Introduction

This report is the work of the CPPA Advisory Workgroup that was organized to provide the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science (CSBS) with recommendations regarding the most efficient and effective way of administering the Master of Public Administration (MPA), Master of Public Policy (MPP), Master of International Affairs and Global Enterprise (MIAGE) and the Center for Public Policy and Administration (CPPA). These programs are critical components of CSBS as they include three of the largest graduate programs in the College and generate substantial Student Credit Hour funds for the College and its departments. The Workgroup recognizes the limitation of resources available to support programs across the University but also recognizes the tremendous potential of these particular programs when the need for qualified public administrators, policy analysts and international navigators is greater than at any other time. We also want to express our appreciation for the efforts of those who have committed themselves to developing important programs with little financial resources.

Charge to the CPPA Working Group

Dean M. David Rudd formed the CPPA Working Group on March 8, 2011 to develop recommendations regarding two areas:

A. Efficiency in administration of the MPA, MPP and MIAGE programs in CPPA, including infrastructure needs and funding requirements. In other words, what's the most efficient and effective administrative model?

B. Clarification of the financial model and relationships between the various master's programs, CPPA, the College and (in particular) the Department of Political Science. The Department currently funds all of the faculty positions in the MPA program but receives no financial incentive from the MPA program. In other words, what is the cost-sharing AND profit-sharing arrangement between the various entities involved in the operation and management of the programs?

Overview of Guiding Principles and Governance Models

The Working Group agreed on a number of principles that would help guide the decision making process within the committee. These principle statements were as follows:

1) Political Science and Public Administration faculty should remain linked together as related academic disciplines.

2) Public Administration should maintain a separate budget from Political Science. This separation would be needed under the current structure and does not mean that faculty lines should be moved from their current departments under the current structure.

3) New faculty hires should be contractually committed to Public Administration, Public Policy, or Political Science or other disciplines depending on their appointment.

4) Student Credit Hours (SCH) based funding should follow the department or program that pays for the faculty member teaching the course.

5) Differential tuition should remain in the program where it is generated and be used to fund faculty positions committed to the program and enhance the program's faculty, student experience, or infrastructure (as described in University rules).

6) Revenue from student fees should remain in the program where they are generated and used for student-related improvements to the program (as described in University rules).

7) Revenue reserves should first be used by the program where the funds were generated to improve the program's capacity and performance with consultation with the Dean of the College.

8) Distribution of reserve funds should be made by mutual agreement by the governing unit, the program that generated the funds and other programs included in the governing unit with consultation with the Dean of the College.

9) The governing unit should receive a share of program revenues to support administrative costs.

10) Accounts should be simplified and consolidated, agreements should be documented in MOUs, and budgets should be transparent.

Programs included for consideration by the Work Group

- Master of Public Administration (MPA), and MPA Executive Program (and other MPA specialty programs such as the Hainan Cohort).
    - Public administration undergraduate and graduate certificate programs,
    - Joint MPA degree programs:
        - MPA/JD
        - MPA/MHA
        - MPA/ MPH
        - MPA/MSW
        - MPA/ PhD in ELP
        - MPA/PhD in SW
- Master of Public Policy (MPP)
    - Joint degree programs:
        - MPP/JD
        - MPP/MPH
        - MPP/BS/BA
- Master of International Affairs and Global Enterprise (MIAGE)
- Center for Public Policy and Administration (CPPA).

Other programs that are academically related to public administration, public policy, and international affairs could also be considered for inclusion in the proposed organizational structure. Some ideas for other programs that could be included are attached as an appendix to this document.

Review of Governance Models

The Committee discussed several potential models to administer the MPA, MPP, MIAGE and CPPA programs effectively. The desired model would be what the programs would need to thrive in the long term recognizing that resources may not be available immediately to implement the ideal model and that an intermediate step may be necessary before reaching the desired structural model.

Seven criteria were used to evaluate various models to determine which would be the most efficient and effective organization, these were:

1) Strategic alignment of the programs' missions,
2) Structural and program integrity,
3) Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff,
4) Administrative efficiency,
5) Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines,
6) Financial sustainability,
7) Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS.

The Committee considered a wide variety of administrative or governance models that include public policy and administration programs. These range from the smallest effort, a program within an academic department such as Political Science to an independent school of public affairs. The range of organizational structures and their advantages and disadvantages are described below. The Committee contacted several universities utilizing some of these models to administer similar programs; some of the comments from these interviews are attached as an appendix to the report.

Alternatives Considered

Several basic models were considered by the Committee as logical extensions of the arrangements currently in place. These alternatives are listed below:

1. Status Quo
2. A *program* or *division* within the Political Science Department
3. A *division* in CPPA
4. A stand-alone *academic department* in CSBS
5. A division in CSBS
6. A *school* in CSBS

Other alternatives exist but are not considered here, including for example: Division in a School of Management (e.g., Brigham Young University, University of Missouri – Kansas City); Program or Department in a School of Urban Affairs or Urban Planning and Public Administration (e.g., University of Southern California, Portland State University).

