

**University of Washington College of Education
Ten Year Review Report
Site visit Dates: May 24-25, 2006
Final Report submitted August 3, 2006**

Submitted by:

Cassandra L. Book	Professor and Associate Dean for External Relations and Student Affairs, College of Education, Michigan State University
Lewayne Gilchrist	Professor, School of Social Work, University of Washington Committee Chair
Kris Gutierrez	Professor, Graduate School of Education & Information Sciences, UCLA
Lowell L. Hargens	Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Washington
Lawrence Snyder	Professor, Computer Sciences, University of Washington

Executive Summary

The University of Washington College of Education is on a clear upward trajectory both within the University and nationally. In recent years it has risen steadily in national rankings from 17th to 11th. The number of recent excellent new hires among both faculty and staff combined with the considerable energy, skill and vision of the Dean bode well for continuing success into the future.

Principal recommendations to the College

- Reconsider and revise current structures and procedures in the PhD program to improve recruitment, advising, support, and satisfaction of PhD students.
- Continue to strengthen resources to recruit and retain a more diverse faculty and student body.
- Encourage and structure more voice in administrative and governance matters for students and staff.
- Allocate both conceptual and material resources toward ensuring the success of the newly redesigned Office of Student Services, including examining the relationship of this Office to the Director of Development role.
- Allocate the resources necessary to design and launch the newly envisioned undergraduate minor in education.
- Improve resources allocated to mentoring junior faculty, especially with regard to balancing teaching and research.
- Continue and enlarge current collective efforts to envision a distinctive future identity and direction for the College.
- Seek resources to extend the College's capacities in the area of electronic technology for both instructional and administrative purposes.

Principal recommendations to the University

- Offer strong administrative support for the College's new undergraduate minor in education.
- Support efforts by the College to improve and create new internal administrative computerized databases for student advising and support.

Introduction

During Spring Quarter 2006 the Ad Hoc Review Committee members reviewed a number of documents related to the function and structure of the College. Prior to the on-site interview activities, reviewers met first with Dean Pat Wasley and then together with Dean Wasley and the two Associate Deans, Steven Kerr and Deborah McCutcheon. At the end of May reviewers concluded a 2-day site visit with College of Education faculty,

students, and staff (see Appendix for site visit agenda). This report summarizes the Ad Hoc Review Committee's overall impressions. The report below addresses the following areas:

- Leadership, Faculty, and Governance
- Curriculum, Teaching, and Student Relations
- The Planned Undergraduate Education Minor
- Technology in Instruction and Administration
- Research and Scholarship
- Diversity
- Intellectual Directions and Visions for the Future

Leadership, Faculty, and Governance

Strengths. In the six years since her appointment, Dean Patricia Wasley has presided over a number of important changes in the College. These changes are garnering a rising national reputation for the College. *US News and National Report* rankings for the College in six years have risen from 17th to 11th. The College has also greatly improved its visibility and relations with other schools and departments on the UW campus. Formal collaborative arrangements if not joint programs—several of them quite creative in nature--link the College to many other units on campus. These achievements are noteworthy particularly in light of the seemingly genuine satisfaction expressed by both faculty and staff members regarding their work, the atmosphere of their work place, and future well-being. Turnover among staff appears low. We note that in similar instances of creative institutional growth and change, the collegiality and communitarian spirit within the unit has not remained so positive. Reviewers found the group of new Assistant Professors to be a delightful and articulate group who, although they expressed some desire for more assertive mentorship on their behalf, appeared in the main happy with their appointments, assignments, and resources. The trajectory for the College overall seems to be upward and positive.

Challenges. While the Review Committee members found the College's administrators to be quite aware of both present and future challenges facing the College, the capacity for strategic planning among the faculty and staff themselves does not seem as well developed as it might be. The section below entitled Intellectual Directions and Visions for the Future discusses this issue in more detail. Education is a highly politicized field that encompasses many intellectual and applied subfields, and comes under the continual scrutiny of a number of organizational and political entities as well as the general public. Washington State's controversial use of standardized tests for public school students (WASLs) is an example of the publicized and politicized nature of public education today. Due in part to state regulations regarding teacher credentialing and in part to the multiple subfields addressed within the College's own programs the College appears to be under constant scrutiny by one organization or another. For example, in addition to the present Graduate School review, the College has recently been reviewed and reaccredited by the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the American Psychological Association (for its program in school

psychology). Although the College has given up its membership in NCATE and thus the opportunity to be accredited by that entity, it undergoes no shortage of official external scrutiny and accreditation requirements. Given all the specialized scrutiny and requirements—not to mention the power of inertia and unscrutinized past practices--the potential exists for the parts of the College to lose sight of the College and its identity as a whole. While established governance procedures include a number of College constituents (except notably student representatives) outside of the Dean's office itself we as reviewers did not get the sense of active collective thought or strategic visioning for the future of the College as a whole. Such visioning is important for several reasons.

