
Toward a New School
of Landscape
Architecture +
Urban & Regional
Planning

New School Task Force
Report 11-25-08

Margaret Portillo, Chair

Walter Dukes

Roy Eugene Graham

Maria Christina Gurucharri

Zhong-Ren Peng

William Tilson

Robert MacLeod

Catherine Taylor

Chase Webb

Introduction and Charge to Task Force

The following review of the proposed school of Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning was conducted from September 10 through November 22, 2008 by an internal task force appointed by Christopher Silver, Dean of the College of Design, Construction and Planning¹. The task force was chaired by Margaret Portillo and included Walter Dukes, Roy Eugene Graham, Maria Christina Gurucharri, William Tilson, and Zhong-Ren Peng. Additionally, three members joined the task force: Robert MacLeod representing the College Faculty Council, Catherine Taylor, a doctoral student in Urban & Regional Planning, and Chase Webb, a fifth year Landscape Architecture student. Dean Silver charged the task force with four primary targets:

- Develop recommendations for the implementation of a new school containing Landscape Architecture and Urban & Regional Planning
- Benchmark quality indicators and recommendations from comparable institutions with such merged programs
- Consider quality outcomes arising from such a merger at the University of Florida
- Summarize challenges and opportunities voiced by the involved units' constituency groups

To gather information, the task force interviewed administrators from respected programs nationwide with a variety of combined structures containing both disciplines, held departmental and joint meetings with Landscape Architecture and Urban & Regional Planning faculty members, interviewed the primary support staff from the affected units, involved student representatives in the process as well as solicited opinions from several members from the departmental advisory boards.

Notably, the historic preservation program was initially included in the proposed new school structure; however based on factors outlined by Dean Silver in his charge to the task force, the decision was made to maintain Historic Preservation's current interdisciplinary focus and stand-alone structure. An expanded rationale for the organizational structure of HP supports its current identity and future vision; this was developed in conjunction with a summarization of leading historic preservation programs.² All units housed within the College will have the opportunity to interface equally with the historic preservation program as currently organized.

Overview of Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning

Both units focus on professional education and applied research relating to natural and built environments. Further, they both share a longstanding history of community outreach and service. Throughout the remainder of the report, Landscape Architecture will often be referred to as LA and Urban & Regional Planning as URP. The LA faculty concentrates most heavily on the professional undergraduate program while supporting a developing masters program. URP has grown most rapidly in its doctoral enrollment, especially in the area of information technology for planning and in growth management and transportation.

¹ See the unabridged charge to the task force in the appendix

² The rationale for the organizational structure of the historic preservation program with benchmarking data are found in the appendix

Both departments have a well rounded balance of senior and junior-level faculty who contribute to their programs' high national rankings.

Landscape Architecture Mission and Degree Offerings³

Overall the departmental mission in Landscape Architecture is to advance the ethical, creative, and skillful application of the arts and the sciences in planning, designing, implementing and managing diverse landscapes. Toward that end, the department offers three, fully accredited degrees:

- BLA: Bachelor of Landscape Architecture
- MLA: First Professional Master of Landscape Architecture
- MLA: Post Professional Master of landscape Architecture
- Undergraduate minor in Landscape Architecture

The Bachelor of Landscape Architecture emphasizes professional practice and service while the Master of Landscape Architecture focuses on professional practice and service within the context of creative scholarship. While the department has had some engagement in the college-wide PhD program, there is an opportunity to increase the level of participation in the doctoral program. With the current faculty and space resources in the department, the interim Chair of Landscape Architecture maintains that her faculty is teaching to capacity in the accredited BLA and MLA programs.

Urban & Regional Planning Mission and Degree Offerings

The Department of Urban and Regional Planning defines its mission as being a leader in planning education, research and practice for the citizens of Florida, in the Southeast and within the nation. URP seeks to educate planners who will work with innovative technologies to create livable cities within sustainable environments. To accomplish its mission, the department endeavors to strategically position itself to benefit from the vast resources of the University of Florida and the larger planning profession. The department offers two accredited graduate degrees and a minor as follows:

- MURP: Master of Urban and Regional Planning
- Graduate Minor in Urban and Regional Planning
- Undergraduate Minor in Urban and Regional Planning

URP participates heavily in the DCP doctoral program and this involvement is anticipated to continue, if not grow further, in the new school.

