Final Report of the Subcommittee Representing the Educational Policy Committee, the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, and the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee on the Proposal to Create a School of Public Policy within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences

The subcommittee was composed of the following: Paul Duff, Chair, Educational Policy Committee; W. B. Griffith, Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee; Gregory Maggs, Chair, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee; Professors J. Friedenthal (Law) and S. McGraw (SMHS).

The Subcommittee met throughout the 02-03 academic year to discuss the proposed School of Public Policy within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences.

Over the course of its deliberations, the members of the subcommittee expressed particular concern over the following issues:

1. Is calling the proposed entity a “school” is a fair way to represent it to faculty, students, and the public at large, especially since it would be a school within a school? The label “school” was of particular concern since the Faculty Senate has already gone on record opposing the creation of schools within schools (see senate resolution 96/14 appendix A). Assuming that the Public Policy group was merged into CCAS, the subcommittee wondered whether there might be a different name that would be more appropriate such as a “Center” or “Institute.”

2. Would the rights of untenured faculty or those who will be facing promotion after the move be protected?

3. Would the affected schools (CCAS and SBPM) would be content with the financial arrangements that would accompany the creation of this entity within CCAS?

In order to address these concerns, the subcommittee reviewed the report of the Task Force on Public Affairs at GWU (appendix B) and the VPAA’s response to that Task Force’s report (appendix C). The subcommittee then met with and discussed the proposed new school with Kathy Newcomer, Joe Cordes, and Hal Wohlman. Information about similar programs (particularly programs run by our competitors) to the one proposed was shared with the subcommittee (appendix D). Next, the relevant deans were asked about any particular concerns that they might have. The subcommittee also consulted with them about the processes envisioned for obtaining faculty approval for the move. After asking if the SBPM Dean’s Council had any comments on the move, the subcommittee received a memo from Dean Phillips, indicating that the council had no objections (appendix E) to the relevant faculty moving to CCAS. A member of the subcommittee then met with and discussed the proposed move with the CCAS Dean’s Council (see appendix F). The subcommittee next discussed the proposed move with the affected faculty to see if they had particular concerns. Finally, the subcommittee consulted with Vice President Lehman. At our suggestion, Vice President Lehman asked that Kathy Newcomer, Joe Cordes, and Hal Wohlman prepare a final document outlining the proposed program that could be presented to the Senate at the May meeting. This
document was provided (appendix G) as was a chronological history of the steps taken to establish the new school (appendix H).

The subcommittee then crafted a resolution that will be presented to the Senate at the May meeting (appendix I).

Respectfully submitted,

Paul B. Duff  
Chair, Educational Policy Committee
A RESOLUTION ON "SCHOOLS WITHIN SCHOOLS" (96/14)

WHEREAS, The established structure of this University, as specified in our Faculty Code and Faculty Organization Plan, consists of Schools, most of which are subdivided into departmental units, and

WHEREAS, Under our Faculty Code, the faculty of a School within the University has certain perogatives and responsibilities inconsistent with being a subordinate unit within another school, such as recommending its own dean, developing its own procedures of governance, establishing an independent school-wide personnel committee, and independence in establishing its own curriculum; and

WHEREAS, Under our Faculty Organization Plan, the faculty of schools of the University are entitled to elect their own representatives to the Faculty Senate, and to cooperate with other schools on an equal basis; and

WHEREAS, Two recently established units lack the independent status provided for above (and typical of most schools within universities in this country); and

WHEREAS, Labelling as a "School" educational units that do not meet the well-established criteria of a School is misleading to faculty, students, and the public at large, NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

That the two units currently designated as 'Schools-within-Schools' be properly re-designated as divisions within a School, or, with consultation with the Faculty Senate, be organized into independent schools with all appropriate rights and responsibilities; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That in future the designation 'School' be applied only to educational units satisfying the conditions of independence specified in the structure of the University.

Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
March 28, 1997
Appendix B

January 28, 2002

To: Donald Lehman  
Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Task Force on Public Affairs at GWU

Subject: Recommendations of Task Force

Per your request an ad-hoc task force, chaired by Carol Sigelman, has been meeting since mid-October to consider ways in which the current arrangements for teaching and researching in the area of “public affairs” might be improved, in order for the university to better fulfill its potential in this area. (“Public Affairs” is the term you used in your charge to the task force to encompass both public policy and public administration). This task force has made substantial progress in its work, and has reached four main conclusions:

1. Creation of a visible institutional home for “public affairs” at GW would enhance the recognition and reputation of GW’s public affairs programs and ultimately increase the quality of these programs.

2. In addition, for reasons of efficient and effective program operation, it would be advantageous to the university to have the current public policy and public administration programs more closely connected. This would best be brought about by having these programs organizationally aligned.

3. In the short run, the best way to bring about this alignment would be to consolidate the M.P.A., the M.P.P., and the Ph.D. programs (the current public policy program and the public administration portion of the SBPM Ph.D.) as a separate school within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences. This would necessitate, among other things, the movement of the Department of Public Administration from SBPM to CCAS. In the long run, some members of the committee believe (as does the Public Administration Department faculty) that the University would best be served by an independent school devoted to public policy and administration.

4. While the committee believes that the aforementioned organizational change is desirable, it is only desirable if certain issues are addressed in ways that ensure that the existing degree programs and research endeavors both in public administration and in public policy programs in CCAS are not made worse off by the move.

This memorandum will discuss each of these conclusions in more detail.

Vision and Rationale

Given its location in the heart of Washington, DC, the overall quality of the university, and its existing faculty resources and programs in the area of public affairs, GW has the potential to be a national leader in the area of public affairs education and research. The
university has done a good job of enhancing our already strong offerings in public affairs, particularly through the recent creation of the Masters of Public Policy and the George Washington Institute of Public Policy. At present, however, GW’s efforts lack visibility and focus. We believe that the creation of a School within CCAS would provide that visibility and place GW on an equal footing with our competitors, nearly all of whom deliver their programs through distinct and visible schools or Institutes of Public Affairs, Public Policy, and/or Public Administration. In addition, we believe an emphasis on public service and public policy and their relationship would provide us with a distinct focus, tied to our Washington, D.C. location, that would distinguish us from our competitors.

We are at a point in history where increasing our emphasis on public service could pay particular dividends. (We define “public service” broadly as interest in and concern for serving others and encompassing not only the public sector, but non-profit organizations, community groups, research institutes and other institutions engaged in activity related to public policy making and administration.) Research points to the current generation’s increased interest in “making a difference,” often through involvement in grass-roots or volunteer organizations. More recently, the response to the events of September 11th, coupled with the softer private sector economy, has made public service even more attractive to potential students. Many of our competitor schools have increased their visibility by creating more visible “schools” or “institutes” designed to train students for public sector careers. The Task Force believes that GW would be missing a golden opportunity to capitalize on our current strengths and our obvious locational advantages if we do not move aggressively to increase our own visibility as soon as possible.

Current Strengths and Potential Improvements

In the view of the task force, GWU can be proud of its record of achievement in public administration and public policy. GWU’s public affairs programs have consistently been rated in the top 20 in the country. We have a nationally recognized faculty that have been productive researchers and committed teachers. Our alumni have achieved responsible positions, particularly in government, research institutes, and professional and non-profit organizations and credit their experience with us as a major contributor to this success.

