

Suggestions for Co-Curricular Enhancement of Interdisciplinary Programs

Candace D. Bloomquist
Creighton University, USA

Jacquelyn Dudasko
Texans for Life Coalition, USA

Lee Ebersole
Jefferson County Schools and Creighton University, USA

Lydia Holtz
Creighton University, USA

Abstract: Interdisciplinary learning does not just happen. One of the great challenges facing interdisciplinary programs is figuring out how to gain collective clarity around program identity (values, principles, and purpose) and make connections between mission-based curricular and co-curricular activities that support interdisciplinary learning for students. The EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program at Creighton University has worked to develop a strategy for strengthening the role of interdisciplinarity both within and beyond the EdD program by establishing a local chapter of the Interdisciplinary Honor Society founded by the Association of Interdisciplinary Studies, Alpha Iota Sigma. This article focuses on the first steps of creating the chapter, as we document the process of making connections between the EdD program and the honor society, including a discussion of the findings from a quality improvement survey completed by some of the first honor society members on how the inaugural year of our membership in the organization helped support their interdisciplinary learning. The objective of this article is to aid interdisciplinary educators in enhancing the life-long interdisciplinary endeavor of their students and alumni by reviewing the scholarship on program identity and co-curricular offerings and by demonstrating the value of specific practices (such as joining the AIS Honor Society as we at Creighton did) that explicitly engage students in interdisciplinary learning outside the classroom.

Keywords: interdisciplinary learning, co-curricular activities, program identity

Introduction

Interdisciplinary educators benefit from stories demonstrating different interdisciplinary program elements. Many such stories focus on formal curricular elements, but interdisciplinary programs can include both formal and informal curricula. This article focuses on telling the story of how the EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program at Creighton University, a Catholic, Jesuit institution, utilizes informal curricular elements to supplement the instruction in leadership development that is central to the formal curriculum of the program.

Students often engage informal curriculum on a voluntary basis, outside of formal course time, and usually in co-curricular activities. In many ways, the informal curriculum associated with a program can bring to life the identity and mission of a program by integrating opportunities for students to move deeper into areas of learning that are of interest and value to them. In our case, it is membership in Alpha Iota Sigma, the honor society of the Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, that has allowed us to offer such opportunities to the students in our Interdisciplinary Leadership Program. The combination of the formal curriculum of the program with the informal curriculum available through involvement in the honor society enables our students, faculty, and staff to gain collective clarity around program identity (values, principles, and purpose) and make connections between mission-based curricular and co-curricular activities that support interdisciplinary work such as is necessary for scholar-practitioners who would deal with complex, real-world problems.

To help elucidate the story of how we integrate the informal curriculum provided by the Alpha Iota Sigma Honor Society within the whole of our Interdisciplinary Leadership Program, we will describe the steps the EdD program took to establish a chapter of the honor society, illuminate the connections between the leadership development model used in the EdD program and the honor society mission and purpose, and discuss the feedback we gathered from some of the first honor society members on how the inaugural year of our membership in the honor society helped support their interdisciplinary learning.

The objective of the interdisciplinary leadership development model, which Creighton has based on the works of Day et al. (2021), Drath et al. (2008), and Raelin (2017), is the development of leadership scholar-practitioners who have a repertoire of dispositions, knowledge, and skills that will help them feel, respond to, cope with, and negotiate with the day-to-day demands of leadership as practice. The interdisciplinary leadership development model involves bringing together diverse individuals as students in our program and challenging them to use interdisciplinary approaches to work on complex tasks or problems. The interdisciplinary leadership development model helps facilitate the learning necessary for scholar-practitioners of interdisciplinarity

through the use of mission, structure, instructional strategies, and curricula, including informal curricular elements such as are the focus of this story.

