

15 October 2008

**To: Jerry Baldasty, Interim Dean of the UW Graduate School
James Anthony, Associate Dean for UW Academic Programs**

**Kenyon Chan, Chancellor, UW Bothell
Susan Jeffords, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW Bothell**

From: Bruce Burgett, Director, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell

Re: UW Graduate School Review of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Overview:

The University of Washington Bothell (UWB) Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) faculty and staff members want to begin this response to the External Review Committee's Report by thanking the committee for the time, energy, and dedication they put into their review of IAS. We particularly want to thank the committee members for their engagement with the program during the site visit itself. It proved a very useful exercise for IAS as we plan for our development over the next decade.

After we received the Report in late May 2008, we discussed it briefly in our June IAS faculty meeting. The IAS Director drafted a response over the summer, with the help of several faculty members. That draft was discussed at the IAS retreat in September and a revision was discussed and voted on in the October faculty meeting. The vote to approve the current response was 26 yes, 0 no, and 3 abstain.

For reasons discussed below, we disagree with the committee's recommendations concerning the timing of the next set of reviews. The committee suggests a 5 year review cycle for the undergraduate programs in IAS, and a 3 year cycle for the Master of Arts in Policy Studies (MAPS). We strongly recommend a 10 year cycle for the undergraduate programs, with a more informal report to the Graduate School after 5 years, and a 5 year cycle for the MAPS, with an informal report after 3 years.

Introduction and Background:

We are pleased with the many positive findings from the External Review Committee's Report. Echoing comments made during the final conference with IAS leadership, those findings focus on our program's many strengths: our commitment to interdisciplinarity; our dedication to student learning; our emphasis on a human scale in our programmatic and institutional development; our attention to the formative assessment of student learning; our participatory structures for faculty governance; our cultivation of student leadership and engagement; our dedication to crafting curricula designed to meet the needs of diverse and non-traditional student populations (2-3).

We also agree with many of the committee's recommendations for the development of IAS over the next decade. Indeed, most of the recommendations echo our own self-reflections and suggestions in the documents that make up our Self-Study. Before jumping into a discussion of those recommendations, however, we would like to provide three contexts for the External Review, the Self-Study, and our response to the committee's Report. The first concerns the Report's assumptions about IAS and UWB growth. The second concerns the Report's discussion of the development of STEM curricula in IAS and at UWB. The third concerns the specific moment of curriculum development IAS was undertaking at the moment of the committee's visit.

1) As we note in our Self-Study, IAS and UWB have always existed in an unstable resource environment. Evidence of this instability is contained in the committee's Report. Much of the Report is based on the assumption of rapid and immediate growth, both in IAS and across UWB. At the time of the committee's visit (May 2008), estimates of new FTE increases were 250-350 annually. Since that time (October 2008), we have been allocated increases of 95 FTE per year for the next biennium, and there is now considerable uncertainty about even those increases.

We note this fact not to undercut the committee's recommendations, but to emphasize that IAS and UWB have always needed to design their growth in flexible ways. If we launch new programs and degrees without assurance of adequate future resources, we undertake considerable risks; if we develop narrowly focused curricula that do not attract students, we risk needing to shut them down. The result, as we explain below, has been a process of curriculum growth that allows for curricular integration and differentiation without exposing the program and, most importantly, its students to future dislocation if programs stagger due to inadequate resources or need to be closed. Starting a degree program represents a legal and moral commitment to students stretching years into the future.

2) As we also note in our Self-Study, IAS and UWB have had difficulties from the start in developing the more costly areas of the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, particularly lab sciences and studio arts. In the appendix to our Self-Study directed to the HEC Board, we put it in these terms: "FTE-funded growth will not cover the start-up costs related to these new curricular areas. We need assistance with the long-term resources and capital planning necessary to remedy these facilities and staffing challenges" (Appendix H, 5).

At the time of the committee's visit these issues had reached a boiling point with regard to the development of STEM fields. In one sense, the committee walked into this situation with little choice but to focus on STEM, especially since the charge letter placed great emphasis on the future of science. Since that time, the campus has made a decision to launch a new "Science and Technology" unit. This new unit is designed to push forward developments in STEM without monopolizing them. Some science degrees and courses, such as our redesigned BS in Environmental Science and our new BA options in Environmental Studies and Science, Technology, and Society, will remain in IAS, while other degree programs will continue to be housed or will be developed in other units.