Opportunity for Strategic Growth

Both units will need to address enrollment growth strategically to align with College and university priorities. The URP Chair believes that enrollment for the MURP could increase to about ten students; likewise, he estimates that an additional five to eight students could be added to the doctoral program.

³ Data was not available on the enrollment of LA and URP minors; this data is tracked by UF central administration and not provided to individual departments.

In contrast, the LA Chair recognizes the real challenge of balancing the needs of a first rate, accredited professional undergraduate program with the increasing urgency to grow enrollment at the graduate level. Currently the MLA offers a more generalized course of study; however, the program appears ready to begin developing explicit foci that reflect faculty expertise and disciplinary areas of specialization. Interestingly, both Chairs noted prospective student interest in graduate studies in Urban Design, which neither unit currently offers; for example, those students with an architecture degree seem attracted to this specialization.

Administrators and Faculty, Staff, and Students

The units each have a department chair; LA has an interim chair and URP has a chair who was appointed through an external search. LA has nine full-time positions--six tenured faculty (two full and four associate rank), two untenured faculty (one assistant and one associate), and one lecturer. Urban and Regional Planning has ten full-time positions--seven tenured faculty (four full and three associate rank), two untenured faculty (one assistant and one joint appointment), and one assistant professor to be hired (search in progress)

LA has one experienced office manager providing administrative support and assistance with the MLA program. URP also has veteran, experienced staff--one office manager, one staff member coordinating student services, and one OPS staff person assisting with research grants.

The majority of LA students (73 in upper division) are enrolled in the BLA program with 25 MLA students and 1 doctoral student. The majority of the URP students (95) enroll in the MURP program with 17 in the doctoral program.

Perceived Departmental Identity and Values

For the LA faculty, *design studio and faculty expertise* represent the life blood of their program. They agree that the core foundations of the Landscape Architecture program rests on a quality design curriculum, full accreditation, and program autonomy. The program's connection to the profession, including the Landscape academy and alumni, was perceived by faculty as critical to achieving their mission of professional education and applied research.

For the URP faculty, *research and scholarly work* symbolize their departmental core identity, articulated as "spatial planning with social conscience." Their focus is realized through a diversity of research areas and the departmental research centers. The well established GeoPlan Research Center, for example, has received numerous awards for its sustained research excellence in GIS research. This unit has one of the most active research programs in DCP, with average research awards of about \$3 million annually.

Both departments appreciate a supportive, collegiate, and collaborative work environment and appear to value deeply close-knit professor-student mentoring. Again, community outreach and service are core values uniting the departments as well as a commitment to interdisciplinary and international collaboration. For example, LA faculty offer international programs in Paris (fall semester graduate and undergraduate program) and has once offered a service learning experience in Indonesia. URP has a study aboard program in Brazil. Students also participate in the Network for European and U.S. Regional and Urban Studies (NEURUS) program. Plans are underway for a summer Study Abroad Program in China for summer 2009.

Leadership and Organizational Structure

Critical to the success of the new school is leadership to guide the vision for the future and make concrete progress on shared initiatives. The Task Force recommends a single director to lead the new school while maintaining a collaborative and collegial work environment that both faculties value. Leadership and organizational structure surfaced as the greatest and potentially the most divisive issue voiced by faculty in task force meetings and interviews. In considering organizational options for the new school, many models were proposed, debated, drawn, scrutinized and studied. All had some advantages and potential drawbacks.

