place by emphasizing the question of interdisciplinarity itself. Our epigraph, drawn from the chapter of *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1998) that kicks off many of our current versions of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, plays on Paulo Freire's conviction that a revolutionary and liberatory educational practice must be problem based and dialogic from the outset. Modifying this passage for our own purposes, we have learned to hold to an analogous axiom as we have worked together on the development of Interdisciplinary Inquiry. In the process of teaching interdisciplinarity, educators cannot utilize disciplinary methods as an interim measure, justified on grounds of expediency, with the intention of *later* behaving in a genuinely interdisciplinary fashion. They must be interdisciplinary—that is to say, dialogic and broadly collaborative—from the outset.

A Short Version of the Long History of Interdisciplinary Inquiry

Since the creation of the UW Bothell campus in 1990, IAS has introduced interdisciplinarity to its students through a core course, with Interdisciplinary Inquiry being the most recent version of that course. The initial iterations of the course may be best characterized as having adopted an approach to interdisciplinarity in the tradition of liberal studies programs of the time. Integration was stressed and developed through team teaching, with the ideal of combining faculty expertise in different disciplinary perspectives. Indeed, the evolution of the course over the past two decades closely mirrors the typology developed by Julie Thompson Klein in her 1996 monograph, *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity*, her 1999 AACU report, and subsequent writings (2004, 2005). The course

has migrated away from an approach best described as “multidisciplinary” (comparing and contrasting two or more disciplines) and toward a version of critical interdisciplinarity (integrating multiple disciplines through a critique of disciplinary knowledge formations). Most recently, versions of the course have experimented with a more transdisciplinary approach by combining the skepticism about disciplinary knowledge production typical of critical interdisciplinarity with a sustained attempt to engage nonacademic knowledge-making sectors on and off the UW Bothell campus.⁴ In this last (partially realized) phase, we have stressed interdisciplinary collaborations among faculty members *and* intersectoral collaborations among faculty members and academic staff, including those working on community partnerships and community-based learning initiatives. While the course has not abandoned multidisciplinary altogether, it has shifted away from the additive model (literature + chemistry + sociology = interdisciplinarity) of the early years.

We want to emphasize that one of the keys to the most recent phase in the development of the course has been viewing interdisciplinarity as an ongoing process of collaboration that includes faculty members and academic staff in partnerships that extend beyond common practices of team teaching and classroom guest visits. While these practices can work well in some institutional contexts, we have found that our project of teaching interdisciplinarity benefits from sustained mechanisms of integration among those academic staff and faculty members teaching *Interdisciplinary Inquiry* and across the IAS faculty and the campus.⁵ The efficacy of such mechanisms has ebbed and flowed over the life of the course, again corresponding roughly to Klein’s typology and paralleling experiences in other programs. In the first stage of development (multidisciplinary), faculty members from different disciplinary backgrounds worked together in team-taught courses with the support of academic staff. In the second stage (critical interdisciplinarity), faculty members worked more closely with academic staff on the design and teaching of the course, including ongoing coordination among its multiple sections. In the third and current stage (transdisciplinarity), the collaboration has expanded to include staff members working on community partnerships, internships, and community-based learning initiatives. Concurrent with these intellectual shifts has been a move away from the informal modes of collaboration that typified the campus in its early years and toward more formal mechanisms that can mobilize sustained interaction across a more complex institutional environment.

As the IAS and UW Bothell faculty and academic staff grew in size and spread across the campus, informal methods of working across disci-

plines and sectors proved insufficient. The result was the creation of a faculty-staff committee to determine what should be covered in Interdisciplinary Inquiry. While the resulting iteration of the course shifted away from the additive multidisciplinarity of the classic liberal arts tradition and toward a more critical interdisciplinarity, the committee that drafted the guiding document functioned as a disappearing task force, disassembling after the adoption of its recommendations. The document this group crafted focused on skills-based learning objectives and added a forceful call for collaboration as central to the course, but the follow-up was largely informal. With the committee disbanded and no structural mechanisms in place to ensure that collaboration was maintained, faculty interest and investment in the course waned. The result was a core course that departed from its original conception; in the absence of ongoing collaboration among faculty and staff, it lost its centrality to the curriculum and was often doled out to part-time lecturers. It came to be treated as a service course—rather than the intellectual foundation—for the IAS degrees. As such, interdisciplinarity in this version of the course rose from a moment of collaboration and fell from the end of that collaboration.

In 2003, a group of full-time faculty members and academic staff involved in the teaching of Interdisciplinary Inquiry recognized the need to reinvigorate the course. This group formed what our campus calls a “teaching circle,” which provides small research stipends for faculty members and academic staff to collaborate on projects related to the scholarship of teaching and learning.⁶ In order to support collaboration in our teaching of interdisciplinarity, the teaching circle drafted an Interdisciplinary Inquiry “manifesto,” a document that states the common understandings and goals among the faculty members and academic staff involved in the teaching of the course. The manifesto is unique in a number of crucial characteristics. First, it is drafted specifically by those teaching the course, not an appointed committee. Second, it is more than a list of skills or outcomes that the course is mandated to teach and assess; it is an expression of what those actively involved in the course are doing now and hope to do in the future. Third, and we believe most important, the manifesto is—by its own definition—a document that must be revisited and either revised or reaffirmed each year, and then brought to the full faculty for additional feedback and approval. Each year since the initial manifesto was written and approved, small but important revisions have been made to the document, further reflecting the increased commitment to sustained collaboration in developing the course. The result is a flexible, responsive, and less static iteration of Interdisciplin-

ary Inquiry guided by a living document. This shift allows those of us teaching multiple sections of the course in any given year to retain the freedom to shape those sections around the varied content, readings, and assignments we choose, while working in collaboration with academic staff and other faculty members on overall course design and implementation.