One effect of this focus in the Report is its neglect of IAS's research and teaching accomplishments in the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts. These accomplishments are the result of considerable and ongoing individual and collective labor. Without criticizing the Report (or the ways in which with site visit was framed), we want to note this oversight at the outset of our response.

3) Included in the appendices to the Self-Study are a number of proposals for new degrees and options (BS in Environmental Science; BA degree options in Environmental Studies; Interdisciplinary Arts; Individualized Study; and Science, Technology, and Society, which replaces our previous degree option in Science, Technology, and the Environment). Also included is a planning notice of intent to transition all of the IAS BA degree options to majors. Since the committee's visit, we have received formal permission to start-up the new degrees in Autumn 2008, and to move forward on the transition of the BA degree options to majors as soon as Autumn 2009.

These proposals have been in development for some time, are congruent with campus-wide strategic planning with regard to the need for more diverse and visible degree opportunities for students, reflect IAS's long-term commitments to the launch of new curricula in the sciences and the arts simultaneously, and forward IAS's institutional movement toward becoming a College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences. To this end, we installed the Curricular Area Working Groups (CAWGs) as a new organizational structure in 2007-08. It may not have been clear to the committee that this organizational structure had been in place for less than a year at the time of the committee's visit. It is only now beginning to take root.

We emphasize these three contexts because they influence the structure and focus of the Report. As we note above, we return at the end of this response to its recommendations for the timing of the next cycle of reviews. We begin by responding to each of the Report's specific recommendations for: IAS as a whole (4-9); the BA degree options (10-11); the BS in Environmental Science (11-12); and the MA in Policy Studies (12-15).

Recommendations for IAS as a Whole:

The Report begins by listing eight broad challenges facing IAS, all of which are also discussed in our Self-Study:

- 1) Building a four-year curriculum that develops foundational skills in students;
- 2) Accommodating program and campus growth;
- 3) Increasing student, staff, and faculty diversity;
- 4) Managing faculty workload;
- 5) Clarifying and supporting faculty research expectations;
- 6) Developing facilities required for new programs, especially in the arts and the sciences;
- 7) Continuing to support and develop existing degrees as we launch new ones;
- 8) Designing organizational strategies for growth.

The Report next lists five specific recommendations about how to move forward on each of these challenges. Again, these recommendations echo much of our thinking in the Self-Study, and we see our work on them as continuous with what has already been accomplished. We will discuss those recommendations in the order of their appearance.

1) Clarifying “Interdisciplinarity”

This recommendation discusses the diverse understandings of interdisciplinarity that circulate in IAS, provides a useful taxonomy of different approaches to the question of interdisciplinarity in the relevant literature, and suggests that we work toward a “shared vocabulary relating to interdisciplinarity and common understanding of the aims and outcomes of interdisciplinary student learning” in order to maintain a “cohesive, well integrated community of faculty and students” (6). We endorse this recommendation and see it as critical to our future development.

As we move forward, our immediate strategies are fourfold: 1) The program core course (BIS 300: Interdisciplinary Inquiry) – and the quarterly meetings of faculty and staff members teaching it – provide one site where many faculty and staff members come together in the project of teaching interdisciplinarity. It has the potential to generate some level of consistency across the program; 2) The program’s portfolio-based learning objectives, including the one devoted to interdisciplinary research, all focus on the question of interdisciplinarity. As a result, the assessment process provides another site for focused attention to this issue; 3) We are initiating in 2008-09 a two-credit undergraduate course (“Interdisciplinary Forum”) and a faculty lecture series (“Interdisciplinary Research Forum”), each of which creates an additional site for explorations of this issue; 4) The Project for Interdisciplinary Pedagogy (PIP), which receives applause elsewhere in the committee’s Report, serves as an ongoing site for collaboration about interdisciplinarity and interdisciplinary pedagogy.

If we are to give life and meaning to any shared vocabulary, it needs to be integrated into projects such as these four, along with our ongoing teaching and research, and conversations about that teaching and research among ourselves and with our students.