Many faculty members participating in the URP + LA meeting with Dean Silver seemed to concur that a model of a single school Director would be best suited to the new school, promoting leadership within a lean administrative structure. The task force recommends an administrative model consisting of a Director and Program Coordinators where a Director works closely with Program Coordinators whose roles and responsibilities will be determined through on-going discussion with new school faculty. The School Director/Coordinator model offers organizational structure and flexibility for the emerging structure. Importantly, the coordinators can allow for disciplinary representation (e.g., LA graduate coordinator) and promote shared identity (e.g., urban design coordinator). A national, open search for this candidate would be most ideal; however, current fiscal constraints in the College and university probably do not support this. Nevertheless, the search and selection of a School Director should be given highest priority. In the meantime, the current Chairs will need to work in collaboration with one another to begin the new school work plan and start implementing faculty-endorsed, priority changes. Therefore, we see a transition in leadership occurring in two phases where the department chairs begin collaborating in earnest, followed by the search and naming of a School Director. Concurrently, coordinator positions will be agreed upon and put into place. After a School Director is named, the role of the Chairs will be evaluated and redefined to reflect the vision of the New School.

The New School Director will need to continue established quality programs, facilitate the transition into the new school, prioritize and facilitate new proposals while troubleshooting the inevitable challenges of people and limited resources. Additionally, the Director not only needs to be skilled as an external advocate but needs finesse as an internal facilitator. He or she must pave the way for a collegial, intellectually exciting and progressive environment that will become a springboard for innovation. This individual must appreciate both disciplines, having the administrative experience and personality characteristics to be an effective agent of change. The new Director also needs to be adept at developing and reinforcing communication between the faculty and the Dean as well as across constituency groups. Faculty members were in agreement that the Director for the new school could hold expertise in either discipline with a doctorate or a terminal master's degree and must have a clear record of research and/or creative scholarship.

Active engagement with faculty across departments about the rationale, steps and status of the new school is critical to successfully launching and building a strong foundation. Faculty need to see its purpose and the potential in order to become engaged stakeholders. If key stakeholders such as faculty, staff, students, alumni, and practitioners affiliated with the respective departments, become disengaged or disenfranchised, then progress will slow and

may even threaten the ultimate success of the merger. Knowing what programs and departmental culture will be honored and remain intact, what will be changed, and how this will be accomplished need to become abundantly clear. The need for clarity and a shared sense of purpose surfaced repeatedly in departmental meetings with the Task Force.

Faculty across units will have more vested interests in contributing to the new and established URP centers to enhance dynamic, interdisciplinary scholarship that will bring into sharp relief the identity of the new school and advance the pool of knowledge. The Task Force strongly recommends that new school retain discipline-specific tenure and promotion criteria to reflect and respect disciplinary uniqueness and distinctions. Further, cross-disciplinary, formalized, and attentive mentoring for untenured faculty should be a priority in the new school. Mentoring processes become even more essential for untenured faculty during periods of organizational restructuring and realignment. Safeguards should be put in place to limit untenured faculty time on committee work and new course preparations during this transition.

The staff most likely will need to adapt their work processes to the new structure and this expanded scope of work needs to be acknowledged with appropriate incentives and rewards. The importance of engagement and maintaining clear channels of communication during the transition period cannot be overemphasized.

Again, engagement and communication was viewed as critical so students understand the integrity of their degree programs is not in any way being impacted by the new school structure while making clear any potential new course offerings or opportunities for new student organizations or initiatives.

Benchmarking of Landscape + Planning Units

Arizona State University

Ken Brooks, Director of School of Planning and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, since 2006

Ken Brooks remarked that, in the past decade nationwide, he has witnessed more landscape architecture and planning programs merge than separate. Unfortunately, “Most have been more like living together than a marriage and very few were shotgun weddings like Michigan State.” For the majority of these mergers the impetus was a resource savings measure but in the end they did not generate appreciable savings. At ASU, the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning merged when the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture was a small emerging program; this joining worked well initially under one particularly effective administrator but deteriorated upon his departure. Subsequently, the Dean moved the LA program out of planning and into architecture but the identity of landscape suffered in this organizational structure. Currently, the situation has improved now that the School has an Urban Design focus and the last three faculty hires have dual degrees in landscape architecture and architecture.

From his perspective, Brooks believes that to be most successful, mergers need to create a new hybrid with interdependent activities. Without such merged programs, there is not a strong justification for connecting landscape and planning programs.

