

Posted on March 19, 2001

Not All Are Created Equal: An Analysis of the Environmental Programs/Departments in U.S. Academic Institutions Until March 2002

Aldemaro Romero* and Hanne Eastwood

Environmental Studies Program

Macalester College

1600 Grand Ave., St. Paul, MN 55105-1899

USA

*romero@macalester.edu to whom correspondence should be sent

Abstract

Environmental programs have traditionally lack definition of their nature and unifying principles. In order to ascertain how these programs are presently constituted in U.S. institutions of higher education, we surveyed 670 environmental programs/departments between September 2001 and March 2002. The states with the highest number of those programs/departments were California (58), New York (56), Pennsylvania (48), Massachusetts (40), and Ohio (28), while those with the lowest numbers are Idaho and Wyoming (0), North Dakota, South Dakota, Mississippi, and West Virginia (1), and Hawaii, Kansas, Arkansas, and Delaware (2). However, when the state population is taken into account and the number of program per 1,000,000 inhabitants is calculated, the results vary greatly for the ones that were at the top in absolute numbers but remain basically the same for those that were at the bottom in absolute number. Thus, the states with the highest number of programs/departments per 1,000,000 inhabitants are Vermont (23.00), the District of Columbia (13.98), Montana (9.96), Alaska (9.57), Rhode Island (8.59), and New Hampshire (8.09), and while at the bottom we find Idaho and Wyoming (0), Mississippi (0.35), West Virginia (0.55), Alabama (0.67), Kansas and Kentucky (0.74), and Arkansas (0.75).

The names Environmental Science and Environmental Studies are, by far, the most

common ones being, between the two of them, 47.62% of the program names. They are followed by engineering (11.04%), Health/Toxicology (7.61%), and Biology/Ecology/Conservation (6.87%). The first two are more commonly used in college settings while Environmental Engineering is more common among universities ($p < 0.5$). The vast majority of environmental programs fall within the natural sciences realm (56.12%). There are 225 programs (33.58%) interdisciplinary in nature because of combining two or all three areas of knowledge, but only 23 (4.18%) are fully interdisciplinary by combining all areas of knowledge.

The mean number of degrees offered per institution was 1.230 for colleges and 1.921 for universities, which was not statistically significantly different (t-test, $p < 0.5$). A total of 119 colleges offer an internship experience (required or not) vs. 263 universities doing so. Universities have a statistically significant higher number of programs that require internship opportunities vs. programs housed at 4-year colleges (t-test, $p < 0.5$).

Between 1900 (the year of the first program created) and 1958, only 14 programs were established. For the period 1959-1999, there is a dramatic increase in the number of programs being created. There are two big "waves" in the creation of programs: one between 1965 and 1976 (with a high peak in 1970) and another starting 1988 and, probably, continuing to this date, with a peak in 1997. Representatives of the programs surveyed, cited students and faculty demand as the most common reason behind the creation of those programs.

The high diversity of names and emphases found in this study is consistent with the premise that Environmental Studies is a field where there is a lack of unifying principles and clarity of what environmental studies programs should be. This is a continuous project to be updated on a yearly basis.

Introduction

There is great uncertainty about Environmental Studies (ES) as an academic field and how to design environmental programs for institutions of higher education (Soulé & Press 1998, Maniates & Whissel 2000). In general, the status of ES programs (ESPs) is characterized by competing proposals. There is neither agreement as to the characterization of the domain nor a basis for identification and selection of accurate and appropriate subject matter of ESPs (Bennett 1996).

Traditionally, most ESPs have been envisioned as an integrating concept that draws elements from many traditional disciplines, but actual integration or synthesis of that knowledge has been difficult to define and/or achieve. Thus, it is not always possible to ascertain when that integration is accomplished. No consensus has been reached on whether ES Studies is a field that can be described as an area for professional and technical preparation, interdisciplinary, multidisciplinary, metadisciplinary or a discipline in itself (Caldwell 1983, Horning 1996,

Jacobson & McDuff 1998, Mattes 1994, McLaughlin 1994, Newell & Green 1982, Schneider 1997, Wilke 1995). Furthermore, whether or not its teaching must include certain ethical values and what those values should be, have also been a source of discussion (Hunn 1996, Kim & Dixon 1993, Orr 1990).

