

**Ad Hoc Committee on Schools and Colleges
University of Washington Tacoma
June 29, 2007**

1. *Committee's Charge*

The Ad Hoc Committee on Schools and Colleges (AHSC) was formed by the Executive Council of the Faculty Assembly on April 23, 2007. The charge of the committee is to i) keep communication open between faculty and administrators, ii) facilitate sensemaking efforts on the implications of reorganizing into schools and colleges, and iii) generate a report to be submitted to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor on June 29, 2007.

2. *Membership*

Julie Nicoletta <jn@u.washington.edu>, Chair
Bill Kunz <bkunz@u.washington.edu>
Kären Landenburger <karenl@u.washington.edu>
Stern Neill <sneill@u.washington.edu>

3. *Process*

Venue	Date	Topics
Executive Council	April 23	Committee's charge
AHSC	May 1	Planning
Faculty Assembly	May 3	Committee's charge and process and faculty concerns
AHSC	May 7	Planning
Directors' meeting	May 17	Committee's charge and process and directors' concerns
AHSC	May 17	Debriefing on directors' meeting
Open meeting	May 22	Discussion of preliminary findings and ongoing concerns
AHSC	May 29	Progress update
AHSC	June 4	Progress update
AHSC	June 12	Progress update
K. Landenburger and Staff	June 12	Committee's charge and process and staff concerns
K. Landenburger and Staff	June 14	Committee's charge and process and staff concerns
AHSC	June 18	Progress update
AHSC	June 28	Completion of report

4. *Synopsis.*

The purpose of this report is to provide background information and present possible impacts of reorganization based on initial discussions with faculty, staff, and administrators. This report

will be shared with key stakeholders to aid in communication and facilitate efforts at developing a collective understanding of the opportunities and challenges that a reorganization into schools and colleges presents. This report presents a preamble, impact statements, various models and mechanisms, and contingencies for growth and change.

5. Preamble.

The challenge before the campus is to organize in a manner that promotes the achievement of our academic mission. The ‘organization’ manifests as repetitive, interdependent patterns among multiple actors that may be described in terms of structure, strategy, culture, policies and procedures. The key is for these patterns to be responsive to current and future stakeholder (e.g., student, faculty/staff, community) needs. Our ability to develop and apply meaning, understanding, and/or solutions is inextricably linked to how we ‘organize’ ourselves. In a far-reaching implication, academic structure functions to legitimate knowledge (Gumport and Snyderman 2002). Thus, the academic organization can both enable and constrain the sharing of information and ideas and the deployment of the academic resources that support the processes of teaching, learning and scholarship, and ultimately the realization of the campus’s mission.

Currently, the campus is organized into seven academic units (Education, Institute of Technology, Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, Milgard School of Business, Nursing, Social Work, and Urban Studies). At issue is whether the current ‘organization’ constrains academic strategy and whether some other form might better promote the campus’s academic mission, serve stakeholder needs, and allow for innovation and growth.

The goal of this committee is to facilitate the collective communication and sensemaking that might allow the campus to take a different path, which is for strategy to shape academic structure. Conceivably, a reorganization would facilitate innovative approaches to teaching, learning and scholarship that better serve the campus’s academic mission, meet stakeholder needs, and provide for growth and change. This report documents this effort and examines current and alternative structures and mechanisms. This report should also complement the efforts of other campus groups (e.g., strategic planning, budgeting, PARC).

6. Areas of Possible Impact.

Based on initial discussions with administrators and faculty, the committee began to investigate the impact of a campus reorganization on four areas: 1) interdisciplinarity and administrative functioning, ii) faculty governance and tenure and promotion criteria, iii) accreditation and program connections to the Seattle campus, and iv) student needs.

6.1 *Interdisciplinarity and Administrative Functioning.*

Interdisciplinarity

The challenge of finding structures and strategies that enhance rather than hinder interdisciplinarity is not unique to the discussion of schools and colleges. The period of exponential growth UW Tacoma finds itself in at the present time is a challenge at various levels and in different areas, and there is little question that collaboration and partnerships were easier to initiate when the entire faculty could fit in a small room and the expertise of each member of the group was well known. That is no longer the case, and the continued growth of the faculty will exacerbate existing issues.