Interdisciplinary Identity in the Higher Education Context

Interdisciplinarity is necessitated by complexity, specifically by the structure and behavior of complex systems (Newell, 2001). The trends driven by the complex and multi-faceted nature of problems across an interconnected global setting have intensified the need for people to utilize interdisciplinary perspectives and skills dealing with such problems. While the need for such perspectives and skills is acknowledged, given the disciplinary history, structure, and culture of colleges and universities, institutions of higher education have not kept pace with the need to prepare individuals to practice interdisciplinarity. Much of the work of educators remains focused on siloed, discipline-specific content. However, there is a sense of urgency and a growing willingness to move beyond merely acknowledging the benefits of working together across disciplines to figuring out how to prepare students to work with diversity and complexity.

Interdisciplinary scholarship reflects work being done across disciplines, tackling a wide array of complex issues in cases demanding input from those in many disciplines ranging from the natural and life sciences to the social sciences and the humanities. While multiple authors have investigated the development of interdisciplinary curricula to prepare students to do such work (Boix Mansilla et al., 2009; DeZure, 2017; Nikitina, 2006), there is a growing demand for focus on situated interdisciplinary practice (Liscombe, 2000), or as Edgar Schein (2009) calls it, being a “scholar-practitioner, because it highlights the complexity of both what is science . . . and what is practice” (p. 142). A good interdisciplinary education moves a scholar-practitioner student from the mere acquisition of knowledge to the application of that acquired knowledge by developing understanding sufficient to enable action effective in dealing with complex problems.

The interdisciplinary movement in American higher education appears to be a significant and continuing one (Payne, 1999). Interdisciplinary programs and interdisciplinary research are becoming increasingly commonplace. The term has become a label synonymous with creativity and progress, signaling reform and modernization via work across formerly siloed disciplines (Weingart & Stehr, 2000). Within the university setting, boundaries have blurred, and the creative energy of the 21st century is decidedly cross-disciplinary (Klein, 2010). New social and cognitive forms have altered the academic landscape, and new practices have emerged. Talk of renegotiation, reorganization, and reconfiguration within higher education is building (Klein, 1990, 2018).

Interdisciplinarity within a university's undergraduate programming dovetails into the goals, missions, and visions of graduate and professional schools that also want to prepare students to do the hard work necessary to transform an unjust world, not merely function comfortably within it (Brackley, 2005). The breadth and depth of the academic field of interdisciplinary education reflect increasing interest in the production of graduates who can move among disciplines (Lindvig et al., 2017), integrating insights from many to understand and deal with complex problems. An important component of interdisciplinary education and research is articulating a clear program identity designed to prepare graduates to be scholar-practitioners with interdisciplinary perspectives and skills (Holley, 2015). We believe we have met the need to align mission, identity, and goals with collective clarity within the EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership program at Creighton University.

Creighton's Program Identity and Co-Curricular Offerings

The EdD program started in 2011 with 40 students. Today the program boasts 295 students and has conferred 421 degrees. Students apply to and are admitted into the program from around the world, from different stages of life, and from a variety of previous academic and work experiences. The formal curriculum of the EdD program is a 60 credit-hour online course of study that is designed for students who have already completed a Master's degree. Students take a series of eight-week courses, complete a qualifying exam called "candidacy," and complete an evidence-based dissertation in practice that works toward a better understanding of, and a development of solutions related to, a complex, real-world problem within the students' workplace, industry, field, or community. Students are encouraged to choose a focus for their dissertation in practice that is of personal importance, in order that they may experience both personal and professional growth.

Like other novel interdisciplinary programs, the EdD program encounters challenges carrying out a unique educational mission with a unique program identity. For one thing, the program brings together people whose undergraduate degrees represent disparate disciplines that cut across many sectors, including business, education, the military, healthcare, and other professional fields that bring with them a discipline/sector-specific vocabulary. *Magis*, one of the Jesuit values that provide the foundation of the EdD program, is interpreted as "doing more good" to create a better, more just world. This value motivates our commitment to strive to make important connections among the program's diverse students by helping them to learn new disciplinary vocabularies and transfer core ideas across discipline/sector areas, integrating insights into better understanding of complex problems that can yield better solutions to those problems. Additionally, the program must

face the challenge of operating online with the majority of the formal curriculum delivered asynchronously to students from around the world. Enacting *cura personalis*, another Jesuit value concerning care for individuals as whole persons, is difficult in the context of a remote, virtual learning environment spanning the globe. However, knowing and understanding the program mission and identity, and assisting its students to do the same, the EdD program has sought to overcome these challenges.