2) Organizational Structure

This recommendation discusses the problem of organizational structure in a rapid growth environment, focusing to a large degree on the question of whether new STEM degrees should be developed inside or outside IAS. It also suggests that any decisions about organizational structure take into account curricular issues related to the sciences.

As we note above, two contexts are important here: 1) The campus’s subsequent decision to create a “Science and Technology” unit that will catalyze the development of STEM degrees on campus without monopolizing them; 2) The likelihood that growth will take place at a slower rate than was anticipated by the committee in May 2008, at least for the next biennium. While there can be no doubt that we will face further growth challenges

in the years ahead, the lower medium-term growth, and the campus-level commitment to accommodate some growth in the Science and Technology unit, both change materially the immediate question of adjustment within IAS.

We endorse the Report's recommendation that our decisions be guided by the following question: "What organizational structure, curriculum, pedagogical approach(es), requirements, and other learning opportunities are needed to ensure that the learning and development of our students are fully promoted and sustained over the next decade?"

As we develop our degree offerings and expand from a two-year to a four-year curriculum (another ongoing development), some areas of the curriculum will require sequencing, others may require alternative forms of scaffolded learning, and still others may benefit from immersive learning.

Our current organizational structure, adopted in the spring of 2007 after extensive discussion, locates the site for the development of curricula in the CAWGs themselves, composed of smaller numbers of faculty and staff who are actively engaged in delivering a degree to students. These working groups do not have absolute autonomy, given resource constraints and needs to coordinate changes across the program, but they have the support of their peers across the program in efforts to innovate and serve students better. Several of the new degree proposals discussed above have already come out of CAWGs during their first year of existence.

As we note in an appendix to our Self-Study, we believe that our "challenge and opportunity over the next decade will be to enable these working groups to diversify our undergraduate and graduate degree offerings in ways that serve UWB lower-division and graduate programs, build students' core competencies, create bridges to community organizations, respond to regional needs, and coordinate with other programs at UWB and the UW.... The trick will be to diversify our curriculum while also enhancing structures that recognize and reward the importance of program/college-wide assessment, interdisciplinary integration, and community-based learning and scholarship" (Appendix H, 3-4).

3) Assessment

This recommendation reviews the current IAS portfolio-based assessment process and suggests several revisions. The summary of the current process is mostly accurate, though it misses the important point that we entered in 2003-04 into a four-year cycle designed to accomplish several goals: 1) To create precisely the "in-house" rubrics the committee recommends by focusing in each of the four years on one of our four learning objectives; 2) To engage all of the IAS faculty in the assessment process; 3) To make faculty members more aware of what happens to learning across the curriculum, rather than in single courses; 4) To begin to document and archive our teaching practices for collective self-reflection on them. We accomplished all of these goals in that period.

Our next steps are in alignment with the committee's recommendations. In 2008-09, we will focus on two things: 1) How to use the rubrics we have developed over the past four

years to implement a more integrative assessment across our four learning objectives; 2) How to make the assessment process formative for both faculty and students. To these ends, we devoted a portion of our 2008-09 retreat to the findings of the assessment process, as we do every year. We plan to establish a task force this year that will be charged with conducting the 2008-09 assessment and making recommendations for how to proceed in the future. We are also in discussions about piloting, in collaboration with the Career Center, a two-credit course on “Academic and Professional Development” that will provide students with the opportunity to reflect on the portfolio process at a midpoint in their coursework. A version of this course is planned for spring 2009.

4) Enrollment Management

This recommendation suggests a campus-wide discussion of and strategy for enrollment and growth management, and adds a series of recommendations with regard to recruiting and marketing strategies for existing IAS degrees. We are in full agreement with the recommendation that the campus resist the temptation to grow only by adding new degrees in hopes of accessing new market niches. While we will continue to develop new degree options and majors in IAS and at UWB, we very much want to devote more time, energy, and resources to our existing curriculum. One of the insights which led the creation of the CAWGs in IAS was that faculty members may be pulled to abandon existing areas when new ones appear. Among other things, the CAWGs allow us to track where faculty effort is concentrated and where new resources are needed.

