

To: Dean and Vice Provost Suzanne Ortega; Graduate School Council

From: Greg Shelton, Director, GTTL

RE: Unit Response to GTTL Program Review

Date: 5/15/2006

We appreciate the Report of the GTTL Graduate Certificate Program (hereafter Report) provided by the GTTL Review Committee. This program review, the first in GTTL's ten year history, offers us an opportunity to learn how to improve the program as well as to explain how GTTL has been working to meet its goals.

Although we respect many of the insights offered by the Report and acknowledge that there is always room for improvement, we find that certain aspects of the Report contain misperceptions or inaccuracies that require clarification. The Report creates the impression that GTTL is a "runaway train" with no competent leadership or policies in place. We contend that the GTTL Program has been, and continues to be, a vibrant, dynamic asset to our students, to the University of Washington, and to society. This rebuttal seeks to dispel these misunderstandings and to show that GTTL is worthwhile and cost effective thanks to many dedicated people who have worked over the last decade to make it successful.

We begin by responding to several broad themes contained in the sections preceding the recommendations. These include: (A) program effectiveness, (B) governance, and (C) directorship. We will then address directly the specific recommendations put forth in the Review.

I. GTTL Response to Major Themes in the Program Review

A. Program Effectiveness

We appreciate the Committee's commendation for staff effectiveness in the day-to-day operations of the program, and we value their suggestions for ways to improve. However, it appears that the Report has understated or overlooked many of the ways in which GTTL is fulfilling its mission and delivering many benefits to the University and its students.

1. GTTL is successful and cost-effective

GTTL is providing quality service to its student and business stakeholders. No department or college within UW, by itself, is capable of offering the breadth and depth of the GTTL Program. GTTL accomplishes this in a cost-effective manner by covering a range of topics without the overhead of establishing a separate academic unit with a substantial dedicated faculty.

There is a strong demand for the GTTL Program (see the market survey discussion in the GTTL Self-study Guide). The student response has been very good as indicated by course

student ratings and individual testimonials. The results of this academic year are like those of the past as summarized in the Self-study Guide. Sixty-five students wished to enroll on the first day this winter in the GTTL 501 class, and we had to deny many of them because the classroom holds only forty. The students in the course did not seem to be disappointed, judging from their exceptional course ratings. The GTTL 502 course this quarter has thirty-two students who seem to be extremely interested and engaged. Its theme is, "The Global Energy Supply: Scarcity, Dependency, Alternatives, and the Challenges for International Commerce." (Incidentally, the Business School considers a graduate class size of fifteen sufficient to cover the corresponding variable costs of instruction and classroom). In addition, the Report does not mention the highly successful GTTL Annual Conference, which is well attended by leaders of government, industry and academia, and provides GTTL students with the valuable opportunity to present their course projects to this audience, as well as learn from the keynote speakers.

Furthermore, the business and UW faculty leaders on the Advisory Board have been very supportive and appreciative. One indication is the many speakers who have volunteered their time to speak in GTTL core classes and Annual Conferences. Another is that industry has donated annually \$6000 of scholarship funds from 1996 to 2001, and \$10,000 since 2002. The GTTL Scholarship Program is based on merit, but the total amount has been sufficient to provide awards to many GTTL students each year.

The Report strongly questions GTTL's cost effectiveness, going so far as to state that "it is difficult to justify the existing expenditure, let alone increase it." Given that GTTL's total annual budget of \$150,000 is primarily used to pay the salaries of the 1.5 FTE staff, this statement is tantamount to questioning GTTL's very existence. The Report bases its assessment of GTTL's cost effectiveness narrowly on the metric of "cost per certificate granted." We feel that this overlooks GTTL's many successes and accomplishments. When GTTL's full range of high-quality services are considered, it is readily apparent that the University of Washington is getting a great deal of value out of the relatively modest GTTL total budget expenditure of \$150,000. The Report's metric fails to adequately capture the broad range of services GTTL provides to students and to the University, as described above and detailed in the Self-Study Document. These include academic and career advising, mentoring, networking, community service, research facilitation, a small library, as well as instruction. GTTL classes are very popular with students, as evidenced by our consistently high course evaluation scores and strong enrollment demand. Furthermore, it is important to note that many students take GTTL classes even though they do not intend to or are unable to complete the certificate, yet they benefit from the educational experience, networking, and advising that we provide. The value added to these students' education is completely overlooked using the Committee's approach. While granting certificates is the primary reason for its creation, it is clear that GTTL's function has grown beyond that.

