Harvey Graff’s Undisciplining Knowledge

Graff book overstates claims but contributes ‘deep understanding’ of case studies

By Julie Thompson Klein

Harvey Graff’s long-awaited book on interdisciplinarity finally appeared in June of 2015. Graff describes the goal as nothing less than writing a history that “reorients how we think and talk about and build interdisciplinarity, and with it disciplinary organization in the production, dissemination, and use of knowledge.” In the process he also aims to reset the origin of interdisciplinarity to the late 19th century, to move beyond blinders of a current science-dominated “standard version,” and to correct myths, exaggerations, and abuses.

Graff’s claim to reorient the study of interdisciplinarity is overstated. The literature already includes historical and comparative studies. Others have also challenged the

Post-Conference Highlights

Conference Sets Sail Amid Autumn Colors

By Dr. Susan Marine
Assistant Professor and Program Director
Higher Education Program
Merrimack College • North Andover, Mass.

Autumn was in full bloom at Merrimack College in North Andover, Massachusetts, the host of the 37th annual AIS conference. Blessed with good weather the entire weekend through, participants enjoyed strolling the grounds of our campus among the changing leaves and warm sunshine.

The conference kicked off Thursday with a rousing invitation by AIS President Machiel Keestra to “sail on an interdisciplinary raft,” weaving together the strengths of an integrated approach to learning that allows for flexible and creative attention to our most pressing social problems.

Machiel’s talk was followed by “five minute madness,” presentations by AIS Board members on such wide ranging topics as strengthening diversity within AIS (Tanya Augsburg), introducing AIS sections along with their functions and purposes...
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(Brian McCormack), going online to advance the reach of interdisciplinarity (Rick Szostak) and improving our ability to teach interdisciplinarily (Marcus Tanner).

Don Stowe shared his thoughts on the benefits of hosting an external review and gathering formative feedback, Jennifer Dellner spoke of the latest in the Interdisciplinary Studies Journal, and James Welch encouraged the ongoing cultivation of emerging scholars.

J. Scott Lee then discussed the Association for Core Texts and Courses (ACTC) and its relationship to IDS, and Jeanne Narum shared her perspectives on the importance of innovative spaces for the fostering of interdisciplinarity. Tami Carmichael closed the session by sharing insights from her work with the STIRS (scientific thinking and integrative reasoning) initiative.

The conference featured 5 different concurrent session blocks, with 60 sessions offered, provided a wide array of presentation formats including workshops, roundtables, and paper panels. A full half of the sessions directly engaged with the concept of “Impact for the Common Good?”—the conference theme.

Presenters highlighted exciting new interdisciplinary connections toward solving important social concerns, including environmental crises, racial oppression, educational inequity, and other pressing problems. Thinking about who is at the proverbial table, and whose voices are (and are not) privileged in interdisciplinary work, was addressed in numerous sessions as well.

Keynote Speakers Jennifer Leaning (Friday) and Lori Pompa and Tyrone Werts (Saturday) provided stirring examples of how interdisciplinary thinking can indeed impact the common good.

Leaning’s work addressing human rights crises around the globe showed the very real promise of bringing public health, demography, international relations and psychology to the work of relieving human suffering globally.

Stateside, Lori and Tyrone’s story of the “Inside Out Prison Exchange” program demonstrated the power of educational foundation-building through partnerships with law enforcement and corrections for the advancement of prisoners’ life chances. Both speakers were highly praised by participants for their clear thinking and tireless advocacy.

Finally, while the conference provided wonderful opportunities for scholarly exchange, fun was also on the schedule. The highlight: a boisterous and joy-filled performance by AIS Board Member Stephen McAlpine’s band, Straight Up Tribal, resulted in much merrymaking, and was a fitting ending to the conference Saturday night...reminding us that the common good can also be found in the fellowship of others, singing, dancing, and banging an improvised noise maker on one’s knee!
hype of overstated claims, argued that interdisciplinarity and disciplinarity are linked, examined relationships among disciplines, accounted for institutional and organizational factors, identified conflicting definitions and purposes, criticized multidisciplinary listing of disciplines for lacking attention to integration, and articulated the centrality of problems and questions.* Nonetheless, Graff contributes a deep understanding of selected case studies.

**The Case Studies**

Chapter 1 compares Genetic Biology and Sociology (1890s–1920s), Chapter 2 Humanities and Communication (1870s–1960s), Chapter 3 Social Relations and Operations Research (1930s–1960s), Chapter 4 Cognitive Science and New Histories (1940s–1980s), Chapter 5 Materials Science and Cultural Studies (1950s–1990s), and Chapter 6 Bioscience and Literacy Studies with concluding remarks.