In 2021, the EdD program updated its mission statement and plan of study (i.e., the guiding document for the 60-credit formal curriculum). The mission statement articulated a program identity focused on interdisciplinarity, scholar-practitioners, and inclusion:

The EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program at Creighton University, a Catholic, Jesuit institution, is a practitioner-based doctoral degree for adult lifelong learners. We believe leadership is practiced in both obvious and subtle ways by anyone willing to help (Lowney, 2003; Wheatley, 2006). We believe in preparing individuals to work for and with others by fostering a rich interdisciplinary learning environment. We believe in preparing individuals to embrace complexity by practicing self-reflection, an openness to diversity, and the integration of Ignatian values. We are diverse in the life experiences, ways of thinking, and knowledge base that faculty, staff, and students bring to the program. We are reflective scholar-practitioners focused on modeling the leadership our communities and workplaces need today and in the future. Alongside critical thinking and social science methodologies, we use innovative, leading-edge education approaches such as the emerging approach of interdisciplinary leadership, adult learning theory, and dissertations in practice to prepare individuals to work across differences to address complex problems.

In addition to the mission and the formal curriculum that supports the mission, the EdD program encourages participation in informal curricular components that do the same, including quarterly JayTalks, monthly newsletters, and biannual Interdisciplinary Leadership Program Learning Institutes. JayTalks are virtual gatherings in which faculty and students take a deep dive into topics central to the program. JayTalks are opportunities to learn more about diverse perspectives and the Jesuit principles that are at the basis of all curricular elements at Creighton, that is, *cura personalis* (care for the whole person), *magis* (the commitment to more), people acting for and with others, and practicing a faith that seeks justice. Whether it is talking about the program elements of the dissertation in practice or the candidacy exam or talking about leadership ethics, emergent leadership approaches, leadership during a global pandemic, or the particularly tough topic of leadership and racial justice in the midst of a racial justice awakening, the JayTalks exemplify the way informal curricular opportunities can enhance what students are deriving from the formal curriculum.

The biannual Interdisciplinary Leadership Program Learning Institutes are another informal curricular opportunity, this time for online students to come to campus for two and a half days of supplemental structured and unstructured educational sessions. The structured sessions are designed to help students prepare for the candidacy exam and/or the dissertation in practice by faculty demonstrating the use of the library search engines or facilitating collective critical thinking sessions for students wanting to talk through their problem statements for their dissertation in practice. The unstructured sessions are opportunities for students to talk to classmates, consult with their faculty advisers, and/or dedicate time away from distractions at home or at work to focus on writing in a group or individually.

Alpha Iota Sigma: A Recent Addition to Our Informal Curriculum

In 2019, I, Candace Bloomquist, a core faculty member in the EdD program seeking to further enhance our informal curricular offerings, began a search for a student organization that could meet the desires of faculty, staff, and students for more networking and research opportunities. After looking into student organizations, I identified Alpha Iota Sigma, the honor society that represents the Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, as an organization that had multiple alignment points with the EdD Program, suggesting Alpha Iota Sigma could add value to the program. I thought creation of a chapter of the honor society at Creighton could enhance the informal curriculum of the EdD program by fostering a co-curricular interdisciplinary learning environment. According to its charter,

The mission of Alpha Iota Sigma is to recognize and advance the academic scholarship and achievements of interdisciplinary students. As an honor society, Alpha Iota Sigma: promotes the benefits of interdisciplinary work; provides a forum to encourage interdisciplinary collaboration among students, faculty, and community members; investigates and encourages methods of interdisciplinary learning; enhances understanding and application of interdisciplinary knowledge among the general public; creates a sense of community among interdisciplinary students and graduates of interdisciplinary programs. (Creighton Alpha Iota Sigma Constitution, 2021, p. 1)