The M.P.P. program and GWIPP have been recent and successful additions to this legacy. The M.P.P. has grown from 6 students its first year (1999/2000) to 44 currently (2001/2002). GWIPP has made substantial progress in encouraging more research on public policy issues and in bringing in sponsored research funding.

These successes have not come without attendant challenges, some of which are related to current organizational arrangements. The M.P.P. enrollments may have cut into M.P.A. enrollments. The M.P.A. has dropped from 133 students in 1999/2000 to 105 in 2001/2002 (although all of that reduction has been in part-time students). Because neither CCAS or SBPM get “credit” for M.P.P. students, this makes it appear to SBPM as
if the Public Administration Department is doing less, when in fact the total number of students in the M.P.A. and M.P.P. (to which many PAD faculty devote substantial effort and course time) combined has actually increased (from 139 to 149) over the past 2 years. If the two programs were combined into a single organization, the unit in which they were located would receive credit for the total number, thus reducing any potential unproductive competition between the two programs.

Further, the programs are in danger of reaching capacity in terms of the number of students that can be handled by current faculty. Several courses are taken as core courses by students in both programs, and these courses routinely have enrollments of 30 to 35 students. Further, the director of the M.P.P. has no real ability to control faculty resources, and has been reliant on the substantial good will of faculty and schools to staff the M.P.P. The current proposal to establish 50/50 faculty is an effort to address this concern.

The committee considered five options for redressing some of the current problems:

- an independent school of public administration and policy;
- movement of the public policy and administration programs into the Elliott School;
- integration of the public policy and administration programs in to SBPM;
- integration of the public policy and administration programs into a new “School” within CCAS (which would necessitate the movement of the public administration department into CCAS); and
- some enhancement of the status quo that would keep all current actors in their current organizational homes, while addressing some of the specific problem issues.

The committee went through an exhaustive exercise of listing the pros and cons of each of these options. In the end, the committee felt that two options were worth pursuing: the option of an independent school and the option of movement into CCAS. The case for this option rests on the view that given our location and record of accomplishment, the university would benefit from the maximum visibility that such a school would offer. The down side is that it would require more resources than other options, and the committee was concerned that an under-resourced independent school might lack the quality we hope to associate with the GW label or might draw resources from other related units to their detriment and that of the university. Under these circumstances it would not necessarily be an improvement over the current arrangement.
The Task Force believes that most of the desirable features of a separate school, including increased visibility, could be captured by creation of a new School within CCAS, and it is our recommendation that this action be taken as soon as possible. A move to CCAS would be an improvement over the current arrangement. Given that combining the existing Masters and doctoral programs in public policy/administration was viewed as a positive step, and given the current ties of many public policy faculty to CCAS, this move would cause the least disruption to these public policy faculty outside of the Public Administration Department. Obviously, however, this would be a significant change for the Public Administration Department, which would need to be satisfied that there were not substantial costs that more than offset the benefits that would accrue from such a move. If these concerns could be appropriately addressed, however, the committee unanimously viewed consolidation of the programs under CCAS as being superior to the status quo.

The Task Force recommends that the School be named either the School of Public Policy and Public Service or the School of Public Service and Public Policy. Such a title would capture the unique opportunity the university has by virtue of its location in Washington, DC to combine an interest in public service and public policy.

Three other issues are worth noting. First, the committee’s belief that this option is superior to the current arrangement assumes that the new organization is set up as a separate school within CCAS and not as a smaller department within CCAS. It is only through this move that we will achieve the enhanced visibility and stature desired by all.

Second, the committee did not consider in detail an option (which came to us late) that would combine public administration and policy with the current School of Media and Public Affairs and the Graduate School of Political Management to create one large school within CCAS. While such a proposal might be made to work, we are concerned that it might have negative implications in terms of our visibility by putting units together that are too disparate in missions. This and other concerns would need to be addressed prior to our embracing such an option.

Third, we assume that GWIRP would reside organizationally within the new school but would still report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, deferring its status as a self-governing unit until that time. We would assume that the Center for Washington, Iraq Studies and the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management would be affiliated with the new school if they so wished (the latter in joint "ownership" with SBPM).

Organizational/Administrative Issues Related to Recommendations

A number of administrative and organizational details would need to be worked out in order to bring the committee’s recommendation to fruition. The following discussion relates to issues that need to be addressed in the move of the Public Administration Department from SBPM to CCAS, issues related to governance of the new school, and
issues related to carrying forward some of the current arrangement governing GWIPP and the M.P.P. In the interest of being as explicit as possible, these issues will be raised in detail, even though, in some cases, we have not yet come to final agreement.

1. **Makeup of the School/Faculty:** The task force believes that, in terms of intellectual coherence, the best arrangement for a new school would consist of a single faculty, which would combine the existing faculty of the PAD Department with public policy faculty. The members of the faculty would be defined as follows: 1) any faculty in full time status who are budgeted to the school (this would include all existing PAD faculty); 2) any faculty in full-time status who teach core courses in the M.P.A., M.P.P. (including courses required in the two fields of emphasis), or Ph.D. in Public Policy programs; 3) 50/50 hires made between public policy and other units, and 4) faculty appointed to serve as field advisors in the Public Policy Ph.D. program. With the exception of PAD faculty, or any other faculty budgeted to the new School, would retain their current appointments and would receive non-budgeted appointments in the new School, along the lines of the model currently used in ESIA.

Using these criteria, the faculty would initially consist of 13 members of the Public Administration Department, five non PAD members of SBPM teaching MPP or Ph.D. core courses, nine faculty in CCAS (which includes the 50/50 person to be hired in the Economics Department) teaching MPP or Ph.D. core courses, five CCAS members currently serving as Ph.D. field advisors, and three faculty in other Schools (SPHHS, GSEHD, and the Elliot School) serving as Ph.D. field advisors. All current budgeted lines would become permanent lines upon transfer. In addition, the positions of any full-time PAD faculty who leave the faculty between now and the time of any move would be retained by the school. The faculty listed above would have full voting rights, except as limited below under sections 2 and 3. The faculty of the school could identify other faculty to be affiliated with the school, as full faculty (with voting rights) or associated faculty (without). Further, the new school would include GWIPP, and, if within CCAS, CWAS (if CWAS so desired), as well as joint custody of CEMM/ CED (with SBPM).

2. **Governance:** The new school would be headed by a director, who would be recommended to the Dean of CCAS by a super-majority (2/3) of those faculty (as defined above) who hold appointments in CCAS. GWIPP would continue to report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, befitting its status as a university-wide endeavor.

The director would appoint, upon the recommendation of the various program faculties, an M.P.A. program director, an M.P.P. program director, and a Ph.D. program director. The M.P.A. and M.P.P. would be governed by separate committees made up of all school faculty who teach in these respective programs. A separate Ph.D. committee would be appointed by the faculty, but would generally consist of any members of the research active faculty who volunteer for such an assignment. These committees would be responsible for considering admissions, curriculum,
other issues related to their respective programs. Final curriculum and other decisions (except for APT, see # 3 below) would be submitted to the full school faculty for consideration and approval.