And these issues are not unique to this campus. The Committee on the Organization of Colleges and School on the Seattle campus issued a report in December 2006 that included a section entitled “Promoting Strategic Transformation, Enhanced Interdisciplinarity, and Greater Collaboration.” The focal point of that discussion was on mechanism and strategies that facilitate innovation and collaboration, not on undoing existing structures. This followed another study undertaken by Gail Dubrow, former Associate Dean for Academic Programs in the Graduate School, entitled “Seeding, Supporting, and Sustaining Interdisciplinary Initiatives at the University of Washington.”

ISSUES & CONCERNS

The discussion of interdisciplinarity can focus in different areas and on different levels. It is critical to consider how changes in the current structure of the campus could impact on not just faculty research and scholarship, but also on curricular issues that affect our staff and students. And in both areas, one can consider both structures and strategies that can move the campus toward common goals.

In a sense, the lower-division core has addressed both of these areas. It has created opportunities for faculty from different programs to work together in the development of curriculum, and this has created space for additional collaborations. The team-teaching model in the lower-division core addresses some of the finding and recommendations in the Dubrow report, since there is “upper-level administration leadership” to “better seed, support, and sustain” a more expensive teaching model.

FACULTY RESEARCH & SCHOLARSHIP

STRUCTURE: Outside of IAS, the program-based structure of UW Tacoma divides the faculty into more or less traditional disciplines: Business, CSS, Education, Nursing, Social Work and Urban Studies. In this regard, Tacoma is not unlike the Seattle campus, which houses four of these six in distinct schools or colleges, with Computer Science & Engineering part of the College of Engineering and Urban Design & Planning part of the College of Architecture & Urban Planning. The National Academies’ well-received

report, *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*, raised various challenges such a structure poses to interdisciplinary research, including the allocation of resources and the recruitment, hiring and advancement of faculty members. Restructuring could provide a mechanism to create new opportunities.

Various combinations might facilitate positive interaction. For example, the Education Program offers a Masters with a focus on Secondary Science Teacher Education so there are some natural connections to the Environmental Sciences, while the Education minor is among the most popular offerings within IAS. The same holds true of Nursing and IAS. The funding of two new academic program proposals, a Health major in Nursing and Pre-Allied Health major in Environmental Science, point to possible benefits from closer links between these two programs. The question in these examples, however, is whether operational strategies could be as effective as formal restructuring.

Much of the interaction between faculties from different programs at the present time is on campus-level committees, so the creation of integrated schools and colleges might increase communication and collaboration. This, however, would depend in part on the internal structures adopted within the schools and colleges. As outlined below, IAS is now at a size that internal sub-structures are being considered, which might mitigate at least some of the opportunities that such combinations create. In the Dubrow report, moreover, the need for additional incentives and opportunities for faculties to contribute to interdisciplinary initiatives was a prominent issue.

STRATEGIES: An important step toward the creation of research projects that cross disciplines is an environment in which the exchange of ideas is encouraged and supported. As discussed above, the program-based structure of UW Tacoma creates some barriers to such work since the interaction between faculties of different programs is often limited. The six-course teaching load that is common on our campus and absence of a faculty club or lounge further exacerbates the situation. The creation of schools and colleges will not eliminate these impediments to collaboration, so it is critical to think of possible strategies.

There are some prominent models on the Seattle campus and elsewhere that provide collaborative settings for research, although a stable source of funding is critical for such initiatives. The Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology (CSDE) in Seattle, for example, brings together population scholars from the departments of Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Statistics, Psychology and International Studies and the schools of Public Affairs, Social Work and Public Health. CSDE provides a range of support services – computer services, biomarker labs, administrative support for grants, statistical consulting, working paper series, weekly research seminar, etc. – that are often wanting at UW Tacoma. CSDE receives some infrastructure support from the Seattle administration, but a bulk of its \$17.7 million funds in December 2006 came from the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health.

Arizona State University has received considerable attention for creating a series of

centers on its campuses around Tempe. President Michael Crow is implementing a vision to break away from department-based models and build problem-focused, interdisciplinary research centers. One such program is the Global Institute for Sustainability, which also includes the School of Sustainability. There are some 50 associated faculty and 25 institutional and community partners involved in the institute. While the research centers at ASU compete for external grants, there is also a sizable pool of funding available through a 2000 state referendum that allocated \$1.5 billion in sales tax revenue over 20 years to research in the state university system.

CURRICULUM

A different set of issues arises when one addresses the impact that the creation of schools and colleges could have on students. Once again, the current structure provides some obstacles. The offerings of some classes are so limited and the demand so great that seats are often restricted to students in a given program or even a particular degree or concentration within a program. This undermines student endeavors to cross disciplines, but there are no easy solutions to this dilemma since priority must be given to students in a particular concentration or program so they can graduate in a timely manner.