Despite all these shortcomings, there is evidence that ESPs are increasing in number and importance among institutions of higher education (Kettl 1999, Romero et al. 2000, Maniates & Whissel 2000). Yet, there have been, to our knowledge, only two extensive, in-depth survey of environmental programs/departments in U.S. academic institutions (Romero et al. 2000, Maniates & Whissel 2000). Past statistical analyses on their number in higher education have always been vague (e.g., Brough 1992).

The major goal of this paper is to analyze on a yearly bases as many environmental programs in U.S. institutions of higher education as possible as a continuation of our previous work (Romero et al. 2000, 2001). We continue to study the following characteristics: 1) geographic distribution; 2) number of programs per institution; 3) how those programs define themselves by name (e.g., environmental studies, environmental science, etc.); 4) emphases of those programs by areas of knowledge (natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, interdisciplinary); 5) degree offered (B.A., B. Sc., Masters', Ph.D.); 6) whether internships and study away/abroad opportunities were offered and if any of those was required; 7) vital statistics (number of students enrolled, number of students graduated in 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 number of faculty involved in those programs and the status of those faculty, i.e., number of faculty that: a) were assigned to the environmental program/department, whether they were b) full-time, c) shared with other departments/programs, d) part-time faculty, 8) year in which the environmental program/department was created, and 9) why the program was created.

Materials and Methods

We define as an environmental program/department any of those that use the word environmental in their title, from the standard environmental studies, science, and engineering to the less common environmental journalism or law. We also include those that although their names do not carry the word environmental, define themselves as environmental in nature in their advertisement material.

Much of the data presented in this study was collected in the last two years from the previous editions of this paper (Romero et al. 2000, Romero et al. 2001). In addition to the methods used then, we obtained the most recent information through direct contact with the administrators of the programs themselves via email and telephone. Administrators of programs for which we had information previously were asked to provide updates, and those who we contacted for the first time were asked to complete the entire survey. We also visited the websites of particular colleges and universities, and consulted Rodenhouse (2000). Direct responses (about 50% of the programs surveyed) were compiled. For those that did not reply to our request for information we based the data provided in this paper on their advertised information either in their web pages or in their brochures. When there was no advertised

information in a specific category, we assumed no changes and left the information as it was in Romero et al. (2001). Each program was treated as an individual entry for statistical purposes even when there was more than one program for the same academic institution.

Data collection was carried out between September 2001 and March 2002. To locate the programs/departments, we used online search engines such as Peterson’s guide to graduate schools (www.petersons.com) and Peterson’s *CollegeQuest* for undergraduate programs (www.collegequest.com). We also used other sites that carry extensive lists of higher education programs in the environmental arena, such as the web page of the Committee for the National Institute of the Environment (www.cnie.org) and Second Nature (<http://www.starfish.org>). We also looked at Brillault (2000) as a source for environmental law programs. Other programs were located through their web pages by typing in the words environment or environmental and matching those with the words program and/or department in the following search engines: Excite, HotBot, LookSmart, Lycos, Snap, About.com, and Google. In order to locate programs/departments that were more recently created and for which information was not readily available in the sources cited above, we have been scrutinizing job advertisements for academic positions in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Science* since September 1999.

Results and Discussion

General: Results are compiled in Table 1. We present information on a total of 670 programs/departments in 378 institutions of higher education. 124 of them were colleges and the rest universities, independent graduate schools, and/or law schools. Of those, 161 (24.03%) responded to our survey, which is about the same for past surveys (Romero et al. 2001). Those programs are listed alphabetically according to the name of the academic institution to which they belong. At the end of this Table we list the URL address from each program from which we obtained the initial information, whether or not people from that program/department responded to our survey, the name of the person we contacted or who at least appeared as responsible for the program/department based on his/her title (program director/coordinator, chair), and the email address of that program/department that we used or at least appeared to be the one for contact/further inquiry for that program.

[Click here for Table 1](#) (Microsoft Excel file).

Geographic Distribution: The second column on Tables 1, identifies the location of the institution by state. The programs/departments per state are summarized in Table 2. In order to see whether these numbers really represent any level of interest for these kinds of programs in the academic institutions of these states, they must be correlated to the population in those states. Using also U.S. Census Bureau data (<http://www.census.gov>) as for 18 March 2002, we divided the number of programs/department by the population of that state and region.