3. APT Committee/Voting on APT Decisions: Faculty members holding appointment within CCAS would be eligible to serve on the APT Committee, which would be drawn from the entire School of Public Policy and Public Service. Voting rights of the faculty on APT decisions shall be limited to faculty who hold appointments within CCAS as follows: for appointments, any member of that faculty shall be eligible to vote; for tenure, all tenured faculty shall be eligible to vote; for promotions, every individual already in the position (or above) aspired to by the candidate for promotion shall be eligible to vote.

Any untenured faculty member in tenure-track status as of the date of the move to CCAS shall have their recommendations on tenure or promotion to Associate Professor considered only by the M.P.A. committee (if previously existing PAD faculty) or the M.P.P. committee (if public policy faculty).

4. Ph.D. Program: The task force believes that bringing the two programs together also has the potential to strengthen Doctoral education in public affairs at GWU. The proposed school would offer a single Ph.D. program, made up of the existing Public Policy Ph.D. and the Public Administration portion of the SBPM Ph.D. There was agreement among task force members that it would be desirable to have common admissions to the program, as well as some core courses common to all students. There was also agreement that it would be desirable to have other required courses in the program vary depending on whether a student chose to focus on Public Policy or Public Administration. Field course offerings would permit students the flexibility to study areas of interest most relevant to their career interest and would include the existing public policy fields (e.g. science and technology policy, gender and social policy, etc.), or public administration fields (organization theory, budgeting and finance, etc.).

In practice, numerous substantive features of the unified program would need to be fleshed out through consultations between Public Administration faculty and the Steering Committee of the Ph.D. Program in Public Policy. For this reason, specific proposals as to the exact form of the combined Doctoral Program are outside the scope of the Task Force. Examples of the types of issues that would need to be considered would include: (a) whether the unified program would offer a common degree (such as a Ph.D. in Public Administration and Public Policy, or Public Policy and Administration), or two Ph.D.s (e.g. with two different Banner codes), (b) the structure of comprehensive examinations, (c) the exact composition of core courses, and (d) the number of required fields and/or subfields.

5. Relation of the Proposed School to Other Policy Programs: The task force also notes that in the process of weighing the various options for reorganizing public affairs, it has not discussed how other policy-related programs at GWU would relate to the
new unit. These programs include the three existing, and autonomous CCAS programs offering the M.A. in Public Policy (Environmental and Natural Resource Policy, Philosophy and Social Policy, and Women's Studies); the Master of Public Health offered in SPHSS, the M.A. in Science and Technology Policy in ESIA, and the M.Ed. in Education Policy in GSEHD. Each of these programs has a fine track record and meets some well-defined demands in the marketplace for policy education. Moreover, faculty in these programs enrich GWU's public policy offerings through their involvement in some of the core public policy courses and/or public policy fields. The presumption is that the new school would continue to work in close collaboration with these programs (as is currently the case), with these programs continuing to maintain their current autonomy. The recommendations of the task force are also not meant to rule out any new relationships that might develop between the proposed school and other policy-related programs if these were deemed to be beneficial.

6. Graduate Assistants and support: All graduate assistant positions and graduate student support budgeted to component units within programs transferred to the new school should transfer with those component units, and those GA positions should remain within the new school. This would include current GA positions reserved for M.P.A., M.P.P., or Ph.D. students with CEMM. Further, the current arrangement of assigning 22.15% of total projected M.P.P. student revenue for fellowship aid would be continued.

Staffing: All existing staff resources budgeted to component units that are to be wholly housed within the new school would be transferred to the new school, to be organized and tasked at the discretion of the director with the input of the faculty.

8. Space: The University should provide space for school faculty and units that permits as much geographic proximity of the faculty to each other as possible.

9. Career Services: The position of career and alumni services director within the school would be fully funded. Internship students in the school would continue to have access to career services in SBPM.

10. Budget and Budget Decision-Making: The full budgets of the component units would transfer to the new school. Any existing budget decision-making authority and flexibility would transfer as well. These budgetary resources and authority would remain at the Director's level.

11. Course Sizes and Teaching Load: Research active faculty shall generally have a 2/2 teaching load, at the discretion of the Director. All other faculty shall generally have a 3/2 load. (As a consequence some, but not all, PAD faculty would move to a 2/2 load, necessitating modest additional resource costs for adjunct faculty during the short-term.) It should be the objective of the School that sufficient resources be provided to permit core courses to be capped at 25 students, with additional students added at the discretion of the individual professor.
12. **GWIPP Arrangements to be Maintained.** There are various arrangements that have governed GWIPP operations that should be transferred to the new entity, as follows:

All of the Director’s salary savings would be moved to the GWIPP “R” fund at the end of the fiscal year;
The Associate Director will be supported 100% by GW in his/her first full year (equally split between CCAS and SBPM), with the Associate Director expected to raise at least 50% of his salary from external funding after the first year;
Faculty salary savings for projects brought through GWIPP would continue to be split 50/50 between GWIPP and the Dean’s office (explicit agreement between SBPM and CCAS), with GWIPP’s share going into its “R” fund;
REIA awards for projects going through GWIPP would continue to be split 1/3 to PI, 1/3 to PI’s Department, and 1/3 to GWIPP (explicit agreement with SBPM and CCAS Deans), with GWIPP’s share going into its “R” fund;
Funds to compensate units for Policy Research Scholars who receive course reductions would continue to be deposited into a specific budget account line in the GWIPP budget. Departments would be allocated $4,000 per policy scholar to use for replacement instructors. These costs will be paid out of the budget account line described above. Funds not used for replacement instructors (but not to exceed 50% of the $4,000 allocation) could be moved to the Department’s “R” fund.
GWIPP shall maintain its ability to move funds between salary and non-salary accounts.

13. **Issues if GWIPP and M.P.P. are separated.** If the M.P.P. and the GWIPP budget are separated from each other, the GWIPP budget would include the funding for the Director’s salary, the salary for the Executive Coordinator, funds for the Policy Research Scholars, funds for the Research Assistants, and sufficient operating funds. Also the Administrative Manager could continue to be funded out of the VPAA’s budget for the full three-year period intended (and at the end of that period the salary for that position would be added to the GWIPP budget). Also, if the GWIPP and M.P.P. budgets are separated, it is assumed that the functions related to the M.P.P. program will be adequately resourced.

14. **M.P.P. Tuition Credit.** Tuition revenue credit would continue to be assigned to the M.P.P. program based on M.P.P. student enrollment. In other words, credit from any course taken by an M.P.P. student will be allocated to the M.P.P. program regardless of whether the course bore a PPOL label.

