

6

Integration as a methodology for redesigning higher education is the main theme of this chapter. After defining how the authors understand and envision integration as an organizational model and as a learning model, they maintain that setting the expectation of the importance of becoming a learning organization is essential for successful whole system change.

Integral Learning and Working: Becoming a Learning Organization

Annette M. Holba, Patricia T. Bahr, Donald L. Birx, Mark J. Fischler

The idea of a liberal education began as a value that would contribute to the notion of free-thinking individuals who would participate as moral agents in their communities and beyond. A liberal education meant cultivating the moral imagination (Tompkins, 2009) in the spirit of contributing to the world around the individual. However, in the twentieth century, liberal arts education became narrow and separate from education that was preprofessional or professional, clinical, or vocational (Kimball, 2015). Today's liberal arts education is typically designed to combine breadth and depth of inquiry through general education and the major (Anders, 2017). The way in which it is structured typically begins with emphasizing the first-year experience and general education in student experiences, leaving the major to come later in the students' educational journey. This is not to say that some students would never take a course in their major until they completed their general education requirements; in fact they generally do, but we typically think about general education as a way to prepare students for deep engagement in their major. Without thinking about the connection between general education and majors, some might think of general education as just a checklist of courses to complete, with no explicit connection between the general education experience and disciplinary courses/programs/majors.

There is increasing concern over the checklist approach when it comes to general education. By keeping general education fully separate from disciplinary major experiences, it is less likely that students, by themselves, will be able to make those connections between general education and their major. This separation simply sends the wrong message to our students,

one that implies general education is not important. We do the same thing with many kinds of cocurricular experiences. By keeping cocurricular and other kinds of learning experiences, especially with external partners, separate, we do a disservice to our students and our communities. This leaves students unable to make connections between their different experiences. Because of this, students are less likely to understand the meaningfulness of their experiences and they will may not be able to talk about them constructively or cohesively.

As higher education has been experiencing economic struggles that have a negative impact on students, families, and the sustainability of institutions, the relevance of learning to the marketplace is also under fire and out of date (Crow, 2007). Those of us leading the academy today were trained in the twentieth century (administrators, faculty, staff), but the way we learned is also now outdated and irrelevant to some extent. We need to lead for the twenty-first century, which means learning new ways of engagement and new ways of providing educational experiences.

As our institution, Plymouth State University, began implementing the paradigm shift to a fully integrated university in 2015 as is evidenced above in Chapter 1 of this volume, simultaneously and without our knowing, the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) had conducted a study that resulted in a project recommending the need to shift higher education to integrated liberal learning (Ferrin & Paris, 2015). That study explicitly reinforced the work we were doing at our university. We initially believed and followed our intuition that told us these were good things to do, and we now know that the AAC&U also firmly supports and endorses these endeavors. However, the AAC&U does not address holistic reorganization toward a fully integrated institution. It does not fully advance the move to an integrated learning model that requires change in how we deliver education, what kind of education we deliver, and the necessary structures needed to make these things happen, such as curriculum integration, collaborative spaces, and external partnership development.

The most obvious structural integration at our institution is the elimination of three colleges and twenty-four departments. Our disciplines lead our organizational structure. The disciplines were themed into seven integrated clusters, self-directed, and placed together with other disciplines around common themes. These themes are: Arts and Technologies; Education, Democracy, and Social Change; Exploration and Discovery; Health and Human Enrichment; Innovation and Entrepreneurship; Justice and Security; and Tourism, Environment, and Sustainable Development. The themes collaboratively evolved through dialogue and deliberation, and once the integrated clusters were identified, we began whole system change via integration.

Applying Integration: Integral Living, Learning, and Working

We link the methodology of integration to the integral philosophy of Jean Gebser (1905–1973), a cultural philosopher who grew up during a time when Europe was fragmented by war and economic uncertainties. We chose Gebser's (1985) philosophy because his cosmology embodies a gestalt understanding of the world, and central to his integral theory is adult education that emphasizes experience instead of the traditional focus on institutions and pedagogies that are separate from lived experience (Molz & Hampson, 2010). This means that Gebser's integral perspective includes a necessary integration of lived experience through different stages of life and academic disciplines; academic and intellectual life of the mind is not intended to be separated from human experience and understanding. Gebser's integral understanding of learning is grounded in experience and in synthesis—a gestalt of consciousness.