One obstacle that emerges in a discussion of these issues is the prominence of FTE-centered analysis and resource allocation on campus. This, too, is not a simple problem to address since FTEs is the language that the state legislature speaks. In discussions with program directors, a number of them indicated a reluctance to share faculty members with other programs since this would reduce the number of FTEs credited to their program. This also results in a number of programs creating courses that are similar to one another to keep student credit hours in-program.

One possible solution to some of these issues would be to have FTEs follow faculty. Under such a scenario, a member of the Urban Studies or Nursing faculty, for example, could teach an IAS course, since Urban Studies and Nursing would receive credit for those hours taught. At the present time, such FTEs would remain with IAS.

Another option is the creation of interdisciplinary programs that draw upon the resources of different academic units, with the various Health majors under consideration and exploration a potential pilot program. The Program on the Environment in Seattle, winner of the 2007 Brotman Award for Instructional Excellence, is an example of such a program. Such models present challenges, however. The Dubrow report focused on 17 interdisciplinary programs in the Graduate School, but the issues are much the same. Foremost among these is that most interdisciplinary programs “operate under severe resource constraints and lack the institutional framework for advocacy ordinarily provided by deans and department chairs.” These issues would need to be addressed for such bridge programs to work.

Administrative Functioning

The creation of a limited number of school and colleges would affect the administrative functioning of the campus, but the impact could be both positive and negative. One recurring issue voiced in various discussions is the impact of such restructuring coupled with what some view as an expanding central administration.

One prominent concern is that creation of school and colleges will add another administrative layer. This unease is most acute in smaller programs such as Education, Nursing, Social Work and Urban Studies. There are minimal organizational levels within these programs, with a single director operating with the faculty. The creation of deanships over a collection of such programs could add another level of administration. This is an obvious concern.

There are also potential advantages with such a structure. The Milgard School of Business represents some of the benefits of such an arrangement. The creation of a school structure included the establishment of a Dean and an Associate Dean. An important dimension of this organization is that it allows the Dean to build external relationships, both to the community and UW Seattle, while the Associate Dean focuses on the internal functioning of the school on a day-to-day basis.

The issues in IAS are different since the program is home to over 50 tenure-line faculty, over three times as many as the next largest program. There is already a single Associate Director in IAS to handle some administrative duties, and the faculty has discussed an internal restructuring with three Associate Directors coordinating various aspects of the program. One consideration in the creation of schools and colleges is whether the size of such combinations requires internal structures that mitigate the advantages that placing faculties under a common umbrella might create.

The administrative structure that emerges in new schools and colleges could also create new opportunities. The program directors are now more or less permanent positions, so the role is similar in that sense to a deanship. With the creation of a school or college that includes two or three programs, however, the senior faculty members in each area could fill the position of a rotating Chair or Associate Dean rather than a permanent director, which might increase faculty involvement in administration and strengthen shared governance on campus. These rotating positions would focus primarily on internal administrative functions, while Deans would focus more on external functions, such as fundraising, thereby dividing the labor that program directors currently have. In addition, programs would benefit from new leadership as the Chair or Associate Dean position rotated to a new faculty member. The success of rotating chairs or associate deans drawn from the faculty would depend, in part, on the UW Tacoma administration's support for training and mentoring faculty moving into these positions. In the case of the Milgard School, two senior faculty members have served terms as Associate Dean since it became a school.

STAFF: The consolidation of programs within schools and colleges could have both positive and negative impacts on university staff. The clearest impact could be on program administrators and other senior personnel whose rank or responsibilities are altered in the merger of program staffs. In addition to the immediate impact of such consolidation, the combination of staff could also slow the promotion of individuals into more senior positions.

This consolidation of program staffs could also hold benefits, however. First, it could create efficiencies in some areas. There are a range of administrative functions that are carried out in seven different programs at the present time; for example, most programs conduct their own recruiting at community colleges. The creation of schools and colleges could enable recruiters to discuss a collection of programs and majors with potential students. In addition, the development of another level of hierarchy could open advancement opportunities for staff.