Graff delivers on the promise of historical recovery. The insights that emerge often accentuate disciplinarity over interdisciplinarity, but Undisciplining Knowledge adds to a growing literature on their interactive relationship.

The strongest case studies are compelling. Comparing Biology and Sociology in Chapter One, for instance, Graff argues “the formation of biology can be understood as an interdisciplinary integration of preexisting fields.” As such, it is a success story of collecting subfields under one umbrella. Graff carefully tracks the emergence of “biology” as a recognized term for intersecting forces while acknowledging differences across departments.

In contrast, Sociology narrowed in the process of becoming a social science. Lacking a unified vision of the field and failing to establish the discipline as the science of society, Sociology is a story of limited development. It fell short of an intellectual synthesis of separate fields in favor of differentiation from the dominant field of political economy.

Chapter Three compares two efforts to bring general theory to social sciences, deeming Social Relations a failure and Operations Research a success. Graff skillfullyunpacks the design of Social Relations at Harvard University and Talcott Parsons’ role in the quest for a unified science of behavior. He is not the first to situate these examples in the history of interdisciplinarity or to criticize the ambition of the Unity of Science movement. However, he presents detailed evidence of how oft-cited locations upon closer inspection lacked integrative dimensions of interdisciplinarity and fell short of synthesis.

He also punctures the Great Man myth in histories of interdisciplinarity, reinforcing the importance of recognizing institutional and organizational factors over the singularity of touted individuals such as Parsons.

In contrast to Social Relations, Operations Research (OR) is an exemplar of synthesis and integration, anchored in specific problems and questions rather than a quest to be a new science of integrated disciplines. “OR,” Graff concludes, “profession-
Diversity of board praised

AIS Board Welcomes New Members

By Machiel Keestra, AIS President

Most readers of Integrative Pathways, being AIS members, find each year in their mailboxes a series of emails concerning the election of members of the Board of Directors. As a board, we do realize that for many of you, these are indicators of a ritual that is necessary yet cannot stir a lot of excitement in you.

Fortunately, though, we have seen in recent years an increase in participation of these elections: more candidates have stepped forward and more members have taken the time to read their bio’s and surfed the election site.

Being an organization which aims to both facilitate and strengthen the exchange between those already engaged in interdisciplinarity as well as to promote interdisciplinarity in other relevant circles, it is crucial for AIS to have in its midst a broad diversity of expertise, perspectives and experiences.

Nourished by this diversity, we can steer our current projects and develop future ones in such a way that they are responsive to the great heterogeneity with regard to interdisciplinarity that we are facing today.

Before telling you about the changes in our Board of Directors, let me therefore express a big “thank you!” to all of you who have participated in the election process (and to our IT Director Jennifer Dellner and our office manager Shaunda Mankowski for facilitating this process successfully). It is thanks to you that our board is once again enriched with two new members, carrying with them lots of ideas and expertise new to the board and very welcome indeed. The two new At-Large board members are Dr. Khadijah Miller and Dr. Heidi Upton.

Dr. Miller is associate professor of Interdisciplinary Studies and chair of the Department of History and Interdisciplinary Studies at Norfolk State University. She has been actively involved in modifying its curriculum so that it includes a service-learning course and other components, geared to serving a population of military, non-traditional, traditional and education majors.

Her research interests include U.S. Black women’s history, online learning and interdisciplinarity, and religiosity of African Americans. Khadijah hopes to assist AIS’s plans for expansion, inclusivity, and longevity.

Dr. Upton is Associate Professor at St. John’s University in New York where she teaches Discover NY, a freshman transition course. Dr. Upton received the B.M. and M.M. degrees from The Juilliard School and the D.M.A. degree from Manhattan School of Music. She is also a teaching artist for Lincoln Center Education and a professional pianist, who performs both with ensembles of various kinds and solo.

Her research focuses mainly on aesthetic education and civic engagement. Heidi has already started bringing her expertise to fruition for AIS in chairing our section on Arts & Humanities and she hopes to be involved in other similar developments.

Happy as I am to introduce these new board members, it is also my sad duty to tell you that we have to say goodbye to two board members who had served their terms and were not available anymore. Diane Lichtenstein and Brian McCormack have been on our board for several years, performed many valuable tasks and contributed countless fruitful ideas.