We must assume that there are better methodologies for assessing program cost effectiveness, but we feel that due to their technical nature, and for the sake of brevity, they will not be offered as a part of this rebuttal.

2. GTTL plays a facilitative role across the University.

The Report contends that “GTTL could play a greater facilitator role” by “play[ing] an indirect rather than direct role in research as a by-product of being a common link among faculty, students and the business and public sector communities.” We welcome the Committee’s suggestions for improving GTTL’s facilitative functions. However, we feel that the Report underplays the many ways in which GTTL has been successfully facilitating cross-disciplinary interactions since its inception. As we pointed out in our Self-Study Document, we notify other units, their faculty, students, and alumni of opportunities we see on a daily basis. We have cooperated in grant proposals, facilitated interdisciplinary conferences and workshops, and match students with researchers.¹

As GTTL has become more widely known, crossing disciplinary/academic unit boundaries has become easier over the years. Usually this involves making the professor of the class in question aware of the GTTL program and the capabilities of our certificate candidates. The main concern and constraint with some units is that slots in their classes are in high demand -- their classes are full, and thus reserved for the students of that unit. As for the Business School in particular (as cited by the Committee), students within their own department must “bid” for their most desired classes, and thus are not ensured enrollment.

Though the program is small, its growing reputation and network of GTTL Alumni and practitioners from the various national and international organizations with which our faculty and staff are affiliated are continuously opening doors and creating opportunities for our students. Additionally, GTTL, with its “clearinghouse” function, helps to broadcast student opportunities, which were normally confined to a particular unit/discipline, to its student body. We get to know our students well, and can match their interests with the opportunities that we encounter. Furthermore, every student we place in an internship or job, or connect with someone who will help them with their career in some way, is also representing GTTL and their home department.

3. GTTL continues to build a strong regional, national and international reputation

The Report acknowledges that GTTL is unique because it is an interdisciplinary certificate program, but suggests that GTTL cannot enjoy a national reputation because it is not a department and lacks a research agenda. Actually, GTTL is garnering a highly positive *national and international* reputation because of our outreach efforts and the large number of international students who have participated in our classes and seminars. We have been instrumental in the formation of the GU-8 Consortium, and we are active in the APEC Transportation Working Group, Russian-American Pacific Partnership, Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER), Association of Canadian Studies in the US (ACSUS), Pacific Northwest Canadian Studies Consortium, World Affairs Council, Women’s Transportation Seminar International, to name a few organizations, and we have conducted exchanges of faculty, researchers, and lecturers, and collaborated on workshops and symposia with educational institutions around the globe.

¹ Please refer to the Self-Study for specific examples of these.

GTTL is doing a good job of interacting with the global affairs organizations and academic units, as the Program Recommendations state we SHOULD do. As mentioned previously, Dr. Jess Browning has been instrumental in representing the University of Washington within the Global U-8 Consortium (GTTL was a co-sponsor, with the office of Vice-Provost for Global Affairs of the GU-8 meeting last month on campus), we attended several of the plenary meetings of the Interdisciplinary Program on Humanitarian Relief, offered our expertise, invited students returning from the field to address our classes, and networked with its faculty to meet the practitioners in the field and invite them into our classrooms. For several years, we have had lectures by a Graduate Faculty member from the Department of Epidemiology, as well as fielded questions about global transportation. Additionally we have hosted and assisted visiting scholars from China, Korea, and Japan; advised and taught other international exchange students and researchers from Russia, Turkmenistan, Morocco, and many EU countries.

B. Governance

The Report's strongest criticisms of GTTL focus on what it sees as a lack of effective governance. The Report contends that "[u]nfortunately as of this review, no graduate faculty members are formally involved in the administration of GTTL and few if any are actively involved in any capacity. The administration of GTTL has long ago evolved to staff directors while the graduate faculty committee which was granted authority to award certificates has become inactive." These statements do not accurately capture the true nature of graduate faculty involvement in GTTL, which has remained vital even as it has evolved and changed over the past decade. The statements of previous program directors Jess Browning and Tom Schmitt (attached) describe in detail the changes that occurred in GTTL governance. The key points are summarized below.