Like many established university-based professional schools, the College is in the midst of a significant number of retirements among long-time faculty members. The opportunity to hire productive and creative new faculty members will benefit from careful College-wide thinking about institutional identity and assessment of the most useful directions for scholarship and training for the College as a whole given anticipated local and national challenges and priorities. Discussions with area heads yielded the impression that processes for identifying hiring needs and recruiting and hiring new faculty were either not clear or not known by this group. Discussion and decision making around new faculty hires is a key organizational space where visions for the future become concrete reality. If reviewers' perceptions are accurate, the College's administrative leadership may wish to consider how to involve more faculty members and faculty administrators outside the Dean's Office in identifying needed faculty expertise and in recruiting applicants for new faculty positions. The College's leadership (in particular) and faculty (to a lesser degree) are aware of this need to craft an articulatable institutional identity to guide faculty hires and institutional priorities. However, this process will require more energy and focus than it presently has and the current omission of student voices from this visioning process is puzzling.

From the perspective of outside reviewers, the governance structure for the College seems unnecessarily bureaucratic and cumbersome. However, this view did not seem to be shared by the administrators, faculty, and staff who were interviewed. While there was recurrent concern voiced by faculty members that governance meetings consumed excessive amounts of their time and that they had to constantly seek opportunities for intellectual exchange external to these meetings, no one independently criticized the existing governance structure. The faculty may wish to review if there is a way to streamline the functions of the present committee and area structures, especially so that the same people aren't drawn into so many meetings. They should examine if the formal parliamentary procedures of the governance structure impedes a collegial exchange among the administrators and the faculty of the College and whether the existing structure is in fact the optimal one for future implementation of policies affecting the College as a whole. Also, it was surprising that students are not brought into some deliberations of the college, for example, on curriculum matters and on the renewal planning for the Office of Student Services.

Junior tenure-track faculty in general appear reasonably satisfied, if a bit overloaded, with their positions. The group of juniors expressed a general desire for more aggressive mentorship on their behalf, particularly with regard to balancing teaching and scholarship/research activities. We were surprised about how many doctoral student advisees each new hire is assigned within just two years of first

appointment. One area of additional support for junior faculty may be to limit their individual advisees to one or two at most, at least until after they've passed their third year review. We were similarly surprised that none of the new faculty members seemed aware of federal grant resources for young scholars (NIH K awards, NSF awards, NRSA individual and institutional awards, etc.). More importantly they didn't seem to know where they could get information about these resources. This lack of information seems consistent with these faculty members' general wish for more focused mentoring and career development advising.

Summary and Recommendations. The College collectively has achieved a great deal since its last Graduate School review. The atmosphere appears low in conflict, a more or less "separate but collegial" one in which units and areas operate fairly autonomously. Over the years, the College has developed a collective perspective and system of governance that permits its many disparate parts and interests to function. The diffusion-of-parts/coordination-of-the-whole issue is one that may require some careful analysis as the College moves into the future with its new identity-building and strategic planning process. Specific recommendations are:

- Re-energize (and redirect?) the Futures Committee and its goals and activities (see Intellectual Directions and Vision and Diversity sections below).
- Permit a stronger voice in governance issues for staff and students.
- Reconsider the number of doctoral advisees assigned to junior tenure-track faculty members and how career advising and mentorship might be increased for this important group of faculty members.

Curriculum, Teaching, and Student Relations

The College's programmatic offerings are numerous and—to this group of outside reviewers—somewhat confusing. The College offers two masters degrees, one in Instruction and Teaching (the teacher credentialing MIT program) as well as a more research-oriented degree in graduate education per se (the MED program). It offers two doctoral degrees as well: the scholarship-oriented PhD and the more applied, administrative EdD. It proved impossible to schedule workable interview appointments with any EdD students, so the Review Committee has less understanding of the practical operations and student satisfaction within this program. We did however hear directly both in person and via e-mail from some MIT and MED and a number of PhD students. Their comments are reflected in a subsection below.

Strengths. Students from all graduate programs praised the high quality and mentoring skills of individual instructors. In particular, the MIT program students we interviewed praised their practicum advisors. At the present time, the College has no undergraduate program or degree but it is in the process of planning an undergraduate-level minor in education. This minor appears to these reviewers to have good chances for success if it can be well integrated into existing operations at both the University and the College administrative levels. Possibilities for the new minor in terms of providing teaching opportunities for doctoral students and to serve as a pipeline for identifying

outstanding potential graduate students are noted below. The planned new minor is discussed in more detail in the next section of this report. In addition to its formal degree programs the College in the last five years has mounted and is contemplating additional self-sustaining, fee-based educational programs. For example the College now has a program in Athletic Leadership and Education offered in partnership with the UW/Seattle School of Business. The certificate and new self-sustaining programs provide a creative means for addressing emerging local and national educational needs, for enlarging the scope of the College's professional interests, commitments, and impact, and—not least—for increasing revenues to the College.