Support for the adoption of a more fluid and contingent model of collaboration has not been unanimous among the IAS faculty. We have experienced an ongoing tension within the faculty, including ourselves, between appreciation for this organic development of the IAS core course and desire for a more stable version of the course that would allow faculty members to assume students in future courses have already developed and mastered specific concepts and skills. Rather than choosing one approach over the other, our response has been to create further support for collaboration through the appointment of a “coordinator” for the course each year as an official service assignment and by requiring quarterly meetings among those teaching the course in any given year. These quarterly meetings operate in much the same way as the original teaching circle, providing opportunities for academic staff and faculty members to share what has and has not worked in their sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, to brainstorm about new pedagogical approaches, to suggest new readings and exercises, and to create opportunities to acculturate new colleagues into the collaboration. The involvement of the Teaching and Learning Center and library staff in these meetings has proven invaluable, increasing the attention to pedagogy across the various sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry. These meetings are collaborative, substantive, and productive for those working with the course, rather than just another bureaucratic obligation. The resulting version of Interdisciplinary Inquiry has deepened our understandings of interdisciplinarity and our pedagogical approaches to teaching it.

Current Strategies for Teaching Interdisciplinary Inquiry

Out of this collaboration, a number of common goals for this multisection required course have emerged, matched closely to the four overarching learning objectives of the IAS curriculum: critical thinking, interdisciplinary research, collaboration and shared leadership, and writing and communication. The design of assignments and workshops is informed by a desire to foreground the critical thinking skills required for problem-based forms of interdisciplinarity, rather than mastery of the technical languages and research methods within one or more disciplines or interdisciplines. We often describe the course to ourselves and to our students as slowing down the research

process, opening up moments for critical appraisal and reflection. “Slowing down,” as we understand it, is not a code phrase for remedial or basic research instruction; rather, it indicates a commitment to making the research process more inductive by revealing the often implicit choices made by students and scholars as they conduct research. These goals are intended to prepare students for subsequent IAS courses, in which they are routinely asked to formulate complex research questions and assess sources from a wide range of disciplines in very short time frames. To this end, faculty members and academic staff have designed two-hour workshops that emphasize decision making within research processes, consideration of alternative approaches, and learning through social interaction. These workshops activate and challenge students’ assumptions about research processes and the social production of knowledge. They also evince and model collaboration-in-action.

There is considerable variation among the questions and problems that different sections of the course explore, ranging from those rooted in literary artifacts such as *The Autobiography of Malcolm X* (2001 [1964]) or Sembene Ousmane’s historical novel *God’s Bits of Wood* (1996) to those emerging from a concept such as “risk” or a site such as the wetland restoration project that makes up a large part of the UW Bothell campus.⁷ What draws these varied approaches together is a consistent pedagogical structure. As an instance of this structure, we will be using Burgett and Leadley’s section of the course, subtitled “Knowledge Travels.” Like most versions of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, this one begins with the chapter of Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* on the “banking” concept of education, a short text that provides an opportunity to explore the possibilities of a university education, encourages a critical stance toward that education, and challenges students to link their formal education to problems that emerge in their everyday lives. Burgett and Leadley nest the Freire reading in a set of writings drawn from Klein (1999), Immanuel Wallerstein (2004), and Michel Foucault (1997), among others. These readings, along with the classroom activities that accompany them, introduce students to the institutional and intellectual history of interdisciplinarity, while also developing a historical and critical understanding of how different problems and questions — problematics, to use Foucault’s term — emerge within research-based communities of practice. Students engage with the materials through in-class and online discussions, by collaborating on the generation of an initial working definition of interdisciplinary inquiry, and by completing an essay assignment in which they write as both Freire and themselves in an exchange of letters based on the individual goals statement they submitted as part of their application to IAS.

This initial cluster of readings is followed on the syllabus by Jamaica Kincaid's memoir of her childhood in Antigua, *A Small Place* (2000). Burgett and Leadley chose this postcolonial literary text as the starting point for the remainder of the course for three reasons: it addresses the reader through a you-I rhetoric that places pressure on the concept of a community of research practice developed in the first set of readings; it poses questions to readers throughout, challenging them to appreciate the limits of their current knowledge and to ask better questions in response; and it opens onto potential research questions about issues ranging from the literary form of the memoir to the strengths and weaknesses of tourist-based economic development policies to the environmental degradation of Caribbean coral reefs and wetlands. After a close-reading exercise in which students unpack the you-I rhetoric that structures the opening and concluding passages of the memoir, an hour of class time is devoted to developing four- to five-person research clusters that will work together for the remainder of the ten-week quarter. The prompt "What questions might you pose after reading Kincaid's *A Small Place*?" invites students to brainstorm. Responses to the prompt are written on the board, time is provided for additions, and the students are then asked to whittle down the often quite lengthy list of suggestions to a limited number of questions they would like to research. After some give and take, the class winds up with five to six research clusters, each of which takes responsibility for one of those questions. Established at the end of the third week of the quarter, these clusters work together on a variety of research-based assignments for the balance of the quarter as they move through the series of workshops, with the major final project being an individual or collaborative research proposal addressed to the Burgett-Leadley Foundation for Interdisciplinary Inquiry.

A. Quantitative Reasoning in Interdisciplinary Inquiry

The first of the three collaboratively developed workshops we focus on in this article brings the director, a position held by Hillyard for many years, of our Quantitative Skills Center (QSC) into the class. Located in the same unit as the campuswide Writing Center, the QSC is an academic support center for students and faculty with the mission of improving quantitative reasoning (QR) across the curriculum (Hillyard 2006). The fluid nature of the Interdisciplinary Inquiry manifesto is reflected in the increasing prominence of the QSC within it. In contrast to the Writing Center, which was positioned as a critical partner in the course from the outset, the QSC was entirely absent from the first iteration of the manifesto; in subsequent years, the manifesto

encouraged collaboration with the QSC as an optional resource, and the most recent manifesto names collaboration with the QSC as an integral part of the course. This change in thinking about the role of the QSC (and QR) in Interdisciplinary Inquiry reflects discussions among the faculty members and academic staff directly involved in the teaching of the course, feedback from other IAS faculty members during the annual review of the course manifesto at the final IAS meeting of the year, and an emerging appreciation of the substantial overlap between writing and QR instruction.⁸ The shift in emphasis also reflects (and has been influenced by) a dynamic national conversation about how best to teach QR across the curriculum as scholars in many disciplines have begun to recognize the need for increased QR for academic scaffolding purposes as well as the basic quantitative literacy requirements for active participation in public and democratic decision making. As in parallel discussions of writing across the curriculum, the emerging question in these conversations is how to integrate QR pedagogies throughout the college curriculum (Madison and Steen 2008). The QSC staff members working with Interdisciplinary Inquiry have answered this question by collaborating with faculty members on the development of in-class workshops that can be used across the multiple sections of the course.

