

# INTEGRATED STUDIES

Michael Hinden

"The ILS Program"

Challenges to the  
College Curriculum

Edited by

Stephen H. Dill

Preface by

James M. Banner, Jr.

Introduction by

Theodore L. Gross

UNIVERSITY  
PRESS OF  
AMERICA



Copyright © 1982 by

University Press of America, Inc.

P.O. Box 19101, Washington, D.C. 20036

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Integrated studies.

Bibliography: p.  
Contents: The Ph. D. program in the humanities / Leon  
Golden -- The Master of Arts in humanities / Bettie Anne  
Doebler -- Interdisciplinary education at an upper  
division college / William J. Mahar -- [etc.]  
1. Universities and colleges--United States--  
Curricula--Addresses, essays, lectures. 2. Education,  
Humanistic--United States--Curricula--Addresses, essays,  
lectures. I. Dill, Stephen H.  
LB2361.5.157. 1982 378'.1998'0973 82-17511

ISBN 0-8191-2794-9

ISBN 0-8191-2795-7 (pbk.)



Steinberg, "The Eye is a Part of the Mind," In Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art (New York: Oxford, 1972), 289-306.

THE INTEGRATED LIBERAL STUDIES PROGRAM  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON

33 Zwoboda, "Disciplines," in Kockelmans, Interdisciplinarity, pp. 82-83.

The Recent Crisis

In April of 1979, acting on the advice of his Academic Planning Committee, the Dean of the College of Letters and Science decided to terminate the Integrated Liberal Studies Program (ILS), a two-year general education sequence that has operated at the University of Wisconsin since 1948 and which therefore was one of the oldest continuing programs of its kind in the nation. Noting that ILS had rendered a unique service to the College and had provided some of its most innovative teaching, Dean E. David Cronon commented on the program's performance in recent years and cited these reasons for his decision:

- 1) declining enrollment, particularly in the sophomore year;
- 2) lack of apparent faculty interest;
- 3) loss of a cohesive vision in the curriculum and consensus as to future direction.

However, the Faculty Senate of the College, meeting in November, recommended instead that ILS be reduced to a one-year freshman program and continued on an interim basis, pending further consideration. An ad-hoc committee (the third in a decade) was appointed by the Dean to evaluate the future of the troubled program.

At the same time, a small group of faculty who previously had not been involved in ILS volunteered to join several of the experienced faculty in developing new courses and restructuring the curriculum. When I became the Chairman in February, 1980, it was agreed that we would alter the basic structure of the program, that we would actively recruit additional colleagues from the tenured ranks, and that we would work closely with the new evaluating committee in drafting our proposals. In December, 1980, the committee reported to the Dean, endorsing our plan for a new Integrated Liberal Studies Program. We are now in the process of implementing that plan. ILS continues on an interim basis and will be re-evaluated in 1983-84.

What follows is a more detailed history of the program and an account of our attempt to redesign it. Because many of the difficulties that beset ILS in the

### Meiklejohn's Philosophy

1970s were shared by interdisciplinary programs at other institutions, our experience may be of significance to educators elsewhere. Wisconsin is an interesting study in this regard. On more than one occasion questions have been raised regarding the mission of an interdisciplinary program, its internal organization, and its relation to the College of Letters and Science as a whole. As one of the major research centers in the nation, the University naturally promotes a structure most responsive to specialization through departments. How, then, to design a program of general education compatible with the characteristics of a large university dominated by its prestigious graduate school and pre-professional programs? In recent years the problem grew acute, but this issue has been a continuing one on the Madison campus for better than half a century.

#### The Meiklejohn Experimental College, 1927-1932

For this reason it may be useful to consider the problems facing ILS in light of past developments. To do so, we must begin in 1925. Those familiar with the history of general education in the United States may be curious as to the relation between the ILS program and the famous Meiklejohn Experimental College, which preceded it. It is true that the two programs are linked historically, but whereas they may have shared a common purpose (that of general education), in specific respects they were quite dissimilar.

Alexander Meiklejohn already had established a reputation as a controversial educator when he was invited by President Glenn Frank in 1925 to come to Wisconsin with the purpose of establishing a "college within a college" to experiment with educational policy. The "college" opened in 1927, charged with criticizing, at least implicitly, the university that housed it. The experiment featured special "outside" faculty imported by Meiklejohn to teach in the program; shared office space and dormitory accommodations for faculty and students; a segregated (and all-male) student population; tutorials instead of lectures; modules rather than semester sequences; a common reading list for the entire college; and policies regarding grading and attendance that differed markedly from standard practice. The chief and most radical aim of the experiment was to fuse together the intellectual and social activities of the students.