**Conclusion**

We appreciate the opportunity that you have given us to consider these issues. We believe that the university has an opportunity to increase its visibility and substantive contribution in public affairs. We believe that the organizational arrangement that we have recommended can make this happen, if it is accompanied by the kinds of
organizational and administrative assurances and arrangements outlined above, along with a modest (and quite targeted) increase in resources. The university has a wonderful opportunity to make a difference at a time when public service has never been more important, while at the same time positioning ourselves for an even stronger role in public affairs education and scholarship for the future.
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Report of the Public Affairs Task Force

Thank you very much for the excellently prepared report on the recommendations of the
Public Affairs Task Force concerning the possibilities for the future of the programs and
faculty that fall in the broad area of public affairs. It is clear that great care and hard
work has been put into your deliberations to assure that the key options were carefully
considered and that the Task Force arrived at a consensus recommendation. Before I
respond to the recommendation, I want to extend to each of you my sincere thanks for a
job well done and to Carol Sigelman for serving as the facilitator of our meetings. I
appreciate greatly the time and effort put forth by everyone involved and the care taken in
following my charge to the Task Force.

Recommendation of the Task Force

The most exciting aspect of the Task Force work is that a specific consensus
recommendation has been put forth: that a new school should be created within CCAS
dedicated to public policy and administration. It is emphasized that this conclusion is
reached with care through consideration of the fiscal resources needed to proceed and the
functioning conditions that must be created. I am pleased to accept this recommendation
and to begin the process to make it happen as soon as practical. Success in creating this
new school within CCAS will contribute to our overall aim of developing those areas that
can bring significant recognition to GW and add to its reputation through being recognized as top-tier in selected academic areas.

**Conclusions of the Task Force**

Now, let me get into some of the specifics. The purpose for going into a bit of detail is to clarify to what I agree in the overall set of detailed recommendations from the Task Force. The recommendations derive from the four main conclusions reached by the Task Force:

- Creation of a visible institutional home for “public affairs” at GW would enhance the recognition and reputation of GW’s public affairs programs beyond their current strong recognition. Over time, such external scrutiny will drive us to continually increase the academic quality of the programs;

- Organizational alignment of the “public affairs” programs is expected to lead to more efficient and effective program operation;

- The best way to bring about this “alignment” is believed to be through consolidation of the MPA, MPP, and the two Ph.D. programs (Public Policy in CCAS and Public Administration in SBPM) into a separate school within CCAS. It is understood that this necessitates the move of the Public Administration Department from SBPM to CCAS in the interim. Ultimately, in the longer term, it is felt that the University will best be served by an independent school of public policy and administration;

- The key is to bring about this organizational change such that the existing degree programs and research endeavors, both in public administration and public policy programs, are strengthened as a result.

I concur with these four conclusions. Moreover, our driving objective in this undertaking must be to make GW a national leader in the area of “public affairs” education and research. Being a leader in this arena means that significant emphasis must be placed on the relationship between public service and public policy in such a way that our strong faculty resources are coupled to our location to arrive at a distinct focus for GW. We have a solid base from which to build through GW’s “public affairs” programs being rated in the top 20 nationally for a number of years. From that base, we are well positioned to take the next steps to significantly enhance our current effectiveness.

**A Transition Course of Action**

Ultimately, our goal is to create an adequately resourced independent school focused on “public affairs.” Understanding that this requires resources beyond those currently available, and realizing that the most desirable features of an independent school (e.g., increased visibility) can be obtained by creation of a new school within CCAS, an interim course of action is appropriate: the creation of a new school within CCAS for a given
time period, for example, five years or less. This approach will provide us the appropriate transition period towards setting priorities and developing the resource base to make the move to independence possible. I emphasize that we are not simply creating a new department within CCAS, but rather a school with a director who also might serve as one of the associate deans within CCAS. The name of the new school might be the School of Public Policy and Public Service (alphabetical approach) as suggested in the Task Force report.

Comments on some of the Details

In the Task Force report, a number of issues that need to be addressed in the move of the Public Administration Department from SBPM to CCAS are brought to the surface. In addition, issues of governance come into play, especially with respect to the joint MPP degree and the The George Washington Institute of Public Policy (GWIPP). Let me address them as they are presented in the Task Force report.

1. Makeup of the School/Faculty: I accept the recommendations with regard to the arrangement of the new school as an entity with no departments and consisting of a single faculty as spelled out in the first paragraph of this section. The key is the last sentence: "All faculty with the exception of PAd faculty or any other faculty budgeted to the new School would retain their current appointments and would receive non-budgeted appointments in the new School, along the lines of the model currently used in ESIA."

With regard to the second paragraph of this section, I accept the general statements with regard to the faculty composition of the new School. Yes, the current budgeted lines shall become permanent lines of the new School upon transfer from SBPM to CCAS – including the existing resources to fund the lines. I agree that the new School includes GWIPP. With regard to CWAS and CEMM, the details will have to be worked out.

2. Governance: I concur with the plan for the leadership of the new School, except for the director possibly having the status of an Associate Dean within CCAS. The director’s reporting line shall be to the Dean of CCAS. Yes, the GWIPP would continue to report to the VPAA through the Associate VP R&GS. I am satisfied with the remainder of the governance comments.

3. APT Committee/Voting on APT Decisions: I concur with the recommendations given, including the grandfathering provisions.

4. Ph.D. Program: I am excited at the prospect of having a single Ph.D. program associated with the new School of Public Policy and Public Service. It does have the potential to strengthen doctoral education in public affairs at GW. I understand fully that working out the details of how such a single Ph.D. program would actually function is key to the success. It is not simple, and the first issue raised will be the degree name. I strongly encourage that this path be pursued
with vigor and with the focused aim of having one Ph.D. program, appropriately named, with possible tracks derived from a core focus.

5. Relations of the Proposed School to other Policy Programs: In the end, success of this evolution of our policy efforts at GW will depend at some level on the close collaboration with those policy programs not specifically included in this transition. I strongly urge that all doors always remain open to new configurations that might evolve as the current path is taken.


7. Staffing: I concur.

8. Space: In principle, I agree with this very general statement. However, the key is what does this really mean in practice? I have been under the impression that the current “housing” arrangements are very good for the objectives we seek to achieve.

9. Career Services: This particular item needs to be fleshed out in more detail. I don’t have enough knowledge to understand what this means. This should be part of the business plan referred to below.


11. Course Sizes and Teaching Load: This is another area in which I don’t understand the consequences or costs of what is being proposed. This needs to be spelled out in such a way that it is possible to understand the current state and the proposed state including the incremental costs attached thereto.

12. GWIPP Arrangements to be Maintained: I concur with all the bullets except the last one. I was not aware there ever was such an arrangement, which to the best of my knowledge conflicts with University policy; in particular, the transfer of salary monies to operating use.

13. Issues if GWIPP and MPP are separated: The key under this particular item is the preservation of the current functioning of GWIPP and MPP as independent entities in the event they are separated. At the moment, GWIPP and the associated MPP Program function as a “tub on its own bottom”, with the MPP Program providing the revenue base for the MPP Program expenses and the operations of GWIPP. This arrangement has functioned extremely well and has provided the means to have a successful “unification” of the public affairs – 3 efforts that has led us to this Task Force recommendation. At this stage, we certainly do not want to do anything to upset this excellent synergy. Therefore, great care will need to be exercised to work through the budgetary details should the GWIPP and MPP end up actually being separated once the school becomes
operational.