Referring to the events of World War I and II, Gebser (1985) stated, “[t]he crisis we are experiencing today is not just a European crisis, nor a crisis of morals, economics, ideologies, politics, or religion. . . . It is a crisis of the world and mankind . . .” (p. xxvii). Gebser advocated for integrality, which means we must recognize that we are humans together in living, learning, and being in the world. “Gebser believed that people acting in harmony with the integral could induce positive cultural resonances” (Arneson, 2007, p. 196). This means that how human beings think, act, and live should align with an integral disposition and relations. This perspective aligns well with a later discussion involving the learning organization (Senge, 1990). This means that the way we think about ourselves and the work that we do should have a gestalt presence and guide all actions.

Gebser (1985) identified five structures of consciousness that divide, dissolve, and disrupt aspects of culture (Arneson, 2007). These five structures of consciousness are (1) the archaic, (2) the vital–magical, (3) the psychic–mythic, (4) the mental–rational, and 5) the integral. For the purpose of this chapter, we do not need to do a comprehensive explanation of each structure; however, we can summarize why thinking about structures of consciousness is relevant to learning and higher education. First, Gebser's cosmology is seeking answers to his question about how changes in human consciousness might lead to varied interpretations or ways of being in the world; in fact, the five structures of consciousness that he identifies coexist. Gebser explains, “[w]e must first of all remain cognizant that these structures are not merely past but are in fact still present in more or less latent and acute form in each of us” (p. 42). Gebser describes each structure through a phenomenological lens with texture and deep description. For the purpose of this chapter, we limit our description to what makes the most sense to the purpose of this essay, which is to advocate for integration, the integral structure that intertwines the academic with life experience, as an

approach for redesigning higher education in the midst of the ever-present challenges.

Arneson (2007) maintains that the archaic structure of consciousness is prespatial and pretemporal; there is presentiment, which is a “movement toward awareness” (p. 198). The vital-magical structure is a structure of consciousness that Gebser (1985) describes as prerational and pre-causal; perception is preperspectival and situated within a spacelessness and timelessness that are not yet connected to a rationality and understandings of causation. The mythical structure hails an imaginary consciousness that is hungry for experience but still without rationality. Gebser describes the fourth as the mental structure, a three-dimensional perception—something we, today, are most familiar with. We have awareness of ourselves and we have rationality. Gebser suggested humanity is evolving toward an integral consciousness, an awareness in which there is an intuitive grasp of the four other dimensions of consciousness, and they each coexist together. This means we can learn from the past and evolve into the future.

Using Gebser’s (1985) cosmological understanding of the integral structure, we understand the need for the integral structure in higher education because while it is a vision of the whole in a dynamic process of temporalization, it opens awareness to all the parts of the whole. This expands understanding of the lived experience. If we think of an integral organization, it is that integral understanding of the lived experience in the organization that enhances experiences and provides “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973, p. 5) that aid our understanding and comprehension in doing our daily work. If we remain in the magical, mythical, or the mental, we are likely to miss the awareness of other parts and miss possibilities for engagement across the organization. Thinking integrally in the domain of higher education can help us better respond to its challenges, all which reside in the mental structure of consciousness.

While this is a brief look into Jean Gebser’s (1985) integral theory, it does impart an invitation to explore how a radically different approach to higher education might offer new insight to an evolving environment. Having an integral perspective opens one’s mindset to see further and see connections as they emerge and before they are manifest; this is where learning and innovation happen. We know that institutions of higher education find themselves facing many complex challenges that cannot be addressed using one approach. The approaches that engage integral elements and invite dynamic and iterative processes are best suited to guide transformation of institutional practices. These practices will look different across the higher education landscape. Engaging integral elements will likely encounter “creative tensions” that include:

- adhering to traditions while at the same time being liberated from the constraints of traditional practices;

- practicing traditional forms of governance through discourse while thinking outside of the box and establishing new forms of governance;
- maintaining disciplinary privilege and distinction while learning to cross disciplinary boundaries for integrative engagement (which is different from interdisciplinary engagement that takes pieces of disciplines and puts them together leaving parts of the disciplines out of the experience); and
- balancing “contemplative dispositions” while taking action (Esbjornhagens, Reams, & Gunnlaugson, 2010).