Table 2. Number of Environmental programs/departments per state/population

Region	# Programs/	Population	Programs/
--------	-------------	------------	-----------

(Total # of Programs)	State	State	(2000)	1,000,000
ALASKA/ HAWAII (8)	Alaska	6	626,932	9.57
	Hawaii	2	1,211,537	2.42
WEST COAST (101)	Washington	22	5,934,300	3.71
	Oregon	21	3,421,399	6.14
	California	58	33,871,648	1.71
ROCKY MOUNTAINS (49)	Arizona	8	5,130,632	1.56
	Colorado	17	4,301,261	3.95
	Idaho	0	1,251,700	0
	Montana	9	902,195	9.96
	Nevada	6	1,998,257	3.00
	New Mexico	6	1,819,046	3.30
	Utah	3	2,233,169	1.34
	Wyoming	0	493,782	0
MIDWEST (151)	Illinois	19	12,419,293	1.53
	Iowa	11	2,926,324	3.76
	Indiana	17	6,080,485	2.80
	Kansas	2	2,688,418	0.74
	Michigan	27	9,938,444	2.72
	Minnesota	15	4,919,479	3.05
	Missouri	7	5,595,211	1.25
	Nebraska	4	1,711,263	2.34
	North Dakota	1	642,200	1.56
	Ohio	28	11,353,140	2.47
	South Dakota	1	754,844	1.32
	Wisconsin	19	5,363,675	3.54
SOUTH (149)	Alabama	3	4,447,100	0.67
	Arkansas	2	2,673,400	0.75
	Delaware	2	783,600	2.55
	District of Columbia	8	572,059	13.98
	Florida	18	15,982,378	1.13
	Georgia	11	8,186,453	1.34
	Kentucky	3	4,041,769	0.74
	Louisiana	10	4,468,976	2.24
	Maryland	12	5,296,486	2.27

	Mississippi	1	2,844,658	0.35
	North Carolina	14	8,049,313	1.74
	Oklahoma	3	3,450,654	0.87
	South Carolina	8	4,012,012	1.99
	Tennessee	8	5,689,283	1.41
	Texas	24	20,851,820	1.15
	Virginia	21	7,078,515	2.97
	West Virginia	1	1,808,344	0.55
NORTHEAST (214)	Connecticut	13	3,405,565	3.82
	Maine	9	1,274,923	7.06
	Massachusetts	40	6,349,097	6.30
	New Hampshire	10	1,235,786	8.09
	New Jersey	15	8,414,350	1.78
	New York	56	18,976,457	2.95
	Pennsylvania	48	12,281,054	3.91
	Rhode Island	9	1,048,319	8.59
	Vermont	14	608,827	23.00

This table shows that in absolute numbers, the states with the highest number of programs/departments are California (58), New York (56), Pennsylvania (48), Massachusetts (40), and Ohio (28), while those with the lowest numbers are Idaho and Wyoming (0), North Dakota, South Dakota, Mississippi, and West Virginia (1), and Hawaii, Kansas, Arkansas, and Delaware (2). However, when the state population is taken into account and the number of program per 1,000,000 inhabitants is calculated, the results vary greatly for the ones that were at the top in absolute numbers but remain basically the same for those that were at the bottom in absolute number. Thus, the states with the highest number of programs/departments per 1,000,000 inhabitants are Vermont (23.00), the District of Columbia (13.98), Montana (9.96), Alaska (9.57), Rhode Island (8.59), and New Hampshire (8.09), and while at the bottom we find Idaho and Wyoming (0), Mississippi (0.35), West Virginia (0.55), Alabama (0.67), Kansas and Kentucky (0.74), and Arkansas (0.75).

Of the above, the data for the District of Columbia needs to be qualified. The reason is that we can assume that a large number of people enrolled in these types of programs in D.C. institutions are actually residents of either Maryland or Virginia.

We produced four maps: the first indicates the absolute number of programs/departments per state (Fig. 1). The second (Fig. 2) represents the number of programs per region of the United States. Those regions were defined using the U.S. Census Bureau definition for states comprising six U.S. regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, West, West Coast, and Alaska and Hawaii (www.census.gov). We also produced a third map (Fig. 3) in which the programs/departments are shown in relation to 1,000,000 people for each state.