Challenges. Growth and change always produce organizational strains. The most commonly and often strongly voiced issue among all students interviewed was a wish for more obvious coherence (and sometimes relevance) in the requirements for their degree and a strong wish for more and better advising as they move through their programs. We summarize the most prominent issues in the particular subsections below.

Office of Student Services. The Office of Student Services serves an essential function for the College of Education. It is presently undergoing some restructuring dilemmas that need to be carefully considered and supported. It is highly unusual for the Director of Student Services to report to the Director of Development. (Ramifications of this issue are discussed in more detail below in the Development section.) Beyond the issue of organizational place and auspice, the goals of recruiting, retaining, and supporting students, even if focused only on the master's students, cannot be realized by a small staff in the Student Services Office alone, but must include the efforts of the faculty and other staff of the College. It is unclear whether expectations exist for the Office to maintain records for the PhD and EdD candidates as well as for the masters degree students after the faculty in specific areas make admission decisions. There appears to be some lack of continuity in tracking students in –and beyond—the degree programs, at least at the doctoral levels. Such systems take time to develop and implement but we did not get a strong sense that any entity has yet been charged with the responsibility to do so.

Recruiting and enrolling the best students are essential to maintain and enhance the quality of the College as a whole. Clarity of responsibility among faculty and the Office of Student Services for how students are identified and targeted for recruitment and admission to the various programs should be more transparent than it was to this review committee. The College needs to be in a mode of recruiting the best candidates, not merely selecting among those who apply. Information about each of the programs, available on the Web and in brochure form, can be used by this Office to communicate with potential students, but it does not seem this Office is staffed to produce such documents. It is not clear in fact who does have such responsibility and how those responsible relate to the Office. Neither is it clear who has primary responsibility for outreach and student recruitment.

The Office of Student Services is (or is soon likely to be) the “face” or the “front door” of the College, especially for the recruitment of prospective masters students in both the MIT and MED programs. It is essential that each of the staff members in this office be fully informed about the programs, the admissions processes and requirements and the nature of the programs. The Web and these advisors must provide accurate, clear, timely, accessible communication to the students. The lack of clear, accurate information

was voiced by a number of students. Also, the Director of Student Services and/or some of the advisors will need to communicate with the other colleges and undergraduate advisors across campus when the planned undergraduate minor in education comes to fruition. This undergraduate education minor could become a significant recruitment tool for students into the education masters programs. The advisors will need to be fully informed about the education minor and again assist with updating the Web and published documents about the minor and its relationship to the master's programs. How the minor will be incorporated into the current functioning of the College—and in particular into the Office of Student Services--must be carefully designed, yet at the moment plans for this are not optimally clear.

The most common desire on the part of all students interviewed was the wish for better advising. In terms of advising masters students, the Director of Student Services may consider having advisors become specialists in each of the master's areas, with cross training of the advisors so they can back up each other across areas. If each of the advisors specialized in an area, each could participate in area meetings with faculty to be updated and informed about key issues or changes in the curriculum and courses and could then take a lead in updating the Web material. (See the Technology section below for further discussion.) It is essential that the Web be accurate about requirements and consistently reflect the new information about the programs. The advisor responsible for each area could take the lead for the program faculty in updating the web and communicating to students in those areas. Leadership is needed to develop some similar structure to insure the currency and accuracy of information on the Web about each of the doctoral programs.

Although consistently respectful of the faculty and administration, students across programs reported a surprising amount of isolation and lack of communication among themselves. This condition is due in part to non-cohort based admissions policies. Although a sizeable task, advisors may need to offer some or more extensive orientation sessions with the students, perhaps something like a "colloquium with your program" at the beginning of the student's program. This could include information about the program as well as how to utilize the resources of the Office of Student Services and the University more broadly. Such orientation activities should include faculty and second year students. It appears the UW gets many out-of-state or first time UW students in the masters program and the College may want to think of the kinds of orientations that are typically offered to incoming freshmen that would be appropriate to help these newcomers to UW feel connected to the College and to their new program. Focus group sessions with the students may give more insight, but it does seem that students need to find an early connection with the College and with other students. If students are admitted to the various programs in a cohort, more consideration of an initial seminar that is common to all may be a valuable way of connecting these students, but that is a curricular matter for the faculty.

Setting up computerized databases on each of the degree programs appears to be essential. It did not appear that the University has a central database that can be easily accessed by the Office of Student Services so that questions can be asked and answered about such topics as students' progress toward degree, number of minority students in specific programs, maintenance of grade point average or specific requirements, GRE scores, etc. Also, it is not clear what kind of a database is available for advisors on

individual students. We were told that the University is “working on it” but it would seem essential for the Student Services Office to create useable databases that allow faculty and administrators to access and interpret continuous data on recruitment, retention, and matriculation of students. Such databases also will facilitate their goals of tracking students as they become alumni. Maintenance and updating of student/alumni addresses, emails, employment, etc. is one of the most challenging and costly tasks and will necessitate assistance from the University to be effective and efficient.