We are also in agreement with the committee’s list of recruitment strategies designed to market our existing and emerging degrees to student populations prepared to take advantage of them. We have already begun to share them with campus leadership in our recruitment efforts. The shift here has not really involved our understanding of what is needed to recruit students. What has changed is the development of an institutional infrastructure designed to do effective campus-wide recruiting. Decisions will continue to be guided by what the Report refers to as “data and careful planning”: all new UW degree proposals pass through a multi-level review that includes questions about regional need and student demand at every stage.

5) Curricular Quality and Depth

We agree with the report that the launch of our first- and second-year curricula enables us, as a campus, to develop sequences of courses, scaffolded learning, and immersive learning over four years. The CAWG structure was put in place to allow those faculty most involved with each curricular area to develop strategies for how to best develop our degrees to serve our four-year and transfer students simultaneously. We remind readers of the Report that 2007-08 marked the first year of sophomore-level offerings at UWB, and that the 100-level curriculum is controlled by UWB’s Center for University Studies and Programs (CUSP). As a result, our developments in this area are quite new and require significant cross-campus coordination. Additionally, we want to note that the ability to sequence courses will continue to be limited by the campus’s mission to serve

non-traditional, time- and place-bound students, which dictates that essential courses be available in multiple time slots.

Recommendations for BA Degree Options:

The Report begins by listing four recommendations, several of which overlap with the general recommendations for IAS.

1) Course Sequencing

This recommendation combines several different areas and echoes some of the general recommendations above. The Report suggests better coordination of courses from the 100- to the 400-level, a recommendation with which we agree and which we now have the ability to implement for the first time. It also suggests the need for the coordination “with existing standard community college curricula so that transfer students will be able to seamlessly transfer into IAS.” As anyone who has worked with the community college system in the state of Washington knows, this sentence is easier written than realized. Still, we are very hopeful that the new appointment of a Director of Curriculum Development in the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs office will assist ongoing faculty and staff efforts in IAS to make these transitions as smooth as possible.

The recommendation also suggests that IAS faculty members work closely with academic support staff to ensure that under-prepared or non-traditional students have the support they need. We agree with this recommendation, but we regret that the review committee did not engage with any of the academic support units on campus and, as a result, may have overlooked the currently high level of interaction between faculty members and academic support staff. We also agree, without hesitation, that we need to do a better job of providing IAS students with feedback at a midpoint in the program concerning their achievements. We see this innovation as central to the next steps in our assessment process; this will also help us plan for certain kinds of sequencing.

2) Course Offerings

This recommendation focuses on the need to prune the course catalogue and provide students better advance warning about what courses will be offered over a two-to-three year period. We prune the catalog on an ongoing basis, and will continue to do so as part of curriculum development. What is crucial is the need to provide students with the ability to plan their coursework more than a single quarter in advance. To this end, we are moving this fall to post the entire year’s schedule in advance, at least for core and required courses, and to develop a two-year plan for course offerings. Our hope is that the inevitable disappointment among students when a course is changed or cut will be balanced by the gains of more intentional scheduling on the parts of the students. One constraint here, as noted above, is difficulty in projecting budgetary allocations very far in advance.

This section also observes that students stated a desire for more arts and humanities and science and math courses. The need to develop more science and math curricula is picked up elsewhere in the Report, but the students' statements about arts and humanities are allowed to drop without further comment. As we note elsewhere, this neglect may result from the moment of the committee's site visit and the framing of their time on campus. We want to emphasize that we remain committed to responding to these student desires by continuing our balanced approach to curriculum development in IAS, and by moving as a program and a campus over the next several years into the more costly areas of curriculum development, most notably the lab sciences and studio arts.

3) BA Degree Options

This recommendation suggests that IAS devote more energy to articulating what makes each degree option and major different from the others. We fully agree that this should be a priority. Having spent the past year in an intense period of curricular development, we see the next couple of years as being focused on this issue, especially as the CAWGs begin to gain traction and to assert more control over the self-definition of the degree options and majors. In fact, the Program Director has used the questions posed about the degree options and majors in this section of the report as a charge to the CAWGs to begin the process of self-definition – a process that commenced at our annual IAS faculty retreat in September 2008.