It is difficult to acknowledge, change, and purge biases when it comes to the work that we do as educators and administrators in higher education. Perhaps this comes from the fact that we were trained in the twentieth century within a tradition steeped in principles of an aesthetic education such as beauty, art, happiness, and moral nobility (Schiller, 2004) that Friedrich von Schiller (1759–1805) espoused in his *Letters Upon the Aesthetic Education of Man*. The reality is that as we were learning and training to work in and lead higher education toward the end of the twentieth century, the world was changing at such a fast pace that not many of us noticed the changes or thought of the implications these changes would bring to our work. Approaching the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century now, we realize that the embedded cultural practices we have come to know in the academy have become anachronisms, leaving many of our ideals of higher education to be seen as irrelevant and faculty centric (Crow & Dabars, 2015). Finding a way to reenergize our work to become relevant in the twenty-first century requires an integral mindset for both administrative leaders and faculty.

We acknowledge that not all administrative leaders and faculty resist evolving their practices to meet the twenty-first century landscape; many do want to evolve but simply do not know how to initiate and sustain an evolutionary disposition. Identifying integral components within higher education can be a first step in envisioning how to transform one’s own mindset or mental models and the actions we take in the course of doing our work.

Integral components in education include the following:

- exploring multiple perspectives;
- allowing first-, second-, and third-hand methodologies in teaching and learning;
- weaving together a tapestry of self, culture, and nature; involving insights from developmental psychology;
- involving personal practices in organizational transformation;
- including multiple ways of knowing beyond the traditional skepticism, empiricism, rationalism, and traditionalism such as contemplative inquiry;
- recognizing various kinds of learners and teachers;

- encouraging shadow work (students and teachers using self-reflection and modes of self-awareness to see their own weaknesses and learning edges, which should be an ongoing process for both all involved); and
- being open to honor other approaches even if one does not resonate with those approaches (Esbjorn-hargens et al., 2010, p. 5–6).

While this is not an exhaustive list of characteristics of integral education, it provides a starting place for understanding what integral education looks like. Keeping this in mind, here is how we see integration in action at Plymouth State.

Integration in Practice

We have identified below key tenets of integration applied to higher education from the AAC&U's project on integrative liberal learning (Ferren & Paris, 2015). These tenets mirror the evolving scholarship on integrated learning (Fan, 2004). In the list below, we identify the tenets from the AAC&U and then describe our corresponding practice within our organizational re-design.

Integrative Liberal Learning Develops the Whole Student for Personal Growth, Economic Productivity, and Responsible Citizenship.

Acknowledging that a college education involves disciplinary learning as well as experiences that cultivate broader intellectual development and sensory experiences that actually shape who students become and how they contribute to the world at large is key to understanding the holistic impact of a college education. College experiences shape identities, expand repertoire, and contribute to the development of a moral imagination and moral compass.

In support of delivering an integrative education we have identified four developmental tools to encourage and promote integrative engagement within our seven clusters, they are: (1) challenge-based first-year seminars, (2) open laboratories, (3) themed general education pathways with the possibility of micro-credentials, and (4) an integrated capstone experience to tie together a student's general education experience in a meaningful way based upon the skills they acquired through their general education journey. These experiences, along with students' experiences in their major field of study, provide integrated breadth and depth for connecting their knowledge with the real world. By working on projects with other students in other courses and having opportunities to work alongside community and business partners in open laboratory spaces, students gain a sense of identity as these experiences contribute to how students see themselves as contributing citizens and working colleagues. Having these experiences and making these connections allows student experiences to become more meaningful to them and better prepares them to be successful in the marketplace (Ferren & Paris, 2015).

Integrative Liberal Learning Prepares Students to Tackle Complex and Unscripted Problems—To Apply Evidence-Based Reasoning, Judgment, and Ethical Responsibility to Questions Where the Answer Is Not Known and the Consequences Matter. As we consider the biggest problems that face the twenty-first century, we used the seventeen global goals for sustainable development identified by the United Nations (<https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/>) to open discussions with faculty about how to develop a first-year seminar course focused on a “wicked problem” or challenge that is relevant to the lives of students (Rittel & Webber, 1973). We understood that the problems or challenges students will face in the workplace will have no one solution and will not be well-defined and simple to solve. Students will need a range of skills that will enable them to be successful in the workplace and provide them with deep satisfaction about the work they do. They will need to use analytical skills and rational reasoning, make moral and ethical decisions, and be able to take responsibility for the decisions they make. When the stakes are this high, students are more likely to find their work meaningful and value the deep thinking and effort it takes to make valuable contributions to their environments.