14. MPP Tuition Credit: I concur.

Next Steps – Course to Realization of a School of Public Policy and Public Service within CCAS

In the closing paragraph of the Task Force Report, it is emphasized "... that the University has an opportunity to increase its visibility and substantive contribution to public affairs. We believe that the organizational arrangement that we have recommended can make this happen, if it is accompanied by the kinds of organizational and administrative assurances and arrangements outline above, along with a modest (and quite targeted) increase in resources." I agree. Simultaneously, I hope that my responses above provide the administrative assurances and arrangements that can make this happen. I am also prepared to commit the modest additional resources, provided I have a "business plan" as to what they are and can see that they truly are modest. Obviously, the mention of a "business plan" indicates that there remains work to be done.

What work remains to be done? I see the following as the main tasks that need to be accomplished:

- A detailed "school plan" document needs to be prepared that indicates the structure of the school including courses associated thereto. This document will have as an appendix the proposed bylaws of the new school within CCAS, plus an appendix that indicates by name those individuals, both faculty and staff, who will make up the new school;

- A detailed document needs to be prepared that indicates the budgetary details of the new school. This is the "business plan" to which I referred above. It should indicate the student revenue base that is to be attributed to the school and the expense structure that derives from faculty lines, staff lines, and general operations. This is where the "modest" resource needs are to be identified as well as all existing resources. In order to do this most expeditiously, I ask that you contact Don Boselovic and work directly with the budget office to make sure that all details are properly handled and verified as correct. This is critical owing to the dissolution of the Public Administration Department within SBPM and the creation of the School of Public Policy and Public Service within CCAS.

One of the most important tasks that needs to be accomplished is the selection of the first director of the new school. I strongly urge that a process for that selection be designed, shared with the faculty who are expected to be part of the new school for their input, and then finalized for execution. As soon as the process is defined, I recommend that the process be carried out, so we can identify the first director as early as possible, and so that individual can provide the necessary leadership in making sure all things that need to occur do occur.
To get this whole process started, we need a core group of individuals to take the responsibility to launch and lead the work described above. For that purpose, I would like to ask Joe Cordes, Kathy Newcomer, and Hal Wolman to serve as the core group, with Hal serving as the convener and chair of each meeting. The initial meeting of the core group should include the deans of CCAS and SBPM as step one of keeping them informed on a regular basis as to the work underway and the progress achieved. The deans’ input in the process needs to be continually sought. Of course, the core group can invite any additional faculty to work on any given task. In that regard, I hope that a number of those faculty who served on the task force will be ready to help this core group move forward rapidly and efficiently.

What timeline would I like to see? Obviously, the quicker we can move, the better it is for GW. I ask that Joe, Kathy, and Hal start as soon after receiving this memo as possible. I think the best target date for the actual realization of the new school within CCAS is 1 January 2003. Therefore, a lot of work needs to be done by early fall, so the faculties in both SBPM and CCAS can be consulted with respect to this initiative. In section IX. of the Faculty Code, it is stated that “The regular active-status members of the faculty of a school are also entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of departments, institutes, or other academic units making up a part of that school. The Faculty Senate or an appropriate committee thereof is entitled to an opportunity to make recommendations on proposals concerning the creation, consolidation, or elimination of schools or other major components of the University.” Though there is much to be done, it is doable since the Task Force has done the groundwork.

Summary – Creation of the School of Public Policy and Public Service within CCAS

I accept the recommendation of the Task Force on Public Affairs to create a new school within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences tentatively called the School of Public Policy and Public Service. I look at this step as an intermediate step to the creation of an independent school within five years or less. This move towards an independent School of Public Policy and Public Service is an important decision from the view of fulfilling our strategic aim of bringing greater external recognition to GW through academic excellence in selected areas of academic strength. Public policy and public service are obvious strengths of GW owing to the caliber of the associated faculty and the positioning of the University within the Nation’s Capital. It is important that we achieve this intermediate step as soon as practical. The development of a “school plan” with an associated “business plan” are the critical documents that must be in place and appropriately vetted to launch the new school on 1 January 2003.

Attachment – Recommendations of the Task Force

Cc: Stephen Joel Trachtenberg, President
    Don Boselovic, Associate VP for Finance
    Jean Folkerts, Interim Dean, CCAS
Susan Phillips, Dean, SBPM
Lilien Robinson, Chair, Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Public Policy/Public Affairs Schools within Colleges – Examples.
Hal Wolman

It is not unusual for Public Policy Schools (or degree-granting Institutes) to be located within Colleges of Arts and Sciences or their equivalents, although, admittedly, it is also not the norm. Below I list and discuss several examples. In many cases, it is not obvious from going to the program’s website that these are not, in fact, independent stand alone schools. It is only when you go to the university catalogue or bulletin that it becomes apparent that they are located within another school.

Although it may be that majority of policy schools are organized as independent administrative units, it bears emphasizing that there are several large, and well-known public policy programs that are organized as schools within larger units, as we are proposing for GWU. We describe four below, one of which includes our most prominent competitor, Georgetown University. In discussions with faculty at each of these schools, the decision to have the school housed within a college of arts and sciences was made for reasons quite similar to those that prompted the task-force to make a similar recommendation for GWU. Among these factors are: (a) the close relationship between the hiring needs of disciplinary departments and of public policy programs, (b) the potential for numerous spillovers between the public policy curriculum and the curriculums of related arts and sciences departments and programs, and (c) a desire in the public policy units to focus on developing high-quality graduate only programs, which can reduce the revenue base needed for an independent school.

Georgetown: The Georgetown Public Policy Institute. (This is our major local competition.) The Public Policy program at Georgetown is located in the Georgetown Public Policy Institute within the School of Arts and Sciences. It offers an MPP program and an Executive Master’s in Policy Management, but no Ph.D. program. It has a “Dean” of Public Policy, but, in fact, the Dean reports to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. They have approximately 200 students. (See accompanying sheet from the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences catalogue.)

Wisconsin: The LaFollette School of Public Affairs in the College of Letters and Science. It offers a Master of Public Affairs and a Master of International Affairs program. It is run by a “Director” who reports to the Dean of the College of Letters and Science. LaFollette has approximately 105 students. (See accompanying sheet from the Graduate School catalogue.)

Duke: The Sanford Institute of Public Policy. The Sanford Institute of Public Policy is within the College of Arts and Sciences. It offers an MPP and an undergraduate major in
Public Policy. It is run by a “Director” who reports to the Dean of Arts and Sciences for academic programs and to the Provost for the Institute’s university wide research function. The Sanford Institute has approximately 160 MPP students, and a large number of undergraduate majors. (See accompanying listing from catalogue).