The use of the Web should be maximized for as many mundane functions as possible. The list of tasks assigned to this office includes room reservations, for example, a task that should be committed to a web site. Advising appointments can be handled on a web site as well. This office will need to streamline its responsibilities so that it can attend to the important activities of working with students one on one or in small group advising sessions. There is no doubt that the Director of Student Services will need to work closely with the Director of Technology to create Web sites and databases to facilitate the work of the Student Services Office.

Recruitment, Training, and Support of PhD Students. Students in various phases of the PhD program were by far the most numerous of the student groups interviewed. They were respectful in their comments about their educational experiences but were collectively firm in their criticisms of some aspects of their program, specifically equity in financial supports, lack of accurate and useful advising resources, lack of opportunities for teaching, and lack of a sense of cohesion and clarity in their academic programs themselves.

In addition to issues of funding and financial support, Ph.D. students who met with us expressed dissatisfaction with what might be termed the “social climate” of the College. In particular, many complained about being isolated from both faculty members and their fellow graduate students and, as a consequence, of feeling that they are “on their own” as far as figuring out how they fit into the graduate program. A related complaint was that decisions about who gets funding and about the apportionment of research and teaching opportunities are opaque, leading to perceptions of inequities in access to these important resources. Finally, several students complained that staff members of the Office of Student Services have often been unaware of College rules and procedures, and that they have responded to student queries by referring them to the College website. A couple of students reported great frustration when they subsequently learned that information on the website on which they had relied was incorrect.

Summary and Recommendations. We are uncertain about how representative the students who volunteered to meet with us are of all PhD students in the College. We believe, however, that structural properties of the College of Education’s graduate program may well foster graduate student perceptions of isolation and lack of guidance. First, the College has a relatively high graduate student per faculty ratio, and a large proportion of the graduate students are part timers. Second, the four major areas within the college apparently do not serve as integrative mechanisms because students are required to have training in more than one area in order to meet breadth requirements. Third, because only a total of two courses are required of all students and there is great flexibility in fashioning a tailor-made curriculum for each individual, incoming students do not have the level of shared experience that fosters a sense of group identity. Fourth, because in recent years the Office of Student Services has been staffed by graduate

student assistants, there has been a lack of continuity in personnel and, consequently, limited opportunity for staff members to learn the ropes reliably. Fifth, in checking the accuracy of some students' comments we learned that Education faculty members are not required to have their courses evaluated by students. Since students are aware of this fact we comment here that such a policy may not model the best educational practice and may promote or prolong feelings among students that they do not have much of a voice in College affairs.

We believe that the College could take steps to foster greater graduate student integration into the College. These steps might include the following:

- Help graduate students form a College level graduate student association. This kind of organization could help reduce individual students' feelings of isolation and increase information sharing.
- Increase graduate student participation in College governance. Such participation is likely to increase students' identification with the College and, if carried out in conjunction with a graduate student association, may also increase students' information about College rules and regulations concerning them.
- Sponsor College-wide social events at which graduate students can meet and interact with each other and faculty members. Possible occasions for such events are at the beginning of the autumn quarter, when new students can be welcomed to the program and old students welcomed back, or at the end of the spring quarter when all can celebrate the conclusion of the academic year.
- Improve communication between Student Services and both the four area committees and individual faculty advisors. Improved communication would make it more likely that Student Services has up to date information on graduate program rules and procedures, and also might reduce differences in the quality of advice that faculty members provide to their advisees. Possible ways to improve communication might be to have the head of Student Services sit in on meetings of the area committees and to have the Student Services office give faculty members quarterly updates on their advisees' progress during the previous term.

In addition to taking steps such as those listed above, we believe that the College might consider more fundamental issues that have consequences for graduate student integration. First, what is the optimal size for the College's the PhD program? Having many students may have benefits that we are unaware of, but it seems to us that large size clearly hinders the development of student solidarity and creates larger advising burdens, particularly on junior faculty. It also lowers per capita funding for students, which may, in turn, hinder the College's ability to compete with peer institutions in attracting highly able new graduate students. Second, should core course requirements for incoming graduate students be increased? Increasing the number of courses required of all students would not only foster student solidarity, but also make it more likely that students will perceive that the College has one or a few key missions. The latter would give students, and perhaps faculty as well, a sense that the College has a coherent scholarly identity.

The Planned Undergraduate Minor in Education

Strengths. The Education Minor is a new initiative that has the potential of addressing a number of key issues and important goals of the College and the faculty. The Dean revealed her plan for the development of an interdisciplinary Minor. Specifically, the intent is to work collaboratively with other units to create several courses, including a course that will involve an experiential component. As we understand it, the program will be rotated among academic units and will begin in Ethnic Studies. There will be several courses offered, including one with a telecommunications component taught by well-respected senior faculty members.