While it is true that the IGTTLC per se is no longer active, it does not automatically follow that GTTL lacks graduate faculty involvement. Rather, the GTTL Advisory Board has become an expanded form of the IGTTLC. We apologize if this was not made sufficiently clear in the Self-Study Document. When assuming the role of GTTL Director, Tom Schmitt changed the form of the Interdisciplinary Committee to include outside advisors and relabeled it as the GTTL Advisory Board. IGTTLC functions continue through the current Advisory Board, which has included faculty representatives from Civil and Environmental Engineering, Geography, The Business School, Marine Affairs, International Studies, and Law. Each Advisory Board meeting began with a review of the academic year by covering program statistics such as those we included in the appendices of the GTTL Self-Study Guide. This was followed by a discussion of key issues and initiatives, including the contentious ones identified in the Program Review. Feedback and advice on these initiatives were solicited from the past and current Dean of the Graduate School, and the feedback was always supportive. Former director Jess Browning also notes that he met on many occasions with the Interdisciplinary Chair, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Graduate School Council, the GTTL Curriculum Committee, the GTTL Steering Committee, and the Interdisciplinary Committee.

The Report correctly pointed out that governance guidelines need to be clarified. Although opinions may differ regarding whether the merger of the IGTTLC into the Advisory Board action adhered strictly to University regulations, Tom Schmitt was not

aware of anything in the GTTL Charter that would prohibit such actions, and he received no negative feedback from the Graduate School. Furthermore, after Tom Schmitt relinquished the Directorship of GTTL, he assumed the new role of Faculty Advisor, while continuing to teach two of the GTTL Core courses. We came to the conclusion that this position would be essentially the same as that of Chair of the IGTTL, within the Advisory Board governance model.

There are many other ways in which GTTL involves graduate faculty. On an ad-hoc and ongoing basis we have sought counsel, advised, collaborated with, or otherwise interacted with a large number of Graduate Faculty². We continually work with other departments and instructors to get GTTL students into their courses. Unit Deans are advised on student presentations at the GTTL annual conference, and of their students who receive the GTTL Certificate. Moreover, anyone who teaches GTTL students is involved in GTTL. Some faculty spend substantial time on GTTL courses directly, such as the development and teaching of GTTL598 "Global Aviation and Management," and the GTTL Core courses. Interested faculty members were kept apprised of GTTL developments over the years. Faculty who were either unresponsive or asked to be removed from GTTL affiliation were assumed to have resigned from the IGTTL. In such cases, we sought alternate faculty members.

Graduate faculty attrition from GTTL raises two questions: why did some faculty members choose to discontinue GTTL involvement, and should a previously committed department/unit be actively solicited to resume participation? There are obvious relationships between some departments and GTTL, while others are more tenuous. As we stated in the GTTL Self Study, this depends on the personal interests of individual faculty, and on the academic and recruiting policy and general focus of the individual disciplines and departments. It is normal and natural to expect that faculty and department interests and focus will evolve and change over time, and that some departments will increase their involvement with GTTL while others will drop away as their focus shifts from GTTL topics. GTTL retains strong connections with Civil and Environmental Engineering, Industrial Engineering, the Jackson School of International Studies, Geography, Marine Affairs, The Business School, Forestry, and the Evans School of Public Affairs. Departments that have apparently decreased interest in GTTL over the years include Political Science, Communications, and Education. GTTL should not be faulted for these changes. Having said that, GTTL welcomes suggestions for seeking further cross-campus collaboration and for ensuring maximum interaction with interested faculty and departments.