The merger of program staffs could also address shortages that exist in some areas. There are tremendous differences in the staff to student ratios in various departments, although state requirements and initiatives contribute to some of these differences. For example, the current student to professional/classified/hourly staff ratio in Education is 21.69 students for each staff FTE compared to IAS with 97.44 students for each staff FTE. The ratio for the Institute of Technology is lowest among existing programs at 11.71 students for each staff FTE, but its mission includes additional duties. The combination of program staffs could address some of the existing shortages.

The development of schools and colleges has raised some concerns for staff. One major area concerns recruitment of students. It has been noted that regardless of how programs are restructured on this campus the major areas of study must be readily identifiable. Recruitment efforts become more difficult when staff must convince prospective students and parents that we offer majors that will prepare them for specific job opportunities or future academic studies. A balance needs to be obtained whereby, as a campus, we promote interdisciplinarity while offering traditional majors as needed.

There are also concerns about how new units would be developed and incorporated into the campus structure. These concerns focused on two major areas: staff work load and the development of new positions. Staff identified the need for more involvement in the functional aspects of transitioning to schools and colleges. Concern has been raised that jobs would be expanded, contributing to a heavier workload. Because staff think that they are already working beyond capacity, support of students may decrease and result in a subsequent withdrawal of students from the university. It was noted that expansion should come with funds to support that expansion. Although restructuring to schools and colleges may offer more support for the development of new programs, these programs must be developed with the commensurate number of staff to handle advising, recruitment and administrative details. A final area that needs to be clarified is the fit of the general education curriculum within the new structure. Situating freshman and sophomore curriculum in a specific school may offer some stability to this program.

Responding to these concerns may effect a smoother transition to a school-and-college structure.

6.2 Faculty Governance and Tenure and Promotion Criteria.

Faculty Governance

The passage of Class A Legislation regarding the UW Faculty Code at the end of May 2007 affirmed the presence of campus faculty governance organizations at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses and their rights and responsibilities regarding shared governance. With this revision to the Code, any campus reorganization at UW Tacoma would still require the presence of the Faculty Assembly with its Executive Council and standing committees. In addition, under the Faculty Code **Section 23-43. College and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties**, any new school or college would need to create its own faculty council that:

A. shall, with respect to academic matters,

1. determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
2. determine its curriculum and academic programs;
3. determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
4. recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
5. exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students

B. shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Section 25-41;

C. may, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties specified in paragraphs A and B of this Section.

As schools and colleges established their own councils, the Executive Council of the Faculty Assembly would need to review its own standing committees and perhaps revise their duties; in addition, new committees may be needed. For example, a campus-wide strategic planning and budget committee may be necessary to provide faculty recommendations across campus even as college or school councils would need to review budgets at a more local level.

Although some faculty members have expressed concern that additional school and college councils would put an added burden on faculty, this is not necessarily the case. Bringing several to a few programs into one school or college should relieve the burden that current programs have of providing a faculty representative on all Faculty Assembly committees, as well as other campus-wide committees. Whereas large programs have plenty of faculty to serve on a variety of committees, small programs often have

difficulty providing representatives to all committees; in some cases, junior faculty carry an extra burden of excessive service demands at a time when they need to focus on teaching and research. Furthermore, a careful evaluation of duties at the school or college versus campus-wide level could result in fewer service duties overall for faculty members.

Tenure and Promotion Criteria

Reorganization into schools and colleges would not expose faculty members undergoing tenure and promotion review to any broader campus-wide review than what currently exists under the Faculty Assembly's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. Also, Section 23-43C of the Faculty Code provides for the delegation of any of the duties attributed to councils of schools and colleges to departmentalized faculty. If faculty felt they needed more control over their specific disciplines regarding tenure and promotion review, they could reserve this right.

Two units at UW Tacoma currently have independent faculty councils: IAS and the Milgard School of Business. These councils participate in all the duties listed above, except for reviewing tenure and promotion cases, which are forwarded to the campus-wide Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee after a vote of the senior faculty and review by the program director or dean. Faculty could decide that a campus-wide Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee continues to exist that sets policies and procedures across colleges, schools, and programs, but does not review tenure and promotion files for content. Then, college and school councils would be the last faculty body on campus to review content for tenure and promotion cases. Depending on how reorganization occurs, faculty should be able to decide what makes the most sense for individual schools and colleges and for the campus as a whole.

6.3 Accreditation and Program Connections to Seattle.

Although joint accreditation is not a major barrier to the development of schools and colleges, the need for open communication with program representatives from the Bothell and Seattle campuses and a review of standards that identify criteria for administrative functioning are essential. Because accreditation is held jointly through the Schools of Nursing and Social Work, coordination with respective deans is important to minimize problems when the programs apply for accreditation renewal.