Let me briefly mention here a significant contri-
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bution for each of them, representative of the kind of work they’ve done for AIS.

Diane has helped us to articulate and develop our mission to enhance diversity within AIS and as an important component of interdisciplinary in general—ranging from a written statement to preparing a panel during last AIS conference—for which she tapped her experience in women’s studies. Furthermore, she has coordinated the AIS Sections initiative for some time.

Brian has contributed to sharpening our thoughts on the future of interdisciplinary teaching in particular, both in writing for this newsletter and during discussions on the board. Having moved to another continent and adapted to on-line teaching in interdisciplinary studies, he brought a fresh perspective on many topics.

AIS is very grateful to both Diane and Brian for all the time and efforts they’ve devoted to the organization and its mission!

Simultaneously with these changes, there are some moves in the Board of Director’s composition to mention as well. Two familiar and long-standing board members are now occupying new seats. Jennifer Dellner has been appointed the new Vice President for Development while James Welch IV is now the President-Elect of AIS. AIS is fortunate to be able to build upon the long-term expertise in the field of interdisciplinarity and the enthusiastic involvement in our organization of Jennifer and James.

As AIS depends to a large extent from the variety of ideas and the energy of its members and its Directors, I am happy to see that we are now looking at a board which is more diverse than ever: with members from two continents, from at least 9 different disciplines (both theoretical and practical), with diverse backgrounds and gender balance, yet all equally devoted to AIS’s mission (see http://wwwp.oakland.edu/ais/about/board/ for an overview). However, we still hope to be able to count on you, our esteemed members, to enrich us with your critical suggestions, your ideas and initiatives!

The Association for Core Texts and Courses (ACTC) 22nd Annual Conference

Thursday, April 14 - Sunday, April 17, 2016
Atlanta Marriott Perimeter Center, Atlanta, GA

ACTC invites you to contribute your thinking on the past and future of core text programs.

Conference Theme:
Tradition and Renewal, Continuity and Change in Core Text, Liberal Arts Programs

What does the future hold for core text courses and programs?
How do the rising generations see the recruitment, development, and enculturation of faculty in core text programs for the next 25 years?
What kind of leadership, what kind of cooperation, what kind of understanding of core texts will be required to rejuvenate and to reshape the next generation’s core text, liberal arts education?
What mentoring of the rising generation should take place?
What legacies does this generation want passed on and by what means?

Online Conference Registration Form is on the conference web page:
http://www.coretexts.org/conferences/annual-conference/

All potential conferees are welcome to contact the Executive Director of ACTC, J. Scott Lee, with questions about panels and proposals: jscottlee@prodigy.net.
government, and industry. Amplified by insights from Science, Technology, and Society studies, Roy and others examined the history, programmatic shape, international contexts, and integrative forms of Materials Research in a book-length account. In the case of OR, disciplinary boundaries of mathematics, physics, and social sciences were crossed but so were occupational professions of business and management, industrial engineering, and extra-academic hybrid groups and think tanks.

Chapter Four compares Cognitive Science and New Histories, though the section on the first case is nearly twice as long at 31 pages versus 16 for the latter. Graff likens Cognitive Science to an octopus with ubiquitous reach and New Histories to a fugitive bat appearing within disciplines. Both originated in opposition to orthodoxies, in the first instance Behavioral Science and the second conventional political and intellectual history. Cognitive Science, Graff rightly argues, reflects a faulty pattern of defining interdisciplinarity by listing disciplines rather than examining their interrelationships or questions that stimulate a new field. Moreover, it has remained multidisciplinary, in contrast to the “bounded set of questions” that made Operations Research a success story.

In the end, he concludes, Cognitive Science is interdisciplinary “only to a very limited degree.” As a result, “It is better seen as a selective form of multidisciplinarity or cross-disciplinarity within which such fields as AI and neuroscience—and a vague conception of cognitive psychology—strive for supremacy.”

When turning to New Histories, Graff contextualizes the case in a series of “turns” in scholarship and new social history that prompted new questions and borrowing methods across disciplines. His analysis of the role of the Social Science History Association as an infrastructure for

“interdisciplinary humanities” with “general education,” while also contending “The characteristics that the humanities supposedly lost are more typical of those associated with interdisciplinary domains today.” This vague claim, however, is countered by new conceptions of interdisciplinary humanities grounded in critique and in notable cases at odds with traditional values of humanities and general education. Graff dismisses the history of new developments by collapsing them into a reductive conclusion that “The history of general education is not an inspiring story,” and he discards historical accounts of the new conceptions and disciplinary relationships in literary studies, art history, and music scholarship (Klein, 83-150). Finally, he charges that “General education curricula often bill themselves as interdisciplinary but in my view none carries that mantle deservedly.” This blanket rejection, however, ignores a large body of case studies of models of integration in general education, ranging from segmented menus of disciplinary courses to fully integrated models framed by core questions and problems.