Alternative 1: The Status Quo: Academic Programs administered under the Center for Public Policy and Administration

The Committee is not aware of any other institution that administers public affairs/public policy programs under an organizational structure similar to the current arrangement at the University of Utah. For the last several years, the Master of Public Administration, Master of Public Policy and Master of International Affairs and Global Enterprise have been administered under the Center for Public Policy and Administration (CPPA). Until recently, the MPA program reported to the Director of CPPA for administrative purposes including budget, and some staff responsibilities. The Dean of the College recently separated the budget for the MPA program from CPPA. Two staff persons are now employees of the MPA program rather than CPPA employees. CPPA continues to provide some financial and other staff support through a contractual agreement. The MPA program now reports administratively to the Department of Political Science.

The MPA program has a Public Administration Committee (PAC) composed of public administration faculty and the chair of the Department of Political Science that has helped guide the program. The MPA program has historically reported to the Department of Political Science for academic purposes including faculty assignments, adjunct faculty appointments and for tenure and promotion decisions.

a. Strategic alignment of program missions

The MPA program is a traditional Political Science-based program with most of the faculty in the Political Science Department. As the MPA has evolved nationally over time, the University of Utah has also evolved to include courses in nonprofit management and concentrations in criminal justice, education, health, and natural resources administration. The Master of Public Policy program was developed to meet the need for policy analysis in state and local government agencies and in the many non-profit agencies. The Master of International Affairs and Global Enterprise was created in response to the demand for expertise in nongovernmental organizations where skills in administration, international relations, and international trade are important to a growing international region. These academic programs are administered under the Center for Public Policy and Administration, a non-academic unit that provides research, evaluation, and outreach to government agencies, nonprofit organizations, and business. Its expertise is founded in public administration and public policy and therefore a natural partner with the MPA and MPP programs. The mission alignment with CPPA is not as strong for the MIAGE program which has stronger

4

connections with Political Science, Economics, Business, Law and nonprofit management.

b. Structural and program integrity

CPPA has functioned like an incubator for new academic programs that have some common areas of interest. It has considerable staff expertise in budgeting, program management, grant management, and information/communication technology. It has the capacity to act as an efficient administrative unit for multiple nascent programs where size prohibits having separate administrative employees. CPPA is at its heart a non-academic outreach unit with an external focus. It does not, however, have extensive experience or the standing to administer academic units.

With the move of the MPA program toward more administrative autonomy and a more direct report for academic affairs to the Political Science Department, the major academic program under CPPA has been removed. The MPP and MIAGE programs remain with CPPA where the administrative resources continue to be available.

c. Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff

The current arrangement of CPPA administration allows for some synergies in the area of public policy and administration. CPPA conducts applied research projects and consultation in a variety of public policy areas that can from time to time coincide with the academic interests of some faculty in Political Science, Economics, and/or Family and Consumer Studies. The potential for synergy with public policy research could develop further with greater attention to this area. Since the MPP and MIAGE programs have no faculty dedicated exclusively to the program, any synergy would need to be forged with faculty from their home departments.

d. Administrative efficiency

The administrative relationship, particularly for the MPA program and CPPA has been problematic for some time. Previously, the MPA program reported to CPPA for budget, human resources, and administrative support. The MPA program, however, reported to the Department of Political Science on academic affairs issues, such as class scheduling and faculty assignments, which often had to be coordinated between the three units. The recent change allows the MPA program to define its administrative requirements by contract with CPPA but the reporting relationship to the Political Science Department remains somewhat ambiguous.

The administration of the MPP and MIAGE programs is more understandable but not sustainable. CPPA offers generous administrative support for these programs, but the majority of the revenue generated by these two programs goes to the departments that pay the instructors to teach the classes rather than to the program. This happens, in

part, because there are no faculty lines dedicated to either program. The administration is efficient but both programs cannot continue under this structure over the long term.

e. Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines

CPPA does not have any faculty positions, but rather has a number of academic staff positions as well as support staff and graduate assistants. Core faculty and adjunct faculty in the MPA program have degrees appropriate to this multidisciplinary program including doctorates in public administration, education, business administration, and political science. As mentioned above, the MPP and MIAGE programs do not have dedicated faculty.

f. Financial sustainability

CPPA has proven to have the ability to generate revenue through contracts and grants; this in combination with its support from the University has contributed to the Center's financial sustainability. The MPA program has also demonstrated its capability to be a major academic program with a consistently large graduate student enrollment generating substantial revenue. In addition, the MPA program has been entrepreneurial in creating lucrative international programs in China and the United Arab Emirates (the latter is a cooperative effort with the Institute for Public and International Affairs (IPIA) at the University) and has used student fees and differential tuition to supplement its revenue stream. The MPP and MIAGE programs have done well financially for programs that have not been given substantial University support. Resources may not be available to provide dedicated faculty lines to these programs, but they have both proven themselves as successful programs with strong student demand in an environment of limited resources. These programs have depended on the participation of faculty from outside departments and administrative support from CPPA to sustain them, and this has proven to be a drain on CPPA resources. The current arrangement is not financially sustainable if the MPP and MIAGE programs do not receive base funding from the University.

g. Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS

The current structure impacts several departments and programs in CSBS. The Department of Political Science schedules faculty in the MPA program and must balance faculty resources with classes in Political Science. The Department receives compensation for these class assignments but faculty resources are limited. Other departments are also impacted by the current arrangement where faculty are "borrowed" to teach in the MPP and MIAGE programs. SCH funds return to the department paying the faculty member, but there are limited resources being applied to the MPP and MIAGE programs and the home department.

This arrangement is beneficial to supporting departments who benefit when MPP and MIAGE students enroll in their classes. For example, when MPP students take Law and Economics, all of the SCH money generated goes to Economics. This is a class that typically has excess capacity. The MPP students reduce the excess capacity and generate revenue for Economics.

Summary and Conclusions: The Status Quo

The status quo works well for the limited resources available in the short term. CPPA has provided administrative services to academic programs that are growing and have very little independent financial support. However, as the MPP and MIAGE programs develop additional program support staff will be needed. If the University desires to retain these programs it will need to provide financial support since the current arrangement is not sustainable.

The MPA program is strong enough to survive in almost any structural arrangement including the status quo. Currently the MPA program is fairly independent although it will report to the Political Science Department. This arrangement could limit the MPA program's ability to evolve in a direction that is more inclusive of other academic disciplines as appears to be the trend in MPA programs across the country.

The status quo is a divided arrangement with the MPA program separated from CPPA, MPP and MIAGE. The current arrangement has a non-academic unit administering two academic programs and providing administrative support for these programs with little payment for these services. This situation is not sustainable. The MPA program will likely be restrained in its development and the MPP and MIAGE programs will probably not survive. As CPPA strives to sustain the academic programs it administers it could lose track of its primary mission of providing services in support of public administration and public policy in the region.

Alternative 2: A *Program* or *Division* within the Political Science Department

Examples of programs within political science departments include:
- University of New Hampshire
- Seaton Hall University
- Bowling Green University
- University of South Carolina
- University of Eastern Kentucky
- University of Iowa
- University of North Carolina – Greensboro
- University of Tennessee
- Texas State University – San Marcos
- Iowa State University.

    a. Strategic alignment of program missions.

The national trend is moving away from political science-based public administration programs. Limiting the programs to the MPA and certificate programs would be counter to national experience. In the most recent *USN&WR* ranking of graduate programs in public affairs, the University of Utah's MPA program was the highest ranked MPA program in the US that is in a Political Science Department. All of the more highly ranked programs are independent departments or schools.

The academic interests of political science departments and MPA programs across the US have continued to move in different directions since the 1980s. For example, public administration programs address many academic issues involving public management and the functions of nonprofit organizations, not traditional areas of interest in political science.

b. Structural and program integrity

By limiting the programs included in this alternative to the MPA and its certificate programs, structural integrity could be strong. All current MPA support staff would be integrated into the Political Science Department. A difficult transition would be required from the current program structure and support system, however, since much of the administration for the public administration program is under the direction of CPPA. Some existing duties would likely need to be transferred into the Political Science Department. Decisions would be needed, for example, about their location, reporting chain, and the scope and limits of their responsibilities. All faculty members in the MPA program would be fully integrated into the Political Science Department.

c. Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff

There are no ongoing synergies between MPA and political science faculty currently. The political scientists in other fields do not share public administration-related research interests. We cannot identify any collaborative research projects in recent years that include public administration faculty and U. of U. political science faculty in any other fields. Thad Hall and Matthew Burbank probably come closest to sharing research interests between MPA and political science faculty at the U. of U. Some new synergies could develop over time.

d. Administrative efficiency

Integrating the MPA program completely into the Political Science Department would clarify and simplify administrative relationships and responsibilities. The MPA program director would report directly to the Political Science Department

for all academic and administrative purposes. There would not be any "dotted line" reporting relationships.

The volume of work and the differences between the admissions, maintenance, and graduation functions between the MPA program and the rest of the Political Science Department would necessitate retaining support staff or moving staff from CPPA/MPA into Political Science. The biggest concern would entail the loss of substantial MPA program autonomy which could affect its national ranking as well as its accreditation status.

e. Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines

If only the MPA and the public administration certificate programs are included in the program under political science the appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines is not too disparate. If other programs are included, the faculty discipline fit would be more diverse and more difficult to integrate into a Political Science Department.

f. Financial sustainability

Full integration into Political Science would require new budgetary arrangements that would substantially change the financial stability of the MPA program and Political Science Department. Most likely the resource-rich MPA program would decrease its financial autonomy to the benefit of the Political Science Department. The MPA program has built its national and local reputation and standing on the co-foundations of academic excellence and entrepreneurialism. These foundations could continue but under the discretion and priorities of the Chair of the Department of Political Science.

g. Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS

This alternative would leave the MPP and MIAGE programs essentially without a home and at risk of dissolution. Currently, the MPA, MPP, and MIAGE program staffs share information, tasks, capabilities and capacities, and it is difficult to envision the MPP or MIAGE being sustainable left on their own. If they remain affiliated with or serviced by CPPA they would require academic direction – essentially creating a new structure for their administration.