² Including (but not limited to): Adam P. Bruckner, Bruce Faaland, Apurva Jain, Douglas L. MacLachlan, Jeremiah Sullivan, Anne V. Goodchild, Joe P. Mahoney, Scott Rutherford, Nancy Nihan, Stephen T. Muench, Yin Hai Wang, Eric S. Cheney, Daniel D. Huppert, Haideh Salehi-Esfahani, Kar-Yiu Wong, Steven G. Olswang, William D. Winn, Loveday L. Conquest, Bruce R. Lippke, William B. Beyers, Kam-Wing Chan, Kim V.L. England, Douglas K. Fleming, James W. Harrington, W. A. Douglas Jackson, H. George Kakiuchi, Gunter Krumme, Victoria A. Lawson, Timothy L. Nyerges, Paul Waddell, Craig ZumBrunnen, Benita M. Beamon, Richard L. Storch, David M. Bachman, Sara R. Curran, Angelina S. Godoy, Christopher D. Jones, Włodzimierz M. Kaczynski, Anand A. Yang, Clark W. Sorensen, Andrea E. Copping, David L. Fluharty, Robert Goodwin, Marc J. Hershman, Thomas M. Leschine, Jere L. Bacharach, Stephen E. Hanson, David J. Olson, Susan Whiting, C. Leigh Anderson, Paul Waddell, Ann M. Kimball, Masashi Kato, Beth Kolko, Michio Tsutsui, Christine Bae, Hilda Blanco, James DeLisle, and Anne Vernez-Moudon

C. Qualifications of Director

Although the Program Review acknowledges that current GTTL Director Greg Shelton has performed well “on the day to day operational aspects of the job,” it implies that someone not on the faculty is unsuitable for strategic planning. We strongly disagree. Academic programs can thrive under Staff leadership. There is no reason why GTTL cannot do the same while keeping a rapport with the relevant faculty and departments across campus. Other University programs, such as the Business School EMBA Program, have succeeded with non-faculty directors. As former GTTL Director and current Business School Professor Tom Schmitt points out, “the Business School’s senior leadership recognized long ago that its faculty members were ill equipped to lead professional programs such as the Executive MBA and Executive Programs. Instead, they have chosen experienced managers as Program Directors who have performed admirably in operational, tactical and strategic leadership.”

The need for strong graduate faculty involvement in GTTL governance does not require that the GTTL Director be a member of the graduate faculty. Nor is there any persuasive reason why the IGGTLC Chair must be the only one who can interact with other units involved. With teaching, research, and service commitments, faculty members do not have time to deal with the daily operations of GTTL, including but not limited to: staying apprised of curriculum being offered across the University, keeping abreast of relevant current events and developments on a global scale, maintaining an international network of contacts that includes practitioners, educators, researchers, and leaders, and advising a broad spectrum of students seeking academic and career advice. Faculty do not have the time to take on such a major role with no new funding. Indeed, a faculty member in this situation can face much more than time constraints when the home department does not recognize interdisciplinary participation as a valid service activity. According to Joe Mahoney [Civil Engineering Professor and co-professor of the Aviation Management Course]: “It is not a given that faculty management of a program is a good thing--better to let them teach and seek funded research.”

The Report further states that “*(Greg Shelton) has not been able to gain graduate faculty status for himself.*” This statement is curious, in that it implies a shortcoming in his performance and assumes without evidence that he tried and failed to attain graduate faculty status. In fact, he has never sought graduate faculty status and we see no need for him to do so. We are confident in his abilities to lead GTTL, and he has a superb reputation among students, faculty and the business community. Moreover, he held Lecturer status within the Graduate School beginning in 2000, and in 2005 he became an Affiliate Instructor in Civil and Environmental Engineering, which enables him to officially teach classes and offer academic advice. He is also recognized as an Affiliate by the Ellison Center for Russia-Eastern European-Central Asian Studies Program (REECAS) and the Canadian Studies Center.

II. GTTL Response to Program and Graduate School Recommendations

A. *Program Recommendations*

1. *Revitalize Graduate Faculty Involvement*

The Review states that “the first and most pressing need is a committed, senior faculty member who is willing to Chair the IGTTLC and able to spearhead the outreach effort which must occur to the numerous relevant units and faculty across campus” and that “GTTL must then attract a group of active, interdisciplinary faculty from relevant units and specialties who are willing and able to contribute on a regular basis.”

RESPONSE: As we have pointed out, with the assumption of the role of Faculty Advisor by Tom Schmitt, we believe we have already taken a great step toward resolving this issue. As for attracting more contribution from relevant units, we welcome that on a more formal basis, though it must not be ignored that we have had faculty input over the last decade.

2. *Return Primary Governance to the Interdisciplinary Graduate Faculty Committee*

The Review contends that “an active IGTTLC is a prerequisite to an effective (and perhaps legal) GTTL.” The Review suggests that if sufficient faculty cannot be recruited for this task, it indicates that “sufficient interest and resources within existing units across campus does not currently exist to adequately support this program.”