After introducing the honor society to the rest of the EdD program faculty and staff and getting their agreement about its probable value for our program, I approached the Chair of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies and the Dean of the Graduate School with the idea to start a chapter of the Alpha Iota Sigma Honor Society at Creighton University. The request was approved, and recruitment of a student executive team started. With the help of Lydia Holtz, the EdD Program Coordinator, four students were recruited and invited to

become the inaugural executive team of the Creighton Chapter of Alpha Iota Sigma. The team of six worked to establish a Chapter “Constitution,”¹ a set of procedures for operations, and guidelines for membership, created four standing committees (the Membership and Induction Committee, the Community Service and Affinity Committee, the Fundraising and Scholarship Committee, and the Committee for Interdisciplinary Research and Networking), planned the inaugural induction ceremony, and facilitated multiple member events in line with the mission and identity of the honor society and the EdD program. For example, the honor society hosted Black History month book clubs, an online yoga session to acknowledge whole person well-being, and a guest presentation by a formerly incarcerated man titled “Leaders Who Lead v. Leaders Who Follow.” The first membership drive produced 183 members, far exceeding expectations for member enrollment.² At the end of the first year of our membership in the honor society we undertook a quality improvement evaluation project to explore the quality of the members’ experience and seek ideas that could make their experience even better.

Data Collection

During the spring of 2021, Bloomquist and Holtz invited Jacquelyn Dudasko and Lee Ebersole, two alumni of the EdD program and associate members of the honor society, to carry out a quality improvement project to assess the co-curricular experience offered by the honor society. We designed a 16-item survey including open- and closed-ended questions that solicited feedback via ratings on 10-point Likert-type scales as well as rankings of various elements of the honor society, inviting participants to reflect on their experience and recommend future directions for meaningful membership in the honor society. Thirty-four participants (approximately 18.58% of the members) completed the survey online using SurveyMonkey. Nineteen participants (55.88% of participants) identified their affiliation with the honor society as Interdisciplinary Leadership Doctoral Program students; 15 participants (44.12% of participants) identified as associate members, a category of membership that comprises graduates and faculty of the doctoral program (see Table 1). After downloading participants’ responses in Excel, we imported responses to open-ended questions into MAXQDA 2020 for coding and qualitative analysis. We performed descriptive statistical analyses of responses to closed-ended questions.

1 Those interested to know more about our Chapter “Constitution” should contact Dr. Candace Bloomquist at CandaceBloomquist@creighton.edu.

2 Membership is voluntary and open to any student in an interdisciplinary program at Creighton University; however, a student member must possess and maintain a 3.7 GPA.

Findings and Discussion

Tables 1 and 2 feature the percentages and ratings of participants' perceptions on multiple survey items related to the honor society. The elements participants ranked as those most valued were (1) creating opportunities for interaction by collaborating on research and publication and (2) offering chances to work together in various groups, such as those doing panel discussions and poster presentations virtually and in person. Participants assessed their ability to connect with other members as neither high nor low with a mean score of five on a 10-point scale. Overall satisfaction with their membership in the society received a score of seven on a 10-point scale. Unsurprisingly, given participants' expressed appreciation of opportunities for collaborative research and interaction among members, they ranked the Committee for Interdisciplinary Research and Networking first among the honor society's four standing committees.

Table 1. Percentage Scores of Affiliation, Preferred Contact, Reason for Membership, and Participation (N = 34).

Survey Item	Percent (%)
<i>Affiliation</i>	
Interdisciplinary Leadership Doctoral Program students	55.88
Associate members	44.12
<i>Preferred Contact</i>	
Creighton email	50.00
Personal email	50.00
<i>Reason to Choose Membership</i>	
Create a sense of community and encourage interdisciplinary collaborations among students, faculty, alumni, and community members	54.88
Enhance understanding and application of interdisciplinary knowledge and learning for personal and professional growth	17.65
Foster connections between academic coursework and the larger community through community service	11.76
Other (research opportunity, loyalty to Creighton, professional advancement)	8.82
Promote the benefits of interdisciplinary work	5.88
<i>Frequency of Participation in Programming and Events</i>	
Induction ceremony	82.35
Racial Equity and Higher Education	20.59
Leaders Who Lead vs. Leaders Who Follow	17.65
None of the above	8.82
Mentoring program	5.88
Online yoga: Slow gentle class	5.88

Table 2. Ratings of Quality of Welcome, Ability to Connect, Satisfaction, and Interest in Committees (N = 34).