Summary and Conclusions: A Program or Division within the Political Science Department

The only existing programs that could be included in this scenario are the MPA program and the public administration certificate programs. This alternative would provide the

advantage of clear MPA program administration, but the limited efficiencies gained would come with high costs. The missions of the MPA program and the Political Science Department have become too different. The integrity and autonomy of the MPA program would be negatively impacted and would put its high national ranking at risk. The faculties would not be likely to generate synergies. The MPP and MIAGE programs would be left essentially adrift and at risk. The existing support staff would need to be moved into Political Science or new staff hired. Some staff whose responsibilities include the MPP program, MIAGE program, and/or CPPA outreach/applied research – and MPA program support would need to be divided between units.

Alternative 3: A *Division* in the Center for Public Policy and Administration (CPPA)

There are no clear examples that could be identified from other universities, but the closest may be the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill although the MPA program at UNC is part of a major School of Government. [1] "The School of Government at UNC Chapel Hill has 49 faculty members and its mission is to improve the lives of North Carolinians through engaged scholarship that helps public officials improve state and local government. The UNC Chapel Hill MPA Program (www.sog.unc.edu/uncmpa) is recognized as a top program nationally."[2]

The current arrangement at the University of Utah is a hybrid between the previous model (a program in the Political Science Department) and this alternative with administrative support coming from CPPA. Conceivably, the MPA, MPP, and MIAGE programs could become divisions within CPPA. This would require expanding the mission of CPPA to include academic degree programs and major structural changes. It would likely create considerable confusion in the community and in the academic world. After considerable discussion, the committee concluded that this alternative would not be effective and is not analyzed here.

Alternative 4: A Stand-alone *Academic Department* in CSBS

Examples of independent departments within a college include:
- University at Albany – SUNY
- George Mason University
- University of Kansas
- University of North Texas

a. Strategic alignment of program missions

---

[1] About 10 years ago, the MPA program was moved into the Institute of Government at UNC-Chapel Hill, a quasi-academic unit composed of academicians and attorneys providing outreach services to government.

[2] www.sog.unc.edu

This alternative would establish strong strategic coherence among missions of the MPA and certificate programs, MPP, and MIAGE. CPPA's applied research and community outreach missions would be a different but compatible focus for a traditional academic department. There are examples of academic departments that maintain an applied research/community outreach operation within the department that compliments the research and teaching of the academic disciplines. With the current focus on CPPA on public administration and public policy, alignment with graduate programs in these areas would appear to make sense. Conceivably, the applied research and outreach services could operate separately from the envisioned department thus having more of a college or university-wide application that could be appropriate for a multi-disciplinary approach.

The opportunities for strategic growth in graduate programs are excellent as has been demonstrated in other universities. The missions of the existing programs complement each other well and would provide excellent opportunity for possible new programs to be developed in the future such as:

- Undergraduate degree in Civil Society
- Graduate Certificate in Nonprofit Organization and Management
- Graduate Certificate in Public Policy Analysis
- Graduate Certificate in Program Evaluation

b. Structural and program integrity

Structural integrity would be maximized in this alternative. A likely organizational structure would include a Department Chair with Program Coordinators for the MPA, MPP, MIAGE and future programs. Support staff, including graduate assistants, would be assigned to programs but would also be cross-trained to back-up and supplement designated program staff.

Program integrity is a strong argument for this alternative. The existing interdisciplinary graduate degree programs in CSBS – MPA, MPP, and MIAGE – would have cohesive independent identities but the department structure also would enhance collaboration and resource sharing among programs. Faculty whose research and teaching interests fit with the MPA, MPP, and MIAGE programs could participate from across CSBS – and the University utilizing different arrangements. The problems associated with a single disciplinary department would be avoided in a department that had a multi-disciplinary foundation.

c. Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff

The synergies among the interdisciplinary graduate degree programs in CSBS – MPA, MPP, and MIAGE – would be excellent, and strategic new program opportunities would be enhanced. This alternative would provide strategic opportunities to create new programs: for example, graduate certificate programs in program evaluation, public policy analysis, public management, and nonprofit organization leadership. There would essentially be no structural or operational barriers.

d. Administrative efficiency

A department reporting directly to the Dean would maximize administrative efficiency. Authority and responsibility would be clear, unambiguous and free of "dotted line" relationships with other units.

e. Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines

An academic department would maximize the appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines. Academic programs in public administration, public policy, nonprofit organizations and leadership, and international NGOs go beyond the boundaries of traditional political science departments or any single academic discipline. Obviously, the discipline of political science is important to MPA, MPP, and MIAGE programs but is one of several disciplines including economics, sociology, family and consumer studies and educational leadership and policy.

f. Financial sustainability

The financial sustainability of an academic department would depend greatly on arrangements decided at the CSBS and university levels. An academic department would require a faculty larger than the current core MPA faculty but the additional faculty members would not be needed immediately. The financial sustainability would be significantly enhanced if all faculty lines associated with the MPA program and any other of these programs were financially supported by the University and formally assigned to their respective graduate program. Additional faculty could be built incrementally and strategically through several means including, for example:
- Increase the use of faculty-lecturers or adjuncts without tenure/tenure-track status;
- Allow a few selected faculty members in CSBS academic departments to move a percentage of their FTE to the department.
- Slowly increase the number of faculty appointed in the department.

The ability of the graduate programs to charge differential tuition, program fees, and to be strategically entrepreneurial provides many opportunities to expand

revenues beyond traditional funding mechanisms. Some additional support staff would be needed in a new department, but not much.

g. Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS

There would be some limited financial impacts to the Department of Political Science since they currently receive funds from political science faculty teaching in the MPA program. An arrangement for joint appointment or partial appointment could be made where faculty from external departments are committed in part to the stand-alone department. In this case there could be a financial impact on these external departments.

Summary and Conclusions: A Stand-alone Academic Department in CSBS

A stand-alone department would provide many strategic advantages and maximize administrative efficiency for the graduate degree programs and academic certificate programs. The integrity of existing academic programs would be protected and likely advanced. CPPA's applied research and community outreach missions would be a complimentary focus for a traditional academic department with public administration and public policy graduate degree programs. The combination of community-oriented academic faculty and outreach personnel would offer the potential for new programs such as the successful Westside Leadership program.

Negative effects on other academic departments would be minimal with gradual implementation and with decisions about SCH allocations from the university-level that should not be controversial.

A new department would require resources – mostly faculty – that could be added incrementally over time. Creating a new department within the College of Social and Behavioral Science is a complicated but not new process within the University system. Formal application is required at the College and University levels of administration.

Alternative 5: A Division in the College of Social and Behavioral Science

Examples of Divisions in a College or School:
- West Virginia University, School of Applied Social Sciences, Division of Public Administration
- Northern Illinois University, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Division of Public Administration.
- Portland State University, College of Urban and Public Affairs, Hatfield School of Government, Division of Public Administration.
- University of Memphis, School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, Division of Public and Nonprofit Administration.

a. Strategic alignment of program missions
A division in the College would create strong strategic coherence among missions of the MPA, MPP, MIAGE, CPPA's applied research and community outreach and undergraduate certificate programs. This alternative could also provide an opportunity for other departments or programs to coalesce into divisions (the example at West Virginia University is interesting in that social work forms a division and the disciplines of sociology and anthropology are combined in a division under a School of Applied Social Sciences). The potential exists for a division to develop into a "school" over time with the addition of new programs and resources.

a. Structural and program integrity

A division provides structural integrity with administrators assigned over the division and individual programs. The division director would report directly to the Dean of CSBS or an associate dean. Staff support would be allocated centrally to serve new or fledgling programs but allow for independent staff when the program matures. Each program would maintain its own identity and could grow at its own pace and with available resources.

This alternative offers excellent opportunities for collaboration among faculty in each program and other departments in the College or University. There would be a strong community outreach interest and a focus on practical public policy.

b. Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff

A division of public administration and policy offers synergies among the CPPA applied research and community outreach programs and the interdisciplinary graduate degree programs. It would also provide the setting for synergies with government, nonprofit, policy, NGO and the burgeoning international community in the community. New programs in areas related to public administration, public policy, and in international affairs/global enterprise would also find a fertile place for development.

c. Administrative efficiency

A division reporting to the Dean or an Associate Dean would demonstrate a clear line of authority over a collection of related programs. Although these programs are interdisciplinary in their composition, the administration would be clear with negotiated agreements with other departments in the College and other departments or colleges in the University.

d. Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines

A division would welcome faculty members from a wide variety of disciplines who could contribute to the variety of areas within public policy, administration and international affairs/global enterprise.

e. Financial sustainability

A division would need to make arrangements with each department whose faculty participated in its interdisciplinary programs. These arrangements could include clarification of how SCH is distributed or the possibility of joint or partial appointments. The division structure allows for incremental growth in faculty but eventually would require the resources necessary to maintain each academic program. The division could grow through joint appointment of faculty and dedicated faculty appointed to the division. Additional support staff would not be needed in a new school which represents a strong argument for this alternative.

Innovative community programs could provide opportunities for collaboration and grant or contract opportunities with willing faculty and CPPA applied research and outreach personnel. Several other universities such as North Carolina School of Government offer examples of successful revenue generation through community outreach.

f. Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS

Financial arrangements would need to be made with all departments that would contribute faculty to the division. As long as SCH remains with the department whose faculty are teaching in the division's programs growth will be slow. The division would actually be a benefit to other departments by generating large student enrollment numbers, but these would decline as the division acquired its own faculty appointments.