As discussed above, we contend that GTTL has fostered connections with and guidance from many graduate faculty members over the years. In addition, GTTL has made a good faith effort to comply with Graduate School guidance while effectively managing the program by merging the IGTTLC into the Advisory Board. Having said that, we agree that reconstituting a separate IGTTLC, headed by a faculty advisor, would be a beneficial means of increasing faculty involvement and including more departments in out governance. We wish to emphasize that we received this feedback as we were preparing the Self-Study Guide for this program review, and we responded by holding an Interdisciplinary Committee meeting on April 26, 2005. Representatives from six core departments were invited and five attended. This appeared to be a useful activity, and we planned to continue holding two such meetings a year. We would have done this anyway without any guidelines and deadlines by the Program Review Committee.

However, it would be very helpful to have clear definitions as to what “primary governance” entails. A group of essentially volunteer, unfunded faculty cannot be expected to expend the same energy as they do governing their home departments. As was pointed out previously, there is precedent for effective staff leadership in conjunction with graduate faculty guidance and support, especially at the program level.

3. *Revitalize Academic Unit Involvement*

The Report states that “GTTL has had considerable difficulty in formalizing stable, mutually beneficial relationships with relevant units across campus” and recommends

that “[t]he IGTTLC should take the lead in establishing these relationships with their various units.”

This would be well worth doing, as it would bolster and reinforce student awareness within these relevant units. It is fair to say, though, that some units are more relevant than others, and given that there are no means to compel participation, should a unit formally decline to participate, it should not be taken as a failure of the GTTL program. There is no reason to assume that all units involved in the initial plenary sessions of GTTL must continue to be involved, so long as there is critical mass to fulfill the mission. Units do evolve and shift focus with time and this must be taken into consideration.

4. Reconsider Curricular Initiative to Provide GTTL Electives

The Report recommends that GTTL “abandon its current plans to create unique GTTL elective courses with paid instructors”, relying instead on IGTTLC faculty members and other departments to supply needed courses.

GTTL has no plans, current or past, to continue creating elective courses. We have created one unique elective course, GTTL 598 (Global Aviation Management), because the only parallel course, GEOG 447 (The Geography of Air Transportation) was discontinued years ago with the retirement of the professor who taught it. We held meetings with representatives of prospective departments and it became clear that no department was willing to offer such a course in the foreseeable future, yet all present felt there was a need for such a course to be offered. Air transportation is vital generally, and particularly to our region³. We welcome other departments offering such a course, but we feel it is vital to GTTL student education that someone offers it. We wholeheartedly welcome and support efforts from other departments to create or re-establish other GTTL-relevant courses that are currently missing from the University curriculum.

B. Graduate School Recommendations

1. Clarify Governance Guidelines for Certificate Programs

We agree that it would be very helpful for the Graduate School to clarify guidelines for certificate programs. Although GTTL has always made good faith efforts to govern the program within existing guidance, it is clear that reasonable minds can differ regarding the details of interpretation and implementation. It would be simpler and easier for all involved if these guidelines were clear and unambiguous.

2. Consider Housing Related Programs Under a Single Interdisciplinary Graduate Faculty Committee

³ Commentary from Dr. Joe Mahoney: “I teach about 20% of the GTTL 598 Aviation course--which I do at no cost to GTTL. Frankly, I love assisting with the course and, in my view, it is badly needed on this campus. If that course is dropped due to changes in GTTL--it will go away. Will I pick it up--no--another important transportation course on this campus goes away. Why wouldn't I pick it up? First, I cannot afford the other instructors and two, I don't have time to do it by myself (and no one can duplicate Barrie Austin!).”

3. Consider Housing Faculty Lines that Support Interdisciplinary Programs in the Graduate School

We decline to comment on recommendations 2 and 3 because they address administrative matters peripheral to the core issues raised regarding GTTL. We do support any initiatives taken that could streamline governance while not detracting from our mission.

4. Employ a Staged Approach to Determining the Program's Future

The Report recommends a staged approach for addressing GTTL's governance issues and recommends another full program review one year later. The Review Committee's one-year timetable to compliance is not unrealistic, but we believe an entire formal program review within one year is not necessary to assess GTTL's progress toward meeting relevant recommendations. The amount of time and effort for this processes is onerous not only upon GTTL's limited staff, but upon the staff and resources of the Graduate School as well.