In the Burgett-Leadley section of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, the QR workshop is the first of the quarter, taking place shortly after students have identified the research clusters within the course and aligned themselves with one of them. At this point, the course slows down by working closely with one scholarly article: Faye V. Harrison's "Women in Jamaica's Informal Economy" (1991). Paired with excerpts from Stephanie Black's documentary film *Life and Debt* (2001), Harrison's article introduces students to the problems involved in accessing and assessing quantitative data. Harrison relies on more than 100 interviews conducted with street vendors, higglers, ganga dealers, prostitutes, and other participants in the informal economy of Kingston, Jamaica, to develop a quantitative data set intended to reveal the workings of gender differentiation within that economy. For these reasons, the article makes for a particularly rich discussion of QR, interdisciplinarity, and the similarities and differences between qualitative and quantitative research practice. Before the in-class workshop, students are asked to close-read two central pages of Harrison's article (180–81), as they had done earlier with the opening and closing passages of *A Small Place*. In this case, they begin by circling all the numbers and other forms of quantification on those pages, including footnotes, page numbers, adjectives such as "large" or "small," and statistical representations. They also participate in an online

discussion centered on the question of what is gained and lost as Harrison moves between quantitative and qualitative representations of her research findings.⁹ In this preclass discussion, students tend to dwell on Harrison's arguments, perhaps citing from her use of numerical and statistical forms of representation, but not typically interrogating the production and rhetorical effects of those numbers and statistics.

The in-class workshop is designed to counteract the tendency among students, often manifested in the online discussion, to treat numerical representations as neutral or objective facts. As the session begins, we focus on the numbers used to support Harrison's arguments, close-read the two assigned pages of the article for the argument being constructed, and take time to reflect on the story the numbers are telling. The director of the QSC works with the students on quantitative reasoning and data visualization skills such as creating graphs and tables, practicing unit conversion, and making estimations. Students compare the groups surveyed in (and constructed by) Harrison's research, analyze what is and is not being measured, and investigate the sources of the numbers in the article. Students often enter the workshop with very little inclination to think critically about where the numbers Harrison deploys come from ("the government" and "the Kingston slum" are two answers we have heard) and what they represent. By the end of the workshop, they have a better sense of the rhetorical strength of numbers in a scholarly argument — both Harrison's and more generally — as well as their limitations. As important, the workshop introduces the students to the QSC (and its staff) as a site of (and as resources for) intellectual collaboration and scholarly inquiry, not merely academic remediation or cocurricular support.¹⁰ In the most recent iterations of the workshop, we have begun the session by conducting a quick survey of the class on a topic such as how they got to campus on that day or their favorite Pacific Northwest plants, crunched the numbers and created a variety of graphic representations of the data during the class, and returned at the end to the question of whether those representations create an accurate or useful portrait of the students in the room.

Each time Interdisciplinary Inquiry is taught, we discuss how to make improvements and tailor the workshop to the students' learning needs, among both those directly involved in the Burgett-Leadley section of the course and the larger faculty-staff cohort responsible for the course's development during that academic year. Reflective thinking and rethinking of the session in this way is extremely important and continues to improve the QR workshop.¹¹ We still struggle to get students to understand the rhetorical function of numbers. Drawing analogies between close-reading a literary source (Kincaid) and

a quantitative analysis (Harrison) has helped to further our central goal of moving students beyond commonsense misapprehensions that numbers are neutral facts that necessarily come from objective sources, as well as related claims that numbers are uniquely susceptible to manipulation, that qualitative representations of data are more subjective than quantitative representations, and that QR is only accessible to those with specialized training or a “math gene” (Devlin 2001). Although many of the QR skills practiced and ideas discussed during the Burgett-Leadley version of this workshop turn out to be transportable across multiple sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, the success of each session comes from tailoring it to individual course needs and texts. While no single canned QR skills workshop is delivered to each class, the primary goal of discussing the rhetorical use of numbers in representing or visualizing the issues at hand remains consistent.

B. Information Literacy in Interdisciplinary Inquiry

The second of the three workshops we focus on in this article deals with issues of information literacy, defined broadly as the ability to find, retrieve, analyze, use, and produce information. The development of students’ information literacy is embedded throughout all of the sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, often with three to five class sessions held in one of the UW Bothell library’s computer classrooms. As with all of the workshops, faculty members and academic staff share ownership for facilitating discussions and hands-on activities, rather than tag-teaming according to expertise (librarians providing a tour of databases, faculty members introducing content and assignments). The workshop format provides space for students to collaborate as they reformulate their initial research questions, position these questions within one or more scholarly conversations, and explore other ways in which knowledge is produced, disseminated, and communicated. The first workshop in this series occurs early in the term. It dwells on collaboration processes and preliminary information mapping strategies; it also initiates the intellectually challenging task of transforming the common interest that originally brought the research cluster together into a driving and manageable research question. The second workshop asks students to work closely with scholarly sources, while the third and fourth workshops typically focus on different forms of research practice, such as archival work with primary documents and qualitative inquiry through interviews or ethnographic methods. We have designed this sequence of workshops to provide students time and space to experience the uncertainty that often accompanies decision making

in research practice, to take intellectual risks through dialogue and informal writing, and to gain confidence as they learn to “think as researchers think” when they produce and consume knowledge.

In the Burgett-Leadley section of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, the second information literacy workshop focusing on scholarly sources follows immediately on the QR workshop and returns the students to the Harrison article. Prior to the session, students are asked to complete a worksheet that guides them through a critical analysis of Harrison’s article. The worksheet contains four sections: the first asks the students to write about the question the author is asking in her research and to consider who else is involved in that research conversation; the second asks them to discuss the research methods the author does (and does not) use as she addresses that question; the third asks them to summarize and assess the author’s argument; and the fourth asks them to consider how Kincaid might respond to the article.¹² As in the QR workshop, the preclass assignment emphasizes close reading of the article and invites students to approach scholarship in a holistic manner. Rather than skimming, reading for the thesis, or simply finding points of interest, students must trace the arc of the researcher’s own path of inquiry, from the framing question or problem, through the methods used and evidence constructed, to the argument or conclusion. Along the way they are challenged to read against the grain of the author’s research, considering how an initial research question shapes the subsequent inquiry, why a researcher might choose one method of inquiry over another, and how data or evidence might be used differently in light of alternative research questions.