Summary and Conclusions: A Division in the College of Social and Behavioral Science

A division in the College maximizes administrative efficiency for the graduate degree programs, academic certificate programs, and the CPPA applied research and community outreach programs. The integrity of existing programs would be protected and likely advanced. Negative effects on other academic departments would be minimal with prompt negotiations with departments within CSBS and possibly other external departments. The only needed addition to the status quo is the addition of a director of the division. The structure is also administratively efficient by clearly designating reporting relationship to the Dean of CSBS. Its programs are clearly aligned and allow for productive synergies across programs and related external partners. The chances of

financial sustainability are greater where resources can be allocated to support new programs or where external faculty have a contractual relationship with the Division.

A division can be an effective transitional structure considering the current funding and faculty and staff situations in preparation for the development of a department or school of public affairs.

Alternative 6: A *School* in the College of Social and Behavioral Science

Examples nationally of schools within colleges:
- University of Arizona
- Arizona State University
- Columbia University
- Princeton University
- George Washington University
- North Carolina State University
- Texas A&M University

Schools reporting directly to the University Provost:
- University of Georgia
- University of Texas – Austin
- University of Colorado – Denver
- University of Missouri – Columbia

a. Strategic alignment of program missions

This alternative would create strong strategic coherence among missions of the MPA, MPP, MIAGE, and CPPA. The opportunities for strategic growth are excellent. The missions of the existing programs complement each other well, and would provide excellent fits with possible future new programs such as:

- Undergraduate degree in Civil Society
- Graduate Certificate in Public Administration – expanded and possibly in collaboration with the Utah State CPM program, Salt Lake County Employees' University, and AOCE
- National Service Corps
- Graduate Certificate in Nonprofit Organization and Management – possibly in collaboration with the Utah Nonprofits Association and AOCE
- Graduate Certificate in Public Policy Analysis
- Graduate Certificate in Program Evaluation

b. Structural and program integrity

16

Structural integrity would be maximized in this alternative. A likely organizational structure would include a School Director, preferably with academic credentials and practitioner experience and interests, who would report directly to the Dean or an Associate Dean and Associate Directors/Program Coordinators for CPPA, MPA, MPP, MIAGE, and future programs. There would be no need for departments in the school.[3] Support staff, including graduate assistants, would be assigned to programs but would also be cross-trained to back-up and supplement designated program staff.

Program integrity is a strong argument for this alternative. The existing interdisciplinary graduate degree programs in CSBS – MPA, MPP, and MIAGE – would have cohesive independent identities but the school structure also would enhance collaboration and resource sharing. Faculty whose research and teaching interests fit with the MPA, MPP, MIAGE and CPPA applied research and community outreach programs could participate from across CSBS – and the University utilizing different arrangements. Multiple problems would be avoided that otherwise would arise if the programs were in a single academic discipline and subject to the department's policies, culture, regulations, and the perception of departmental "ownership."

c. Synergies among component units, faculty, and professional staff

The synergies among the CPPA applied research and community outreach programs and the interdisciplinary graduate degree programs in CSBS – MPA, MPP, and MIAGE – would be excellent, and strategic new program opportunities would be maximized. This alternative would provide strategic opportunities to create new programs: for example, graduate certificate programs for practitioners in program evaluation, public policy analysis, public management, and nonprofit organization leadership. There would essentially be no structural or operational barriers.

d. Administrative efficiency

Focusing programs into a central administrative unit such as a school can provide administrative efficiencies such as in the case of the University of Arizona that consolidated similar programs to those discussed in this report under budgetary duress (see Appendix B – comments from Dr. Milward from the University of Arizona). A school reporting to the Dean or an Associate Dean would maximize administrative efficiency across the full array of academic and community

---

[3] Examples of schools without departments in colleges at the University of Utah currently include the School of Accounting in the David Eccles School/College of Business, the School of Computing in the College of Engineering, and the School of Music in the College of Fine Arts;

outreach programs. Authority and responsibility would be clear, unambiguous and free of "dotted line" relationships with other units.

e. Appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines

A school or a stand-alone academic department as described above would maximize the appropriateness of faculty members' academic disciplines from a variety of academic disciplines.

f. Financial sustainability

The financial sustainability of a school would depend greatly on arrangements decided at the CSBS and university levels. A school – or a stand-alone academic department would require a faculty larger than the current core MPA faculty and other departmental faculty teaching in the MPA, MPP, and MIAGE programs. The additional faculty members would not be needed immediately. The faculty could be built incrementally and strategically through several means including, for example:

- Increase the use of faculty-lecturers without tenure/tenure-track status;
- Allow a few selected faculty members in CSBS academic departments to move a percentage of their FTE to the school – as the CSBS consultants recommended in fall 2010.
- Slowly increase the number of faculty appointed in the school.