Depending on how the Minor is conceptualized, this new initiative holds the possibility of attracting ethnic minority or culturally non-dominant students across disciplines, students interested in teaching, graduate study in education, and a new population of students who never imagined education as an intellectual, rigorous, and rewarding area of study and profession. To this end, the courses must be rigorous, thoughtful, and organized around educational issues of deep importance. Practicum courses and courses with fieldwork opportunities would provide rich opportunities for students who are interested in educational issues and working in under-served communities.

Challenges. The College's initial and ongoing involvement in this program and the degree of interface the Minor has with various academic divisions in the College will be critical to its credibility and sustainability. For this reason, we believe that an Education faculty member should serve as the Minor's Director. While the idea of the Minor having a rotating academic home sounds interesting, it is important that the intellectual identity of the program be established early on. Rotating responsibility for the program with other departments may make it more difficult for the Minor to have the identity and outcome desired. Moreover, housing the program in Ethnic Studies may make it more difficult to attract a wide range of students from a variety of disciplines. We recommend that the Minor be housed permanently in Education with the Minor's courses cross-listed in relevant departments such as Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Sociology, etc., rather than rotating responsibility for the program. Housing the Minor permanently in Education should make it easier to involve education faculty and provide a number of opportunities for doctoral students to serve as teaching assistants in these undergraduate courses. Depending on the number of courses offered and the enrollment, these teaching assistantships should create a new funding source for doctoral students.

Summary and Recommendations. In sum, we believe that the Education Minor will help the College contribute to the university's commitment to improve undergraduate education. Toward this effort, the College should involve its best faculty to create a program of study that will attract highly competent students to consider education as an area of specialization. A rich program of study can also attract highly competent students of color and can serve to help create a pipeline of students into graduate study. In many ways, the Education Minor should be conceptualized as an apprenticeship for undergraduates who are provided ongoing opportunity to work with doctoral students and talented faculty, while also providing apprenticeship opportunities for graduate students who have limited opportunities to teach and work with faculty members. Specific recommendations are:

- Bring the planning efforts for the minor to fruition.
- Consider carefully the leadership and auspices for the minor once it is launched.
- Design a comprehensive “marketing plan” so that advisors in all relevant undergraduate units are aware of the minor and its opportunities and requirements.

Technology in the College’s Teaching and Administrative Activities

Strengths. The newly hired Director of Technology Scott Macklin appears to be an excellent resource for the College. He has expertise not only in technological hardware but in software and the production of electronic presentations. Although the task ahead is a large one for his role, he appears to have suitable administrative support and faculty good will to eventually succeed in improving the College’s somewhat lagging computer infrastructure and need for computerized administrative systems. A fine example of his work is the College’s new electronic classroom. With regard to use of technology for instructional purposes, he is working on getting the faculty up to speed using technology—he has an ambitious plan to get “non adopters” to use it. We trust that with time and budget (it’s a worthy place to spend money) he will get all of the non-curricular and many of the curricular IT issues resolved.

Challenges. The primary site for the College, Miller Hall, is in itself a technological challenge since reception for many wireless devices is impeded by the structure of the building itself. Capital improvements in the building will need support from UW Administration to alleviate the worst of these structural problems.

The Review Committee makes note here of two issues regarding the application of electronic technology within the College’s curricula and training programs. The technology component of the various degree programs appears in serious need of upgrading. MIT students asserted that they were getting little training in technological skills—not enough to equip them for the realities of public school classrooms. This is of great concern because U.S. youth are entering the educational pipeline with quite sophisticated and ever growing technological skills, creating an “achievement gap” between their knowledge and that of their teachers. Though the existence of some gap may be inevitable for years to come, a teacher’s IT facility should be “current” at the time he or she graduates.

The second issue concerns matter of teaching teachers to teach technology. It is clear that the K-12 curriculum will in the future include technology class—not classes to use basic applications like Microsoft Office, but either general knowledge classes (e.g., Fluency with Information Technology) or specialized science classes on computer science. Such a class is analogous to a chemistry or biology class. These curricular components have only recently been developed and because they are not yet widely offered, could be a way to create a distinctive programmatic emphasis within the College. Both Fluency and “science path computing courses” are of wide interest in Washington State, and could be the basis for funding initiatives. A final issue is of course increasing

the capacity of all College of Education faculty to model creative and effective uses of educational technology in their own classrooms.

Research and Scholarship

Strengths. The College is on an impressive upswing in terms of its capacity to attract distinguished scholars—both junior and senior—to its ranks and to launch significant competitively-funded research centers and scholarly institutes and initiatives. The relatively new Associate Dean for Research role appears effective in identifying funding opportunities for faculty and in supporting the creation of applications for external research resources. The Review Committee has chosen not to review the College’s research portfolio in detail. We believe that the steeply rising national ranking for the UW College of Education—from 17th to 11th over 6 years—reflects in large part national recognition of the growing strength and quality of the College’s knowledge production directions, capacities, and resources.