Meiklejohn believed that the purpose of education was to build intelligence, not to disseminate knowledge or professional skills. The college, he argued, should be "as much and as little interested in the making of scholars as it is in the making of bankers, legislators, grocers, or the followers of any other specialized occupation or profession."<sup>1</sup> He asserted also that "a college is a group of people, all of whom are reading the same books."<sup>2</sup> In effect, participants found themselves immersed in an intense, two-year theme course in which everyone studied a unified reading list focusing on the comparison between classical Greek and present day American society. The program was divided into six-week segments, during which students discussed government, economics, literature, the arts, and philosophy, with an aim toward "integrating" the material they read. Writing assignments were frequent. Provisions were made also for inclusion of the physical sciences in the curriculum. Meiklejohn estimated that students by the end of the sophomore year had completed the equivalent of 5 semester courses in economics, politics, and other social studies;  $4\frac{1}{2}$  semester courses of literature and the arts;  $3\frac{1}{2}$  semester courses of philosophy and religion; 3 semester courses of science; 1 semester course of general introduction to college work; and 3 semester courses of "special papers" (or independent study).<sup>3</sup> As an example of the latter, each student in 1928 was required to undertake an analysis of the political, economic, and cultural life of his home town, keeping in mind what he had learned about Athenian civilization.

#### Failure of the Experiment

At its peak, the Experimental College enrolled 155 students. According to the testimony of some of these graduates, the program was enormously stimulating. But the college also encouraged rivalry and dissension. Whatever were the fruits of Meiklejohn's experiment, the idea of a separate college with separate policies for a "special" group of undergraduates did not root well in Wisconsin soil. The college, as critics observed, attracted a larger proportion of out of state students than did other units at the University; there were free-thinkers, artists, a few socialists, and a visible Jewish population from the East. This cluster discomfited provincial constituencies on campus and in the state legislature. Too, certain students outside the program resented the fact that the Experimental college

dispensed with the usual semester grades.

Personality also played a part in the college's demise. Although Meiklejohn won the loyalty of his students, he failed to forge reciprocal relations with his colleagues in other departments. His procedures--indeed, the very existence of the College--threatened to undermine departmental hegemony. Often where tact might have served, Meiklejohn barged ahead. For example, chairmen were asked to absorb Meiklejohn's faculty into their own departments and then to grant them release time to teach in the experimental program. More than a little resentment accompanied Meiklejohn's proposal to set salaries for his faculty at higher rates than those current in the regular departments. Finally --and above all--there were not many on campus who actually subscribed to his philosophy. As the Depression worsened, the perception grew that the College was an unaffordable luxury, and each year Meiklejohn's support decreased. In 1932, after a colorful half-decade during which Meiklejohn received more favorable notice outside the community than within it (which sometimes is the case with prophets), the Experimental College closed its doors.

#### The Integrated Liberal Studies Program, 1948-1979: Founding

In the period of growth on the Madison campus following the Second World War, there arose considerable faculty interest in reviving the principle of general education, although the concept of a separate college based on the Meiklejohn model was now deemed undesirable. In this context ILS was established--sixteen years after the Meiklejohn experiment ended.<sup>4</sup> Following a general review of the Letters and Science curriculum, a committee appointed by Dean Mark Graham in 1946, chaired by Professor Frederick Ogg, proposed a two-year program that came to be called Integrated Liberal Studies. Its declared purpose was "to help students see the interrelationships between the various areas of specialization." The program was organized in 1947 and went into effect in 1948, chaired by Professor Robert Pooley of the Department of English. Initially enrollment was restricted to 300 students per class to encourage close contact and informal relations with the faculty. But these students did not constitute a group separate from the rest of the campus, and they were governed by normal university regulations. Many other features of the program owed their existence to the memory of the

failed Experimental College. Courses were taught in the traditional way with lectures, examinations, and grades. The integrating theme was history, and the courses taken as follows:

<u>First Year</u>	
Greek and Roman Culture (4 credits).	Walter Agard,
Paul MacKendrick.	Medieval and Renaissance Culture (3 credits).
Gaines Post.	Early Man and His Society. (3 credits).
William W. Howells.	Transition to Industrial Society (4 credits).
Robert Reynolds.	Arch Gerlach,
Physical Universe (6 credits).	Aaron Ihde.
Aaron Ihde.	English Composition (4 credits).
<u>Second Year</u>	
European Culture, 1750-1850 (4 credits).	Robert Pooley.
Recent American Culture (3 credits).	Frederick Hoffman.
Modern Industrial Society (4 credits).	James Early.
The International Scene (3 credits).	Llewellyn Pfankuchen.
Biology (7 credits).	C. Leonard Huskins, Lowell E. Noland.

