A Four-in-One Interdisciplinary Training Model for Physics Master´s Students

Sun Tingting, Feng Mei, Wang Yan

Department of Physics, Zhejiang University of Science and Technology, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310023, China.

Email: tingtingsun@zust.edu.cn

DOI: 10.64649/yh.eg.issn3078-4794.20260505

Abstract: Interdisciplinary research has become a defining feature of contemporary science, yet graduate training in physics often remains organized within disciplinary boundaries: courses are built by discipline, facilities belong to individual groups, supervision is one-to-one, and progress is judged mainly by publication counts. This paper describes the design of a four-in-one training model for physics master´s students that addresses these constraints. The model combines an interdisciplinary curriculum anchored by a course on soft matter and molecular simulation, a shared practice platform with mandatory rotation across four functional zones, team supervision by faculty from physics, materials science, biology, and computer science, and a multi-source assessment scheme that judges integration, innovative practice, problem solving, and communication. For each component the paper sets out the design rationale and the activities through which it operates. The emphasis is on the architecture of the model.

Keywords: Interdisciplinary training; Physics master´s education; Team supervision; Multi-source assessment

1. Introduction

Research in the physical sciences has become increasingly collaborative across disciplinary boundaries. Bibliometric analyses show steady growth in publications drawing on more than one field, and disproportionate attention to work at the intersection of established fields.[1][2] Physics has long functioned as a connective discipline in this landscape: soft matter physics, biological physics, materials modeling, and machine-learning-assisted simulation all depend on concepts and instruments that sit between traditional departments. For graduate students, however, this connective role is rarely reflected in the structure of their training.

Institutional practice changes more slowly than research practice. Curricula are still organized by discipline, laboratory facilities usually belong to individual research groups, a student is normally assigned to one supervisor, and progress is judged by publications in venues recognized within that supervisor´s community. The result is a familiar mismatch: the problems students are expected to address are interdisciplinary, while the environment in which they are trained remains disciplinary. Students may run a simulation package without being able to judge whether the model suits a biological or a materials question. Such difficulties arise less from motivation than from the absence of occasions in which boundary crossing is rehearsed and rewarded.

Research on interdisciplinary graduate education identifies several conditions that matter. Studies of interdisciplinary programs report that outcomes, activities, and assessment are often misaligned, so that students are asked to become integrators while being evaluated as disciplinary specialists.[3][4] Work on interdisciplinary assessment argues that the quality of integration should itself be the object of judgment.[5] Research on graduate socialization shows that disciplinary norms are transmitted through sustained participation rather than formal instruction.[6] Studies of team science document both the productivity gains and the coordination costs of cross-field collaboration,[7] and studies of active learning point to structured practice with feedback as the

condition for complex competence.[8] Taken together, these strands suggest that interdisciplinary capacity is produced by the settings in which students work rather than by adding content to existing courses.

This paper describes one attempt to redesign those settings in a physics master´s program at Zhejiang University of Science and Technology, where four components were combined: an interdisciplinary curriculum, a shared practice platform, team supervision, and multi-source assessment. The account concentrates on design logic and organizational arrangement rather than on evaluation.

2. Design Considerations

The program admits a small cohort each year. Most students enter with a bachelor´s degree in physics or applied physics, a minority from materials science or engineering. Faculty research spans soft matter and molecular simulation, optoelectronic materials, and computational biophysics, and several groups already collaborate with colleagues in biology, chemistry, and computer science informally. The design built on these ties rather than creating new structures, which kept the organizational cost within what a department could absorb.

A needs analysis carried out before design, consisting of a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with students, supervisors, and two partner companies, identified three gaps. The first was curricular: no course connected statistical physics and soft matter theory to the simulation workflows and data-driven methods students encounter in research. The second concerned access: instruments and computing resources were tied to individual groups, so a student who needed a technique or a cluster outside the supervisor´s group had few legitimate ways to obtain training. The third concerned assessment: innovation was invoked in program documents but described only in general terms and inferred in practice from publication counts, which encouraged safe, incremental work.

Five principles were derived from these findings and from the literature. Progressive scaffolding establishes conceptual understanding before computational tools are introduced, so that software never substitutes for physical reasoning. Authentic boundary objects, that is, problems that cannot be addressed without drawing on at least two fields, make collaboration instrumentally necessary rather than merely desirable. Constructive alignment matches the stated outcome of interdisciplinary competence with the activities students perform and the evidence on which they are judged.[9] Sustained participation in a mixed community recognizes that standards of judgment are acquired through practice within a group.[6] Evidentiary pluralism refuses to let any single indicator, and in particular any bibliometric indicator, stand for interdisciplinary capacity.

These principles were operationalized in four components, summarized in Table 1. The components are deliberately coupled: the curriculum supplies the shared vocabulary that makes cross-group conversation possible, the platform supplies the occasions, the supervisory team supplies the audience and the standards, and the assessment scheme supplies the incentives. Removing any one of them weakens the others, which is the main design lesson of the model.

Table 1. Components of the four-in-one interdisciplinary training model.