The in-class library workshop furthers the development of these core information literacy skills. The session begins as Burgett and Leadley lead a discussion of Harrison’s article grounded in the completed worksheets. This discussion is followed by a brief overview of the UW Bothell library resources for database searching, with a particular emphasis on multi- and interdisciplinary resources. Students then have an hour in class to select and print out one scholarly source for their research cluster to work with over the next week as they complete another iteration of the same worksheet, facilitate a discussion of their findings with the class as a whole, and write a short essay in which they place Kincaid in dialogue with the author(s) of their source (a writing assignment telegraphed by the fourth question on the worksheet). As in other workshops, the second hour slows down the research process by challenging students to talk through their selection process and to address specific information retrieval skills as needed. This slower pace has been par-

ticularly illuminating, providing faculty members and librarians with a window into the decision-making processes students use when selecting sources from database searches, particularly when they are still struggling to move from a broad topic to a more focused research question. The process encourages students to articulate their reasoning in selecting sources, unsettling the implicit good-bad dichotomy that often transforms literature reviews centered on a research question into scavenger hunts for an authoritative answer to that question. The workshop enhances the students' ability to identify the questions an author is posing, to recognize the power and limitations of those questions, and to weigh the source's relevance to their own research.

Discussions of the methods and evidence deployed in the scholarly sources under review similarly engage students in thinking about why a researcher would choose to explore a problem or question through one or more research methods: interviews, ethnography, surveys, historical archives, visual observation, experimentation, statistical analysis, government documents, mass media or journalistic sources, and creative practice, among many other options. We have found that this analytical uncoupling of research questions from research processes provides a powerful means of engaging students in thinking about how knowledge is produced (the large and small choices all researchers make), as does an uncoupling of research findings from any prescribed mode of research dissemination or publication (the five-page essay or peer-reviewed article). It also prepares them to consider similar questions and choices either in their own research practice or when they encounter research-based claims in academic and nonacademic settings.¹³ The skills needed to complete this analytical exercise are scaffolded in the work prior to class, reinforced in the classroom discussion, and reinforced again in the worksheet the students complete, for a second time and in collaboration with others members of their research cluster, after the library workshop. Written feedback on the worksheets allows the faculty member to comment on the progress of individual students, while verbal feedback to the research cluster as a whole by the faculty member and librarian during and after the library session focuses on overarching themes and questions as they emerge.

Across the many sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, faculty members and librarians have developed this sense of shared responsibility for teaching information literacy, creating opportunities for upper-division students to learn and practice foundational and advanced research skills through assignments that foreground critical thinking, reading, and writing. This collaboration has been successful on two levels. First, students bring a wide variety of expectations and assumptions to "library workshops" at

the upper-division level. Informal show-of-hands surveys indicate that most have had some kind of library orientation or structured information literacy instruction at the lower-division level, and many express confidence in their ability to “do research.” Yet students’ initial formulation of research questions reveals that many still struggle to understand the conventions of research-based debate, academic or otherwise, and that they tend to move too quickly to the adoption of a thesis or the assertion of an opinion as a substitute for sustained and open-ended inquiry. The information literacy workshops for Interdisciplinary Inquiry challenge and restructure these assumptions about how and why research-based knowledge is produced. Second, faculty members and librarians at UW Bothell have long struggled to articulate and enact specific information literacy outcomes. By focusing on broad learning goals and ongoing collaboration among faculty members and academic staff, the current version of Interdisciplinary Inquiry has avoided much of the turf warfare common in upper-division (and lower-division) core courses, while also improving the actual student outcomes around information literacy. Although the current manifesto clearly expects that faculty members teaching the course will collaborate with academic staff, it does not specify what this will look like in each section of the course, thus shifting the focus from static and nontransferable outcomes to active and generative collaboration within and across sections of the course.

C. Oral Communication and Presentation in Interdisciplinary Inquiry

The final of the three workshops we highlight in this article develops skills related to oral communication through in-class presentations or, to use our preferred term, facilitations. Research clusters in Interdisciplinary Inquiry are typically assigned two or three opportunities to facilitate an interactive discussion of their research findings with the class as a whole. One of the most troubling aspects of these in-class activities has been the tendency of students to provide “talking head” or “hostage video” serial monologues, replete with overloaded PowerPoint slides. These formats often result from students’ fear of risk taking — intellectually and socially — in what is already, for many of them, a very anxiety-producing classroom activity, and they typically fail to engage other students or to provide any opportunity to advance the presenters’ or the audience’s understanding of a topic through interaction. In response to this penchant for uncreative and unilateral methods of presentation (habits often learned from lecture-based classrooms or, for many of our returning students, business retreats), faculty members and academic staff across the UW Bothell campus began to implement strategies to support

students in the development of their oral communication capacities. One result was the creation of trainings for Writing Center and QSC consultants (in conjunction with Media Center staff) that prepare them to work with students, in and out of the classroom, as they shape and practice their classroom presentations and facilitations. These trainings have included sessions on public speaking, performance techniques, digital storytelling, visual representations of quantitative data, and team building for group projects, among other topics. From our work with specialists in these areas and conversations with a wide array of faculty members, we have been able to develop guidelines for assigning presentations and facilitations.