The ability of the graduate programs to charge differential tuition, program fees and to be strategically entrepreneurial provides many opportunities to expand revenues beyond funding generated through SCH productivity.

The structural steps already implemented to expand CPPA's applied research and community outreach programs should provide excellent opportunities to increase contract and grant revenues and activities. With entrepreneurial CPPA program leadership, revenues could rise substantially.

Additional support staff would not be needed in a new school which represents a strong argument for this alternative.

g. Financial and programmatic impacts on other departments and units in CSBS

There would be some limited financial impacts. A school would need to be able to generate resources as other schools generate funds across the University.

Programmatic impacts on other departments and units should be negligible.

18

<u>Summary and Conclusions: A School in CSBS</u>

A school would provide the most strategic advantages and maximize administrative efficiency for the CPPA applied research and community outreach programs and for the graduate degree programs and academic certificate programs. The integrity of existing programs would be protected and likely advanced. Possible future community-oriented academic/outreach programs would be enhanced. Negative effects on other academic departments would be minimal if there is gradual implementation and with favorable decisions about SCH allocations from the university-level that should not be controversial. As with a stand-alone academic department, a school would require resources – mostly faculty – that could be added incrementally over time. This alternative is administratively and programmatically efficient, and offers the greatest opportunities for strategic entrepreneurial program expansion.

Recommendation: A Division or Stand-alone Department in CSBS – Transition to a future School of Public and International Affairs

The Committee enjoyed detailed discussions about the future of the programs under consideration with members from both inside the University and external representatives expressing their opinions in the beneficial interest of these programs. The general consensus of the Committee was that the ultimate goal should be the creation of a school of public affairs although there were varying thoughts about the time and effort required to attain this goal. The Committee felt that the MPA, MPP, MIAGE and CPPA programs shared interests in public affairs and should remain closely affiliated. The Committee recognizes that the creation of a school would require addressing some very complex issues such as funding, faculty lines, and university policy. The number of dedicated faculty and the funding needed would take several years to accumulate to become a school. In addition, arrangements would need to be made with current faculty and staff working in the affected programs.

The Committee recommends that the College take a measured approach and establish a "Division" or "Stand-Alone Department" within the College of Social and Behavioral Science that would have responsibility for the MPA, MPP, MIAGE and CPPA programs. Each of these entities would have directors to administer their programs and utilize current staff, but coordination of staff could continue between programs or be reassigned if needed under a Division or Department structure and arrangements between departments and faculty could begin to be formalized.

A community representative on the Committee expressed the ideal of the Committee's recommendation as a goal that could be attained gradually, but had value as a vision for faculty, staff, students and supporters:

19

"As the environments within which these programs operate become more competitive (among University programs and departments, with other in-state institutions, in the region and nationally), there will be an increasing need to look toward actualizing the best way to offer all of these programs in the most competitive, sustainable way.

It may not be practical to reach that point tomorrow, or in the next few years, but given what other institutions are doing, we will be left behind if the school concept is not seen as the ultimate goal. The transitional step of establishing a division is a way to respond to current realities but sets the stage for growing into the school model. Having that goal in place helps not only administratively and structurally, but provides a vision for potential supporters of the school, who could bring resources and advocacy to bear on meeting this goal."

We encourage the Dean of the CSBS to begin taking steps to create a Division or Department in discussions with University administration.

Appendix A

Potential Additional Program Related to the Combination of MPA, MPP, MIAGE and CPPA Programs

Some of these programs currently exist on Campus such as Disabilities Studies and the Health, Society and Policy undergraduate degree. Other programs not presently found on Campus such as a program in Civil Society or the National Service Corps could be included as well as graduate certificates in public administration, nonprofit organization and management, public policy analysis, program evaluation.

Other potentially related programs:

- Disabilities Studies – undergraduate minor and graduate certificate
- Health, Society and Policy – B.S.

Other programs that could be included in the future:

- Civil Society (Duke University)
- Graduate Certificate in Public Administration – expanded and possibly in collaboration with the Utah State CPM program, Salt Lake County Employees' University, and AOCE
- National Service Corps (Colorado Compact Service Corps)
- Graduate Certificate in Nonprofit Organization and Management – possibly in collaboration with the Utah Nonprofits Association and AOCE
- Graduate Certificate in Public Policy Analysis
- Graduate Certificate in Program Evaluation

Appendix B

Comments from other universities regarding tenure and promotion decision making in departments or schools of public affairs.

University of Wisconsin
The Committee contacted several programs across the country with experience working in various structures. One such interview was with The University of Wisconsin LaFollette School of Public Affairs. In the LaFollette School, faculty members are in the Public Affairs Department with specialty fields in economics, sociology, political science, etc.