We re-envisioned our first-year seminar to focus on complex challenges/wicked problems because it requires thinking by students working in teams—thinking that runs across disciplines—and engagement in real-world problems while partnering with other students, faculty, and external partners. Addressing problems today and into the future requires an integral approach (Rittel & Webber, 1973). Without taking this critical integral approach to higher education, students may not be prepared for the changing marketplace demands (Crow, 2007). Our first-year seminar course is the curricular introduction to integrative learning and our integrated clusters.

Integrative Liberal Learning Intentionally and Coherently Connects Student Experiences in the Curriculum, Between the Curriculum and Cocurriculum, and With Larger Communities. Some of our significant changes involve re-orienting our curriculum to align with integrative learning and developing relationships and partnership beyond the university. We intentionally cultivate external partners who will benefit from working with our students and who will give students high-impact learning opportunities by partnering with faculty, projects, and communities across campus. Student learning more deliberately develops when we link the academic setting to cocurricular activities, cluster project experiences, internships, service learning, and other kinds of community partnering opportunities. The emphasis on external partnerships and experience beyond the classroom gives students meaningful experiences that are relevant to them and have currency in the communities in which they work. This helps them to make sense of themselves in an integral relationship to real-world work.

By the end of the Fall 2017 semester, approximately 3,000 students, either through class/curriculum or independent participation, were involved in cluster projects. The cluster projects involved integrative experiences across multiple disciplines, engagement with various partnerships, and collaboration in open lab spaces both on and off campus. One example of this is a cluster project called the *North Country Community Development Pilot*, which is designed to provide a range of supporting services to a team of highly motivated community leaders in order to strengthen the local economic and social conditions in Lancaster, New Hampshire. Cluster project leaders envisioned this project as one that would connect curricula and create other linkages so that students, Plymouth State faculty and staff, and the North Country business community could partner on a variety of initiatives designed to provide students real-world experiences as they make a significant positive impact on a region with many needs.

Cultivating the emphasis on partnerships has led to other advantages for our students. Plymouth State completed three new open laboratories in the first year and prepared and placed approximately 300 students with over 100 industry partners in high-impact learning experiences such as internships, service-learning, coops, and community service. Plymouth State also has successful ongoing high-impact projects around our state in partnerships with communities and businesses designed to support and serve interests of our rural communities.

Integrative Liberal Learning Allows Students to Demonstrate to Themselves and to Others the Gains Made Through Curricula, Programs, and the Educational Experience as a Whole. When we make connections between what we learn, how we learn, and what it means to the world beyond the classroom, we can make sense about our learning in meaningful ways, thus helping us to understand our own experiences and own them. Students can describe their work, accomplishments, and interpersonal growth and development in ways that cannot be represented on a traditional transcript. Students are able to talk about, describe, and evaluate their experiences in integral ways that allow them to see and understand their educational journey. They can show and demonstrate a body of work that provides evidence of their learning experiences and pathways as well.

Besides the many majors that require a capstone portfolio, the four tools that guide our curricular revisions include an integration capstone course that will include a portfolio where students and others will be able to see what the students have learned in their integrated curriculum and learning experiences. The integration capstone course will help us gather evidence for our accreditation, but it will also be beneficial for students to see their learning journey. The capstone will give them a framework for talking about what they learned and seeing how it connects to the world beyond the academy.

Integrative Liberal Learning Provides the Greatest Value for Both the Individual and Society. An integrated learning model creates active,

ethical, and innovative individuals who will be tomorrow changers in a new marketplace. Integrated learning and our four tools provide students with tools for a lifetime. Students develop their identities and understand how to be responsible, ethical citizens guided by their moral imaginations. They understand the value of formal learning and its connection to being a good citizen, a good worker, and living a morally responsible good life, finding meaning in all that they do.

Our view is that there should be a strong integral connection between higher education and the marketplace. We also believe that, at the same time, colleges and universities should stay true to the principles embodied in a liberal arts education, particularly the integrated perspective that such an education provides. There are challenges on both fronts. The consequences of the disconnection between subject areas, basic and applied research, universities and the communities and market place they serve, manifests with incremental evolutionary discoveries and advancements and weak economic growth compared to earlier years in the twentieth century when discoveries were made in leaps and bounds.