The Nursing Program is accredited jointly with the School of Nursing, Seattle campus and the Nursing Program, Bothell campus through The Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). CCNE assesses "the extent to which programs achieve their stated mission, goals, and expected outcomes. In addition, consideration of the program's mission, goals, and expected outcomes is of importance to the accrediting agency in determining the quality of the program and the educational preparation of members of the profession or occupation (AACN, 2003)." Dr. Marjorie Dobratz identified a particular

standard that she thought was essential to review prior to campus restructuring to schools and colleges: Standard II, Program Quality: Institutional Commitment and Resources.

Standard II, Program Quality: Institutional Commitment and Resources involves the commitment and support of the partner institution and the availability of resources so that the goals, mission and outcomes of the program can be accomplished. Three key elements were identified for review:

II-B. Fiscal and physical resources are sufficient to enable the program to fulfill its mission, goals, and expected outcomes. These resources are reviewed, revised, and improved as needed.

II-C. Academic support services are sufficient to ensure quality and are evaluated on a regular basis to meet program and student needs.

II-D. The chief nurse administrator is academically and experientially qualified and is vested with the authority required to accomplish the mission, goals, and expected outcomes. The chief nurse administrator provides effective leadership to the nursing unit in achieving its mission, goals, and expected outcomes.

The Social Work Program is accredited jointly with the School of Social Work, Seattle campus through the Council of Social Work Education (CSWE). “Accreditation Standards establish basic requirements for baccalaureate and master’s levels” and pertain to the mission, goals, curriculum, governance structures and program outcomes (CSWE, 2004).

The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) “permits programs to use time-tested and new models of program design, implementation, and evaluation. It does so by balancing requirements that promote comparability across programs with a level of flexibility that encourages programs to respond to changing human, professional, and institutional needs. (Council on Social Work Education, 2004).” Similar to the nursing program, CSWE accreditation standards for Program Governance, Administrative Structure, and Resources are as follows:

3.0 The social work program has the necessary autonomy and administrative structure to achieve its goals and objectives.

3.0.1 The social work faculty defines program curriculum consistent with the Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards and the institution’s policies.

3.0.2 The administration and faculty of the social work program participate in formulating and implementing policies related to the recruitment, hiring, retention, promotion, and tenure of program personnel.

3.0.3 The chief administrator has demonstrated leadership ability through teaching, scholarship, curriculum development, administrative experience, and other academic and professional activities in the field of social work.

B3.0.3 At the baccalaureate level, the social work program director who is the chief administrator, or his or her designee, has a master's of social work degree from a CSWE-accredited program with a doctoral degree preferred or a baccalaureate degree in social work from a CSWE-accredited program and a doctoral degree.

M3.0.3 At the master's level, the social work program director who is the chief administrator, or his or her designee, has a master's of social work degree from a CSWE-accredited program. In addition, it is preferred that the MSW program director have a doctoral degree.

Appointment standards for the director of Social Work programs are explicitly proscribed. Support staff, financial support, library holdings and functional and structural mechanisms for a successful program are outlined. Although these guidelines are enumerated clearly, Dr. Marcie Lazzari asserts that it is essential to work collaboratively with the School of Social Work on the Seattle campus on any changes that take place because there may be factors from both CSWE and the School of Social Work that prohibit restructuring of the Social Work Program.

The process of creating the Milgard School of Business progressed smoothly without difficulties. Each of the three business programs, The UW School of Business on the Seattle campus, The Milgard School of Business on the Tacoma campus and the Business Program on the Bothell campus, has separate identities. In reality it is as if there are 3 accreditations in one. Each program is assessed independently of the other programs.

The Education program reports that accreditation issues with the School of Education on the Seattle campus are non-existent.

6.4 Student Needs.

Any proposed structure should be accommodating and flexible to our students' diverse needs and support the institution's commitment to learning. A number of areas were identified where a reorganization might either directly or indirectly affect responsiveness to student needs. Two principal areas are i) degree programs and courses, and ii) recruitment and advising.