University of Washington
The Evans School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington provided their policy regarding tenure, promotion, and reappointment of tenure-track faculty. For appointment to the rank of professor, The Evans School "requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching and in research…" The Evans School also considers service to the public sector and non-profit communities as an important aspect of a candidate's record, but service does not compensate for less than satisfactory performance in teaching and research. Candidates for reappointment, promotion or tenure are first reviewed by a committee of three, one of whom must be from outside the School. The Review Committee makes its recommendations then eligible faculty vote on the proposed action. The Dean then makes a recommendation to the President.

University of Georgia
Another response came from Tomas P. Lauth, Dean of the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia. His comments provide additional understanding of the critical questions surrounding faculty appointments and tenure and promotion decisions.

"At the University of Georgia, the kind of faculty member you describe in the second paragraph of your message, *might* be appointed in the Department of Public Administration and Policy, but he or she is much more likely to be appointed in the Carl Vinson Institute of Government, into one of the public service ranks (public service assistant, public service associate and senior public service associate). Public service ranks are not eligible for tenure. The Vinson Institute of Government reports to the Vice President for Public Service and Outreach; it does not report to the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

In the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia, the appointing unit and promotion and tenure unit (PTU) is the academic department. Authorization to fill a new or existing vacant faculty position is granted by the provost and dean. The department conducts the search, screens candidates, and extends the written offer of appointment (co-signed by the dean). Promotion and tenure decisions are initiated by a vote of all tenured faculty members in a department, e.g., the Department of Public Administration and Policy. Department votes are a recommendation to the School of Public and International Affairs school-wide promotion and tenure review committee (comprised of faculty

representatives from all departments within the School) and to the dean (who is charged with exercising an independent judgment from the School-wide promotion and tenure committee). The School-wide committee and the dean's decisions are recommendations to a University-wide committee (comprised of faculty representatives from across the university). The response to one of your specific questions is that appointment and tenure reside within an academic department; there no such thing as appointment or tenure only in a school or college.

All part-time or temporary faculty members are authorized by the Dean of the School of Public and International Affairs, but the appointing unit is the academic department. The School does not appoint part-time or temporary independently of an academic department.

Joint appointments are infrequent in the School of Public and International Affairs; currently only one. A joint appointment must be approved by faculty vote of the "second" department. A joint appointment gives the faculty member full voting rights in each department. However, tenure resides only in one department and that department is the primary one for a jointly appointed individual. **Adjunct appointments** are somewhat more frequent in the School of Public and International Affairs, especially in the Department of Public Administration and Policy. An adjunct appointment is more of a courtesy appointment and does not accord voting rights in departmental decisions."

University of Arizona, School of Government and Public Policy

Phone Interview with: *H. Brinton Milward*, School Director

H. Brinton Milward is the Providence Service Corporation Chair in Public Management and the Director of the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona. He has been president of two national associations: the Public Management Research Association and the National Association of Schools of Public Administration and Affairs.

The School was established three years ago as the result of a merger between the Department of Political Science, College of Social and Behavioral Science and the Public Administration and Public Policy programs which were then part of the Business School. The School of Government and Public Policy is the second largest school at the University.   The University is trying to collapse as many programs as possible within schools: "It wants bigger units."

The merger occurred primarily due to budget cuts: Dean of the Business School was going to cut both PA and PP programs and eliminate all associated faculty. There was a $100 million cut cumulatively from all the programs/department that ended up merging together. The merger went fairly smoothly because not to do so would have been the end of programs. ("We had a gun to our head and had to make it work.")

Because they were placed in a dire situation, Dr. Milward noted that everyone was willing to work together to put the School together, knowing that given the large budget cut, not everyone was going to get everything they wanted, and there wasn't much of an issue with

disciplinary turf. A working group representing various affected stakeholders spent the summer of 2008 developing bylaws and governing documents to guide the new school. While a number of issues came up during the process, consensus was reached on the new structure and governing documents.

There is a philosophy of sustainability that also permeates the School; it is trying to seek as much private funding as possible and to, in essence, wean itself from public funding where it can: "We are trying to develop a portfolio of product lines in an environment that is becoming more and more privatized. We've thought about it long & hard and we have to find a way to pay our way in the world." As part of the School's effort to think about long-term sustainability and to be competitive, they are engaged in a capital fundraising campaign to support the National Institute of Civil Discourse, which has (as of late) been amplified by the tragic shooting of Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords and has as its honorary chairs former Presidents George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton.

The home department of the faculty member determines where student tuition ($$/student) goes in the case of joint appointments. But these are courtesy appointments and there is no tenure associated with joint appointment. All faculty are tenured in the School of Government and Public Policy; disciplinary focus is ignored in terms of tenure: All on the same team. Everyone goes through the same committee for promotion and tenure (however, it may be made up of disciplinary experts who can evaluate the relevant expertise of the individual) but it is convened by the School.

NOTE: Dr. Milward is open to sharing more information and advice. I asked if our working group could have a copy of their governing documents and although he said they are probably pretty specific to the needs of their institution, that he was more than willing to share whatever documents or info we might like to review.