Ohio State: The School of Public Policy and Management. The School of Public Policy and Management is located within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (where it moved in 2000 from the College of Business). It offers both masters and Ph.D. programs. It is run by a Director who reports to the Dean. It also has within it the John Glenn Institute of Public Service and Policy Research whose purpose is to “promote policy research in a wide variety of fields.” The School has approximately 210 students. (See accompanying description from web page.)
Public Policy

Fact Sheet

Degrees offered: M.P.P. (Masters in Public Policy); M.P.M. (Executive Master’s in Policy Management)

Joint degree programs:
- M.P.P./J.D.
- M.P.P./Ph.D. (Government)
- M.P.P./M.A. (Economics)
- M.P.P./M.B.A.
- M.P.P./M.S. (Foreign Service)

Campus address:
Georgetown Public Policy Institute
Georgetown University
3600 N Street, N.W., Suite 200
Box 571204
Washington, DC 20057-1204

Telephone: (202) 687-9186
Fax: (202) 687-5544

Department e-mail: gppiadmissions@georgetown.edu

Department Website:
http://www.georgetown.edu/grad/gppi/

Dean of Public Policy: Judith Feder
Dean of Admissions: Andy Cornblatt

M.P.P. Contact: Kerry J. Pace
M.P.M. Contact: Joseph Ferrara

Size of program: 200 Masters students; of these, 15 students are in joint programs.

Other Information: Credits required: 48 credits for M.P.P., 36 credits for M.P.M.. Part-time Option: Yes.

© 2002-2003 Georgetown Graduate School of Arts & Sciences
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Public Affairs, La Follette School of

- Capstone Certificate in Public Affairs
- Accelerated Master's Degree Program
- Financial Aid
- Admission to the Master's Programs
- Courses
- Criteria for Satisfactory Progress

College: Letters and Science

Designation: School

Majors and Degrees Offered: Master of Public Affairs, Master of International Public Affairs

Other: Ph.D. Minor in Public Affairs; Capstone Certificate in Public Affairs; Accelerated Master

Tracks: MPA degree options in policy analysis, and in public management

Faculty: Cancian (Social Work), Chang (Political Science), Dresang (Political Science), Engel (Economics), Felstehausen (Urban and Regional Planning), Haveman (Economics), Holden (Human Ecology), Kettl (Political Science), Lyall (Economics/UW System), Manion (Political Science), Nichols (Economics), Reschovsky (Agricultural and Applied Economics), Wallace (Public Affairs), Weimer (Political Science), Wilson (Political Science), Witte (Political Science), Wolfe (Population Health Sciences/Economics)

The La Follette School of Public Affairs offers the master of public affairs and the master of international public affairs degrees. The multidisciplinary program promotes an understanding of governmental processes and develops the quantitative and analytical skills needed in public administration and public planning and analysis.

The curricula for each degree build on a central core of courses. For the domestic degree, each student then chooses one of the program's two degree tracks--public management or policy analysis. Other courses are chosen according to the student's career goals and may include courses from the
MISSION

The School’s mission is to create a dynamic interdisciplinary environment that enhances excellence in research, teaching, and service and furthers the public interest. We create and disseminate knowledge that offers insights into public values and policy challenges, anticipates and frames public discourse, and develops creative, informed, and effective responses. Our School, focused on lifelong learning, will be one of national and international repute in which our constituents become reflective practitioners and scholars who serve the public interest with dedication, innovation, and integrity.

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

1969--School of Public Policy and Management (originally, the Division of Public Administration) created at Ohio State University and located in the College of Administrative Science (later renamed the College of Business). With an initial faculty of 3.72 and an enrollment of 11 students, the School’s faculty grows to a steady state of 10 FTE during the 1990s and an enrollment that has ranged from as high as 230 to around 180 currently.

1978--Among the first 45 policy schools in the U.S. to be accredited by the National Association of Schools of Public Administration and Affairs (NASPAA). The School successfully completed a second accreditation review in 1987 and will undergo another during academic years 2001-2003.

1987--School undergoes a University Program Review in which the site visit team made up of Don Stokes, then Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, Professor Dick Netzer of NYU, and Professor Kingsley Haynes, then at Indiana University, conclude
in their report that,

"[T]he School of Public Administration has thus far developed into a small program of impressive quality. This general conclusion is based on our judgment of the quality of students, faculty, curriculum and career experiences of graduates, as well as the support given by the College of Administrative Science and the University."

2000--Having relocated administratively to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the School successfully recruits its 4th Director, Professor Bert Rockman. Professor Rockman is University Professor of Political Science at the University of Pittsburgh, Director of the Center for American Politics and Society at the University of Pittsburgh, and Nonresident Senior Fellow in the Governmental Studies Program at the Brookings Institution. He will take over as School Director in July, 2001.

DEGREE PROGRAMS

MPA--a two-year master's program with a core curriculum in economics, policy analysis, organizational theory and management, statistics and MIS. Includes a summer internship and a second-year curriculum organized around a policy paper (applied thesis) and a variety of policy labs and electives in a field of specialization. (18 newly enrolled students for AY 2000-01)

In-Career MA--a one-year master's program based on a core curriculum similar to that of the MPA degree. Limited to in-career professionals with 3 or more years of significant professional experience and, therefore, does not require internship or policy paper. (25 newly enrolled students for AY 2000-01)

Dual Degree MA and MPA--the School has dual degree masters programs with Social Work, City and Regional Planning, Natural Resources, Law, and Health Services Management and Policy. It also has a joint master's degree program in Arts Administration with Art Education. (15 newly enrolled students for AY 2000-01)

Ph.D.--a research degree in public policy and management, primarily for persons with a master's in public policy, significant professional experience, and preparing for an academic career. Curriculum includes a set of core doctoral seminars taught within the School as well as disciplinary-based theory and method coursework in the student's field of specialization. (5 newly enrolled students for AY 2000-01)

ALUMS

There are now nearly 1,900 graduates from the School's various degree programs. In addition to public service careers at every level of government throughout the U.S., as well as the private and not-for-profit sectors, there are graduates in 23 countries around the world.
MEMORANDUM

To: Paul B. Duff, Associate Professor  
Chair, Department of Religion  
Faculty Senate

From: Susan M. Phillips  
Dean

Date: January 28, 2003

Subject: Proposed Transition of the Department of Public Administration from the School of Business and Public Management to the Columbian College of Arts and Science

I am following up on your earlier inquiry as to whether SBPM's Dean's Council had particular comment on the proposed move of PAD from SBPM to CCAS. The Council met on January 13 and had a discussion of the proposed move. While the members of the Council have no objection to the move, they did raise several issues relating to specific course coverage, possible joint appointments, budget and transition arrangements for current students. We talked about possible approaches to these transition issues — these are all solvable issues. I indicated I would be making recommendations to Executive Vice President Lehman on these and other transition issues as a result of the Dean's Council discussion and several discussions with the School's Executive Committee.

If you have any further questions about the Dean's Council discussion, please feel free to contact Professors Jill Kasle or John Carson, Chair and Vice Chair of the Council respectively.

C: Jill Kasle  
John Carson  
Donald R. Lehman
Meeting with CCAS Dean’s Council about Public Affairs School within CCAS

Jan 31, 2003

I expressed to the Dean’s Council our subcommittee’s concerns as follows. A summary of their response follows each point. Those concerns marked with an asterisk (*) indicate that the CCAS Dean’s Council had similar apprehensions.

Concern about untenured SBPM faculty who would seek tenure in CCAS (or tenured faculty who would seek promotion): Would the standards for tenure and promotion be the same? Would there be representation of SBPM faculty on the P & T Committee?

Response: There seemed to be no interest in having SBPM faculty sit on the CCAS P & T committee for these 5 or 6 individuals. It was suggested by one member that these people should meet with the CCAS P & T committee.