It is critical to intertwine the disciplines through avenues such as urban design, environmental studies, housing and community design, etc. that connect design and policy. Further Brooks maintains recognition and rewards for such interdisciplinary activities need to be in place. He also recommends that faculty identify common values and develop a shared vision and mission for joint programs and initiatives. However, identifying commonalities is not enough; it is also important that they recognize their differences. Brook asserts that tenure and promotion criteria should not describe performance per se but instead describe outputs that have contributed to the body of knowledge in the respective disciplines.

Brooks recommends that the LA+URP merger at the University of Florida should capitalize on the fact that the state is in the top five in the nation regarding environmental policies and is a state with more rigorous licensure for the practice of landscape architecture. Within this context, he sees a unique opportunity to design a program that integrates design with policy and that can specifically address ways to make a difference in the state of Florida. This type of program could further “put UF on the map” and would result in productivity that University administrators would be more amenable to supporting.

Clemson University - Department of Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture

Dan Nadenicek, Past Department Head

The merger of the Department of Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture at Clemson University may have been easier than others documented in this benchmarking exercise because the original units were programs, not departments.

The Chair of the Department of Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture is responsible for the budget oversight and physical planning, while Program Directors are in charge of teaching assignments and curricular issues. From the perspective of former department head, Nadenicek, the merger has increased opportunities for collaborative research and scholarship between regional planning and landscape architecture. The joint T & P process has worked between the units since the tenure and promotion guidelines focus on nationally significant and peer reviewed work, regardless of content area.

Overall Nadenicek considered the merger to be successful; yet this was attributed in large part to the personality types and attitudes of the involved administration and faculty members. From a curricular standpoint, commonalities between units offer possibilities for joint courses and that this is where efficiencies are found, not by reducing FTEs. Like Ken Brooks, he maintained a new program like Urban Design could offer an important common thread.

Iowa State University- Department of Landscape Architecture; Department of Community and Regional Planning

Douglas Johnston, Chair since 2007

Both departments of Landscape Architecture and Community and Regional Planning are comparable in size and administrative structure. One Chair oversees the two departments and landscape architecture has an associate chair, program coordinator, administrative assistant, academic advisor, director of graduate education and 17 faculty members.

Community and Regional Planning has an administrative assistant, academic advisor, director of graduate education and 15 faculty members.

When discussing the challenges of the merger, Johnston indicated that the faculties still appear somewhat anxious about the merger. From his perspective, one of the problems was that the merger process did not have sufficient faculty input and participation from both departments; however, he see potential for the merger to provide opportunities to work together on planning-oriented projects such as public facilitation needs, small-area planning studies and other opportunities to integrate teaching with such outreach projects.

Kansas State University - Department of Landscape Architecture, Regional and Community Planning

Dan Donelin, Department Head since 1995

The merger of Landscape Architecture and Regional and Community Planning at Kansas State has been fraught with difficulties and one of the biggest challenges of the merger revolved around tenure & promotion criteria. The Provost insisted on joint T & P criteria for the merged unit; developing these criteria resulted in a contentious process. Since the department has 21.5 faculty, 16 in LA and 5.5 in planning, the T & P votes are done at a 3:1 ratio. Other challenges and conflicts have arisen in faculty searches where the educational qualifications of candidates have become a point of contention. This has led to debate over what defines a terminal degree (Ph.D. versus masters) and the larger argument of a common definition of what defines research and scholarship.

Donelin did not feel that a merger between a landscape and urban and regional planning necessarily offered any curricular advantages. For example, if LA students take one additional planning course and planning students take three LA courses, then what is the true benefit? In his context, Donelin also felt that the merger did not increase collaborative faculty research nor strengthen the department's national standing. While the program is ranked in the top ten in the country, the department head attributes this to the strength in their construction curricula.

Texas A & M- Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning

Forster Ndubisi, Department Head, since 2003

Currently, the Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning has over 400 students, with 12 faculty members in the Landscape Architecture program and 22 faculty members in the Urban Planning program. The departments of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning at Texas A&M University were merged in 1992 in order for it to have a bigger voice at the College of Architecture. In 2002, the faculty at the department voted to stay together as one department rather split into two; in 2003, the current department head Forster Ndubisi was hired.