The curriculum for the second year once again placed stress on social issues, but compared to the Meiklejohn curriculum, this emphasis was much reduced. Finally, to mark the program clearly as part of the College of Letters and Science, ILS adopted a departmental structure in conformity with normal college practice. A key provision was that its faculty were to be "borrowed" from other traditional or "home" departments.

#### Borrowed Faculty

In this way, the organizers of ILS addressed the problem of "outside faculty" that had proved so distressing under Meiklejohn. As far as could be seen, this policy was sound. However, no satisfactory mechanism was established to evaluate the work and teaching loads of borrowed faculty or to provide funds outside departmental budgets for merit increases or other faculty support; nor were reciprocal relationships

established with the home departments regarding the important matters of promotion and/or nonretention. To this extent the new ILS program inherited Meiklejohn's dilemma. Later, failure to resolve these issues resulted in a pattern of disincentives for those faculty who might be interested in teaching in the program yet who naturally were concerned with normal progress in their careers.

Nevertheless, owing largely to the efforts of the original ILS faculty, many of whom had distinguished themselves in their respective fields, the program functioned with notable success, acclaim, and student interest for better than a generation. The founders had a clear vision of their goals and seemed spurred by their collective purpose. They met frequently for discussion and occasionally monitored each other's courses. By all accounts, the level of teaching in ILS was high. In addition, an active faculty-student social life developed in the 1940s. Lectures, coffee-hours, "Firesides" in faculty homes, and other group events generated cohesion in the program. Obviously, these events reflected a willingness on the part of faculty members to devote a good portion of their time to ILS-related activities. In these years the program thrived.

#### Faculty Attrition

Only gradually did negative trends appear. In the mid-1960's, the generation of founding faculty reached retirement age (12 of the original 14 faculty had remained with the program from the start), and it proved difficult to replace them. Evidently their dedication had long sustained a system that was ill-designed for self-renewal. Those who did enter the program in the '60s labored against odds; for the first time faculty turnover was high. It then became necessary to recruit lecturers who were not regular tenure-track faculty, a situation that the founders of ILS had hoped to avoid. Later this problem was underscored by the case of a popular lecturer in ILS who, having no home department outside the program, could not be renewed. Graduate assistants were called upon to assume a higher proportion of teaching duties in the program; on this basis some administrators questioned the quality and level of instruction. It is difficult to assess the facts in this matter, but one pattern was definite: as senior faculty left, it became increasingly difficult to recruit full-time faculty from the home departments, which controlled the reward-system of the college. It became even more difficult to maintain the cohesive

integration between courses that had characterized the program in the early years. Here and there excellent new courses were added, but often in a fashion tailored more to the interests of the volunteering instructor than to the overall concept of the curriculum. Thus, faculty attrition was the first indication of decline.

#### Enrollment Decline

A second negative trend was an alarming decline in student enrollment. About 200 freshmen entered the program in 1948, while a high of 415 enrolled in 1965. But throughout the late '60s and the '70s, the numbers fell, and precipitously in the sophomore year. Only a small percentage of the entering freshman class remained to complete the program, as evidenced in the following table:

TABLE 1

Approximate Enrollments in ILS, 1965-1979

Year entering UW	Freshman Sem. 1	Freshman Sem. 2	Sophomore Sem. 1	Sophomore Sem. 2
1965	415	327	137	129
1966	346	221	116	80
1967	266	186	86	73
1968	269	161	91	70
1969	230	140	89	61
1970	301	119	75	58
1971	172	123	83	65
1972	180	129	72	48
1973	171	106	63	42
1974	173	106	53	43
1975	186	107	45	43
1976	141	66	54	43
1977	176	121	68	26
1978	163	112	57	?
1979	168	79	--	--

#### Politics

Finally, the social turmoil of the early seventies --in competition with the demands for even greater professional training on the campus--brought a variety of pressures to bear on ILS that were impossible to balance. Job-conscious undergraduates gravitated away from the program toward departments whose offerings fit their prospective careers, while activists, drawn to the program by its image of "alternative education," balked at its historical organization, expecting more "socially relevant" courses. Again, as in the Meiklejohn years, political tempers flared. Residents murmured darkly about "out-of-state troublemakers." Faculty drifted away, some bitter. In these years there were frequent debates about curricular reform, but no clear consensus emerged. While it is true that by 1979 many of these special stresses had been eased, the chronic problems remained unsolved. The faculty had lost much of its original unity of purpose, and so had the students. Fine teaching and dedicated leadership were not enough to stem continued enrollment losses and administration ire.