Reorganization into schools and colleges at UW Tacoma could influence the number and quality of degree programs and courses. While strong individual units provide students with core disciplinary exposure, linking these units into broader-based academic clusters may provide students with opportunities for academic exploration. These linked academic units, coupled with strategies that promote pedagogical innovation and a rigorous curriculum, could be channeled to support learning-focused, student-centered

outcomes (e.g., interdisciplinary knowledge, service learning, global citizenship, community engagement, appreciation of diversity, integrated learning). An ongoing challenge is the management of course capacity and demand.

Reorganization could also influence the level and quality of recruitment and advising. For example, a college or school could support centralized recruitment, advising, and other student services (e.g., orientation, career counseling). While some academic services require specialization for a particular degree program, economies of scale might be created through linked academic units. A college or school level structure would support greater communication and coordination among related advising units. This would benefit potential and current students through greater awareness of academic offerings and a stronger support structure. It may also level out the student-to-adviser ratio across academic units, thus providing each student with the same level of support that is necessary for educational goal attainment and degree completion.

7. Proposed Models and Strengths and Weaknesses.

In considering different models (i.e., academic units), the Chancellor provided the following guidelines: I) there should be 3-4 units, ii) each unit should have more than one major, and iii) each unit should have enough faculty and students to be feasible. Based on faculty input, the committee generated models for discussion. During these discussions, a number of coordinating mechanisms, beyond academic structure, were offered. We include these for consideration as well.

Model A

	Strengths	Weaknesses
Education	No or little transition necessary.	Would create two schools and colleges, so would create differences in administrative structures, funding, size, etc. Not scaleable; potential for simply adding separate, new programs. Role of director is too multi-faceted for any one person to fill effectively; potential conflict between administrative and faculty roles and responsibilities.
Institute of Technology	Although this is not perfect, has worked more or less.	
College of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences	Programs are easily recognizable by external stakeholders.	
Milgard School of Business		
Nursing		
Social Work		
Urban Studies		

Model B

	Strengths	Weaknesses
Milgard School of Business	Holds potential for innovation.	Marginalizes the arts and humanities, typically underfunded areas at UWT.
College of Arts and Letters (Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, Education)	Interesting growth opportunities for Nursing with the Institute of Technology.	Breaks up IAS; separates science from humanities and social sciences.
College of Community, Health, Environment and Technology (Environmental Science and Studies, Institute of Technology, Nursing, Psychology, Social Work, and Urban Studies)	Room for rotating associate deans and chairs within colleges. Possible development of courses that would be common among students in the larger units. Fewer, larger units could result in economies of scale for tasks, such as student advising and recruiting.	Why about science education curriculum? Proposed names of colleges may not be clear to external stakeholders. College of CHET is an artificial construct that loses the connection to the arts, humanities, and some of the social sciences, particularly with environmental science, and psychology.

Model C

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Milgard School of Business</p> <p>College of Arts and Sciences (IAS, Urban Studies, and the Institute of Technology)</p> <p>College of Health, Education, and Welfare (Nursing, Social Work, Education)</p>	<p>Holds potential for innovation.</p> <p>Integrates technology into the broader arts and sciences curriculum.</p> <p>Brings Urban Studies into IAS; strongly related academically.</p> <p>Possible development of courses that would be common among students in the larger units; students would have expanded opportunities to take a broader range of courses.</p> <p>Fewer, larger units could result in economies of scale for tasks, such as student advising and recruiting.</p> <p>Potential for creation of an early childhood development program.</p>	<p>Marginalizes Nursing, Social Work, and Education as professional, not academic, programs. Curriculum not necessarily integrated.</p> <p>College of HEW lacks academic unity.</p> <p>College of Arts and Sciences too big?</p>

Model D

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>School of Applied Science (Institute of Technology and Engineering)</p> <p>School of Health and Human Services (Social Work, Psychology, and Nursing)</p> <p>The College at UWT (IAS, Urban Studies, Education)</p> <p>Milgard School of Business and Public Administration</p>	<p>Provides room for growth and bringing on new programs.</p> <p>Brings Urban Studies into IAS; strongly related academically.</p> <p>Possible development of courses that would be common among students in the larger units; students would have expanded opportunities to take a broader range of courses.</p> <p>Fewer, larger units could result in economies of scale for tasks, such as student advising and recruiting.</p> <p>Many IAS students go into education and the Education Minor in IAS is the most popular, so opportunities for more connections with Education.</p>	<p>Isolates technology; creates barriers to connections with art, environmental science, nursing, etc.</p> <p>Should public administration be part of the Milgard School or School of Health and Human Services?</p> <p>Marginalizes Nursing, Social Work, and Psychology as professional, not academic, programs. Curriculum not necessarily integrated.</p> <p>School of Health and Human Services seems to emphasize public service over science.</p> <p>College at UWT too big?</p> <p>May conflict with environmental science's plans to develop an environmental engineering program.</p>