Similar to the University of Texas – Austin model, the department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning at Texas A&M University is organized by degree program. For example, the Texas A&M real estate program is called Master of Science in Land Development. The department head is in charge of budgeting, resource allocation, faculty hiring, etc. Faculty lines belong to the department, not to the individual programs. Tenure and promotion consideration

is conducted at the department level. Initially there were different tenure and promotion standards for Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning faculty, now it's the same criteria across the board. From Ndubisi's viewpoint, the current organizational structure with degree programs works well by fostering cross-curriculum teaching, interdisciplinary research collaboration and increased faculty productivity in research and scholarly work.

University of Texas at Austin

Fritz Steiner, Dean of the School of Architecture and Henry M. Rockwell Chair in Architecture, since 2001

The current Landscape Architecture program has four faculty members and more than 40 Master students. The near term target is to have six faculty members and 60 master students. The Community & Regional Planning program has 13 faculty members and more than 90 students. The School of Architecture at the University of Texas –Austin has no departments, just programs arranged by degrees. Graduate programs exist in Landscape Architecture, Community & Regional Planning, Urban Design, Sustainable Design, and in Interdisciplinary Studies. The Dean is in charge of budget and resource allocation, faculty hiring, and oversight of the unit. Faculty lines belong to the school, not to programs; faculty hiring is school-wide. Further, tenure and promotion consideration occurs at the school level. Much of the operations of the school occur by committee; for example, the committee on graduate studies is responsible for graduate-level curriculum development while the scholarship committee oversees school-wide scholarship.

According to Steiner, the program structure affords the school more flexibility to consider professional changes, reduces insular thinking, fosters interdisciplinary research and collaboration, and creates the foundation for interdisciplinary programs. The synergy of Landscape Architecture and Community & Regional Planning stems from the growing areas of urban design as well as ecologic design and planning. The School is also organizing an interdisciplinary team to develop a LEED-ND (LEED for Neighborhood Development) program.

Quality Indicators of Benchmarks

The most important quality indicator at several universities with LA + URP programs was the ability to create a credible hybrid program whether in Urban Design at ASU or a Masters in Real Estate at Texas A & M. Effective mergers realized a gain in collaborative research and scholarship noted by administrators at Clemson University, University of Texas-Austin, and Texas A & M. Several recommendations were made to prioritize the support of interdisciplinary research ventures by the College. Another quality indicator surfaced as the marked increase in doctoral students at Texas A & M. Collaborative studios jointly taught with LA + URP faculty represented yet another mark of quality as did the strategic hiring of faculty with joint experience and education across fields. While four of the targeted program cited advantages of such a merger, two programs did not appear to accrue benefits. Namely, Kansas State and Iowa State University did not perceive added value from a merger; in these settings the LA and URP programs appeared, for the most part, to operate in relative isolation from one another. Grassroots support for a merged structure by faculty seemed to be lacking in both cases, resulting in a somewhat acrimonious environment.

Quality Indicators for the New School at UF

The following recommendations reflect comments voiced by LA and URP faculty in departmental and combined faculty sessions on the new school as well as ideas that were developed by the Task Force who saw quality indicators as reflecting (1) degree programs, curricula, and student experience, (2) research and scholarship, (3) leadership and resources, (4) collegiality and a shared sense of purpose.

Quality of Degree Programs, Curricula and Student Experience

Degree Program

- Create a new Master of Urban Design Degree as a new hybrid program that will capitalize on the opportunity to engage policy and spatial planning with physical design
- Create a new specialization for Ecological and Regional Planning and Design that maximizes opportunities for cross-fertilization and fusion between programs
- Promote joint studios (this is especially advantageous to URP students) and encourage joint field experiences beneficial to LA + URP students occurring locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally
- Expand the Ph.D. program with hybrid LA + URP concentrations

Challenges

- *How can more degree programs, specializations, and course offerings be managed with leaner support and the current faculty base while maintaining the expected quality in current degree programs?*
- *What are creative ways to reduce teaching loads, particularly the required contact hours in LA curriculum that do not compromise excellence, while growing the research enterprise in the new school?*
- *How can the number of DRF faculty in the new school be increased, particularly in LA?*
- *How can physical spaces be identified for students and faculty that support joint studio offerings and faculty interaction?*