Component	Function	Organizational form
Interdisciplinary curriculum	Shared conceptual and computational vocabulary across fields	Core course; frontier lectures; case seminars
Shared practice platform	Legitimate access to instruments and workflows outside the home group	Four functional zones; rotation; company projects
Team supervision	Transmits standards of judgment; provides a mixed audience	Primary supervisor plus cross-field co-advisor; joint seminar; mixed thesis committee
Multi-source assessment	Signals what counts as good interdisciplinary work; supports revision	Four dimensions judged against four evidence sources at three milestones

3. The Four-in-One Model

3.1 Interdisciplinary Curriculum

The curricular core is a one-semester graduate elective, Soft Matter and Molecular Simulation, developed for the program and described in detail elsewhere.[10] Its content is organized into three progressive modules. The first covers the statistical physics of soft matter, including polymers, colloids, and biomolecular assemblies, together with the principles of molecular dynamics: equations of motion, ensembles, and the control of temperature and pressure. The second turns to practice with widely used simulation packages and to the free-energy methods that connect simulation output to experimentally meaningful quantities, with attention to thermodynamic cycles, pathway design, and uncertainty. The third presents application cases, such as protein-ligand recognition and mutation-induced stability change, and introduces machine-learning approaches to structure prediction and molecular property estimation.

Two features matter for the wider model. The course adopts a physics-first stance: tools are introduced as implementations of assumptions, and students are asked which assumptions a workflow makes and when those assumptions fail. Artificial intelligence is taught for judgment rather than technical mastery, on the view that the scarce competence at master´s level is the ability to evaluate a method rather than to reimplement it. Frontier lectures from other departments and case seminars, in which one published study is examined successively from the perspectives of physics, chemistry, biology, and computer science, make visible the fact that different fields ask different questions of the same object.

3.2 Shared Practice Platform

The platform consolidates facilities previously distributed across groups into four functional zones: physics teaching and research laboratories, materials preparation and characterization, biophysics sample handling and measurement, and a computational zone with simulation software and GPU resources. Access is governed by a common booking procedure and a short certification requirement for each instrument or software environment, so that a student can obtain legitimate access to another group´s equipment without relying on personal arrangements.

Two arrangements give the platform its interdisciplinary character. The first is mandatory rotation: each student spends an extended period in a zone outside the primary supervisor´s area, with a defined task and a written record of what was learned. Rotation is not meant to produce expertise; it makes students conversant with the constraints under which other kinds of evidence are produced, which changes how they interpret their own results. The second is company-based projects in electronics, biopharmaceuticals, and advanced materials, in which students address a partner´s problem under joint academic and industrial supervision. These projects introduce a further boundary, between research questions and engineering requirements.

3.3 Team Supervision

Each student is assigned a primary supervisor and a co-advisor from a different discipline, drawn from a pool spanning physics, materials science, biology, and computer science, and allocated according to the project rather than departmental affiliation. Supervision is organized around a biweekly joint seminar at which students at different stages present work in progress to a deliberately mixed audience. The seminar does two things a single-supervisor arrangement cannot: it forces students to explain their work in terms outsiders can follow, and it exposes them to standards of criticism that differ from those of their home field.

The thesis committee includes at least one member from outside the student´s discipline, and milestone reviews are conducted jointly by the supervisory pair. The arrangement has a cost: coordination takes time, and disagreements about scope or standards must be resolved explicitly. Such disagreements were treated as useful, because they surfaced assumptions that would otherwise have remained unexamined, but they required a convener with authority to settle them; biannual supervisor development activities were introduced to make coordination more predictable.

3.4 Multi-Source Assessment

The fourth component replaces the implicit criterion of publication count with an explicit scheme. Four dimensions are judged: application of knowledge drawn from more than one field, quality of innovative practice outcomes, process of complex problem solving, and interdisciplinary communication and collaboration. Each dimension is evidenced by more than one source, as set out in Table 2. Proposals and oral defenses provide evidence of framing and justification; reports, manuscripts, software, or prototypes provide evidence of products; rotation logs and supervisor ratings provide evidence of process; peer review and partner feedback provide external perspectives.

Table 2. Assessment dimensions and the evidence used to judge them.

Dimension	What is judged	Primary evidence
Interdisciplinary knowledge application	Whether concepts and methods from more than one field are justified rather than juxtaposed	Proposal; oral defense
Innovative practice outcomes	Originality, completeness, and reproducibility of a product	Report; manuscript; software; prototype
Complex problem solving	Decomposition, iteration, response to failure, decisions under uncertainty	Rotation log; milestone reviews
Interdisciplinary communication	Explaining work to non-specialists; contributing to joint work	Joint seminar; peer review; partner feedback

Judgments are recorded as emerging, proficient, or exemplary at three milestones: end of the first year, proposal defense, and pre-submission review. The scheme is used formatively. Students receive the rubric before the first milestone and use it to identify what evidence they still need to produce, which shifts the assessment conversation from ranking to planning. Partner feedback is weighted only for company-based projects, since external judgments speak to practical value rather than scholarly quality.