2. * Concern over moving the SBPM faculty to CCAS: Has CCAS vetted the faculty who would be moving over from SBPM? Are any faculty members reluctant to move? Do the SBPM faculty meet the standards of CCAS?

Response: The Dean has looked at all of the c.v.’s and he seemed satisfied with the quality of the relevant SBPM faculty. According to the Dean, the SBPM faculty reported being “O.K. on [the move].”

3. Concern about the name: Should there be a school within a school especially in light of the past senate resolution? Is calling this entity a “school” misrepresenting it?

Response: The Dean’s Council was unconcerned about the name. It was pointed out that some universities have abolished the title “department” in favor of “school” (e.g., a School of Chemistry instead of a Department of Chemistry)

4. Concern about adding additional faculty to CCAS and enlarging CCAS: Is this a problem from the side of CCAS?

Response: The Dean’s Council was unconcerned about this.

5. * Is CCAS satisfied that the budget transfers are fair?

Response: Also a concern of the Dean’s Council but the Dean seemed sure that he could work this out.
Besides those overlapping concerns that are indicated with an asterisk (*) above, the Dean’s Council (*in whole or part) also expressed concern about the following:

1. Overlapping courses was mentioned as a concern although the Dean seemed unconcerned about this.
2. There is concern that the entity will eventually split off from CCAS. The Dean and the Dean’s Council do not want to lose this entity after it moves to CCAS. The Dean mentioned that he is “hardwiring” the budget in such a way as to make a future move out of CCAS difficult.

-Paul Duff
School of Public Policy and Public Administration  
Columbian College of Arts and Science  
History and Organization  
April 15, 2003

Summary

After two years of discussion among themselves and with the Administration, the Public Policy Programs (the Ph.D. program, currently in CCAS and the MPP program, split between CCAS and SBPM) and the Department of Public Administration have proposed the creation of a new School of Public Policy and Administration (SPP&PA) within CCAS. The faculty of the Public Administration department and the MPA program, along with the budget that supported it, will thus move from SBPM to CCAS. The new School will have a non-departmentalized faculty that will consist of the current members of the PAD and faculty members who have been associated with the Public Policy program. Tenure and budget lines for the latter will remain, however, in their current units. The Master of Public Policy (MPP), Master of Public Administration, and Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration will remain as distinct programs. Each of these will have a “program faculty,” but members of the School faculty may serve on more than one program faculty. The Master of Arts in Telecommunication, at its request, will also be a part of the new School. Discussions are ongoing with the M.A. in Public Policy with a concentration in Women’s Studies concerning their possible participation. The School will be headed by a Director who reports to the Dean of CCAS. The School will also house the George Washington Institute of Public Policy (GWIPP) and The Center for Washington Area Studies.

Rationale

Given its location in the heart of Washington, DC, the overall quality of the university, and its existing faculty resources and programs in the area of public affairs, GW has the potential to be a national leader in the area of public affairs education and research. However, GW’s efforts currently lack visibility and focus. At present GW’s public policy and administration programs are scattered: The Ph.D. in Public Policy is in CCAS, the MPP is divided into two areas, with students choosing Policy Analysis and Research receiving their degree from CCAS and students choosing Public/Private Policy and Management receiving their degree from SBPM, and the Public Administration department and the MPA program are located in SBPM. The George Washington Institute of Public Policy (GWIPP) nominally houses the public policy academic programs and serves a university wide policy research function; the Director of GWIPP, who is also currently the Director of the MPP academic program, reports directly to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. The creation of a School within CCAS would provide that visibility and place GW on an equal footing with our competitors, nearly all of whom deliver their programs through distinct and visible schools or Institutes of Public Affairs, Public Policy, and/or Public Administration, many of which (e.g., Georgetown, Duke, the University of Wisconsin, and Ohio State) are located within Colleges of Arts and Science. Creation of the School of Public Policy and Public Administration will also focus and integrate our efforts by placing faculty engaged in
similar pursuits within the same organizational framework and in a non-departmental setting designed to encourage cooperation.

History

In Summer, 2000, VPAA Don Lehman called and hosted a meeting of faculty with public policy programmatic interests from across the university to consider a proposal for creating a new stand alone school of Public Policy and Media. There was little support. In Fall, 2000 VPAA Lehman asked Hal Wolman, newly hired Director of GWIPP and of the MPP program, to prepare a “White Paper” setting forth possible scenarios for the public policy and public administration programs. In Spring, 2001 the White Paper was shared with Kathy Newcomer, Chair of the Public Administration Department, Joe Cordes, Director of the Public Policy, Ph.D. Program, and Jean Folkerts, Interim Dean of CCAS. A series of discussion ensued. VPAA Lehman, in late 2001, then set up a task force, chaired by Carol Sigelman (without vote), to consider alternative proposals for restructuring public policy and public administration. The Task Force members consisted of Wolman, Newcomer, and Cordes, plus three additional faculty members from PAd and three from CCAS. After three months of considering various alternatives and narrowing down to three for more intensive consideration (a separate stand-alone school; an “enhanced” status quo; and a new school within CCAS), the Task Force submitted its report to VPAA Lehman. The report recommended a new School within CCAS. VPAA Lehman accepted the main recommendations of the Task Force Report with the understanding that after four years of experience, the issue of whether the new School should continue as a part of CCAS or become a separate stand-alone school be revisited by the faculty. During the Spring and Summer of 2002, The Public Administration Department discussed the implications of leaving SBPM and moving into the new School within CCAS. In the Fall, 2002 they voted unanimously to do so. In the Fall of 2002, the MPP curriculum was redesigned by the MPP Executive Committee to establish a common core of classes and a new and unified Ph.D. program in Public Policy and Administration was created by a joint Public Policy and Public Administration task force and was approved by the CCAS Ph.D. in Public Policy Steering Committee. These degrees, along with the MPA all submitted to the CCAS Curriculum Committee in Fall, 2002-Spring, 2003 and approved. In the Fall of 2002, The Faculty Senate formed a special subcommittee, consisting of members from the Faculty Senate committees on Fiscal Planning and Budgeting, Education Policy, and Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, to consider the proposal. The subcommittee discussed the proposal with the various program heads (Wolman, Cordes, Newcomer) and the Deans involved (Frawley and Phillips). The Subcommittee will report its recommendations to the full Faculty Senate after CCAS faculty take action on the proposal.

Organization

The School of Public Policy and Public Administration (the name was selected by the faculty after a series of votes among competing names) will be a new School within CCAS. It will be headed by a Director who will be selected by the Dean of CCAS upon
the recommendation of the faculty and will report to the Dean of CCAS. Its faculty, which will be a non-departmentalized school-wide faculty, will consist of

1. PROGRAM FACULTY:
   a. Full-time, active status faculty budgeted within the school (at present, the current PAd faculty);
   b. Full-time, active status faculty who regularly teach core courses in the MPP, MPA or PhD programs or other degree programs offered by the school;
   c. Fifty-fifty hires made between public policy and other academic units;
   d. Full-time, active status faculty appointed to serve as field advisors in the PhD program; and
   e. Other faculty voted to become program faculty by the program faculty.