Survey Item	Mean (SD)
<i>Quality of Welcome to Honor Society</i>	7.94 (2.38)
<i>Ability to Connect with Other Members</i>	4.97 (3.25)
<i>Overall Satisfaction with Honor Society</i>	6.52 (2.80)

The quality of welcome scale was 0 (very poorly) to 10 (very warmly). The ability to connect scale was 0 (not at all) to 10 (very well). The overall satisfaction scale was 0 (not at all) to 10 (very satisfied).

Suggestions for Improvement and Future Initiatives

We asked participants a series of open-ended questions within the survey to gather ideas on areas for improvement and future initiatives. Time constraints involving commitments to work, school, and family appeared to hinder many members from greater engagement with activities sponsored by the honor society. To increase participation, survey participants advised (1) selecting members earlier during their time in the EdD program and (2) acknowledging members' scholarship and professional achievements through a variety of platforms such as newsletters, journals, and social media. When asked about how to improve the interdisciplinary focus of the society and collaboration among members, participants mentioned (1) increased interaction through mentorship, (2) opportunities among students, faculty, and alumni for public scholarship including publication in academic journals and participation in panel discussions and poster presentations, and (3) generation of applicable industry, social justice, equity, and inclusion collaborations. When asked for ideas on who could be invited as guest speakers, participants mentioned Amy Edmondson, John Creswell, Brené Brown, Noam Chomsky, Jared Diamond, Ronald Heifetz, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Barbara Kellerman, James Martin, S.J., and Jeffrey Pfeffer, in addition to "African American women" and "program alumni." Finally, we asked participants how the society could help facilitate connections between academic and community initiatives. As the scholar-practitioners that Creighton encourages all students to be, many participants acknowledged that the work they were doing for their academic program already had them making the connection between theory and practice, applying their learning outside the university. They suggested that highlighting the work that is already being done by members could illuminate that good work.

The formal and informal curriculum of the EdD program, built on the foundation of the Jesuit values that infuse Creighton University as a whole, strives to prepare leaders to address complex problems plaguing our world.

Yet betterment of the world's problems, the goal that grounds the doctoral program's mission and identity, requires specially prepared leaders whose training in interdisciplinarity embraces a sense of shared identity and collective efficacy. Such leaders need to learn the skills necessary to address complex problems in all types of organizations (Kolditz et al., 2021). As scholarly practitioners, students of the Interdisciplinary Leadership Program develop such skills as they experience different types of opportunities to apply theory to real-world practice. The doctoral program itself and informal co-curricular components of the program like the honor society co-create in tandem a curriculum that teaches interdisciplinary leadership with the expected outcome of graduates' enhanced capacity to solve complex problems threatening organizations of all kinds and indeed whole societies worldwide.

The Creighton University chapter of Alpha Iota Sigma, as a student-led organization, focuses on creating affinity with the Interdisciplinary Leadership Program through alignment of the program and chapter missions. Students as members, along with faculty and alumni as associate members, get to know one another through activities sponsored by the honor society. The honor society particularly promotes stewardship among alumni by offering them opportunities for active participation in programming that provides mentorship for students. Students engage in authentic learning experiences while attending activities along with alumni, and the alumni not only serve as mentors but as mentees, learning from the collaborative process as well. All members practice stewardship by contributing to the sustainability of the honor society through support of its various programs, service on committees, and involvement in projects such as the current quality improvement project and sometimes hosting discussions and other events.