4. Implementation Arrangements

The model was introduced in five stages: literature review and baseline survey; needs analysis; design and external review; implementation with iterative revision; and consolidation. Design followed evidence about local conditions rather than preceding it, and the model was revised twice during implementation, once to add stratified support for computational work and once to shorten the interval between the course and the first rotation.

Activities are organized so that each stage produces an artifact the next stage can use. Course assignments mirror the structure of a research project, from system preparation to analysis, each part accompanied by a short justification of the choices made. Rotation produces a log and a brief report addressed to a non-specialist reader. The research project produces a proposal, a progress report, and a final manuscript or software release, and the joint seminar requires a presentation at each stage. Because artifacts accumulate, assessment does not rest on a single performance. Two supporting activities address gaps the four components do not target directly: an annual student-organized forum, and a writing arrangement combining peer review of drafts with a short course on scientific writing in English.

5. Discussion

The first tension concerns coupling. The curriculum is the easiest component to build and the least sufficient on its own: without access to facilities and a mixed audience, a course in interdisciplinary modeling remains an isolated elective that students treat as a requirement to be passed. The platform and the supervisory team convert curricular content into practice, and both depend on arrangements that are administrative rather than pedagogical.

The second concerns assessment. Specifying integration in advance is difficult, because what counts as a good interdisciplinary argument depends on the problem at hand. A rubric improves transparency and gives students something to plan against, but it does not by itself solve the validity problem, and peer review within a small cohort is susceptible to familiarity effects. The rubric is therefore best treated as a communication device rather than a measurement instrument.

The third concerns sustainability. Team supervision consumes time that workload calculations rarely recognize; shared equipment requires access rules that cut across group autonomy; cross-field co-supervision requires formal recognition in thesis procedures. Models of this kind depend on a few committed individuals and are vulnerable when those individuals move or when resources are reallocated, so writing the arrangements into regulations is part of the design rather than an afterthought. Two limitations follow from the nature of this account: it describes a single program whose fit with local conditions, including cohort size, existing collaborations, and instrument base, is what determines whether the model is workable; and it is a design account rather than an evaluation, so questions about what students learn remain open.

6. Conclusion

This paper described a four-in-one model for interdisciplinary training in a physics master´s program: an interdisciplinary curriculum built around soft matter and molecular simulation, a shared practice platform with mandatory rotation, team supervision across four disciplines, and a multi-source assessment scheme centered on integration, innovative practice, problem solving, and communication. The organizing idea is that interdisciplinary capacity is produced by the settings in which students work, not by adding interdisciplinary content to a disciplinary structure. Each component makes a particular kind of boundary crossing possible, legitimate, and visible, and the components are coupled so that removing one weakens the rest.

Three observations seem transferable. Curricular change alone is unlikely to alter how students work unless access and audience change with it. Assessment deserves more attention than it usually receives, because it determines whether students can afford to take intellectual risks. And the viability of the model depends on administrative arrangements, including cross-field co-supervision, access rules for shared equipment, and recognition of coordination work, that pedagogical discussions tend to leave out.

Acknowledgments

This work was financially supported by the 2025 Graduate Teaching Reform Project of Zhejiang

Province (JGCG2025685), the 2024 ZUST Graduate Teaching Reform Project (General Program, NO: 09) and the ZUST Postgraduate Course Development Fund (2025yjskj05).

References

[1]Porter, A. L.; Rafols, I. Is Science Becoming More Interdisciplinary? Measuring and Mapping Six Research Fields over Time. Scientometrics 2009, 81 (3), 719-745.

[2]Van Noorden, R. Interdisciplinary Research by the Numbers. Nature 2015, 525 (7569), 306-307.

[3]Borrego, M.; Cutler, S. Constructive Alignment of Interdisciplinary Graduate Curriculum in Engineering and Science: An Analysis of Training Grant Proposals. Journal of Engineering Education 2010, 99 (4), 355-369.

[4]Newswander, L. K.; Borrego, M. Engagement in Two Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs. Higher Education 2009, 58 (4), 551-562.

[5]Mansilla, V. B.; Duraisingh, E. D. Targeted Assessment of Students´ Interdisciplinary Work: An Empirically Grounded Framework Proposed. Journal of Higher Education 2007, 78 (2), 215-237.

[6]Wenger, E. Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 1998.

[7]Stokols, D.; Hall, K. L.; Taylor, B. K.; Moser, R. P. The Science of Team Science: Overview of the Field and Introduction to the Supplement. American Journal of Preventive Medicine 2008, 35 (2 Suppl), S77-S89.

[8]Freeman, S.; Eddy, S. L.; McDonough, M.; Smith, M. K.; Okoroafor, N.; Jordt, H.; Wenderoth, M. P. Active Learning Increases Student Performance in Science, Engineering, and Mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2014, 111 (23), 8410-8415.

[9]Biggs, J.; Tang, C. Teaching for Quality Learning at University, 4th ed.; Open University Press: Maidenhead, 2011.

[10]Feng, M.; Sun, T.; Wang, Y. Curriculum Construction of "Soft Matter and Molecular Simulation": Integrating Computational Physics and Artificial Intelligence in Graduate Education. Journal of International Education and Development 2025, 9 (12), 130-133.