Discoveries arise from disciplines that come together to solve complex challenges, so the connection between disciplines is more important than ever if we are to produce students who can work with others to solve the challenges of the twenty-first century. Providing students with ample opportunities to explore ideas with depth and breadth is critically important. Without the ability to make connections between ideas and disciplines, our students will not be able to create a world that offers the kind of economic growth we have come to expect.

If we consider the liberal arts historically, when they were first established in the sixth century, it was believed that if an individual studied seven (to nine) subject areas they would have the tools they needed to learn, succeed, grow, and interact with the world around them. In other words, they would be fully equipped with an educated perspective that would enable them to contribute meaningful ideas and actions within their local communities and beyond because they could see, from all perspectives, the challenges they faced while anticipating fitting responses that would make their world better. An educated perspective in this fashion embodies exploration and discovery (astronomy, biology), communication (grammar, rhetoric, and mathematics), and art and technology (geometry and music) thus creating the well-rounded renaissance individual in intellect and experience (Klibansky, 1966).

The integration of the liberal arts was more than just preparatory; in reality, the liberal arts were considered to “promote the specifically human values, revealing to man his place in the universe” (Klibansky, 1966, p. 9–10). Today, the educational terrain is radically different than the sixth century in that the academy has deviated from this perspective and isolated itself from having that well-rounded perspective; in fact, it has become so

specialized that an integral perspective is more difficult to develop (Ferrall, 2011). Engaging in an integral fashion in all facets of higher education provides a pathway toward an integral consciousness in our institutions and our organizations.

Integrative Liberal Learning Promotes Adaptability, Creativity, and New Perspectives So Students Can Apply Their Knowledge and Skills to New Situations. We hear from employers that what they want and need in employees are the general skills, knowledge, and attitudes that our four tools and other integrative components offer so that students are ready to see connections between problems and solutions, be able to adapt to changing situations, work with others to solve problems, and collaborate in new and unique ways especially in relation to advancements in technologies (Friedman, 2014). Through integrative learning, students will be able to adapt, envision, and implement strategies in collaboration with others with the mindset that we are in this world together, so we ought to work together to make the world better and more sustainable. The ability to be a holistic thinker with a liberal arts background and expertise in a particular area is a competency necessary for the modern worker to be effective and successful moving into the future (Sopegina, Chapaev, & Simonova, 2016).

Integrative learning plays a significant role in student success (Ferren & Anderson, 2016). Key features of integrative learning include providing students with holistic experiences and project-based learning. Another feature includes helping students make connections between their education and the outside world through experiential education and real-world applications, all of which make education that is integrated with the liberal arts purposeful, personal, and practical. Integration is not only beneficial for students; the integration of faculty creates an infrastructure that naturally allows pathways for disciplines to come together in collaboration and problem solving. This kind of collaboration is challenging to do in a traditional silo-centric organizational structure where disciplines are situated within their own disciplinary departments with boundaries.

Integrative Liberal Learning Is Powerful for All Students Across All Types of Institutions and Modes of Education. As we move into twenty-first-century living, we cannot continue to provide a twentieth-century education model. Providing a narrow or one-dimensional education will no longer be enough to contribute to a sustainable future. Socioeconomic factors should not drive who gets what kind of education. For all students moving into their area of responsible citizenry, we must provide the most relevant and current education that will prepare them for the world as it is now and the world as it might be tomorrow. In every kind of education beyond high school, we need to shift our educational methodologies and models and move toward an integrative learning model for the benefit of our future citizens and world changers.

At Plymouth State, we adopted an integrated learning model as well as integrated the traditional administrative structures that have

faculty, staff, students, and other constituents working together across every function and environment around campus. With this new organizational integration, we have teams of people making decisions collaboratively within a flattened hierarchical environment. By the end of the academic year 2019 we will no longer have deans and department chairs. The University president, provost, group leaders, and collaborative teams of people work to lead the integrated clusters and realize the University's mission. These teams are constitutive of the university. Teams of people from across campus lead clusters where administrative, strategic, and academic roles are tied together. There is full integration of constituents leading from within rather than from above. The complete integration of our organizational practices and processes in academic affairs and student affairs creates a horizontal/flattened organizational structure designed to enable streamlined collaboration while keeping students' needs and experiences at the forefront of our work. We recognize we all need to become what Peter Senge (1990) refers to as a learning organization in order for all these plans to be successful. Before concluding this chapter, we show how integration enables the development of a learning organization.