Chapter 5 takes up Cultural Studies and Materials Science (abbreviated as MSE to signal close association with Engineering). Like Operations Research, MSE walks the boundary of the academy and industry, which

Surprisingly, though, humanities receive short shift. Given the impact of New Histories on humanities disciplines and interdisciplinary fields with strong ties to humanities at least some mention was warranted.
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Graff describes as a “fluid terrain.” He presents multiple definitions, including the entry in Wikipedia, but here too would be better served here by Roy’s concept of “interactive research” and even more so expansion of the concept of “boundary work” to account for negotiating different forms of knowledge and practice across institutional sectors.

Demonstrating one of the strengths of the book, though, Graff carefully examines the role of a professional organization in providing an infrastructure for the possibility of interdisciplinarity, the Materials Research Society, and a particular institutional location, the Center for Materials Science and Engineering at MIT. While deeming MSE more successful than Cognitive Science, he concludes the case for interdisciplinarity is “built on multidisciplinarity.” The “multidiscipline” is located primarily in departments of materials science and engineering while also practiced in government and industrial laboratories.

When turning to Cultural Studies, Graff suggests this case provokes the strongest reaction of all fields that assert interdisciplinarity. He presents a number of definitions, including another questionable entry in Wikipedia, but bypasses pertinent scholarly insights into the interdisciplinarity nature of cultural studies such as Joe Moran’s (2002) reflection on the relationship of disciplines, or Giles Gunn’s (1992) typology of mapping interdisciplinary including relationships of disciplines, or a deeper understanding of the rhetoric of “anti”-, “post”-, and “trans”-disciplinarity in new conceptions of interdisciplinary humanities and the study of culture.

Chapter 6 is surprisingly short given the combination of two final case studies and a conclusion to the book in only 22 pages, versus 51 for Chapter Four. Graff contrasts the “fragmentary” nature of Bioscience to the “fiction” of interdisciplinarity in Literacy Studies.

More broadly he faults a “name game” for generating more confusion than clarity, charging “The endless typologies, classifications, and hierarchies of multi-, inter-, and transdisciplinarities are not helpful.” He himself, however, adopts a hierarchical distinction between multi- and interdisciplinarity throughout the book to reinforce integration as a primary criterion for interdisciplines.

He also fails to acknowledge consensus definitions that have emerged over the history of terminology and does not distinguish the book’s core term “interdiscipline” from the widely used terms “interdisciplinary field” and “interdisciplinary studies,” or clarify how the formation of Biology differ from other scholars’ use of “interdiscipline” in such diverse examples as information science, environmental studies, and digital humanities.

Graff also associates “so-called hyphenated fields” primarily with racial, ethnic, and gender studies without accounting for scholarship that clarifies relationships with disciplines, in for example Women’s Studies and American Studies. And, while rightly criticizing overstated rhetoric in Bioscience, he does not acknowledge the historical significance of realigning the concept of interdisciplinarity with “convergence” and “transdisciplinarity.”

Toward a Fuller Understanding of the History of Interdisciplinarity

Graff anchors his discussion of Convergence in a 32-page White
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Paper that proclaimed a Third Revolution is integrating knowledge, tools, and ways of thinking across life sciences, physical sciences, and engineering, beyond earlier interdisciplinary revolutions of Molecular and Cellular Biology and of Genomics (Sharp, et al., 2011). In concluding that Convergence is only a “pipe dream,” however, he ignores the more than 108-page report of a task force commissioned by the National Academies of Science, which appeared a year prior to publication of Undisciplining Knowledge. The report aligns this “expanded form of interdisciplinarity” and “higher level of synthesis” with transdisciplinarity in order to benchmark the formation of new macro domains of research activity that cross sectors of the academy, national laboratories, clinical settings, industry, and governmental agencies. The practices of working scientists, not abstract theory alone, reveal a “convergence-divergence” process appearing across a spectrum ranging from basic discovery to translational problem solving in areas such as biodesign, energy storage for food security, and new treatment protocols for disease. In contrast to the older linear model of research, components are also being combined and recombined.