#### Requirements as Deterrents

The relatively inflexible requirements of the program served as deterrents to enrollment. Students were asked to commit themselves to 25 credits of ILS courses in the first year and 21 in the second. The program required concurrent registration in at least two ILS courses each semester, and 36 credits had to be completed by the end of the sophomore year. Many of these were 4-credit courses, which meant that 8 to 12 credits of the normal 15-credit undergraduate load had to be reserved for ILS. As requirements changed at the College level, it became difficult for students to find room in their schedules for such large blocks of time. Specifically, the institution of a foreign language requirement (1964) and a more stringent mathematics requirement in the College of Letters and Science discouraged incoming students from committing themselves to a two-year program not geared to meeting those requirements. Mounting prerequisites for most majors, pressures for early declaration of a major, and above all, an increasing emphasis throughout the College on specialization and professionalism, combined to erode enrollments in the program.

## The New Integrated Liberal Studies Program: Reforms

These were the issues confronting us as we met to restructure the program in the fall of 1980. Certainly the problems were daunting, but we had the advantage of starting fresh, an immediate crisis to motivate us, and the assurance that we could not possibly make matters worse. The publicity surrounding the near-demise of the program had been a spur to faculty recruitment; that much we recognized from our own response. Other potential volunteers were identified by word of mouth. We sought colleagues who had demonstrated a genuine enthusiasm for undergraduate teaching as well as a cast of mind congenial to interdisciplinary thought. It was our policy to approach only tenured faculty from the disciplines to avoid any repetition of past controversies over non-tenure track appointments. We also wanted to prevent junior faculty from joining at possible damage to their positions in the home departments during their probationary years. The results of this recruiting campaign were more successful than we had expected.

### Personnel

Of the continuing faculty, Herbert Howe and Barry Powell, both classicists, had team-taught a course in Greek and Roman culture, combining history, literature, and art. Another colleague, Gretchen Schoff, taught a popular theme course called "The Interpretation of Technology in Literature," which we wanted to retain. With this link to the past, precedent was set for two kinds of interdisciplinary courses in the new curriculum: historical sequences in the mode of history of ideas, and what later we decided to call contemporary topics courses to build upon and follow them.

When, early on, Daniel Siegel and David Lindberg, two historians of science, joined the planning group, the concept of historical sequences received additional support. In this sense, personnel was destiny.

We soon agreed that our primary aim would be to offer an inducement to students to satisfy a good portion of their breadth requirements from ILS courses, but we lacked representatives from the natural and physical sciences and also from the social sciences. We therefore went on to recruit in these areas, now with a better idea of what was needed. Robert March (Physics), Timothy Allen (Botany), and Charles Anderson (Political Science) joined, followed later by Robert

Sack (Geography) and Joseph Elder (Sociology). Thus, over the year, the Planning committee expanded, and in weekly meetings we discussed course proposals with one another and set priorities for the curriculum. John Lyons (English) and Haskell Fain (Philosophy) also participated. At one time or another, Fourteen faculty were involved.

### Educational Philosophy

In retrospect, it seems unusual that we spent so little time discussing educational philosophy, but we proceeded on the assumption that practical solutions were needed for immediate problems. As Dr. Johnson once remarked: "Depend upon it, sir, when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully." Indeed, there was remarkable unanimity in our thinking. We all seemed comfortable with the goals of the former program, which were to counter the fragmentation of undergraduate education and to provide a common ground of learning. We now considered how best to achieve these goals. We concluded that busy students in the '80s might well be attracted to a "package" of integrated courses as an alternative to the wide array of unrelated electives scattered across the College Catalog.