4) External Support for Program Development

This recommendation focuses on efforts IAS faculty and staff members could make toward better articulating their efforts to national initiatives such as those of the PEW Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and the AAC&U, along with parallel initiatives within the region. We agree that we can usefully expand on our current (individual and collective) efforts in these areas. Several faculty members are beginning to work with the Office of Research Support to these ends. We enthusiastically support the recommendation contained in this section of the Report that we seek “endowed professorships in key areas of need.”

Recommendations for BS in Environmental Science (BS ES):

The Report lists four recommendations for the BS ES degree. Before moving to them, however, we should correct two misstatements in the Report. The first concerns the claim that IAS has “lacked focus on foundational knowledge needed for a strong science degree” (11). As we note above, this lack is not a result of “focus.” Rather, it results from the absence, until this past year, of first- and second-year curricula on the UWB campus, along with the financial challenges the program and campus have faced in developing more costly curriculum in the sciences (and the arts). The second concerns the misrepresentation of the BS degree as requiring no lower division prerequisites and as insufficiently distinguished from the Environmental Studies BA degree option (11).

These assertions overlook the structure of our BS ES degree. The committee seems to

have missed the prerequisites for the BS degree (see the IAS website for details). These prerequisites are at least equal to those of comparable programs at UW Seattle. The upper division requirements are also stronger than the committee implies, with a number of courses that require the prerequisite courses in both the Conservation and Restoration Ecology (CRE) and Earth Systems Science (ESS) pathways. The upper division requirements in CRE are comparable to those of two analogous degrees at UW Seattle: the Department of Biology's BS option in Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation; the School of Forestry's degree in Environmental Science and Resource Management.

The committee is correct in its observation that the requirements for the ESS pathway are not as substantive as comparable programs at UW Seattle, largely due to the fact that we currently have few faculty members in this area of the curriculum. The proposal for the BS ES degree (included in the Self-Study) requested a new hire in the physical/earth sciences to help fill this gap, and we hope that this new hire, combined with growth in the new Science and Technology unit will enable us to strengthen our offerings. We also agree with the committee that further development of coursework at the upper division to support advanced learning within environmental science *per se* is warranted. Again, we expect to work closely with the new Science and Technology unit to maximize benefits to students in all UWB programs through cross-listing of courses, and joint appointments of faculty as appropriate.

With regard to the overlap between the Environmental Science and Environmental Studies degrees, we should note that they were designed to connect students with different strengths, and to be taught in ways that enhance interdisciplinary teamwork among students with distinct backgrounds. Further, due to the small size of student cohorts opting for science programs to date, class sizes have been quite small in those courses that have prerequisites of lower division sequences. Given the enrollment demands faced by our campus, the intent in developing this degree program has been to begin by maximizing its intersection with our program-wide resources while minimizing the potential for under-enrolled courses.

We appreciate the review committee's praise of the integration of our BS curriculum with the social sciences and our commitment to community-based learning at a level surpassing comparable programs at UW Seattle. We also appreciate their encouragement to maintain this level of integration. This is a common goal of all of our degrees, and the efforts of BS ES CAWG over the coming year will focus on further developing these aspects of the degree.

1) Support for Science Faculty

This recommendation notes the challenges faced by junior faculty members in the sciences in IAS and at UWB due to a relatively weak research infrastructure, most notably lab space and mentoring opportunities. We agree with these problems need to be addressed, and we are optimistic that campus-wide planning devoted to the development of STEM fields will point toward some solutions. We also agree that more concerted efforts to build mentoring arrangements across the three campuses of the UW will be

beneficial. To this end, we are currently making some modifications to our mentoring and third-year review processes for junior faculty.

We would like to add here that these challenges are not unique to junior faculty in the sciences, and that similar efforts to develop research infrastructure and mentoring networks will benefit all ladder faculty in the program, regardless of field. We should also note that IAS has, in the past few years, reduced the annual teaching load for ladder faculty from six to five courses per year and installed a “point system” designed to count FTE-producing, out-of-the-classroom teaching effort: independent studies, senior capstone supervisions, MA advising, etc. Finally, the size of the program faculty (nearly 35 ladder faculty members) now allows us to do a better job of protecting junior faculty from undue service loads.