The report is open to criticism for prioritizing product innovation, but it goes beyond “hyperbolic rhetoric” to contextualize Convergence historically, provide examples of institutional locations and organizational strategies, identify the problem- and question- foci of specific projects and programs, and grapple with obstacles to implementation (Committee, 2014).

Eschewing typology and terminology also overlooks implications of the ascendancy of transdisciplinarity. Definitions and the epistemic commitments they classify differ, but plurality does not spell cacophony. Close reading of the history of transdisciplinarity reveals three major patterns of discourse: transcendence, problem solving, and transgression.

The epistemological problem at the heart of transcendence is the idea of unity of knowledge and culture. The emergence of transdisciplinarity was not a complete departure from this historical quest, but it signalled the need for new conceptual frameworks that go beyond combining existing disciplinary approaches to generate new paradigms such as structuralism, general systems theory, phenomenology, Marxist and feminist theory, cultural critique, and a form of “transcendent interdisciplinary research” that is fostering new methodological and conceptual frameworks for health and well-being (Science of Team Science, 2008).

The discourse of problem solving, Graff correctly notes, gained visibility in World War II. However, it complexified with a new connotation of problem solving that arose in the late 1980s and early 1990s in contexts of environmental research and has now expanded across Europe, South Africa, Brazil, and Australia. This discourse highlights participation and co-production of knowledge with stakeholders in society while also crossing the categories of transcendence and transgression.

The discourse of transgressing disciplinary and institutional boundaries is strong in interdisciplinary humanities, critiques of disciplinarity, and socio-political movements for change that catalyzed new interdisciplinary fields. It is also evident in the difference between transdisciplinary problem solving involving academics and industrial partners for the purpose of product and technology development and projects involving academic experts and social actors in the name of democratic solutions to controversial problems such as sustainability and risks of technological modernizations such as nuclear power plants. A single “standard narrative” of problem solving does not account for the ethics of problem choice entailed in concluding that Convergence is only a “pipe dream,” however, he ignores the more than 108-page report of a task force commissioned by the National Academies of Science, which appeared a year prior to publication of Undisciplining Knowledge.

Continued on page 9
in the latter, which also moves beyond traditional “reliable scientific knowledge” to advance “socially robust knowledge” fostering new partnerships between the academy and society (Nowotny, et al., 2001; Klein 2015).

The strengths of Undisciplining Knowledge merit reading. However, the book’s value is undercut repeatedly by unsubstantiated generalizations. It is reasonable to assert that the history of interdisciplinarity is “littered with great expectations and disappointed hopes.” However, to further characterize it as “replete with sheer absurdity, wasteful competition, and hurtful personal invective” borders on gratuitous negativity (all the moreso when Graff himself dismisses the work of other scholars as “whiggish,” “muddled,” and “oddly blinkered”). The claim of a monolithic “standard version” is no less dubious, characterized as resembling “a morality play between interdisciplinarity’s proponents and critics, both of whom exaggerate the dangers if their views are not followed.”

Early in the book Graff singles out the US-based National Institutes of Humanities (NIH) as an exemplar of the “standard narrative,” calling a document from the Committee on a New Biology “a succinct, conflict-free, and romanticized account of a ‘great transformation’ neatly unconstrained by time, place, and historical context.” However, NIH is a large federation of institutes that do not follow a single view of interdisciplinarity or priorities for basic versus applied research and single investigators versus teams.

Moreover, case studies of NIH-funded research depict differences of context while testing claims of interdisciplinarity. No less sweeping is indicting “the fallacies of multidisciplinary ‘wars’ on poverty, cancer, drugs, history, communication, the human genome, and on and on.” Graff concedes outcomes have produced invaluable gains but argues they pale in comparison to “more coordinated careful problem- and question-driven interdisciplinarity.”

Yet again, the literature contains numerous studies that are problem- and question-focused. To cite just one notable example, Kessel, Rosenfield, and Anderson’s (2003) edited collection features cases at the boundaries of health and social sciences, including innovations in cardiovascular health and disease, neuroscience, HIV/AIDS, mental health, and human development.

The most astonishing claim for members of AIS will be Graff’s dismissal of the organization, [concluding that] the Association is nothing more than “a miscellany of additive and multiplicative disciplinarities that cannot substitute for problems, questions, and intellectual relationships of knowledge, theory, method and practice.”