The one question that we discussed at length was what we meant by "integration." Consistently, answers were framed in terms of what we felt we could teach best. We determined, first, that integration would be provided both within the separate courses by means of their interdisciplinary focus--resulting, perhaps in some unfortunately long course titles--and, second that integration would be provided within the program as a whole by connecting the courses through a pattern of related sequences. These were the guidelines to which we referred whenever questions arose regarding the suitability of any course. The entire faculty, it should be noted, discussed in detail the syllabus of each new course proposed. As Robert March has remarked: "this process was in itself an intellectually broadening and stimulating experience." At least that was true for those of us who boarded early; later shipmates found a crew to greet them--and had the benefit of a corresponding increase in constructive comments.

During this period we produced only a scant paragraph of dogma: "As in the past, ILS accepts its mission to integrate undergraduate education by emphasizing interdisciplinary courses as valuable in them-

selves and as a necessary background for more specialized work in the student's later years. We affirm the principles of general education and aim to provide an overview of important themes, ideas, and developments in Western civilization. We hope thereby to provide a sense of continuity for students who will go on to choose a variety of majors.

#### Interim Program

But if our proposal appeared modest, we had undertaken a fundamental remodeling of the program. The continuing courses were altered so as to fit better with the new ones; two courses were adapted from other departments; and eight new courses were developed and introduced. During 1980-81, freshmen were presented with an "interim" program consisting of some old and some transitional courses, while the concept of a sophomore year was dropped temporarily from the curriculum. Simultaneously the new courses were submitted for approval to the Executive Committee of the three Faculty Divisions of the College (Humanities, Physical Sciences, Social Studies) charged with such review. A few of these proposals led to negotiations with department heads who objected to possible infringement of their subject matters, but in the end, the courses were approved. The new curriculum as a whole, along with a plan to alter radically the structure of the program, was then presented to the ad hoc Committee on General Education that had been appointed by the Dean. In December, 1980, this committee, chaired by Professor Leonard Berkowitz of the Department of Psychology, endorsed our proposals and so reported to the Dean, who agreed to extend the program at least through 1983-84.

#### Structural Revisions

The new curriculum, which came into effect in the fall of 1981, is geared toward satisfying the breadth requirements of the College of Letters and Science. A total of 12 credits is offered in each of the subject areas (humanities, natural sciences, social studies) as defined by these requirements. The courses, which are discussed in greater detail below, are distributed as follows (H=humanities credit; L=literature credit; N=natural science credit; S=social studies credit; P=physical science credit; B=biological science credit):

- 200: Critical Thinking and Expression. 3 cr.
- (H) Sem. I.
- 201-202: Western Culture: Science, Technology,

203-204:	Philosophy 3-3 cr. (N) Sem. I & II. Western Culture: Literature and the Arts. 3-3 cr. (H) (L) Sem. I & II.
205-206:	Western Culture: Political, Economic, and Social Thought. 3-3 cr. (S) Sem. I & II.
251:	Contemporary Physical Sciences. 3 cr.
	(P) Sem. I.
252:	Contemporary Life Sciences. 3 cr. (B)
	Sem. II.
254:	Literature and Contemporary Issues. 3 cr. (H) (L) Sem. II.
255-265:	Contemporary Social Sciences. 3-3 cr. (S) Sem. I & II.

Each course in the program has been reduced uniformly to 3 credits; the requirement of concurrent registration in two or more courses has been dropped; and courses are now open to any student in any year. The thrust of these several structural revisions is to permit flexibility in distributing ILS courses over the full four-year undergraduate program. To further encourage students who begin as freshmen to stay with the program, a certificate now is awarded, with designation noted on the final transcript, to students who complete 21 credits of ILS courses. The certificate attests to the student's accomplishment in completing a program of interdisciplinary study in addition to a major. It is possible that such notation may be of interest to employers or to graduate schools insofar as breadth in a candidate is considered a desired trait.

#### Requirements as Incentives

Recognizing that today's student is preoccupied with professional goals, we have tried, in other words, to match the benefits of ILS with student interests. It may be that students with well-defined professional goals will avail themselves only of those ILS courses outside their major areas, but it is too early to tell if indeed this will be the pattern. Under this more flexible arrangement, the occasional student can benefit from ILS courses, too, whether or not he or she elects to participate in the full program. Obviously, we hope to increase enrollments by these strategies and to remove the deterrents associated with the previous requirements.