Appendix 1- Input from Faculty Advisor and Ex-Director Tom Schmitt⁴

Dear Greg,

Here are my impressions about the GTTL Review Committee Report. While several of the conclusions are insightful, others were based on inaccurate information and misperceptions. I trust that you will shed light on these misperceptions. Beyond this, I would like to stress four points.

1. I believe the Report loses “sight of the ball,” in that it fails to recognize that GTTL is providing quality service to its student and business stakeholders. No department or college within UW, by itself, is capable of offering the breadth and depth of the GTTL Program. Unlike most other Universities, we are able to offer the global logistics/ transportation program that covers the same or more topics without the overhead of establishing a separate college with a substantial dedicated faculty.

There is a strong demand for the GTTL Program (see the market survey discussion in the GTTL Self-study Guide). The student response has been very good as indicated by course student ratings and individual testimonials. The results of this academic year are like those of the past as summarized in the Self-study Guide. Sixty-five students wished to enroll on the first day this winter in the GTTL 501 class, and we had to deny twenty of them because the classroom holds only forty. The students in the course did not seem to be disappointed, judging from their exceptional course ratings. The GTTL 502 course this quarter has thirty-two students who seem to be extremely interested and engaged. Its theme is, “The Global Energy Supply: Scarcity, Dependency, Alternatives, and the Challenges for International Commerce.” (Incidentally, the Business School considers a graduate class size of fifteen sufficient to cover the corresponding variable costs of instruction and classroom.)

Furthermore, the business and faculty leaders on the Advisory Board have been very supportive and appreciative. One indication is the many speakers that have volunteered their time to speak in GTTL core classes and Annual Conferences. Another is that industry has donated annually \$6000 of scholarship funds from 1996 to 2001, and \$10,000 since 2002. The GTTL Scholarship Program is based on merit, but the total amount has been sufficient to provide scholarships to many GTTL students each year.

2. The Report does not recognize that the GTTL Advisory Board is an expanded form of the Interdisciplinary Committee, and I take responsibility for this misperception by not mentioning it in the GTTL Self-study Guide. When assuming the role of GTTL Director, I changed the form of the Interdisciplinary Committee to include outside advisors and relabeled it as the GTTL Advisory Board. I was not aware of anything in the GTTL Charter that would prohibit such actions, nor did I ever receive feedback from the Graduate School that this was

⁴ Less formalized input from other faculty and interested parties has been cited in this Response, but not included as appendices.

inappropriate. The functions of the Interdisciplinary Committee have continued on an annual basis. The Advisory Board has included faculty representatives of several affiliate departments, including Civil Engineering, Geography, Business School, Marine Affairs, and Law. Faculty from other affiliated departments have been invited, but did not attend. Each Advisory Board meeting began with a program review of the academic year by covering program statistics such as those we included in the appendices of the GTTL Self-Study Guide. This is followed by a discussion of key issues and initiatives, including the contentious ones identified in the Program Review. Feedback and advice on these initiatives were solicited. Shortly after each annual Advisory Board Meeting, I would meet with Marsha Landolt, and later Elizabeth Feetham when she took over, to cover the issues presented to and comments provided by the Advisory Board. Marsha Landolt took notes in these meetings, and these notes should be available for review. I'm not sure whether Elizabeth Feetham took notes in the few meetings we had. The feedback from these meetings was always supportive. In fact, Marsha often praised us for our initiative.

3. The Program Review states that you [Greg] have performed admirably “on the day to day operational aspects of the job,” but it seems to imply that someone not on the faculty is unsuitable for strategic planning. This strikes me as uniformed and discriminatory. When the Program Review Committee interviewed me by telephone, I mentioned that the Business School EMBA Program has been successful for twenty years with non-faculty directors at the helm. The Business School’s senior leadership recognized long ago that its faculty members were ill equipped to lead professional programs such as the Executive MBA and Executive Programs. Instead, they have chosen experienced managers as Program Directors who have performed admirably in operational, tactical and strategic leadership. In my telephone interview, I encouraged the Review Committee to study the EMBA Program as a model for GTTL. In any event, I believe the UW would be hard pressed to find someone with the foresight of the market and delivery processes, initiative, passion, and managerial skills that you possess to lead the GTTL Program.
4. The Program Review makes a good point that we could have done better in including more affiliated departments in our governance. You and I know that this is easier said than done, especially with units that have provided only a few students in the ten-year life of our program. Nevertheless, I agree that a separate Interdisciplinary Committee, headed by a faculty advisor, is a good way to facilitate involvement and input. (The EMBA program has a faculty advisor that plays a similar role in its governance.) We received this feedback as we were preparing the Self-Study Guide for this program review, and we responded by holding an Interdisciplinary Committee meeting on April 26, 2005, about the time of our program submission. Representatives from six core departments were invited and five attended.