Figure 1: Environmental Programs/Departments by State




Figure 2: Environmental Programs/Departments by Region


Studies, E. Science, E. Engineering, E. Biology/Ecology/Conservation Biology, E. Health/Toxicology, E. Policy/Analysis/Planning, E. Management, E. Law, E. Chemistry, E. Education, Natural Resources/Management, E. Economics/Economics Management, E. Geology. When the name of the program was dual (e.g., Environmental Science/Studies), we used the most inclusive denomination (Environmental Studies) unless they had two clearly distinct tracts (e.g., environmental science and environmental engineering). We created a column for "others" when there were fewer than four carrying a particular name. The results of programs according to their name are summarized in Table 3 and represented in Fig. 4.

Table 3. Environmental Programs/Departments according to their own denomination (March 2002).

Program Name	Number
Science	180 (26.87%)
Studies	139 (20.75%)
Engineering	74 (11.04%)
Health/Toxicology	51 (7.61%)
Policy/Analysis/Planning	48 (7.16%)
Biology/Ecology/Conservation	46 (6.87%)
Law	38 (5.67%)
Management (i.e., business management perspective)	30 (4.48%)
Natural Resource Management	26 (3.88%)
Chemistry	20 (2.99%)
Geology	15 (2.24%)
Economics	14 (2.09%)
Education	10 (1.49%)
Others	64 (9.55%)

Figure 4: Environmental Programs/Departments - March 2002, n=670

Environmental Programs/Departments by Name



The names Environmental Science and Environmental Studies are, by far, the most common ones being, between the two of them, 47.62% of the program names. They are followed by engineering (11.04%), Health/Toxicology (7.61%), and Biology/Ecology/Conservation (6.87%). Although the number for "Others" seems high, the reason is the huge diversity of names given to many programs.

In order to determine if there is a dependence between the name of the environmental programs and the nature of the institution, a chi-square test was performed. The null hypothesis was that the names given to environmental programs are independent of the type of academic institution in which they are found. We found that the names "Environmental Studies" and "Environmental Science" are much more commonly used in college settings while "Environmental Engineering" is more common among universities ($p < 0.5$).

Area of Knowledge: In order to ascertain the particular area of knowledge on which different programs could be placed and whether or not they have any degree of interdisciplinarity, we analyzed their course requirements. If 75% or more of the courses required were within a particular area (natural sciences vs. social sciences vs. humanities) then the program was categorized as belonging to that area of knowledge. Otherwise they were categorized as belonging to two or more areas of knowledge, but also using the 25% of courses within a particular area as the litmus test. Thus, programs that were classified as fully interdisciplinary were those that contain at least 25% from each of those fields of knowledge. For the accounting of courses, courses that by itself were interdisciplinary in nature such as the capstone seminar were not assigned as belonging to any particular area of knowledge. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 4 and Fig. 5.

Table 4. Programs by actual area of knowledge they emphasize.


Area of Knowledge	Number of Programs
Natural Sciences	376 (56.11%)

Social Sciences	69 (10.30%)
Natural Sciences/Social Sciences	193 (28.81%)
Social Sciences/Humanities	4 (0.60%)
Natural Sciences/Social Sciences/Humanities	28 (4.18%)

Figure 5: Environmental Programs/Departments Emphases - March 2002

Environmental Programs/Departments by Emphases

NS = Natural Sciences; SS = Social Sciences; HUM = Humanities



Again, the vast majority of environmental programs fall within the natural sciences realm (56.12%). There are 225 programs (33.58%) interdisciplinary in nature because of combining two or all three areas of knowledge, but only 23 (4.18%) are fully interdisciplinary by combining all areas of knowledge.


By degree offered: Results of compiling information about degree offered are summarized in Table 5 and Fig. 6.

Table 5. Number of programs according to the degree they offer

Degrees Offered	Number of Programs
Bachelor in Arts	190
Bachelors in Science	318
Masters'	275
Ph.D./Doctoral	146
Law Degree	38
TOTAL	967

Figure 6: Degrees Offered - March 2002

Degrees Offered



As suspected from the high number of natural sciences-based programs, the larger proportion of undergraduate programs offered a Bachelor's in Science degree. Notice that the sum is higher than the number of programs identified for this study. The reason is that many programs offer more than one degree. Also, this figure is not complete, since we did not receive explicit information from some programs regarding the degree they offer and, thus, they were left in blank.