## Students

Student response after a year has been encouraging. Total enrollment in ILS courses in the fall semester increased from 487 in 1980 to 580 in 1981, and there were even waiting lists in some courses. Registration in the spring semester of 1981 was even more dramatic. In 1980-81, only 247 continued in the second semester. In 1981-82, there were 470. Of course, it is difficult to compare these figures to past years when all ILS students were enrolled in several courses concurrently. (In 1980, 192 students accounted for the total registration of 487 throughout the various courses). But more sophomores and upperclassmen now appear on our registration lists, and that is a cause for optimism.

Who are the new ILS students? It would be difficult to characterize them. Most are Wisconsin residents. Some are extremely enthusiastic, but although our freshmen seem more curious and more highly motivated than their peers, as a group they do not appear to be necessarily more able or better prepared. The upperclassmen are diverse. A small number from the University's new Medical Scholars program is enrolled, but these have not made their presence noticeable as did the Ford Foundation scholars in the 1950s, who contributed to the image of ILS as an elite, competitive enclave. We do not wish to revive that reputation. Student-faculty relations so far have been excellent.

## Faculty

Regarding faculty, ILS now has at its core a new group of volunteers who have a stake in the program that they have initiated. Camraderie at present is strong. We all feel the benefits of interacting with colleagues from other disciplines, and all would say that the challenge of designing a curriculum has been stimulating. But history suggests that no structure can rely indefinitely on enthusiasm. To address this concern, we have asked the administration to find means of crediting ILS workload to the home department of each instructor. In this way, faculty will continue to contribute to the workload of their departments, and they will receive credit for the students that they teach. Inasmuch as this will increase the credit-hour base of the departments, those departments may be more willing in the future to allow their faculty to teach in ILS. We believe that such an arrangement--which in a sense pays interest to the departments from which faculty are borrowed--is important to the long-range

health of an interdisciplinary program in a university organized along disciplinary lines. For voting purposes, all "loaned" faculty actually teaching in the ILS program, or who have taught in it within the preceding two academic years, are members of the ILS Executive Committee. All lecturers in ILS are tenured in their home departments. Those departments currently represented on the ILS faculty include: Classics, English, General Engineering, History of Science, Physics, Botany, Political Science, Geography, Sociology and Philosophy.

## Curriculum

The new curriculum, reflecting this diversity, offers a set of introductory courses that are organized historically, tracing the achievements of Western civilization from antiquity to the modern period. Taken concurrently, ILS 201-206 provide a synoptic view of literature and the arts; science, technology, and philosophy; and political, economic and social thought. Wherever possible, the syllabi for these courses have been synchronized, so that students may be able to make connections on a weekly basis. The remaining courses in the natural sciences, social studies, and the humanities cover contemporary topics. By contrast, these courses are more loosely orchestrated, and some are arranged thematically. In the sciences, one course is physical and the other biological, as required by the College's breadth requirements. Rounding out the curriculum is a communications skills course that serves the entire program. A brief description of each course follows:

### ILS 200 Critical Thinking and Expression

The three modes of argument and expression: verbal, visual, numerical. Critical thinking about how these modes are structured and used. Practice in, and interpretation of, the three modes. Gretchen Schoff (General Engineering) and others.

### ILS 201 Western Culture: Science, Technology, Philosophy I.

Western science and technology in the making. Major developments, viewed in their philosophical and social context, from antiquity to the 17th century. David Lindberg (History of Science).

ILS 202 Western Culture: Science, Technology, Philosophy II.

Introduction to selected basic themes in modern physical and biological science in historical context (late 17th to early 20th centuries); interactions with technology, philosophy and society. Daniel Siegel (History of Science).

ILS 203 Western Culture: Literature and the Arts I.

The development of literature and the arts in the ancient and medieval world: Akhmaton's Egypt, Homer's Troy, Euripides' Athens, Virgil's Rome, Dante's Florence. Literature and art in the context of society and ideas. Barry Powell (Classics).

ILS 204 Western Culture: Literature and the Arts II.

The development of literature and the arts from the Renaissance to the modern Period, such figures as Shakespeare and Michelangelo through T.S. Eliot and Picasso. Literature and art in the context of society and ideas. Michael Hinden (English).

ILS 205 Western Culture: Political, Economic and Social Thought I.

The development of Western political, economic and social thought, from its origins in classic Greece and the Judaean-Christian tradition, through Rome and the Medieval Period, to the Renaissance and Reformation. Charles Anderson (Political Science).

ILS 206 Western Culture: Political, Economic and Social Thought II.