Limitations

The results of our quality improvement project must be considered in light of two main limitations. First, the response rate for the survey was low. In quality improvement projects it is standard practice to note the response rate, which is the number of completed surveys divided by the total number of possible participants. Although the proportion of members who participated in the survey did fall within the typical response rate range (34 participants out of 183 members is 18.58%), to guard against non-response bias our desire is to achieve an excellent response rate in future surveys (i.e., 50% or higher). Based on research by Booker and colleagues (2021) strategies to enhance response rates might include promoting the survey among members through multiple channels, cutting the length of the survey, and rephrasing questions. The latter strategy might also yield deeper understanding of members' experiences. Second, since this quality improvement project was undertaken in the very

first year after the formation of the honor society, participants' responses were based on limited experience. While the lack of member experience associated with the honor society was a limitation, the willingness of members to participate in the survey anyway also highlights the high level of member engagement and desire to provide feedback. We acknowledge the importance of repeating the survey when members will have had more experience with honor society activities.

Looking Ahead: The Future of the Honor Society Chapter

The description and assessment of the founding and initial operation of the Creighton University chapter of Alpha Iota Sigma as reported in this article is a step in an iterative process of continuous improvement. As we look toward the future of the honor society as a co-curricular component within the EdD Program in Interdisciplinary Leadership two areas of focus emerge: (1) reducing curricular and program siloing and (2) looking within and beyond mission and vision. In this section we describe the need for continuous improvement in each focus area and the initial ideas for change to provide improvement.

Reducing Curricular and Program Siloing

As interdisciplinarians know well, multiple disciplines are invariably involved in solving complex problems, making knowledge sharing across the disciplines foundational to effective problem solving (Newhouse & Spring, 2010). Academic disciplines provide a framework for the transfer of knowledge from one generation to the next, shaping our education and understanding, while structuring our professional lives (Weingart & Stehr, 2000). However, while disciplines create communication competence (Turner, 2000), interdisciplinarity helps broaden understanding beyond discipline-specific competence. Interdisciplinarity generates patterns of collaboration and exchange that allow scholar-practitioners to find commonalities as well as differences in disciplinary views and apply the resultant improved understanding to deal with the complex realities of the world.

Reducing rigid expectations related to administrative structures characteristic of higher education will be necessary if we are to pivot to educating students to do collaborative and interdisciplinary work (Newhouse & Spring, 2010). Too often interdisciplinary activity does not fit current administrative structures, existing, some say, in the "white space" of organizational charts (Klein, 2010). Strongly established institutional structures frequently create barriers to the kind of knowledge generation and knowledge translation that interdisciplinarity can provide.

The good news? At Creighton, the EdD program, enhanced by co-curricular programming like the honor society, has an opportunity to reach beyond the traditional educational structures to be creative in facilitating interdisciplinary learning among our scholar-practitioners. One example of our innovative approach lies in the aforementioned introduction of programming that engages alumni as mentors for current students. Alumni of the EdD program can provide benefits to students in offering workshops based on their experiences presenting scholarly findings at trade/professional conferences and sharing their experiences publishing their dissertation scholarship. Additionally, alumni have begun hosting dissertation support group sessions with students. Dissertation support groups provide spaces for collaboration and exchange in which students, with the help of alumni and faculty, hold each other accountable, share experiences/challenges of the dissertation process, and ask questions that they may not be comfortable asking their dissertation chairs. Finally, the EdD program alumni contribute to the growth and sustainability of those in our Creighton community by encouraging involvement in international service and learning projects related to teacher training in South Sudan and northern India—projects that both draw upon and further develop interdisciplinary skills.

Looking Within and Beyond Mission and Vision

A commitment to values provides people with a stronger identity, a deeper sense of mission, and a specific set of beliefs that will help an institution, and those involved in the institution's programs, fulfill the vision of a better future. When a university gives priority to values—such as justice and dignity—it promotes a more rigorous search for truth and a more principled commitment to action in service of truth. At Creighton University, whose informal curriculum is infused with the same values as the formal curriculum, the EdD Program, and all those involved in the co-curricular programming like that of the AIS Honor Society, commit themselves to what Brackley (2005) calls that greater academic excellence which produces wisdom. And in that wisdom, they stand with victims and all in need, struggle to overcome bias, and help other people, too, to discover their values and vocation and live accordingly.