2) Strengthen Mathematics Education in IAS

This recommendation applauds the mathematics curriculum that has been developed by the junior faculty in IAS, and suggests the need for more mathematics faculty in the near future. We are in full agreement with this recognition and recommendation. The question is where mathematics faculty members will be housed across campus since IAS is an upper-division and sophomore unit. Currently, the campus is searching for one or more lecturers in mathematics, largely to support our lower-division curriculum, and to be housed for purposes of merit review in the academic program most appropriate. This is a good start, but we will need additional ladder-faculty hiring in the near future. A task force on math education across campus will be convened this coming year. Like similar initiatives regarding rhetoric/composition and media literacy, IAS will play a central role in developing these essential capacities on campus, but CUSP, the Education program, the new Science and Technology unit, and the Teaching and Learning Center will all need to be involved.

3) Structural Considerations

The review committee recommended that the BS CRE pathway be maintained within IAS, and that connections between a separate Science and Technology unit, if developed, should be fostered to “provide an integrated interdisciplinary focus for traditional science degrees” (12). We agree with this discussion of how synergies between our BS ES degree, along with other future degrees, and the emerging curricula in the Science and Technology unit are a good fit with our institutional and programmatic mission. We also agree that as we nurture this new degree area, it will be critical to develop and maintain the defining characteristics of the BS ES – the integration of natural and social sciences, along with the arts and humanities, and the focus on community-based education.

The review committee here emphasizes the importance of foundational coursework to enhance the opportunities of our students in the workforce and in graduate education. We concur that this is essential, and have discussed above how we plan to augment our curriculum to better achieve these aims. We also note that this issue is not unique to the

BS ES, but is a concern for all of our curricular areas, and an important topic of discussion in all of our CAWGs.

4) Student Advising

This recommendation suggests the need for stronger advising for BS ES students and a better awareness of BS ES programs regionally and nationally, especially with regard to graduate education. Again, we strongly agree with this recommendation, and we see it as a critical need for all of our students, not just those in the BS ES cohort. We should note here that there is an emerging, campus-wide discussion of how best to advise students at UWB. Resource constraints suggest that we will have limited capacity to hire additional advisors in the near-term. Instead, we will need to create innovative strategies for improving student advising: peer advisors; faculty advisors; better coordination with the campus career center; etc.

Recommendations for the MA in Policy Studies (MAPS):

The Report lists three areas of concern about and recommendations for MAPS.

1) Program Demand and Marketing

This recommendation discusses market demand and marketing strategies for the MAPS program, and worries about the high admissions rates since the program's launch in 2001. It also notes that the decision by the Evans School of Public Affairs at UW Seattle to shut down their evening degree program could help MAPS recruitment. We agree that this decision will help. In addition, we have been working over the past year to build out the staffing in the IAS Graduate Office (adding one professional staff member and one new Graduate Student Assistant). These additional resources, combined with the promise of better campus-wide coordination for graduate recruitment over the next two years, should help to develop a broader applicant pool for the program.

2) Faculty Involvement and Links to Undergraduate Curriculum

This recommendation notes that MAPS will be gaining some new faculty resources in the 2008-09 academic year: a new junior faculty member and a new research center on campus that works on educational policy (the Center for Reinventing Public Education). But it worries that even these resources are insufficient for the health of the program. In response, the Report suggests that "at least two more faculty should be involved with the MAPS program at a significant level (2 to 3 courses offered in MAPS, and applied expertise in policy analysis and/or management)" (15). It adds that these faculty members should "have a broad appreciation of the interdisciplinary approach and mission of IAS, and need to be engaged in other IAS degree programs" (15).

We fully agree with this recommendation. In addition to the Center for Reinventing Public Education, the campus is adding a second research center devoted to education policy in the next year (the John Goodlad Center), and IAS has recently hired new faculty

members with policy interests and backgrounds. We will be discussing our plans for future hiring priorities this academic year. (Since the Committee's report arrived at the end of the spring, there has been no earlier opportunity to do so). We anticipate the need to hire faculty with expertise in policy management and/or policy analysis, especially in non-governmental and non-profit organizations. In accordance with the committee's recommendation, this type of hiring would support MAPS as well as other curricular areas, including SEB, CP, and MACS. Through these means (and others like them such as cross-campus joint and adjunct appointments), we plan to build the MAPS program and further develop its strengths in relation to our undergraduate degrees. We should be clear that we remain fully committed to the success of MAPS.