These campuswide discussions have influenced (and have been influenced by) our collaborative work on Interdisciplinary Inquiry. The staff trainings underscore that when we work with students we need to encourage them to experiment, take risks, and not rely only on forms of presentation with which they are familiar or comfortable. In the Burgett-Leadley section of Interdisciplinary Inquiry, this support for risk taking is critical. The first of the three in-class facilitations follows on the scholarly source library workshop and asks students to work in their research clusters to create an interactive fifteen-minute “show-and-tell” presentation of their scholarly source. Students are encouraged to draw on previous experience with successful (and unsuccessful) presentations in which they have participated, to plan by working backward from shared goals within the research cluster, and to develop creative entrance and exit strategies (something other than “Well, we should get started” and “Well, I guess that’s all we have”). The one rule Burgett and Leadley set in advance is that no group can use the same form of presentation twice in the course. This rule ensures experimentation and demonstrates that research findings can lead to multiple forms of dissemination and publication. During the class session, the resulting presentations are videotaped, and the students receive written feedback from their peers on the effectiveness of their use of the fifteen minutes. This videotape and written feedback, along with readings about performance ethnography by Coco Fusco (1995) and performance-based pedagogies by Sally Harrison-Pepper (1999), set the stage for the in-class workshop, which takes place one week later.

The in-class workshop brings consultants from the Teaching and Learning Center to the course, with the goal of creating presentational forms that aim not to settle a research-based inquiry but to unsettle that inquiry by exploring, opening, and interrogating it with others in the room. Students prepare for the class by reviewing their initial videotaped facilitations and completing a worksheet oriented toward the same four questions that struc-

tured the peer feedback received earlier: (1) Was your group clear about the goals of its activities? (2) Was your group cohesive? (3) What worked well in your group's facilitation? (4) What areas of your group's facilitation could be improved?¹⁴ The workshop begins as the director of the Writing Center leads a discussion of the first round of facilitations, focusing on students' emerging insights about what worked well and what did not. Students tend to stress the value of a clear and explicit statement of purpose early in the facilitation, even when they may have failed to provide one themselves. This clarity enhances their ability to follow along and remain engaged since they know where the discussion will lead and when they will be asked to become actively involved in it. They also tend to identify strategies as varied as good use of the whiteboard to references to current events or popular culture to role-playing as effective in engaging their interest and enabling them to be more active participants in the unfolding of the discussion. Throughout this first section of the workshop, we stress that more standard modalities of content delivery (visual, multimedia, audio) are not necessarily bad but that they need to be understood as a means to the end of discussion and interaction, not as ends in themselves.

The remainder of the in-class workshop is dedicated to transferring these lessons learned to the upcoming facilitation, focusing this time on an interview the research cluster has selected in another library session. Writing Center and QSC consultants who have completed one or more of the presentation trainings described above prepare for this portion of the workshop by viewing the videotape of the first facilitation of the research cluster to which they are assigned and familiarizing themselves with that cluster's online discussions of the interview. The consultant then works with the cluster as a mentor in the development of the upcoming facilitation. As in other workshops, the principal responsibility of the mentor is to slow down the group process. In this case, "slowing down" often means asking individuals in the group to identify their goals for the facilitation and ensuring that the group as a whole comes to consensus on its shared learning objectives before moving to a discussion of presentation strategies designed to meet those objectives. We stress this initial stage in the process because we have found that students sometimes ignore the diversity of aims in a group, avoiding any potential conflict and moving directly to scripting, often with the result that conflict reemerges at a later and more damaging moment. Once the learning goals are articulated, mentors become kibitzers, assisting the group in thinking about multiple modes of facilitation, which of those modes fit with their objectives, and when and where they might take risks. By the end of the workshop, each

cluster has produced two different scripts for the facilitation, at least one of which they rehearse with the mentor acting as the audience and providing feedback.

These final steps in the in-class workshop have proven particularly useful. They break down the assumption that there is only one right way to present material in class, while also providing a space for group members to contribute who might have been initially reticent to push their ideas. Our emphasis on audience engagement and interaction inevitably leads to some “cheap tricks,” like bringing donuts for no apparent reason or rewarding “correct” answers with candy. More often, however, students respond by seeing the communication of research findings not as an end in itself but as one element in a process of collaboratively interrogating the ideas they encounter and drawing their audience into that inquiry. In the case of this interview assignment, we ask students to be particularly attentive to the significance of staging: where, when, and by whom the interview was conducted; how the performance of ethnographic practice shapes the “data” or “content” reported. The outcome is often a set of in-class facilitations that are newly attentive to the *form* of knowledge production—both the knowledge produced in the interview under discussion and the knowledge produced in the interaction with the class as a whole. And like the QR and library workshops, this session introduces students to academic staff as collaborators in processes of knowledge production, not merely remedial or cocurricular support for those processes. As reflected in our preference for the term “facilitation” over “presentation,” this emphasis on process teaches and models key ingredients of interdisciplinarity as we have come to understand it: a focus on research practices rather than research products, a decentering of claims to preexisting expertise in favor of inquiry-based exploration, and a centering of collaboration in processes of interdisciplinary inquiry.

The Burgett-Leadley section of Interdisciplinary Inquiry concludes with assignments designed to reinforce the learning objectives introduced in the three in-class workshops. The first assignment returns to the question of interdisciplinarity. During the penultimate week of the course, students read a second article by Klein (2004), reflect on their working definition of interdisciplinary inquiry generated during the second week of the course, and nominate four to five IAS faculty members to participate in a roundtable discussion of interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary practice. This roundtable resurfaces several of the themes with which the course began (the institutional and intellectual history of interdisciplinarity, the significance of problem-posing education and inquiry, the idea of a research-based com-

munity of practice) but this time with a more grounded appreciation among the students of what those abstractions can mean in practice. The second assignment links the discussion of interdisciplinarity to the site where the course began. Students reread Kincaid's *A Small Place* and reflect in writing about how they now think of the difference between a "knowledge tourist" and "knowledge traveler" — to adopt and modify Kincaid's central metaphor. The third assignment links the discussion of interdisciplinarity to a proposal for future research. Students are asked to craft an individual or collaborative research proposal that emerges from the process of inquiry they have pursued during the course. This assignment returns the students to many of the lessons learned during the in-class workshops: how to formulate research questions in relation to ongoing scholarly conversations, how to justify the use of specific research methods, how to anticipate intended audiences for their research findings, how to create appropriate means of dissemination, how to think about research on a human and social scale by crafting a budget and timeline for the proposal.¹⁵ In contrast to a final research paper (which often forces students to draw premature conclusions or mimic the discourse of established authorities), this proposal invites them to think as researchers think.