Graff’s dismissal of the organization. Citing edited collections by William Newell and Joseph Kockelmans, plus program descriptions and sample syllabi on the AIS website, he concludes the Association is nothing more than “a miscellany of additive and multiplicative disciplinarities that cannot substitute for problems, questions, and intellectual relationships of knowledge, theory, method and practice.” Thus, “AIS fosters diversity, multidisciplinarity, and nondisciplinarity, not interdisciplinarity.” This characterization is not accurate, given the Association’s centering of integration as the cornerstone of interdisciplinary research and education in its sponsored publications and conferences.

In the first footnote of the book Graff announces his intention to publish a separate critique of the literature and discourse of interdisciplinarity. Any credible account, though, will require engaging rather than dismissing valuable contributions to the literature.

To cite only a few final examples, Chapter Two raises important questions about the identity of Communication as a discipline, multidiscipline, interdisciplinary, postdiscipline, nondiscipline, or professional field. However, it overlooks David Scholle’s (1995) careful distinctions across identities.
Ironically, in light of the epigraph of the book, Roberta Frank’s claim of origin for the Social Science Research Council in the 1920s is missing as well, countering the premise of “standard” origin story in World War II. Also lacking are insights from chapters in The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity pertinent to Graff’s case studies: especially Calhoun and Rhoten on integrating social sciences, Sheila Jasanoff on Science and Technology Studies, Paul Thagard on Cognitive Science, Carl Mitcham and Anne Balsamo on ethics, and Hirsch-Hadorn, Pohl, and Bammer on transdisciplinary problem solving (Frodeman, Klein, and Mitcham, 2010). Missing as well are insights on the interdisciplinary nature of Cognitive Science in a book on interdisciplinary collaboration (“Studies,” 2005). Early in the book Graff asks for a “fair hearing and judgment” of his project. He deserves it, but so do others whose work should not be ignored or distorted.

References

* The Resources link on the Association for Interdisciplinary Studies website includes multiple works accounting for the history of interdisciplinarity, case studies of practices and institutional contexts, and consensus definitions of terminology, http://wwwp.oakland.edu/ais/resources/ais-connected-publications-on-interdisciplinarity/; for one example of comparative studies Klein, 2006, 87-132.


Checkmate—a single synaptic flash of well-schooled intuition! But beyond the exquisite cognition of the end game, lies the finesse of fingers & wrist in motion: a multitude of cellular slaves lifting the Queen high above the King’s final resting place.

Biological inquiry is cordial in its social discourse but a bit rough and edgy around the cellular membranes: You think doing the tango with an excited electron is taxing? Try enticing an ever evasive evolutionary virus into a vaccinating embrace.

Knocking on the door of Nothingness… It’s no cosmic joke: It’s the existential blood sucker of perplexity! And not the ‘nothingness’ of the—quirky quantum—field theory which is really nothing, but oscillations of variable variables—a quasi-religious science, striking up an expose pose.

To really knock on Nothingness is to venture what one will hear within the void, when no—physical or energetic—thing seems to be, even frowning back at you… Do you dare to believe in the non-existence of belief?

By John F. Decarlo

John F. Decarlo, Associate Professor, Writing Studies, Hofstra University, has authored a monograph in Hamlet Studies, two collections of poems, and is the poet in residence with the Long Island Philosophical Society. He teaches writing in a film and philosophy cluster, and recently received the Chancellor’s Award for Teaching Excellence.
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About AIS
The Association for Interdisciplinary Studies is the U.S.-based international professional association devoted to interdisciplinary teaching (including service learning), research, program administration, and public policy. Interdisciplinarity integrates the insights of knowledge domains to produce a more comprehensive understanding of complex problems, issues, or questions. AIS serves as an organized professional voice and source of information on interdisciplinary approaches and the integration of insights from diverse communities to address complex problems in education and research. Founded in 1979, it is incorporated as a non-profit 501(c)3 educational association in the state of Ohio.

ON THE WEB:
www.oakland.edu/ais

WHAT’S NEW
Find the latest news about the Association and interdisciplinary studies.

CONFERENCES
The 2016 AIS Conference will be held Oct. 27-30 at the University of Ottawa in Canada.

PUBLICATIONS
Find current and past editions of Integrative Pathways, Issues in Interdisciplinary Studies, and other publications.

RESOURCES
Resources include the 2nd edition of Intentionally Interdisciplinary: Master’s Interdisciplinary Program Directory, SOTL section, Peer-reviewed Syllabi, and more.

MEMBERSHIPS
It’s time to renew your membership for 2016.