The development of Western political, economic and social thought from the Reformation to the present day: the origins, logic and evolution of Liberalism, Marxism and organic conservatism as the principal systems of thought of the modern age. Charles Anderson.

ILS 251 Contemporary Physical Sciences.

Twentieth century physical theory and its applications in the physical sciences and technology. Relativity and the quantum theory; modern cosmology

and astrophysics; the quantum basis of chemistry and molecular biology; nuclear physics and nuclear power technology; quarks and gluons; some philosophical problems connected with these theories. Robert March (Physics).

ILS 252 Contemporary Life Sciences

A systems-oriented approach to the interrelation of plants and humans in their evolution and cultural development; an historical geographic perspective concluding with a consideration of eco-systems in 20th century America. Timothy Allen (Botany).

ILS 254 Literature and Contemporary Issues. Topic: The Interpretation of Technology in Literature.

Examination of the world of modern science and technology as the literary artist sees it. Study of writers who have confronted and interpreted the implications of new creations: the computer, the spaceship, nuclear power, biological manipulation. Gretchen SchoFF.

ILS 255 Contemporary Social Sciences I: The Analysis of Social Issues

The critical use of systematic methods of social, political, economic, and ethical inquiry in analyzing social issues and in making deliberate and informed judgments about them. Joseph Elder (Sociology); Haskell Fain (Philosophy).

ILS 256 Contemporary Social Sciences II: Theories and Methods.

Introduction to the scope of human behavior and perspectives and modes of analysis employed by contemporary social science including anthropology, economics, human geography, history, political science, psychology, and sociology. Robert Sack (Geography).

A visualization of the curriculum with reference to the breadth requirements, as drawn by Professor Siegel, is given in Table 2.

A casual comparison of this curriculum to the original ILS curriculum of 1948 might lead to the conclusion that the former curriculum served as a model. It is interesting that no reference was made to the old curriculum during our planning process, and we were surprised to discover the parallels later. Of course, if one is to assume an historical model for an integrated curriculum, certain developments are likely to follow. Moreover, it may be that the historical model is the approach best suited to the Madison campus, where faculty are compartmentalized by research units, many of which are organized along historical lines.

Another aspect of the curriculum worth noticing is its apparent emphasis on science. In fact, science is featured no more prominently than the humanities or social studies, but it certainly is given equal weight. Indeed, one strength of the new program is that the courses integrating science with the other disciplines are actually taught by faculty with science backgrounds. For this reason, we have been permitted to offer these courses for science credit. This service should prove particularly attractive to students majoring in the liberal arts or social studies. So far, enrollments in the literature courses still exceed those in the science courses--but we do expect increases in these areas.

#### Course in Critical Thinking

One particular innovation in the new curriculum is the "Critical Thinking and Expression" course. Geared to the entering freshman, it stresses analytical and interpretative skills and offers practice in written and oral communication. This is now the only team-taught course in the program, and it is probably the most experimental. The course meets once a week for lecture and twice for workshop exercises in small sections. In the fall of 1981, seven faculty participated, each lecturing in blocks of approximately two weeks. Topics included the use of rhetorical techniques in composition, some principles of logic, characteristics of propaganda, manipulation of statistics and the approach to literature and art as "meaning systems." The objective of the course is to stimulate the students' analytical powers and to provide an introduction to the array of subjects that are treated at greater length elsewhere in the program. Overall, student response, as measured by written evaluations, has been favorable.

TABLE 2 Integrated Liberal Studies (ILS) Program University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1981-82			
	Natural Sciences (12 cr.)	Humanities (12 cr.)	Social Studies (12 cr.)
Foundation Course		200 Critical Thinking & Expression	
Historical Sequences	201 Western Culture: Science, Technology, Philosophy I  202 Western Culture: Science, Technology, Philosophy II	203 Western Culture: Literature and the Arts I  204 Western Culture: Literature and the Arts II	205 Western Culture: Political, Economic, and Social Thought I  206 Western Culture: Political, Economic and Social Thought II
Contemporary Sequences	251 Contemporary Physical Sciences  252 Contemporary Life Sciences		255 Contemporary Social Sciences I  256 Contemporary Social Sciences II

Format

In teaching format, the other courses in the program do not differ from standard practice in the university. The normal pattern of two lectures, one discussion, is adhered to (except in courses where there are labs), and grading policies are traditional. Some classes are small, but some are quite large (for example, in 1981-82, the first semester of "Literature and the Arts" enrolled 200). It would be fair to say that, in comparison with former years, the emphasis in ILS now lies more in integrating subject matter than in promoting an alternative educational environment. Certain options in that area have been foreclosed by local history.