When analyzing the number of degrees per type of institution (4-year college vs. university offering either a master's degree, a doctorate or law degree), we found that in terms of absolute numbers the total number of degrees offered by colleges is 146 while by universities is 496, which is consistent with the fact that unlike 4-year colleges, universities can offer both undergraduate and graduate (masters' and doctorate programs) simultaneously. Yet the mean number of degrees offered per institution was 1.230 for colleges and 1.921 for universities, which was not statistically significantly different (t-test, $p < 0.5$).

Internships/Study Away-Abroad Programs: Results of the survey are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Programs/Departments according on whether they offer/require internships and study away opportunities.

Program Type	Number
Internships (required or not)	323
Required Internship	118
Study Away/Abroad	193
TOTAL (Internships + Study Away/Abroad)	634

The figures shown in Table 6 represent a lower number of the actual internships and study away/abroad programs offered at those institutions because a number of programs did not

return our surveys in that regard. Yet, it is safe to assume that most programs include internships opportunities and that about one third of them require that internship to be completed as part of the graduation requirements. Study away/abroad opportunities also seem to be fairly common. We could not find any single program that requires taking such opportunities as their graduation requirements.

We analyzed whether the type of the institution affected the fact that an internship was offered. A total of 119 colleges offer an internship experience (required or not) vs. 263 universities doing so. Universities have a statistically significant higher number of programs that require internship opportunities vs. programs housed at 4-year colleges (t-test, $p < 0.5$).

Demographics: Table 7 summarizes the demographics for those programs that responded to our request for information in this area. It includes number of students enrolled, number of graduates in 1998, number of full-time faculty involved in the program, number of faculty assigned to that program and/or department, number of faculty shared with other department/program, and number of part-time faculty working in that program/department. For this compilation, we used data only from the 297 programs that responded to our survey.

Table 7. Vital statistics of those programs/departments that responded to our survey.

Data	Number
Number of Students	32,512
Number of 1998 graduates*	7,217
Number of 1999 graduates*	2,742
Number of 2000 graduates*	2,982
Number of 2001 graduates*	240
Full-time faculty	5,365
In Department/Program	2,230
Shared	5,949
Part-time	2,825

*These are gross underestimations since the numbers depend upon the responses to interviews.

These are, by far, the most problematic statistics to obtain. First, the data depend entirely on feedback from the person in charge from the program. Those statistics are highly variable because of the continuous flow in the number of students and faculty assigned to a program at a particular time. Finally, the interpretation of what means "shared" faculty with "full-time" (tenure track or none-tenure track?), part-time (for the program itself or for the entire institution?) varies drastically among institutions. Given than less that the programs responded to our survey, they could safely be extrapolated multiplying them by two, yet taking into consideration the above-referred shortcomings. It seems that the only way to obtain more accurate statistics in this regard is via phone interview where the meaning of our

categories can be better explained.

The number of institutions for which we have graduate information in 1998 is 335, for 1999 it is 46, and for 2000 it is 43. Because of these large discrepancies in sample size, the only statistic that is somewhat interesting here is the average number of graduates per program (for which we have information) across the three years. In 1998, average number of graduates was 23.7, in 1999 it was 38.7 and in 2000 it was 33.1. There are really not enough data to make any claims about a trend, especially since the institutions for which we have graduate information in one year may not be in the same set as that for another year. This means that any change, like graduate numbers from a large university in 1999 not reporting their information for 2000 would skew these averages.

Year of creation: Based on the information provided by those who responded to our survey, we used the year in which the program/department was created by the academic authorities irrespective of whether the program was initiated in effect that very same year.

To see if there are historical patterns in the creation of those programs, we displayed the number of programs/departments created per year in two figures. Fig. 7 shows the number of programs/departments created between 1900 (the first year for which a program was created) and 1958. Fig. 8 shows the number of programs/departments created between 1959 and 1999. The cut-off date of 1959 was selected because before that year very few programs/departments were created and they appeared very parsimoniously while beginning in 1959 at least one program/department was created every year. We did not find information about programs that after being created may have been eliminated and, thus, if that has been the case, those possible programs have not been taken into consideration.