Quality of Scholarship and Creative Work

- Maintain discipline-specific tenure and promotion guidelines
- Continue, expand and reward collaboration between LA and URP on research projects
- Encourage more faculty involvement in URP research centers and college-wide centers
- Promote interdisciplinary research topics for graduate students, especially PhD students
- Develop marketing strategies to promote new programs recruiting doctoral students
- Implement more research opportunities at the undergraduate level

Challenges

- *In recognition that the development and implementation of shared, innovative research activities take time, how can time be allocated for such strategic planning?*
- *Where can untapped sources of funding be found to support new joint programs and initiatives?*
- *How can these shared scholarly initiatives be successfully launched without overextending the faculty?*
- *How do junior faculty best maintain focus and productivity during the organizational transition and be well mentored by senior faculty in the new school?*

Quality of Leadership and Resources

- Respect disciplinary uniqueness
- Create a culture of innovation and focus
- Promote new partnerships with the School of Architecture and the Historic Preservation Program for the Urban Design curriculum
- Promote new partnerships with units across campus like Geography and Ecology for the Ecological and Regional Planning and Design curriculum
- Encourage cluster hires through joint appointments with other units or recruit faculty with degrees in both fields, when appropriate
- Maximize efficiencies (e.g., teaching- co-listing courses and college-level committee work)

- Enhance mentoring of junior faculty
- Invite visiting scholars who offer a progressive model for bridging both disciplines
- Employ practicing professionals with hybrid practice experience for adjunct/visiting/affiliate professors

Challenges

- *How can the Director develop vision, trust, participation, and excitement to launch and cultivate a sense of identity and purpose for new school?*
- *How should the new school leadership balance growth with quality? For example, what is the optimal number of doctoral, masters and undergraduate students, given faculty and physical space resources?*
- *If the new school increases its reliance on part-time faculty and doctoral students to support expanded programs, how can Balkanizing be avoided?*

Quality of Collegiality and a Shared Sense of Purpose

- Director must keep a pulse on stakeholders in the new school and place a premium on clear and open communication as well as dialogue and convergence of ideas
- Prioritize focused joint initiatives in teaching and scholarship
- Bring in lecturers and visiting scholars with hybrid expertise in LA + URP to inspire those participating in the new school
- Seek input from other units across campus that have merged, such as in the College of Education and other benchmarked programs
- Consider using a facilitator to help establish unifying strategies at a critical meeting, if necessary, (like UF's John Dain) with expertise in facilitation and conflict management
- Staff involvement is critical in maintaining the workflow in the new school. Involve staff in defining their new roles and job descriptions. Consider rewards commensurate with responsibilities, and increased productivity
- Seek input from staff on their work spaces, consider a central staff location, to improve efficiency
- Mark the merger with social gatherings with faculty, staff and students. Capitalize on the restructuring and new launch. Develop new ways to commemorate the milestone. For example, host a new school event and invite similar programs from other leading universities to participate.

Develop a “white paper” that spells out the ideal conditions for such a school, establish UF as a model program, document processes and results, and seek national publicity.

Challenges

- *Inter-unit department cultures, traditions, and philosophical differences are not trivial. What can be done to cultivate collegiality across LA and URP faculty, staff and students?*
- *How does the new school avoid common pitfalls that have plagued other units with similar organizational structures to explicitly avoid a merger in name only or one that threatens disciplinary identity?*

Summary, Recommendations, and Next Steps

Create a new organizational model

- Create an organizational structure with a phased change to a School Director model
- The new organizational model will maintain T & P guidelines at the disciplinary level
- Phase 1:
 - Find resources to support an open search for the New School Director
 - Maintain Department Chair structure until New School Director is appointed
 - Study programs (existing and new) housed in the new school that need coordinators. Define and assign coordinators agreed upon by Chairs and faculty.
- Phase 2: New School Director in Place
 - Evaluate and redefine Chair roles to reflect the vision of the new school
 - Operationalize new administrative structure. The Director in conjunction with program coordinators contribute to the administration of programs and major endeavors within the new school.