Nevertheless, members of the faculty have commented that the "feel" of an integrated program is pleasureably different from that of a regular department, and we are aware of the desirability of maintaining close student-faculty contact, as was the case in former years. We suspect that this will become more difficult to achieve as enrollments increase (if they do) and as students spread their coursework over four years instead of registering concurrently, as they used to, for three or four courses at a time. However, we hope to create a core of dedicated students by means of our certificate offered to those who complete 21 credits by graduation. Presently we are discussing other methods of increasing cohesiveness and continuity in the program. It is still too early to predict what consequences our revisions will have in this area.

#### The Future

Ahead of us lie related difficulties (assuming that we are extended after 1984). For many years ILS enjoyed the services of an advisor who recruited students during the University's summer orientation program and who continued to counsel those students throughout their undergraduate careers. The current advisor, Dr. Evelyn Howe, retires at the end of the 1981-82 academic year, along with her husband, Professor Herbert Howe. Both will be missed. Moreover, for budgetary reasons, the advisor's position will not be renewed. This loss will impose an added burden on faculty time (which already is strained between ILS and the individual's home department) in the area of advising. And because in the past the advisor also acted as a liaison between faculty and students, the loss will further add to the problem of maintaining contact and cohesiveness.

As we look ahead, other areas of concern include increasing the rewards to faculty who donate their time; providing for replacements when faculty go on leave; generating publicity concerning changes in the program; and of course, ensuring quality instruction, by which we must be judged. Indeed, over the long run it may be more difficult to maintain the program than it was to create it; twice before, that has proved to be the case.

Yet in each instance, faculty at the University of Wisconsin, Madison have renewed their dedication to the principle of general education. In the future, it may become necessary for others to do so once again. In the 1980s it falls to the current group of ILS faculty to build a program suitable to the times. In our efforts we seem to have adopted, almost without realizing it, Meiklejohn's essential goal: "Our primary task is to see, and to help students to see, subjects in their relations."<sup>5</sup> But the structure that is evolving here will not resemble greatly the former ILS program that many alumni recall. Of course, we owe a great debt to the past. As we continue to build and experiment, we increasingly grow to appreciate the idealism and the tenacity of our predecessors.

Michael Hinden  
Integrated Liberal Studies  
Program

HUMANITIES ON THE BORDER: A SPECIAL  
INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM FOR A UNIQUE LOCALE  
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, EL PASO

Footnotes

1 Alexander Meiklejohn, The Experimental College  
(New York: Arno Press, 1971), p. 15.

2 Ibid., p. 40.

3 Ibid., p. 106.

4 Much of the information concerning the early history of TTS has been drawn from Samuel Kellams, U.S. An Analysis of a General Education Program at the University of Wisconsin (Ph.D. dissertation, Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin, 1971).

5 Meiklejohn, p. 164.

Neither the *raison d'être* nor the conceptual framework within which the Interdisciplinary Humanities Program in Border Studies at The University of Texas at El Paso developed are intelligible without some consideration of the history of The University, its location on the United States-Mexico border, and the formation of the Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center at this University.

The University was founded in 1913 as the State School of Mines on what is now the Fort Bliss Military Reservation. After a seriously destructive fire, the school moved in 1916 to the present campus in the foothills of the Franklin Mountains overlooking the Rio Grande and Juárez, Mexico, on the other side of the river.

Among the important dates in the University's history are the following: in 1919 the school became a branch of the University of Texas System as the Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy; in 1927 the first liberal arts classes were added to the curriculum; in 1949 the name was changed to Texas Western College (enrollment 2,283); and in 1967 the name became The University of Texas at El Paso (enrollment 9,029).

At the present time there are over 15,000 students enrolled in six colleges: Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, Nursing, and Science, with both baccalaureate and masters degrees offered in all of the colleges; since 1974 the doctorate has been offered in Geological Sciences.

In each of these there have been various consequences of the border location. For one thing, The University of Texas at El Paso has the largest enrollment of Mexican citizens of any college or university in the United States (plus a very large number of Spanish-speaking students from Central and South American nations); for another, there are regular courses taught in Spanish in most academic departments. (In fact, there is a special unit called the Inter-American Science and Humanities Program in which all of the regular courses are taught at first in Spanish while the students take special classes in English as a second language. Then gradually they are taught more