Figure 7: Chronological 1900-1956





Figure 8: Chronological 1959-1999




Although they represent less than half of all the programs, patterns are clearly defined. For example, between 1900 (the year of the first program created) and 1958, only 14 programs were created. Only one year, 1944, shows more than one being created the same year. Only

between 1948 and 1950 and between 1955 and 1956 we see programs being created in consecutive years.

For the period 1959-1999, there is a dramatic increase in the number of programs being created. There are two big "waves" in the creation of programs: one between 1965 and 1976 (with a peak in 1970) and another starting in 1988 and, probably, continuing to this date, with a peak in 1997. The lower number of programs reported for 1999 is probably lower than the actual number since more recent programs are more difficult to locate. The publicity material is less noticeable; some may not have even developed a web page of their own.

Is there any explanation for this swing in the creation of programs? Fig. 9 points out to major events that took place in environmental issues per year. The first peak (1965) coincides with the publication of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring*. The next peak, 1968, coincides with the publication of Paul and Anne Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb*. The big peak for 1970 coincides with the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (which was also the year of the enacting of the Clean Air Act and the creation of the League of Conservation Voters). There is a dramatic drop in programs created for 1971 (the year Greenpeace was formed) and a rebound for 1972 (the year of the enacting of the Clean Water Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the publication of Club of Rome's *The Limits of Growth*). It drops again for 1973, the year of the enacting of the Endangered Species Act, and from then on there is steady decline with a low for 1977. Until virtually 1992, the creation of new programs seem to be stabilized despite big ecological news in the media in 1978 (Love Canal), 1979 (Three-Mile Island), 1988 (Exxon Valdez), and the public uproar by the policies implemented in 1982 by Ronald Reagan's Interior Secretary James Watt. The latter should not be underestimated because that triggered an exponential increase in membership among environmental organizations.

Figure 9: Chronological 1959-1999 with Major Events



However, these data may lead to false conclusions such as that the creation of the EPA convinced college and university administrators about the need of offering careers to would satisfied public sector demand for those professionals. Although that might have been the case for some institutions, the decision on commitment of faculty, staff, and financial resources is not something that takes place within a few months period in academic institution given the complex governance system (i.e., multiplicity of committees with a say in such matters, approval by the board of trustees, etc.) that operates in most of them.

A much safer parsimonious interpretation is that those were the years of rise in environmental awareness and that colleges and universities were competing for students with expectations to graduate with a degree in that area. The low plateau reached between 1977 and 1991 coincides with the country's preoccupation on other matters (Watergate, the U.S. hostages in Iran, the more conservative views in government during the Reagan administration). The resurgence observed from the early 1990's may well be explained by two factors: 1) the increased respectability of environmental careers as a source of professionals needed not only in government but also in the private (e.g., consulting firms, in-house environmental professionals) sector as well as in the increasingly professionalized non-profit organizations; 2) Interdisciplinary programs became more and more acceptable, particularly among Liberal Arts Colleges.

Program Inception

Environmental programs in the U.S. were created for a variety of reasons. Among the 90 respondents to our question as to why the institution began its environmental programs, the main reasons cited by these institutions were student demand (39 schools), faculty demand (21 schools)^[1], and the growing job market for environmental careers (13 schools). The fourth most common response was that the program was added in response to a major environmental event, such as an oil spill, the formation of the EPA, or Earth Day. There were some very unique responses as well. Alabama A&M initiated its program in 1969 to attract more African Americans to the natural sciences. Dordt College in Iowa cites that an environmental program fits with the Christian belief that humans are to care for the earth as their reason for starting the program in 1985. While several respondents named need for an interdisciplinary program as a reason for starting up, only the University of Colorado at Denver noticed a lack of interdisciplinary skills among its faculty with different backgrounds. It began its environmental program in 1970 to, in some sense, force the faculty to learn to relate to one another.

The student and faculty demand responses are somewhat unrevealing in that there are probably other underlying reasons why the students and faculty were demanding such programs at the times they were. Nonetheless, it is important to note how many institutions responded to this demand by actually creating programs. In this case, it is clear that the students and faculty had a voice in their institutions' curriculum process. Interestingly, 20 of the 23 institutions that cited student or student and faculty demand as their reason for starting a program are small colleges. This perhaps demonstrates the larger student voice at such institutions than at large universities.