Becoming a Learning Organization

Peter Senge (1990) is a faculty member at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the founding leader of the Society for Organizational Learning. Senge's hallmark publication, *The Fifth Discipline* (1990) lays out the principles of what he refers to as the learning organization, the kind of organization most prepared to respond and evolve with the changing economic, political, and financial environments.

Senge (1990) describes learning organizations as places where people, workers, employees have the capacity to expand their knowledge, understanding, and practices so that their work flow and work outcomes are open to and invite truly creative results that require new ways of thinking. An ongoing learner develops expansive patterns of thought that are liberated from assumptions and perceived constraints. These learners are also able to think in a gestalt sense and see the entirety of the system at play and in sync. Senge argues that if organizations want to survive such a rapidly changing environment as the one in which we live in today, we need to be flexible, we need to adapt, and still we need to be productive; the only way this can occur is if the workers, the people who do the business of the organization, are continually learning and expanding their ways of understanding their work and their world.

Learning is not as simple as acquiring new knowledge. People in the organizations are not the only ones responsible for keeping the organization going. The organization itself, and its structures, need to be flexible enough for people to see their work differently and do their work differently. Leadership in the organization must see that the structures in the organization

allow for new ways of doing things, for varying perspectives to coexist, and for people to experiment without the fear of consequences for failing.

Senge (1990) argues that a learning organization survives through “adaptive learning”; this is essential. However, an organization cannot stop there; adaptive learning must be coupled with generative learning to become the “learning that enhances our capacity to create” (p. 14). The difference between a learning organization and a traditional organization can be described through Senge’s five key elements of systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, building a shared vision, and team learning.

Systems thinking is a central component of the learning organization. Systems thinking is the principle discipline that integrates the other disciplines into a cohesive framework that is interdependent and focused on interrelationships and brings together theory, practice, and possibility (Senge, 1990). Systems thinking allows one to conceptualize inner workings, relationships, feedback, and delays, or pauses as the dynamic process of working together remains ongoing. Systems can be complex and dynamic; we cannot assume systems are static and emotionless. Because people are parts of systems, there are always challenges, changes, and risks at play, which lead to a dynamic environment that is not always predictable or certain.

Personal mastery refers to the process of ongoing clarification and deepening one’s understanding of the self, one’s personal vision, a focusing of energy, cultivating an ability to be patient, and constantly checking one’s assumptions and perceptions so that seeing an objective reality is more of a real picture of the world (Senge, 1990). This is not just referring to knowing one’s skill sets, expertise, or experience, although these are part of the overall mastery. Personal mastery includes a spiritual understanding of the self and one’s way of being in the world. People with a high level of personal mastery usually learn constantly and yet never believe they know what they need to know. These individuals are always learning and growing.

Mental models are “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures and images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (Senge, 1990, p. 8). Mental models left unchecked can become barriers to growth and perspective-changing. Organizations must find a way to work with mental models so that people begin to understand their own mental models and the organization will understand better how to motivate and inspire its workers to learn new skills and see the world differently. Left unchecked, mental models can quickly become a playing field of groupthink. Self-reflection and introspection are key attributes for the learning organization to foster in all of its human partners.

Building shared vision is key to the survival of organizations, and leadership must empower all constituents to have agency in this process of building. A shared vision encourages people to take risks and experiment with new ideas and new possibilities. Senge (1990) argues that when there is a genuine vision that is created by the heart and soul of the organization, people will want to learn, excel, participate, and engage within that vision.

The vision itself becomes embodied through the commitment of the people. A shared vision is created through dialogue, dialectic, finding common ground, shared interests, and trust. Having a shared vision is integral to the success of the organization.

Team learning involves “the process of aligning and developing the capacities of a team to create the results its members truly desire” (Senge, 1990, p. 236). Team learning depends on the team, and the team members need to know their personal mastery, understand their mental models as well as the mental models that others on the team have. Also, they all need to have agency when it comes to the shared vision. When this happens, people learn together, and their learning drives the trajectory of the organization.