Challenges. As the College moves forward with its strategic planning it may be useful to more formally consider the relationship of the prestigious externally-funded centers to the more mundane curricular requirements and student needs in the College’s degree granting programs. This is the age-old tension that exists in professional schools in every Research 1 university. Some danger exists in permitting—through lack of attention—the nationally prominent externally-funded projects and resources to become not simply inaccessible but invisible to many students. The heads of research centers and projects currently do sit on at least one of the standing internal governance committees but whether or how they play a role in curricular decisions, student recruitment and on-going support, the hiring of new junior faculty members, and the College’s strategic planning efforts was not clear to the present reviewers.

A second issue concerns the position of Associate Dean for Research. The fact that the incumbent was at first overlooked in invitations for administrators to meet with the Ad Hoc Review team raises the possibility that her role at this time may be understood to be “merely” technical in nature and not a basic contributor to forging the College’s future identity and operating policies. As research becomes more and more prominent within the work life of all faculty members and many students it will be imperative for administrative decisions and policies to reflect the perspective of the Associate Dean for Research equally with that of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

Summary and Recommendations. There is no question about the quality and importance of the College’s existing centers, institutes, and scholarly initiatives. The primary issue is integration of the growing research efforts into College policies and procedures as a whole.

- Ensure that the College’s research operations, centers, and staffs are optimally integrated into on-going planning, governance, and student training efforts.
- Ensure that the Associate Dean for Research has a voice in identity building, strategic planning and policy making within the College.

Diversity

We address the issue of diversity as a separate topic as it is central to the mission of the Dean, the College, and the University.

Strengths: New initiatives exist within the College that provide clear evidence of a College-wide commitment to diversity. Dean Wasley identified the diversification of the faculty and study body as a high priority and faculty refer to open discussions and conversations regarding diversity at faculty meetings and among colleagues. In fact, several faculty members reported that there is continual dialogue around issues of diversity, as there are enough people in the college who “get it.” Others reported that there was a slow but noticeable change, marked by a perceived openness to dialogue and encouragement to think in new ways. The faculty members interviewed, especially the junior faculty, express a strong commitment to diversity. This critical mass of faculty will serve as a resource for building and sustaining a new agenda around diversity.

Another positive development within the College is the group called Educators for Social Justice. This grassroots group of primarily student members has formed in order to have a vehicle for formally expressing their concerns about the lack of official structures and mechanisms for dealing with issues of diversity within the College. To address a vacuum that they believe exists in the College, this group has sponsored a number of activities that focus on issues of social justice, equity, and race, including a diversity summit. This latter activity brings back former students to share their experiences and career pathways with young scholars.

Challenges: While the climate for increasing diversity appears genuine and is improving in important ways, we noted several areas that warrant attention:

Integration of focus. Diversity is addressed as an issue that appears to be parallel but integral within the College’s major vehicle for strategic planning and change, the Futures Committee. The existing Diversity Committee is an important initiative that requires continued support. However this committee should not exist solely as a parallel initiative. Ultimately, the College needs to institutionalize the commitment to diversity and not rely on a committee that is comprised largely of persons of color to sustain this initiative. Specifically, the Diversity Committee needs the involvement of faculty members from key academic programs to give it the visibility and credibility it needs. One interviewee recommended the involvement of external partners. It is not clear how recommendations from the Diversity Committee will be implemented across the Divisions and College. We as reviewers believe that the function of this committee must be tied to larger issues of mission, funding, recruitment, and curriculum.

Finally, we are not clear why the question of diversity does not appear to be a topic for or by the Futures Committee. If diversity issues are to be addressed seriously, they must be a central component of the College’s mission, strategic plan (including faculty and student recruitment), and research and community initiatives. Currently, there appear to be two parallel structures within the College that could and should be integrated: the Futures Committee and the Diversity Committee. We recommend that the Futures

Committee be charged with integrating issues of diversity in its work and that collaboration between these two committees should be encouraged.

Educators for Social Justice. The growing positive climate and responses to issues of diversity within the College should not suggest that all members of the community hold the same views about the progress that has been made or the potential for realizing a social justice agenda in the College. There is an evident disconnect between the broader views articulated by the administration and faculty and those of non-dominant students (i.e., students of color) and students who are motivated toward a social justice agenda. The Educators group recommended that there needs to be more transparency in the College about what is going on, as well as new opportunities for non-dominant students. As an example, the findings of the Casey initiative designed to elevate and make diversity central have not been made public. The group further noted that while colloquia are an important step for building knowledge in the community, more training around culturally responsive practices and more collaboration with K-12 partners are warranted. The Educators group at this time seems clearly student driven. Changes in leadership, energy, and focus are inevitable as currently involved students graduate. It is unclear whether this group will remain active in future years.