Lessons for Teaching Interdisciplinarity

Interdisciplinary Inquiry, as a required course, is only one approach to how one can go about teaching interdisciplinarity. Moving from the particular to the general, though with a healthy skepticism about the transferability of generalizations to particular situations, we offer several lessons learned from our collaboration on the course. The first concerns research processes: *Assignments need to foster open-ended and inquiry-based forms of research practice.* Across the in-class workshops we have developed and the many sections of Interdisciplinary Inquiry we have taught, we have found that students' appreciation for problem-based or problem-posing forms of interdisciplinarity often hinges on their willingness to engage in collaborative and inductive research processes that do not allow them to push only their individual or preexisting idea of where those processes should end up. Indeed, the desire to circumvent collaboration in the research process and anticipate the finished research product frequently appears to be the most difficult habit for students to break, particularly self-identified "good students" (often those students who have experienced success in other formal academic settings). This observation highlights for us the degree to which students arriving in IAS — and, we strongly suspect, other formal educational environments — have been actively

trained and rewarded for mimicking the role of experts, rather than for pursuing inductive forms of research-based inquiry across multiple knowledge arenas. Students have been trained in these habits not only in formal educational settings but also in their occupations and careers, where assuming the mantle of expertise is often essential for advancement.

This disjuncture between students' previous educational training in how to lay claim to discourses of disciplinary (or interdisciplinary) expertise and our emphasis on a form of interdisciplinarity that troubles those claims leads us to our second lesson learned: *Faculty members need to reward student risk taking at moments of assessment.* Uncertainty about criteria for assessment often creates profound anxiety for students entering IAS. In contrast to many of their previous experiences with formal education, students in Interdisciplinary Inquiry are assessed on neither the quantity of facts and information they have amassed nor their facility with foundational works in a discipline or interdiscipline; rather, we assess them on the quality of their research questions and the appropriateness of the methods of inquiry and sources they select together, again decentering the certainty provided by expertise in favor of process and collaboration. Our solution to this problem of assessment and risk taking has been to make Interdisciplinary Inquiry a portfolio-based course. This requirement across all sections of the course has several positive effects: it allows us to reorient student assessment toward issues of metacognition that are central to interdisciplinarity, enables us to introduce and model IAS's programwide degree portfolio process, and assures students that they will be rewarded for their ability to reflect critically on their learning across the assignments in the course, not merely for the additive "point total" of those assignments. In other words, we have oriented the course—across assignments, activities, and assessment—not around the question of whether students *know* the particulars of a single field of disciplinary or interdisciplinary research but around the more important question of whether they *know how to conduct* interdisciplinary inquiry.

Our final lesson learned is one we have stressed throughout our account of the course and its history: *Institutions need to support ongoing collaboration among faculty and staff.* We see our collaborative approach to interdisciplinarity—and the workshops that embody it—as essential to the success of the course and students enrolled in it. This success does not result from the fact that each of us brings a different area of expertise to a resource-rich collaboration, though it is nice to have those resources in the room. Rather, it results from our commitment to modeling, on a very small scale and

in the classroom itself, the social production of knowledge. All instruction is thoroughly integrated into specific sections of the course, emphasizing the connections among the questions we ask, the methods and resources we use to address them, and the discoveries we make as a result. By focusing on collaboration among students, faculty members, and academic staff, the course takes a different direction each time it is taught, driven by the people who are in the room during that particular term. This adaptive flexibility allows us to respond to traditional and nontraditional students with diverse types of educational preparation and professional experience by encouraging them to think about how various types of knowledge are produced, how they as students can become active, creative, and self-critical producers of knowledge (in either academic or nonacademic genres), and why we privilege interdisciplinarity as an institutional form and a practice of inquiry. Although each of us continues to experiment with new approaches to teaching interdisciplinarity in this and other courses, our experiences in *Interdisciplinary Inquiry* have convinced us that inquiry, innovation, and collaboration are crucial to all such endeavors.

Notes

1. The other two are “innovative and creative curriculum” and “a dynamic community of multicultural learning”; for the full mission statement, see www.uwb.edu/about/mission.
2. We should stress that IAS institutionalizes interdisciplinarity in the broad sense of the term. The IAS faculty makes hiring, tenure and promotion, and curricular decisions as a whole, though subgroups (curricular area working groups) initiate proposals for reform of their area. For more about IAS, see www.uwb.edu/ias.
3. In this sense, our approach to interdisciplinarity differs from the important work done by Veronica Boix-Mansilla and her colleagues at Harvard University’s Project Zero (<http://pzweb.harvard.edu/index.cfm>). In general, the type of interdisciplinarity that informs the IAS curriculum places emphasis on student-driven choices in the research process and a problem-based approach to interdisciplinarity and its audience(s). For these reasons, our approach to the teaching of interdisciplinarity may have more in common with units that are already interdisciplinary (gender studies, ethnic studies, science studies, environmental studies, community studies, among others) than units that are currently disciplinary in orientation and are seeking to build bridges to other disciplinary units on their campus. For a related appraisal of Project Zero, see Lardner and Malnarich (2008–9).
4. Other scholars of interdisciplinarity have developed overlapping vocabularies. Lisa Lattuca (2001), for instance, distinguishes among “synthetic interdisciplinarity” (work

that combines disciplinary approaches while keeping the differences among them clearly identifiable), “conceptual interdisciplinarity” (work that is explicitly critical of disciplinary knowledge formations), and “transdisciplinarity” (work that mutes disciplinary distinctions). For our purposes, these minor differences in nomenclature are less important than the difference between approaches that stabilize disciplinary formations in the process of integrating them and those that critically investigate the formations themselves. Though it is beyond the scope of this article, our motivation for stressing this distinction lies in our interest in pedagogies and knowledge projects that are cross-sectoral and, as a result, tend to particularize and relativize the ways in which universities carve up knowledge-making processes, both intellectually and administratively. Like Klein, we disagree with approaches that credit the “real world” with a “holism” that academic disciplines falsely divide, thus equating interdisciplinary work with more worldly approaches to knowledge making. But we do want to stress that different sectors, on and off university campuses, do carve up knowledge making differently. An awareness of these differences is crucial for any reciprocal knowledge partnerships. Our thinking about this set of issues has been influenced by the important work of Michael Gibbons et al. in *The New Production of Knowledge* (1994). For more on how these issues play out with respect to collaborations among units at UW Bothell, particularly relationships among faculty members, librarians, and other academic staff, see Leadley and Rosenberg (2005).