Create a new Masters of Urban Design Degree (longer range but critical goal)

- Seize the opportunity to integrate policy and spatial planning with physical design
- Strategically position this degree program as a centerpiece of the school’s identity
- Partner with other programs, with a vested interest in Urban Design, such as Architecture, Historic Preservation, and Interior Design
- Benchmark other programs in Urban Design to fine tune goals and objectives
- Develop curriculum and program, co-listing existing LA and URP courses with an urban design focus

Create a new specialization for Environmental Planning and Design (GIS)

- Again, capitalize on the opportunity to integrate policy and spatial planning with physical design
- Continue to conduct joint GIS studios
- Co-list existing courses with an environmental planning and design focus
- Explore new supporting courses across disciplines in allied disciplines such as Geography and Ecology
- Explore the possibility of integrating issues of sustainability, especially Low Impact Development, into the specialization

Promote faculty initiatives

- Continue, expand and recognize URP/LA collaborations on research projects
- Encourage more faculty involvement in research centers, especially those housed in URP
- Prioritize mentoring of junior faculty, particularly during the transition times
- Consider cluster hires, when appropriate, with expertise across URP and LA
- Explore joint appointments with other programs/units
- Invite lecturers, visiting scholars, practitioners etc. who model the successful bridging of both disciplines

Promote student initiatives

- Communicate clearly and frequently about the logic and process of the restructuring
- Involve students in the transition. For example, they could contribute to the new shared mission statement, new school name, new logo, new academic and professional identity, etc.
- Encourage 100 % student participation in an international experience in the new school (i.e., Paris, Brazil, China, etc.)
- Promote the expanded interdisciplinary research topics for masters and PhD students
- Introduce interdisciplinary LA + URP research and scholarship at the undergraduate level

Promote staff initiatives

- Involve staff in defining their roles and responsibilities in the new school and consider rewards for increased workload and productivity
- Seek input from staff on ways to facilitate the transition and facilitate the workflow
- Consider physical office proximities among new school staff, director, and program directors; it would be ideal to locate the staff in fairly close proximity to one another as well as to key administrators and coordinators

Celebrate new school milestones

- Mark the merger with celebrations with faculty, staff, students, and stakeholders
- Enlist Julie Frey and her team to get the word out in multiple venues
- Host an event on the merger and invite programs in other universities which have been through similar reorganization to participate. Write a white paper that discusses the ideal conditions for such a merger, present the UF model and outcomes, and seek national publicity

Timeline Ideas for Planning and Implementation

November – December 2008

- New School Task Force completes their report
- Share report with both departments and DCP Faculty Council for discussion and planning
- Plan a retreat in early 2009 to begin a work plan on the transition, new school name, short-term and longer range goals

Spring Semester 2009

- Appoint a transition team representing both departments to keep focus and momentum
- Host a faculty retreat and begin the work plan with goals continuing over the semester

Spring semester – August 2009

- Leadership, transition team, and faculty will spearhead work plan and draft a vision, mission and strategic indicators for the new school with stakeholder participation
- Present, redraft, finalize, and approve work plan with faculty majority (see constitution)

- Develop and refine ideas generated by faculty teams in the Fall 2008 semester:
(1) New Programs, (2) Curriculum, and (3) Centers/Collaborative Research
- Develop communications plan from mission to logo.
- Engage staff in planning logistics and beginning the transition
- Communicate the logic and benefits of the new structure with students and alumni
- Update communications network- retool websites and communication materials

June - September 2009

- ***Celebration of New School***
- Develop press releases on campus and in national professional networks to share news
- Host a series of celebration events with faculty, students, and friends of the new school

New School Task Force Report

Appendices

- 1. Charge to the Task Force (Silver)**
- 2. Rationale for the Structure of UF Historic Preservation Program (Graham)**
- 3. National Benchmark Data: LA/URP Joint Program Matrix (Dukes, Gurucharri, Peng)**
- 4. Merger Report on Centers & Research Opportunities (Steiner, Thompson)**
- 5. DCP Constitutional Issues (MacLeod)**
- 6. Task Force Time Frame**