Of course, if we at Creighton are to continue to pursue our mission effectively, more and even better strategic planning will be necessary. Bryson (2011) defined strategic planning as a “deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that define what an organization (or other entity) does, and why it does it” (pp. 7–8). Our honor society chapter, with interdisciplinary leadership development that supplements our formal curriculum as a primary focus, may be especially well situated to undertake and profit from such furtherance of strategic planning.

Many organizations choose strategic plans with a five-year timeframe to allow sufficient time for implementation of objectives (McHatton et al., 2011). Our honor society chapter, however, may benefit from a strategic plan with a three-year horizon (Bryson et al., 2018), time enough to permit members who are doctoral students—and typically graduate within four years—to engage fully in all phases of the strategic planning from design through enactment of plans. Within the scope of a three-year strategic plan, members representing various stakeholders within the honor society chapter could, for example, collectively define goals and objectives with specific action steps to address the problem of curricular and programmatic siloes. As a result of successful implementation of the strategic plan's action steps, at the end of three years, members of the honor society would have substantial experience in an organization fully committed to the shared mission of interdisciplinary collaboration among students (both current students and alumni), faculty, and community members. And at that point, follow-up surveys would allow us to assess the programming again to see if another round of planning for possible change could strengthen it further still.

Conclusion

By establishing a chapter of the Alpha Iota Sigma Interdisciplinary Honor Society, an organization that operates under the aegis of the Association for Interdisciplinary Studies, the EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program at Creighton University has enhanced its ability to meet the needs of its interdisciplinary learners. The honor society, as an informal curricular element, complementary to the formal curriculum of the program, provides opportunities for scholar-practitioner students and alumni, interdisciplinary faculty, and hard-working staff to further develop student capacity to work on complex, real-world problems and better the world in which we live. Early feedback from members suggests we should pursue efforts to reduce the siloing associated with the disciplinary structures that still characterize so much of university life. To promote collaborative endeavors that cross disciplinary boundaries we plan to develop honor society programming to more fully involve alumni in a mentoring program that will help our students as they, too, become alumni trying to exercise the interdisciplinary leadership so needed all around the globe.

Biographical Notes

Candace D. Bloomquist, PhD, is an Assistant Professor in the EdD in Interdisciplinary Leadership Program of the Graduate School at Creighton University.

She has worked as a health educator, a community action specialist, and in the U.S. Army as a medical laboratory technician. In addition to exploring interdisciplinary leadership, she researches cultures of trust, continuous quality improvement, and teaching and learning in higher education. She may be reached at CandaceBloomquist@creighton.edu.

Jacquelyn Dudasko, EdD, serves as Director of Education and Policy for Texans for Life Coalition. Jacquelyn's passion for service to individuals facing poverty and marginalization leads her in her work within the community and in research for legislative policy. She strives to provide a voice for those she serves by utilizing their lived experiences as a means for developing policy and educational programs. Her research interests include information use and information access by individuals facing poverty and marginalization and servant leadership. She may be reached at judasko2015@gmail.com.

Lee Ebersole, EdD, serves as the Director of Social and Emotional Support for Jefferson County Schools. He serves a team of interdisciplinary leaders responsible for a breakthrough initiative promoting wellbeing among the district's children and adults through relationship, classroom practice, and coordination of wraparound services. He also teaches a capstone course in interdisciplinary leadership in the Graduate School at Creighton University. His research interests include foster care and servant leadership. He may be reached at LeeEbersole@creighton.edu.

Lydia Holtz, MBA, is Program Coordinator for the EdD Interdisciplinary Leadership Program in the Graduate School at Creighton University. She has research interests in quality improvement and scholarship of higher education and shares her expertise in refinement of processes and data analytics across institutions of higher education. She may be reached at LydiaHoltz@creighton.edu.