3) Curriculum

This recommendation focuses on two concerns regarding the MAPS curriculum: 1) The reliance on four-hour long, five-credit course; 2) The perceived lack of microeconomic principles as a foundation for policy analysis. In each case, the recommendation stresses comparison to the MPA curriculum at UW Seattle's Evans School.

The first concern has been a topic of discussion among the MAPS faculty and staff since the inception of the program. The one-night-per-week 5-credit class was a response to focus groups with our core constituency and has from the beginning been supplemented with Saturday workshops (usually three 4-hour workshops), an extensive use of online activity through a course website, and outside activities such as site visits. Over time, we have developed several variations on this theme, not all of which are drawn from or in relation to Evan's School curricular choices. We look forward this year to standardizing the course time and to exploring other credit options for classes in MAPS.

The second concern is based on a misunderstanding of the MAPS curriculum. We agree that microeconomics is a fundamental element of any academic endeavor in policy studies. Accordingly, foundations in microeconomics and welfare economics are the foci of one of the two core courses taken during the Spring Quarter of the first year of the curriculum (BPOLST 501: Public Finance and Budgeting). The course develops microeconomic rationales for, and analysis of, policy by connecting the theoretical literature to standard budget issues through the use of case studies. This microeconomic content was previously included as part of a 10-credit course in the Autumn Quarter of the first year, but we split it off and moved it for two reasons: we now require a background in economics for admission to the program; we wanted to highlight the importance of this course to the degree.

Other Recommendations:

The Report also notes two areas of concern, without making specific recommendations about them: 1) increasing student, staff, and faculty diversity; 2) clarifying and supporting faculty research expectations. We want to record our plans about how to improve in these areas:

1) In the appendix to our Self-Study directed to the HEC Board, we place diversity initiatives within the context of questions concerning student recruitment, while also highlighting diversity as one of the areas where coordinated effort across UWB and the UW would be helpful:

IAS and UWB have always been burdened by low levels of funding and effort devoted to effective marketing, recruitment, and public relations initiatives. In terms of student recruitment, the fact that UWB (like UW Tacoma) is a largely FTE-funded institution means that new programs need to open at or near full enrollment. This funding structure has made it particularly difficult to build more specialized, sequenced, and/or expensive curricula, especially in the sciences and the arts. University-wide strategies designed to ensure that student recruitment efforts are well coordinated, combined with temporary financial support for gaps in start-up FTE funding, would be useful.

In terms of student diversity, the campus's emphasis on meeting consistently higher FTE targets to grow new programs (in part to attract new students) has shifted attention away from efforts to build specific bridges and programming designed to recruit and retain students from underrepresented and underserved groups. The will to take on this work is strong among the faculty and staff. What we need is leadership from the UWB and UW central administration, along with appropriate campus-level resources. Recent hiring in the Office of Minority Affairs points in this direction, so we are hopeful, though only if programs like GO-MAP become truly university-wide in their focus (4).

Here, we want to add that several UWB initiatives have been launched over the past year in our undergraduate recruiting office that are strategically designed to build sustainable bridges for the recruitment of a more diverse student body. We should also note that campus-wide strategic planning calls for a task force on diversity to be charged in the next year. We are confident that the UWB leadership is now committed to diversity initiatives – in student recruitment, as well as staff and faculty hiring.

2) In the same appendix to our Self-Study, we discuss some UWB and UW initiatives that could build a stronger faculty research culture in IAS and at UWB and, as a result, the UW:

Many faculty members are attracted to IAS and UWB due to the promise of a career in which they can integrate their research, teaching, and institution-building interests and responsibilities. They are genuinely excited about taking part in the many opportunities afforded by a new and emerging program and institution. But they also need to know that they will gain support and recognition within their institution, and that they will have the resources necessary to make their innovative research and teaching nationally and internationally visible. Pre-tenure sabbaticals might be one means of recognizing the service load placed on junior faculty who are hired, in part, to develop new programs.