5. Our emphasis on broad and sustained processes of collaboration that cut across IAS and the campus can be seen as an extension of the common emphasis on process and collaboration within discussions of interdisciplinarity. In contrast to some of those discussions, however, our experience suggests that team teaching and classroom guest visits are best understood as strategies that may be conducive to teaching interdisciplinarity but that may also do little more than reinforce habits of disciplinary (“as the sociologist in this team-taught course, I will not be concerned with historical aspects of the issue at hand”) and/or divide the labor of teaching research skills from that of content delivery (“now the librarian will show you how to do a literature search while I work on my lecture for the second half of class”). Clearly, these examples are hyperbolic, but we have found that it is important to work intentionally and continuously against their underlying tendencies, both as individuals in the collaboration and as an institution.
6. The teaching circle met every several weeks to share syllabi, discuss approaches to readings and assignments, and, as we detail below, develop in-class collaborative skills-based workshops that involved and evinced for the students the coproduction of knowledge. Although we anticipated that the teaching circle would build coherence and increase cooperation around Interdisciplinarity Inquiry, our experiences far exceeded our original hopes. A much clearer and shared sense of the purposes and goals for teaching interdisciplinarity arose from this initial foray into closer and broader collaboration among all of us involved with the course. Perhaps most notable, we recognized the need for ongoing, sustained collaboration rather than a once-off reorganization of the course.
7. Different sections of the course have adopted a very diverse range of starting points for the development of the questions and problems that students explore. In addition

to those listed above, these starting points have included Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore's *The Medium Is the Massage* (2005), the expansion of the Seattle Art Museum, the master plan for the growth of the UW Bothell campus, and the bioregion in which the campus is located, among many others. The trick, we have found, is to begin with a site—textual or otherwise—that allows the students to develop a range of research questions in their subsequent assignments that emerge from problems and questions related to their intellectual interests and practices of everyday life.

This strategy corresponds with and instances Freire's insistence on student-driven, problem-posing education. Difficulties emerge when the site chosen is too closely tied to one subject area, since students tend to perceive that choice as limiting them to "what the faculty member wants" and/or "is interested in."

8. The overlap and (potential) synergies between quantitative reasoning (QR) and writing across the curriculum (WAC) pedagogies and learning objectives are clear in the National Numeracy Network's definition of the former as "higher-order reasoning and critical thinking skills needed to understand and to create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative data." At our campus, the intentional partnering of the Writing Center and Quantitative Skills Center (within an overarching Teaching and Learning Center) has enabled insights into the commonalities between forms of literacy and argumentation stressed by QR and WAC. For more information about the National Numeracy Network, see serc.carleton.edu/nnn/index.html.
9. The prompts for this online discussion read as follows. (1) There are a whole lot of numbers in Harrison's article. After you read the article once, go back through it and use the following method to "close-read" the numbers (as we did in class with the passages from Kincaid). On pages 180–81, circle every number and term of quantification (e.g., "a lot" or "very little") that appears on those pages; create a list of the different types of numbers and terms (among those you have circled). What is being quantified by the numbers and terms you have isolated (and in Harrison's article as a whole)? (Everyone should do this exercise on a separate piece of paper and bring it to class.) (2) Harrison's map of the "small place" of Jamaica's "Kingston slum" reads very differently than Kincaid's map of Antigua. What do you learn from Harrison's political economic approach that is missing from Kincaid's literary memoir (and vice versa)? What does this tell you about these two different (and overlapping) modes of producing knowledge? Which do you prefer? Why? (3) Toward the end of Harrison's analysis, she shifts from the discipline of political economy to that of ethnography. Why? What does she gain through this move? What does ethnography make visible that political economy misses (and vice versa)? (Be particularly attentive to the ways in which she introduces, uses, and translates vernacular speech. Why is it there at all?)
10. More details of the workshop can be found in Thomas, Place, and Hillyard (2008).
11. The in-class survey described in the previous paragraph is an example of this sort of revision. Previous QR workshops had prepared students to think critically about the power of numbers and the visualization of data, but only at a distance. We designed the survey to bring those issues into the classroom. Students typically objected in an animated manner to what they perceived as inaccuracies in the ways they were being represented, thus grounding a more abstract lesson about QR and data visualization

in their lived experience. Were more time available, our next step would have been (and may be) to ask the students to respond by designing more accurate research methodologies and forms of quantitative representation.

12. Here are the specific questions as they appear on the worksheet: (1) What is the author's driving research question? Are there sub-questions? Who else seems to be engaged in the research conversation about this question? (Check out both the text of the article and the endnotes. Please be specific.) What disciplinary and interdisciplinary conversations does the author engage with and contribute to? (Remember that a question is not a thesis or conclusion. Those come later.) (2) What research activities did the author undertake to address his or her question (other than reading articles by other researchers)? Do those activities seem appropriate to that question? Are there other research methods and activities you think might be helpful but the author does not undertake? (3) What is the author's answer to his or her research question(s)? Are you persuaded by/satisfied with the author's arguments and conclusions? How are they shaped by the research activities the author undertook (and didn't undertake)? (4) How might Kincaid respond to this article if she were conducting research on your cluster's initial question(s)? Are there additional questions she might raise? Are there other research activities she might want to undertake?
13. As we stress elsewhere in this article and throughout the course, this uncoupling of research questions, research methods, and research products lies at the intellectual heart of interdisciplinarity, at least as we understand and teach it. Disciplinarity, along with some forms of multidisciplinarity, gains much of its power and authority from the vertical integration of these three discrete moments in any research process. Discipline-bound literary scholars, for instance, do not need to justify responding to research questions under discussion in their discipline, investigating those questions through archival and interpretative research methods, and disseminating their findings as an article in a professional research journal, a research "talk" at a professional conference, or a research monograph. Interdisciplinarity gains its cross-cutting power and authority by moving laterally across these three vertically integrated moments, asking questions at each stage: Why not a different research question? Are archival and interpretative research methods really the best means of addressing your question? Is an article or "talk" or monograph the best way to disseminate your research findings? Each of these questions could be answered by literary scholars (or their students) without a substantive change in their research practice. But at that point they would be thinking not as disciplinarians but as individuals immersed in interdisciplinarity.
14. Here are the questions as they actually appear on the worksheet: (1) Was your group clear about the goals of your activities — e.g., what you hoped to accomplish, what kind of response you hoped to elicit, what central point you wanted to convey? And when the goals were particularly clear, what contributed to that? (2) Was your group cohesive — e.g., did you operate collaboratively, were the individual contributions to the group's work evident? And when the group was cohesive, what contributed to that? (3) What worked well in your group's facilitation? Why? (4) What areas of your group's facilitation could be improved? Why? How would you change what you did?