Feel free to share my views in your rebuttal document.

With Best Regards

Tom

Appendix 2- Input from Director Emeritus Jess Browning

Greg,

I have reviewed the Report of the Global Trade, Transportation and Logistics (GTTL) Graduate Certificate Program Review Committee and find certain aspects of it inconsistent with the facts. Most of the inaccuracy centers on the term "administration".

In a letter preceding President McCormick's letter in the fall of 1996 there was one from the Graduate School written by the Associate Dean Stephen C. Woods dated June 9th, 1995 to Marc Hershman. It is a follow-up to the meeting with the Graduate School Council June 1, 1995 where they authorized the start-up of GTTL by the Interdisciplinary Committee. Wood's letter states "For the foreseeable future, the administration of the Option Program will rest with the current GTTLS Committee with yourself (Hershman) as Chair." It was later that that I was hired as Director to administer the Program under the supervision of the Interdisciplinary Committee. In correspondence, the Director's position was clearly articulated as a leadership role for the program.

In review of other documents, I see from "day planner" records that from early 1996 to August 2000 when I retired, I met with the Interdisciplinary Chair (Hershman and Schmitt) more than 40 times. I met with the Dean of the Graduate School 14 times. I met with the Graduate School Council 2 times. I attended 4 GTTL Curriculum Committee meetings to establish the Core Courses GTTL 501 & 502. In addition to that there were 8 GTTL Steering Committee meetings and 9 Interdisciplinary Committee meetings.

In that context, Page 6 of the Report that states "The administration of GTTL has long ago evolved to staff directors while the graduate faculty committee which was granted authority to award certificates has become inactive." and the statement "While no section in the program review materials specifically addresses the issue of program administration, it appears that the role of the faculty Interdisciplinary Global Trade, Transportation, and Logistics Committee (IGTTL) was lost early in the program's history". Both these statements are totally inconsistent with the history of the Program.

After I retired and Tom Schmitt became Director, he adopted the new guidelines for interdisciplinary programs consisting of a "advisory board, consisting of faculty from the University and, where appropriate, representatives of the professional community". Who is to say he wasn't correct in doing so? In that light, the statement also on Page 6 states that "Unfortunately as of this review, no graduate faculty members are formally involved in the administration of GTTL and few if any are actively involved in any capacity." that is also inconsistent with Tom's role as "Faculty Advisor" or "Interdisciplinary Chair" which ever the case may be.

The statement on Page 10 that "Yet the President's letter gave authority not to an advisory board, but to an interdisciplinary program committee." may be an accurate statement but it doesn't take into consideration Wood's letter that stated "For the foreseeable future" and recognized that an administrator would be hired. Woods letter was also the basis for President McCormick's letter, which formalized establishing the program.

The last item under recommendation that another review take place within a year does not consider the amount of effort required to administer the Program. I agree that there should be academic guidance that may come from an Interdisciplinary Committee as was done in the past or an Advisory Committee which includes Faculty. In either case, the number of faculty needs to be determined by some sort of formula, established by the Graduate School or Graduate School Council for Interdisciplinary Programs.

If you have any questions or want any supporting documents, please let me know. Also feel free to use this message in any way that may be useful. Since I have not formally received a copy of the Report, I don't feel it would be appropriate to respond, unless you request it.

Best wishes,

Jess

Dr. Jess Browning, Ph.D.
Director Emeritus, Global Trade, Transportation, and Logistics Studies, and Affiliate
Professor, Civil & Environmental Engineering University of Washington
4927 NE Tolo Road
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Phone: 206-842-5797

Fax: 206-842-4381