Unevenness Across Academic Units. There appears to be an uneven commitment to issues of diversity across the College or at least in how that commitment is instantiated. For example, the Committee noted that non-dominant students are clustered in C&I and ELPS and not distributed across academic units. Students reported that discussions about diversity tend to occur mostly in curriculum and instruction courses, to a lesser extent in educational psychology, even less in human development, and never in measurement and statistics. And faculty support for nominating students for positions and funding awards varies significantly across divisions.

It is important for the College as a whole to be aware of differences in how its organizational commitment to diversity plays out across all its various academic programs and hiring practices. Is there a strategic plan for recruiting, funding, and enrolling a diverse student body? Do non-dominant students have access to high status programs, research and teaching assistant positions? Further, since some student funding (e.g., GOMAP) requires a nomination by the College and its faculty, this issue is central to insure that students of color are supported. It would be important to know what C&I and ELPS do to attract and recruit students. Why are the other academic unit not recruiting and enrolling more non-dominant students? How diverse is the faculty in those under-represented units? What support systems and what changes need to be in place to have a College-wide response to the goal of achieving a genuinely diverse College? The Futures committee should address the topic of the under-representation of non-dominant students across the College and their uneven distribution across units. The Committee should also examine how this dilemma might be related to the larger organizational issues of the College, most notably the perceived hierarchy in divisions, its programs, faculty, and students.

We recommend that the proposed database we discuss in this report would allow administrators and faculty to make queries about individual students and sub-groups. Further, a comprehensive plan for recruiting and funding non-dominant students should be a high priority for the College and the Dean's Office. All divisions would benefit from learning more from academic units that are more successful in attracting and admitting a

diverse student population. The College also should explore ways to link up with GOMAP and other similar recruiting activities across the University.

A related issue surfaced in the discussion of the MIT program. Students and faculty interviewed expressed that there is no substantive focus on English Learners or bilingualism; what is offered is available only to those preparing for elementary school teaching. Students also reported that the multicultural class is treated as an add-on, disconnected from other courses in the program. Building the bilingual and multicultural strand could be a way to create a pipeline of graduate students interested in working with non-dominant students and their communities. We believe that diversity must become an organizing principle of everyday and key activities of the College if issues of diversity are to be taken seriously and addressed in any substantive way. We recommend that the diversity plan must be tied to questions of equity and to the fundamental questions: What kind of College of Education are we? What kind of College Education do we aspire to be?

Summary and Recommendations. While increasing diversity is an important goal recognized by most of the College's constituents, attending to diversity issues and integrating this attention into all aspects of the College's daily functioning is not yet well established. Specific recommendations are:

- Consider adapting the recommendations we make earlier in this report for students in general and PhD students in particular to fit the needs of specific groups of non-dominant students.
- Provide clearer faculty leadership for the Educators for Social Justice and other student groups interested in the promotion of diversity.

Development

Strengths. College administrators and faculty noted a need for development of new funding—especially for student support--in addition to that coming in from research and foundation grants. At the time of this review the College is without a Director of Development due to a recent resignation. The outgoing incumbent was by all accounts good in her role. When interviewed by the Chair of this Ad Hoc Review Committee on her last day in office, she made clear that she had not been seeking another job but had received an unsolicited, career enhancing off-campus offer that she couldn't refuse. The current situation provides a good opportunity for the College to reassess its development needs for the future.

Challenges. Given the previously summarized needs for an active and influential Director of Student Services and the clear and regularly expressed needs for better financial resources for students and improvements in the College's technological capacities, we believe that future planning for the Office of Development and the Director role in particular requires some careful thought. The outgoing director's responsibilities included supervising the Director of Student Services. It wasn't clear whether this unusual organizational arrangement was an outgrowth of the skills of that particular individual or the product of a more far-reaching philosophical position by the

Dean. Director of Student Services Marty Howell identified an ambitious agenda for that important office, that of continuous communication with students from their initial contact with the University as applicants through their status as alumni and eventual donors. The combination of admission, advising, retention efforts, alumni relations and development functions is potentially overwhelming. It may be important for the Director of Development to consider the potential conflict of interest that could be perceived with those combined functions and to make sure that the independent goals can be realized effectively. It is essential that student issues from admission decisions to other special considerations not be compromised because the Director of Student Services reports to the Director of Development. When a large donor wishes to sway admission or programmatic decisions, for example, a potential compromise of integrity could be realized.