15. Here is the actual assignment for the research proposal:

The Burgett-Leadley Foundation for Interdisciplinary Inquiry solicits proposals for research projects developed by and for new and emerging interdisciplinary scholars, with special interest in projects related to “knowledge travels.” The foundation has \$500,000 to give away during this funding cycle and is able to support projects that range from one quarter to one year in length.

Proposals to the foundation should be no more than six double-spaced pages and should address the following six topics:

1. A description and justification of the problem(s) you will pose, including question(s) you will be asking;
2. A discussion and rationalization of the types of scholarly sources you will be reading in order to orient your inquiry (the scholarly conversation/s you will be entering into). Please include the bibliographic citations for three to five scholarly articles that seem especially promising. (You do not need to have read these articles, but you should be able to discuss in your proposal the problems and questions they pose, the methods they use to address them, and any arguments they might make);
3. A discussion and justification of the methods of inquiry you will be using (and not using). Be specific;
4. A description and justification of the archive(s) that you will be mining and assembling/collecting. Again, be specific;
5. A discussion of the intended audience for your research findings and a description of how and where you will publish your findings (a scholarly article in a specific journal, a documentary film screened at a specific location, a site-specific performance project, a series of workshops developed for specific locations, among others). The foundation welcomes scholarly articles but is also interested in developing other innovative and effective modes of publication, performance, and intervention;
6. A detailed project budget and schedule of research activities (this may be an additional page).

Feel free to end your proposal with a tentative hypothesis concerning what you will find at the “end” of your research and what the significance of those findings will be. Finally, be sure to let the foundation know the time frame for the completion of your project (between one quarter and one year) since proposals will be reviewed, in part, on how likely they are to be completed within that time frame and with the resources available to the project team.

Works Cited

- Life and Debt* [documentary]. 2001. Directed and produced by Stephanie Black. Tuff Gong Pictures.
- Devlin, Keith. 2001. *The Math Gene: How Mathematical Thinking Evolved and Why Numbers Are Like Gossip*. New York: Basic Books.

- Foucault, Michel. 1997. "Polemics, Politics, and Problematizations: An Interview with Michel Foucault." *Ethics, Subjectivity, and Truth*, ed. Paul Rabinow, 111–19. New York: New Press.
- Freire, Paulo. 1998. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Fusco, Coco. 1995. "The Other History of Intercultural Performance." In *English Is Broken Here: Notes on Cultural Fusion in the Americas*, 37–63. New York: New Press.
- Gibbons, Michael, Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott, and Martin Trow. 1994. *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage.
- Harrison, Faye V. 1991. "Women in Jamaica's Informal Economy: Insights from a Kingston Slum." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, ed. Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres, 173–96. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harrison-Pepper, Sally. 1999. "Dramas of Persuasion: Performance Studies and Interdisciplinary Education." *Theater Topics* 9.2: 141–56.
- Haynes, Carolyn, ed. 2002. *Innovations in Interdisciplinary Teaching*. Westport, CT: Onyx.
- Hillyard, Cinnamon. 2006. "The Quantitative Skills Center at the University of Washington Bothell." *Newsletter of the National Numeracy Network*, 8 March.
- Kincaid, Jamaica. 2000. *A Small Place*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Klein, Julie Thompson. 1996. *Crossing Boundaries: Knowledge, Disciplinarity, and Interdisciplinarity*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- . 1999. *Mapping Interdisciplinary Studies*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges and Universities.
- . 2004. "Prospects for Transdisciplinarity." *Futures* 36: 515–26.
- . 2005. *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Lardner, Emily, and Gillies Malnarich. 2008–9. "Assessing Integrative Learning: Insights from Washington Center's National Project on Assessing Learning in Learning Communities." *Journal of Learning Communities Research* 3.3: 1–20.
- Lattuca, Lisa. 2001. *Creating Interdisciplinarity: Interdisciplinary Research and Teaching among College and University Faculty*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Leadley, Sarah, and Becky Rosenberg. 2005. "Yours, Mine, and Ours: Collaboration among Faculty, Library, and Writing Center." In *Centers for Learning: Writing Centers and Libraries in Collaboration*, ed. James K. Elmborg and Sheril Hook. Publications in Librarianship, no. 58. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Madison, Bernard L., and Lynn Arthur Steen. 2008. "Evolution of Numeracy and the National Numeracy Network." *Numeracy* 1.1. services.bepress.com/numeracy/vol1/iss1/art2.
- Malcolm X and Alex Haley. 2001 [1964]. *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. New York: Penguin.
- McLuhan, Marshall, and Quentin Fiore. 2005. *The Medium Is the Massage*. Berkeley, CA: Gingko Press.
- Newell, William H. 1994. "Designing Interdisciplinary Courses." In *Interdisciplinary Studies Today*, ed. William Newell and Julie Thompson Klein, 35–51. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- . 1998. Introduction to *Interdisciplinarity: Essays from the Literature*, ed. William H. Newell, xv–xix. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Ousmane, Sembene. 1996. *God's Bits of Wood*. London: Heinemann.
- Repko, Allen F. 2008. *Interdisciplinary Research: Practice and Process*. London: Sage.
- Thomas, Elizabeth, Nancy Place, and Cinnamon Hillyard. 2008. "Students and Teachers Learning to See: Using Visual Images in the College Classroom to Promote Student Capacities and Skills." *College Teaching* 56.1: 23–27.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