References

- Boix Mansilla, V., Duraisingh, E. D., Wolfe, C. R., Haynes, C. (2009). Targeted assessment rubric: An empirically grounded rubric for interdisciplinary writing. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 80(3). <http://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.0.0044>
- Booker, Q. S., Austin, J. D., & Balasubramanian, B. A. (2021). Survey strategies to increase participant response rates in primary care research studies. *Family Practice*, 38(5), 699–702. <http://www.doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmab070>

- Brackley, D. (2005). *The Jesuit university in a broken world*. [Speech]. Loyola Marymount University. <https://mission.lmu.edu/media/missionandministry/documents/Brackley%20-%20The%20Jesuit%20University%20in%20a%20Broken%20World.pdf>
- Bryson, J. M. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations*. Jossey-Bass.
- Bryson, J. M., Edwards, L. H. & Van Slyke, D.M. (2018). Getting strategic about strategic planning research. *Public Management Review*, 20, 317–339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2017.1285111>
- Creighton Alpha Iota Sigma Constitution (2021).
- Day, D. V., Riggio, R. E., Tan, S. J., & Conger, J. A. (2021). Advancing the science of 21st-century leadership development: Theory, research, and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 32, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101557>
- DeZure, D. (2017). Interdisciplinary pedagogies in higher education. In R. Frodeman, J. T. Klein, and R. C. S. Pacheco (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of interdisciplinarity* (2nd ed., pp. 558–572). Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198733522.013.45>
- Drath, W. H., McCauley, C. D., Palus, C. J., Velsor, E. V., O'Connor, P. M. G., & McGuire, J. B. (2008). Direction, alignment, commitment: Toward a more integrative ontology of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 635–653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.003>
- Holley, K. (2015). Doctoral education and the development of an interdisciplinary identity. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 52(6), 642–652. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2013.847796>
- Klein, J. T. (1990). *Interdisciplinarity: History, theory, and practice*. Wayne State University Press.
- Klein, J. T. (2010). *Creating interdisciplinary campus cultures: A model for strength and sustainability*. Jossey-Bass.
- Klein, J. T. (2018). A conceptual vocabulary of interdisciplinary science. In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practicing interdisciplinarity* (pp. 3–24). University of Toronto Press.
- Kolditz, T., Hall, L., & Brown, R. P. (2021). *Leadership reckoning: Can higher education develop the leaders we need?* Monocle.
- Lindvig, K., Lyall, C., Meagher, L. R. (2017). Creating interdisciplinary education within monodisciplinary structures: The art of managing interstitiality. *Studies in Higher Education*, 44(23) 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2017.1365358>
- Liscombe, R. W. (2000). Practising interdisciplinary studies. In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practising interdisciplinarity* (pp. 134–153). University of Toronto Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442678729.14>
- Lowney, C. (2003). *Heroic leadership: Best practices from a 450-year-old company that changed the world*. Loyola Press.

- McHatton, P. A., Bradshaw, W., Gallagher, P. A., & Reeves, R. (2011). Results from a strategic planning process: Benefits for a nonprofit organization. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 22, 233–249. <https://doi.org/10.1002.nml.20051>
- Newell, W. H. (2001). A theory of interdisciplinary studies. *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 19, 1–25.
- Newhouse, R. P., & Spring, B. (2010). Interdisciplinary evidence-based practice: Moving from silos to synergy. *Nursing Outlook*, 58(6), 309–317. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2010.09.001>
- Nikitina, S. (2006). Three strategies for interdisciplinary teaching: Contextualizing, conceptualizing, and problem centering. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38, 251–271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220270500422632>
- Payne, S. L. (1999). Interdisciplinarity: Potentials and challenges. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 17(2), 173–182. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1022473913711.pdf>
- Raelin, J. A. (2017). Leadership-as-practice: Theory and application—an editor’s reflection. *Leadership*, 13(2), 215–221.
- Schein, E. H. (2009). Reactions, reflections, rejoinders, and a challenge. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 45(1), 141–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886308328942>
- Turner, S. (2000). What are disciplines? And how is interdisciplinarity different? In P. Weingart & N. Stehr (Eds.), *Practising interdisciplinarity* (pp. 46–65). University of Toronto Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442678729.9>
- Weingart, P., & Stehr, N. (Eds.). (2000). *Practising interdisciplinarity*. University of Toronto Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442678729>
- Wheatley, M. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.