2. ASSOCIATE FACULTY:
   a. Research faculty associated with the school;
   b. Faculty in other schools who participate in policy education and research and desire to be associated with the school; and
   c. Visiting and adjunct faculty.

Except for the transfer of tenure and budget lines from SBPM to CCAS for current PAd faculty, there will be no transfer of tenure or budget lines for other faculty of the School. Only faculty with appointments in CCAS departments will be eligible to vote on director selection and personnel matters.

There will be four academic programs within the School, each with a separate program faculty and a program head (appointed by the Director upon a recommendation of the faculty of the program). Faculty can be members of more than one program. The programs within SPP&PA at inception will be the Master of Public Administration, the Master of Public Policy, the Master of Arts in Telecommunication, and the Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration. Other programs may decide to seek to be a part of the School, and they will be accepted by the Director upon the vote of the faculty.

The George Washington Institute of Public Policy (GWIPP) will become a research institute and will no longer be responsible for academic programs. GWIPP will be housed in SPP&PA, but will serve a university wide function. Its Director will be appointed by the VPAA and report to him. Because the purpose of GWIPP is to support policy research throughout the University, it will have a separate budget that will not have its source in CCAS funds.

Currently, the Center for Washington Area Studies shares resources and space with the Ph.D. Program in Public Policy. This arrangement will continue in that SPP&PA will also house the Center for Washington Area Studies (CWAS), which will continue to maintain a separate budget and identity.
Proposal for New School of Public Policy and Public Administration
Chronological History

Summer, 2000: VPAA Don Lehman calls and hosts a meeting of faculty with public policy programmatic interests from across the university to consider a proposal for creating a new stand alone school of Public Policy and Media. There is little support.

Fall, 2000: VPAA asks Hal Wolman, newly hired Director of GWIPP and of the MPP program, to prepare a “White Paper” setting forth possible scenarios for the public policy and public administration programs.

Spring, 2001: White Paper is shared with Kathy Newcomer, Chair of the Public Administration Department, Joe Cordes, Director of the Public Policy, Ph.D. Program, and Jean Folkerts, Interim Dean of CCAS. Discussions begin.

Fall-Winter, 2001: VPAA Lehman sets up a task force, chaired by Carol Sigelman (without vote), to consider alternative proposals for restructuring public policy and public administration. Task force members consist of Wolman, Newcomer, and Cordes, plus three additional faculty members from PAd and three from CCAS.

Winter, 2002: After three months of considering various alternatives and narrowing down to three for more intensive consideration (a separate stand-alone school; an “enhanced” status quo; and a new school within CCAS), the Task Force submits it’s report to VPAA Lehman. The report recommends a new School of Public Policy and Public Service or School of Public Service and Public Policy within CCAS.

Spring, 2002: VPAA Lehman accepts the main recommendations of the Task Force Report with the understanding that after X years of experience, the issue of whether the new School should continue as a part of CCAS or become a separate stand-alone school be revisited by the faculty.

Spring-Fall, 2002: The Public Administration Department discusses the implications of leaving SBPM and moving into the new School within CCAS. In the Fall, 2002 they vote unanimously to do so.

Summer, 2002: VPAA Lehman appoints a core group of Hal Wolman, Kathy Newcomer, and Joe Cordes to oversee the development of a plan for bringing the new school into existence, bringing others into the process for specific components as necessary.

Spring, 2002: MPP Executive Committee discusses and approves MPP curriculum revisions that would occur if the new school is approved.
Summer, 2002: Core group meetings begin to create a “Business Plan, including a proposed budget. After an orientation meeting with Don Boselovic, the core group, with the addition of Jed Kee, develops unified enrollment and budget projections for MPP and MPA programs.

Summer, 2002 Core group and Jed Kee meets with Bill Carter, Budget Director of SBPM, to discuss details of how the resources that have been supporting the operations of the Public Administration Department and its programs would be exported to CCAS upon approval of the new school.

Fall-Winter, 2002: Task force of Public Administration and Public Policy faculty engage in discussions about merger of the Ph.D. in Public Policy Program and Ph.D. in Public Administration Program into a single Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration. Discussion is extended to include the existing Steering Committee of the Ph.D. in Public Policy program. The task force and Steering Committee endorse the merger and curriculum changes.

Fall, 2002: Core group presents proposal to Dean’s Council of CCAS which approves the proposed plan “in principle.”

Fall, 2002: Faculty Senate begins consideration of proposed plan. Core group appears before the Faculty Senate special committee to present the proposal and respond to questions.

Fall-Winter, 2002-03: Changes in the MPP curriculum are presented to the CCAS curriculum committee and approved. The MPA curriculum is presented to the CCAS curriculum committee for consideration and approval. In 2003, the proposed curriculum for the Ph.D. in Public Policy and Administration is presented to the CCAS curriculum committee.

Winter, 2003: Core group holds series of meetings with Dean Frawley to discuss plan and proposed budget.

Winter, 2003: The proposed faculty of the new school engages in discussion via e-mail and a series of votes which result in overwhelming support to name the school “School of Public Policy and Public Administration.”
DRAFT: A RESOLUTION ON ESTABLISHMENT OF A "SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION" WITHIN THE COLUMBIAN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES  (Res __/__)  

WHEREAS, a Task Force established by the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs has recommended, and the EVPAA has agreed, "that a new school should be created within CCAS devoted to public policy and administration"; and  

WHEREAS, since the Faculty Senate is entitled under the Faculty Code to make a recommendation on 'proposals concerning the creation... of schools or other major components of the University', the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has charged the Joint Subcommittee now proposing this Resolution with recommending a course of action to the Faculty Senate; and  

WHEREAS, in Resolution 96/14 the Faculty Senate recommended, in pertinent part, "that in the future the designation 'School' be applied only to educational units satisfying the conditions of independence specified in the structure of the University"; and  

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee, having consulted broadly with the parties to be affected by creation of this 'School', as set out in our Interim Report to the Senate on March 11, 2003, has identified a number of considerations supporting this proposal that argue in favor of recommending an exception to the above policy, including (a) the cross-disciplinary nature of the curriculum and research, (b) the administrative simplification to be achieved in managing the activities of faculty most of whose home departments are already in CCAS, (c) the fact that many of the educational units competing with our programs in public policy/administration are themselves organized as schools subordinate to other schools, thereby lessening the likelihood that students will be misled materially by the designation of what is in effect a large department as a school, (d) the fact that Arts & Sciences has now designated itself a college rather than a school, thus minimizing many of the confusions accompanying a "school within a school", and (e) the fact that a fully independent School of Public Policy and Public Administration is not a financially viable alternative at the present time, NOW, THEREFORE,  

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:  

That the Faculty Senate concurs in the proposal to establish a "School of Public Policy and Public Administration" within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences, as a justifiable exception to the policy recommended in Resolution 96/14.  

The Joint Subcommittee:  
Paul Duff, Chair, Educational Policy Committee; W B Griffith, Chair, Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee; Gregory Maggs, Chair, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee; Professors J. Friedenthal (Law) and S. McGraw (SMHS)  
May 9, 2003