While we can compete for UW Royalty Research Funds and other small internal grants, the majority of the faculty must seek funding from private and public agencies, which is made difficult in our institutional context due to high teaching and service loads, interdisciplinary and community-based research agendas, and organizational constraints on grants management. UWB has recently instituted an Office of Research Support, so we are working to put into place the infrastructure needed to support grant-funded faculty research. Other campus- and university-wide means of supporting our research and its dissemination work would be welcome (5).

We can add here that one of the tasks and opportunities we see IAS undertaking in the next year or two will be for us to articulate more fully and publicly our understanding of scholarship as activity that integrates disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, innovative and effective pedagogy, community engagement, and institution-building service. We intend to place this understanding of scholarship in the context of national conversations about professional and institutional development.

Other Observations about the Site Visit and Report:

Before concluding, we need to note a few additional areas of the committee's Report that triggered discussion and criticism among IAS faculty members. Each concerns areas the faculty felt were unacknowledged or misrepresented in the Report. We recognize that the committee's visit was limited to one-and-a-half days, that choices needed to be made, and that the charge to the committee needed to be followed. But we want to mark these oversights in our response to the Report.

1) The committee met with several groups during its visit without commenting on those meetings in the Report. Most notable here is the lack of any comment on the treatment of staff and non-ladder faculty in the program, which we assume means that the committee found no problems in this area. We also know that this is a typical problem area in many programs. What the lack of comment overlooks, however, is the considerable time and energy needed to ensure that all members of the program are integrated into its development and treated with respect. This is the often invisible work of formal and informal personnel and mentoring processes. We want to make it visible here.

2) The committee's Report is heavily skewed toward discussions of STEM curricula, as was the site visit itself, largely for reasons having to do with the campus conversation about STEM at the moment of the review. A stranger reading the Report would know next to nothing about IAS's existing or proposed degree options across the social sciences, arts, and humanities: Culture, Literature, and the Arts; American Studies; Global Studies; Community Psychology; Society, Ethics and Human Behavior; and Interdisciplinary Arts. For the purposes of this document, we want to underline once again that we remain committed to balance in our approach to the development of all of the aspects and areas of our curriculum.

3) The committee did not meet during its visit with faculty or staff from any other academic program on the UW Bothell campus, including the unit that coordinates our first-year curriculum, the Center for University Studies and Programs (CUSP). This oversight is particularly limiting since the committee's Report makes several assertions about the state of lower-division programming at UWB and in IAS. We agree with the Report that one of our major challenges as we move forward as a program will be to coordinate as effectively as possible with CUSP, but recommendations about how to do so would need to understand the structure of that unit. And we want to add that another challenge will involve the need to establish more integrative relationships among all programs at UW Bothell, including the new Science and Technology unit.

Conclusion:

The Report recommends another review in 5 years for the IAS undergraduate degrees and 3 year for MAPS. The 5 year recommendation is based on the high level of growth and change in the BA degree options and the new re-introduction of the BS in Environmental Science. The 3 year recommendation is based on what the Report represents as a pressing need for new faculty in the MAPS.

We take the recommendations contained in the committee's Report seriously. At the same time, we also know that things are always changing quickly, degrees are often being revamped, and additional faculty members are always needed at a new campus like UW Bothell. We note these realities not to minimize the recommendations of the Report, nearly all of which we agree with and are acting upon. But we do want to emphasize the significant burden the full external review process places on any unit. We also know that the UW Graduate School is committed to *not* placing an undue burden on new and developing programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

For these reasons, we make the following recommendations for our future reviews:

- 1) With regard to IAS, we request that we be granted the standard review period of 10 years for the IAS undergraduate degrees (BA and BS), with an interim report to the Graduate School at 5 years.
- 2) With regard to MAPS, our understanding is that the committee should have been asked to recommend that the program either retain its "provisional" status as a new degree, which requires a review at 5 years, or transition to "continuing" status, which requires a review at 10 years. We request an abbreviated review at 5 years for MAPS, with an interim report to the Graduate School in 3 years. One advantage of this timeline is that it will align the MAPS process with the initial 5 year review of our new Master of Arts in Cultural Studies program, also in 2012-13.

We strongly believe that this approach will enable us to do our best work over the next critical decade in the program's and campus's development.