Conclusions

The high diversity of names and emphases found in this study is consistent with the premise that this is a field where there is a lack of unifying principles and clarity of what environmental studies programs should be. Based on the information we have been able to access, we suspect that patterns regarding graduation requirements (e.g., number of courses) and tracks (majors, minors, cores, etc.) are even more diverse which reflects the lack of consensus of what are/should be environmental studies in general as a discipline.

We plan to continue this study every year not only aimed to maintain information current, but also to improve the quantity and quality of information as discussed about by conducting phone interviews with those responsible for programs.

We encourage our readers not only to forward their general comments on this article, but also to update the information we have on their academic institution.

Acknowledgments

We thank all the faculty/administrators who responded to our request for information about their programs/departments. Their names can be found in Table 1. Molly Brandt, Phoebe B. S. Vanselow, Joel E. Creswell, Amanda Stern, and Katherine Benz worked on the 2000 version of this report, and Amanda Stern and Kathryn Benz worked on the 2001 version. Joshua Young of Macalester College provided help with the statistical analysis. Ann Esson prepared the manuscript in its current web format.

Literature Cited

- Bennett, B. Y. 1996. *Metaphor and Curriculum Theorizing in Environmental Studies*. Temple University Graduate Board, Ph.D. Dissertation, 81 pp.
- Brillault, M.R. 2000. *Assessment of Law Schools with Environment and Natural Resource Programs*. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 28(1):276-281.
- Brough, H. 1992. *Environmental Studies: Is it Academic?* *World Watch*. Jan.-Feb.: 26-33.
- Caldwell, L. K. 1983. *Environmental Studies: Discipline or Metadiscipline?* *The Environmental Professional* 5: 247-259.
- Horning, J. F. 1996. *Training the Next Generation*. *Environment*. June: 28-30.
- Hunn, J. L. 1996. *Toward a Reconstructive Education: An Environmental Studies Curriculum for the University Level*. San Diego State University, Master Thesis, 185 pp.
- Jacobson, S. K. & M. D. McDuff. 1998. *Training Idiot Savants: The Lack of Human Dimensions in Conservation Biology*. *Conservation Biology* 12(2): 263-267.

- Kettl, D. F. 1999. In Pollution research, Universities Can Bridge the Critical Gap Between Science and Policy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26 February 1999, p. B8.
- Kim, H. S. & J. P. Dixon. 1993. Subject Indicators to Present the Nature and Limit of Environmental Studies in US Graduate Schools. *The Environmentalist* 13(2): 137-144.
- Maniates, M.F. & J.C. Whissel. 2000. Environmental studies: The sky is not falling. *BioScience* 50(6):509-517.
- Mattes, K. B. 1994. How to Study the Environment? *Harvard Magazine* March/April 1994: 28-32.
- McLaughlin, Jr., C. H. 1994. Development Environmental Literacy Through Technology Education. *Technology Teacher* 54(3): 30-34.
- Newell, W. H. & W. J. Green. 1982. Defining and Teaching Interdisciplinary Studies. *Improving College and University Teaching* 30(1): 23-30.
- Orr, D. W. 1990. Environmental Education and Ecological Literacy. *The Education Digest* 55 (9): 49-53.
- Rodenhouse, M.P. (Ed). 2000. 2000 Higher Education Directory. Falls Church, Virginia: Higher Education Publications, Inc., 812 pp.
- Romero, A., M. Brandt, P. Vanselow, & J. Creswell. 2000. Not all are created equal: An analysis of the environmentally-related programs/ departments in U.S. academic institutions until December 1999. *Macalester Environmental Review* (www.macalester.edu/environmentalstudies/MacEnvReview/equalarticle.htm).
- Romero A., A. Stern, & K. Benz. 2001. Not all are created equal: An analysis of the environmental programs/ departments in U.S academic institutions until March 2001. *Macalester Environmental Review* (<http://www.macalester.edu/environmentalstudies/MacEnvReview/equalarticle2001.htm>).
- Schneider, S. H. 1997. Defining and Teaching environmental literacy. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 12(11): 457.
- Soulé, M. E. & D. E. Press. 1998. What is Environmental Studies? *BioScience* 48(5): 397-405.
- Wilke, R. 1995. Environmental Literacy and the College Curriculum. *Colleges and Universities Have a Challenge to Meet. EPA Journal*: Spring 1995: 28-30.
-

[1] Note that those schools that responded with “student and faculty demand” were added

into both the “student demand” and “faculty demand” categories.