Model E

	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Milgard School of Business</p> <p>College of Arts, Education and the Community (Environmental Studies, Urban Studies, Social Work, IAS, Education)</p> <p>School of Health and Technology (Nursing, Psychology, and Institute of Technology)</p>	<p>Might be interesting growth opportunities for Nursing and the Institute of Technology.</p> <p>Brings Urban Studies into IAS; strongly related academically.</p> <p>Possible development of courses that would be common among students in the larger units.</p> <p>Fewer, larger units could result in economies of scale for tasks, such as student advising and recruiting.</p>	<p>The name College of Arts, Education, and the Community seems to minimize the importance of environmental science, environmental studies, and urban studies.</p> <p>The College of AEC loses the emphasis between Nursing and the community.</p>

8. Plan for Growth and Change.

8.1. Criteria for the Separation of Multi-Unit Academic Programs. This section outlines the transition of multi-unit academic programs to separate academic units. The following criteria are from a working group of administrators and faculty in October 2003.

- a. Complexity of degrees, concentrations, and certifications offered by the unit
- b. Size relative to other schools and colleges at the University of Washington
- c. Organizational complexity of unit (e.g., reporting relationships, structure, existence of faculty councils, etc.)
- d. Multiplicity of skills and knowledge required for head of unit
- e. Readiness for professional accreditation independent of the University of Washington, Seattle
- f. External (non-UW TACOMA) responsibilities and relations of the unit

8.2. Criteria for the Separation of Multi-Campus Schools and Colleges. This section outlines the transition of multi-campus schools and colleges to separate academic units. The following criteria were derived from the University of Colorado’s “Guidelines for the Separation of Multi-Campus Schools and Colleges.”

- a. Capacity to be accredited
- b. University standards of quality
- c. Distinctive nature of academic unit
- d. Size and quality of faculty
- e. Size and quality of students
- f. Breadth and depth curriculum
- g. Level of support resources

9. Summary and Next Steps.

This report is not the definitive voice on schools and colleges at the University of Washington, Tacoma. Rather, it serves as a vehicle for building a collective understanding of the implications of reorganizing academic units in order to inform future decisions. More consideration and deliberation is needed.

10. Resources Consulted.

University of Washington Tacoma Reports.

University of Washington, Tacoma: Transforming Academic Programs to Schools and Colleges, 2/13/01 (S_&_C_Document_02_13_2001).

UWT Academic Affairs, *The Establishment of Colleges at UWT*, 2/14/02 (UWT_College_Proposal_02_14_2002).

Chair of the Faculty Assembly of UWT, *Colleges at UWT: It’s Not Just a Name Change*, 3/5/02 (UWT_Structural_Change_FAMemo_03_05_2002).

Criteria for Granting Collegiate Status to Academic Units at the University of Washington Tacoma, 10/20/03 (S_&_C_Report_10_20_2003).

UWT Academic Affairs, *Restructuring of Academic Units – Draft*, July 26, 2005 (AC_Unit_Restructure_Proposal_07_26_2005).

Proposal to Establish a College of Arts and Sciences at UWT – Draft, November 3, 2005 (College_of_Arts_Proposal_11_3_2005).

UWT Nursing Program, *Restructuring Academic Programs Rationale*, undated (Nursing_Restructure_Document).

University of Washington Reports

Dubrow, Gail, and Jennifer Harris. *Seeding, Supporting, and Sustaining Interdisciplinary Initiatives at the University of Washington: Findings, Recommendations, and Strategies* (Draft for Public Comment). Seattle, WA, January 17, 2006.

University of Washington Committee on the Organization of Colleges and Schools, December 22, 2006.

Other

University of Colorado. "Guidelines for the Separation of Multi-Campus Schools and Colleges." 1985.

Rhodes, Frank H. T. *The Creation of the Future: The Role of the American University*. Ithaca, NY, 2001.

Gumport, Patricia J. and Snyderman, Stuart K. "The Formal Organization of Knowledge: An Analysis of Academic Structures," *The Journal of Higher Education* 73:3 (2002): 375-408.

Macilwain, Colin. "The University of the Future," *Nature* 446:7139 (26 April 2007): 968-970.