With regard to actual fund raising efforts themselves, the College might consider soliciting endowments that could be targeted for fellowships or guaranteed support or even “signing bonuses” for recruiting outstanding graduate students. Administrators at the College noted that their graduates were not as affluent as graduates of health sciences and other professional schools. Nevertheless creative ways exist for soliciting and pooling a number of small donations to form both endowed and one-time use fellowships and support resources for students. The Director of Development position when filled may be useful in this creative enterprise. It is not in fact clear that the Director of Development has any direct responsibility for creating resources specifically for students. The College needs to shape processes to help it consider centrally how much nonrecurring funding is available each year and how much can be anticipated from unfilled faculty lines, annual giving from alumni and donors, and from indirect cost returns. These funds or a substantial portion should be carefully summarized at the institutional level and procedures developed to allocate these funds to improve recruitment and retention of the best doctoral and other graduate students. These funds, although nonrecurring, are expected and could be committed on an annual basis. Such guaranteed funding for graduate students could allow the Dean or Faculty Advisory committee to offer research assistants to junior faculty on a regular basis. Without some central strategic planning about obtaining significant funds for the guaranteed support of top students, the College will be left in the situation of accepting only those students who can find their own funding or who are geographically limited in their choice of graduate programs or will increase the likelihood that the doctoral students will have to go part time in order to work outside jobs.

Finally, it is not clear whether the future Director of Development role will be envisioned to encompass more than alumni relations. In other schools and departments, directors of development create connections with corporations and business leaders, political figures, foundation boards, and others who may have interests to be creatively developed for both monetary and political reasons. These latter tasks are perhaps currently understood to be the purview of the Dean. If so, a question for strategic planning within the College becomes how might the Director of Development role be structured to complement to Dean’s role so that the greatest amount of energy and attention is available for creating and pursuing the maximum array of new areas and funding opportunities.

Summary are Recommendations. The College has a good opportunity in hand to revise the role of Director of Development to meet emerging needs.

- Consider separating the role of Development from that of Student Services.
- Define the separate but complementary purviews of the Director of Development and the Dean.

Intellectual Directions and Visions for the Future

The College is in the process of recognizing its need for strategic planning for the future. In the last five years a significant number of new faculty hires and newly funded large research centers have become part of the College. Last year the Dean appointed a committee of faculty and some staff to consider procedures for examining the College's identity, potential, and future challenges and for planning strategically for such an envisioned future.

Strengths. In addition to meeting directly with the Futures Committee representatives, the review team heard testimony from many in the college about this highly visible initiative. We learned that the Futures Committee was constituted by Dean Pat Wasley to envision where the college should be headed in coming years, especially given the large number of anticipated retirements that would allow the college to make deep and fundamental changes if it sees fit to do so. The Futures Committee included broad representation, with the notable and unfortunate omission of students. They met biweekly and conducted focus group meetings with most college constituencies, again with the unfortunate omission of students. They solicited thoughts from external leaders in the field. They asked four questions of their colleagues:

- 1) What would make you want to stay in the college?
- 2) What would be indicators of productivity and health of the college?
- 3) What is your metaphor for the college, e.g. "a 911 college?"
- 4) Who would you want to join the college—meaning what kind of expertise?

These seemed to be excellent questions designed to get everyone thinking about the future. The process seems to be reaching a conclusion—we were handed a draft report. The principle conclusion is to initiate a "colloquium series," meaning a regular forum in which faculty, student, and staff speakers can present content to all members of the college. The goal of the series is to strengthen the "intellectual backbone" of the college. In the opinion of Review Committee members, though such a series would be of unquestionable value, it is not sufficiently powerful enough to accomplish the College's transformative goals.

Challenges. In the Review Committee's view the Futures Committee was not thinking expansively enough. A substantial opportunity presents itself, one of great enough magnitude to justify "outside the box" thinking. We did not hear of any targets of opportunity. We heard no mention of the intellectual challenges facing education in America or the world. We heard no evidence that the committee considered the educational implications of major societal changes: migration, globalization, explosion of information and technology, etc. Diversity was mentioned, but only as an immediate

problem to be solved locally, not as a topic that could profoundly change the college's form and mission. In the opinion of the review team, the Futures Committee has not yet changed the discussion nor accomplished its mission. Our recommendation is that a Futures Committee, including student representation, but possibly reconstituted in other ways, should return to the table for another try. The College's administrative leadership may need to consider expending some creative resources to find stimulating models for thinking about creating and adapting to change in units like the College. The Futures Committee will have fulfilled its mission when it has developed a vision worthy of headlines in the PI. One final note: Review Committee members note that the UW offers degrees in education at all three of its campus sites (Bothell, Seattle, and Tacoma), yet the three existing education programs do not seem to interact with one another at all. Such complete independence may in the long run be desirable, but the existence of the branch campus programs particularly the one in nearby Bothell may be something that the Futures Committee will wish to consider in honing a vision of the unique strengths and optimal educational emphases of the College on the main Seattle campus.

Summary and Recommendations. A committee charged with crafting a process for achieving a holistic strategic vision for the future seems an excellent opportunity at this time in the life of the College. Internal resources are well placed in making this committee and its subsequent activities successful.

- Reconsider and if necessary reconstitute membership and structure of the Futures Committee to provide clearer goals and products.
- Consider inclusion of students on the next iteration of the Futures Committee.
- Provide clear administrative support and enthusiasm for College-wide identity-building activities proposed by the Committee.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Charge letter

Appendix 2: Site visit agenda