Integration as a methodology for organizational change requires learning. Overhauling work flow, changing mental models that have come to form individual identities, and, inviting people not only to enhance their competencies and skills sets, but also to do the sometimes more difficult work of becoming more spiritually aware of how they work and who they are at work, are central attributes to flexibility and adaptiveness in a work environment. Leading organizational change by integration requires the organization to become a learning organization. Integration as a method is a dialectical partner with the learning organization. The commonality between the two conceptualizations is the understanding of systems thinking and recognition of the role of interdependence and interrelationships within organizational culture.

Conclusion

Plymouth State University not only shifted to an integrative learning model, we have also evolved our organization to becoming a learning organization and one that is a deliberately integrated organizational model. We are an integral university. While we are teaching our students through integrated education and thinking, we are also inviting our constituents to be active and open participants in a deliberately integrated organization. We decided to shift our stride and find a better way that involves innovative thinking, an entrepreneurial action plan, and focus on integrated learning to ensure we lift the boundaries and constraints that led us to the point of becoming irrelevant and isolated from the real world (DeMillo, 2015; Ford, Rajagopalan, & Birx, 2014). Within our integrated educational model, we work to ensure that students will have an integrated experience that provides the most potential to prepare them for lifetime success in a changing and evolving world.

References

Anders, G. (2017). *You can do anything: The surprising power of a “useless” liberal arts education*. New York: Little, Brown, and Company.

- Arneson, P. (2007). *Perspectives on philosophy of communication*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Crow, M. M. (2007). Enterprise: The path to transformation for emerging public universities. *The Presidency*, 10(2), 24–28.
- Crow, M. M., & Dabars, W. B. (2015). *Designing the new American university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- DeMillo, R. A. (2015). *Revolution in higher education: How a small band of innovators will make colleges assessable and affordable*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Esbjorn-hargens, S., Reams, J., & Gunnlaugson, O. (2010). The emergence and characteristics of integral education: An introduction. In S. Esbjorn-hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.), *Integral education: New Directions for Higher Learning* (pp. 1–16). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fan, M. (2004, October). *The idea of integrated education: From the point of view of Whitehead's philosophy of education*. Paper presented at the Forum for Integrated Education and Education Reform sponsored by the Council for Global Integrative Education, Santa Cruz, CA. Retrieved from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/CGIE/fan.pdf>
- Ferrall, V. (2011). *Liberal arts at the brink*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ferren, A. S., & Anderson, C. B. (2016). Integrative learning: Making liberal education purposeful, personal, and practical. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 145, 33–40.
- Ferren, A. S., & Paris, D. (2015). *Draft: Principles and practices of integrative liberal learning*. Retrieved from <https://undergrad.ucf.edu/whatsnext/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Principles-and-Practices-of-Integrative-Liberal-Learning.pdf>
- Ford, R. M., Rajagopalan, B., & Bix, D. (2014). Rethinking universities as innovation factories. *Translational Materials Research*, 1(1), 016002, <https://doi.org/10.1088/2053-1613/1/1/016002>.
- Freidman, T. (2014, February 22). How to get a job at Google. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/23/opinion/sunday/friedman-how-to-get-a-job-at-google.html>
- Gebser, J. (1985). *The ever-present origin*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kimball, B. A. (2015). Will the liberal arts survive the bronze age of American academe? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(1), 156–170.
- Klibansky, R. (1966). The school of Chartres. In M. Clagett, G. Post, & R. Reynolds (Eds.), *Twelfth century Europe and the foundations of modern society* (pp. 3–14). Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Molz, M., & Hampson, G. P. (2010). Elements of the underacknowledged history of integral education. In S. Esbjorn-Hargens, J. Reams, & O. Gunnlaugson (Eds.), *Integral education: New Directions for Higher Learning* (pp. 35–46). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155–169.
- von Schiller, F. (2004). *Letters upon the aesthetic education of man*. New York: Kessinger Publications.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The art & practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency.
- Sopegina, V., Chapaev, N. K., & Simonova, M. V. (2016). Integration of pedagogical and technical knowledge in forming meta-competencies of a modern worker. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11, 7836–7846.
- Tompkins, P. (2009). Rhetorical listening and moral sensitivity. *International Journal of Listening*, 23(1), 60–67.

ANNETTE M. HOLBA is the discipline coordinator for the Department of Communication and Media Studies at Plymouth State University.

PATRICIA T. BAHR is executive assistant, Office of the President at Plymouth State University.

DONALD L. BIRX is president of Plymouth State University.

MARK J. FISCHLER is associate professor of criminal justice at Plymouth State University.