Appendix 1: Charge to the Task Force

C. Silver

September 15, 2008

DCP Faculty and Staff

We have established a Task Force (called the New School Task Force) to assist the College in devising the best possible approach to merging several departments into a new unit. The basic mandate for this comes from the budget reduction plan approved by the UF Board of Trustees in July, under which we are obliged to act. But as I noted in the State of the College address at the Fall Faculty Meeting, it is up to us to strategically carry this out, one that will strengthen rather than diminish the excellent programs that are affected. And when the work of the Task Force is completed, their efforts will be reviewed, and revised where appropriate, through full input from our Faculty Council, DCP faculty at large, staff, students and our alumni and professional constituents. In other words, the Task Force will lead us toward appropriate models of excellence but the process ultimately will incorporate the full DCP community.

Here is the charge that I presented to the Task Force at its initial meeting on September 2, 2008:

- 1) to identify, assess, and develop recommendations for implementation of a new school that combines the Department of Landscape Architecture and the Department of Urban and Regional Planning
- 2) to base this work on careful examination of best practices at other comparable institutions which have undertaken similar mergers (or where these two programs are under a single unit)
- 3) to offer suggestions on how such a merger might create opportunities to enhance the quality of these programs
- 4) to summarize the challenges and opportunities voiced by faculty, students, and other involved constituency representatives from Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning
- 5) to identify areas within the DCP constitution that may need to be amended or reconsidered in light of the restructuring

One notable modification incorporated into this charge (given the original plan submitted to the UF Administration) was to exclude the Historic Preservation program from the merger. The addition of Historic Preservation to a new school was, premised on the notion that this program, more than any other, was being so heavily impacted by the budget cuts. By adding it to the other two departments, with their staff and faculty resources, I believed it was in its best interest to do so at the time. But as we discovered subsequently, the approval process for the Masters of Historic Preservation, which occurred while the budget cuts were underway, demonstrated that a program drawing its faculty support from all five DCP units, and based in the College rather than in just one School, was in a better position to thrive. So the Task Force was asked by me to include in its deliberations ways to further strengthen the impact of the HP program and ensure it has adequate support without the allocation of significant additional resources, and not be considered as a part of the merger. It will be my responsibility to justify this change to the UF administration but I am confident it will be accepted in the spirit of taking the proper action toward one of our distinguished programs.

I have asked the Task Force to try to complete its work by the end of October, so the ensuing document can be vetted by the Faculty Council and the implementation of the new school can move forward in a timely way.

The New School Task Force is chaired by Dr. Meg Portillo, Chair of Interior Design, and includes Tina Guruchari, Interim Chair, Department of Landscape Architecture and Dr. Zhong-Ren Peng, Chair, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, and faculty members Bill Tilson (ARC), Dr. Walter Dukes (BCN) and Roy Graham, representing the Historic Preservation program. Two students, one each from LA and URP are being secured to assist the Task Force. In addition, I have offered one additional position on the task force representing the Faculty Council (but not a faculty member from either of the affected departments). The schedule of meetings for the Task Force have been posted on the DCP Sharepoints site at <http://extranet.dcp.ufl.edu/College>, and the minutes of its

meetings will be available as well. Moreover, anyone from the DCP community is welcomed to sit in on its deliberations.

Although the work of the Task Force is just underway, it is obvious that there are many examples of comparable mergers at leading institutions, and that these mergers have taken different forms and with possibly different outcomes. Yet, I should note, that I recently met with a group of our alums and several other partners at the Miami-based firm, Bermello Ajami and Partners, and discovered that they have recently integrated landscape architecture and planning functions into a new unit, and this unit is leading the firm in securing important international work in this challenging economic environment. It is my hope that our efforts will produce the sort of dynamic combination that BA and Partners has achieved, and that will help to further our impressive efforts.

I have every confidence that we will find the best path to create the desired synergy between the landscape architecture and planning programs to even better serve our students, our constituents, and to elevate even further the prestige of our College. Support from all of the DCP community in this important endeavor will help to ensure that we achieve this objective.

Chris Silver

Appendix 2: Rationale for the Structure of UF Historic Preservation Program

R. Graham

Rationale for the Structure of the UF Historic Preservation Program: A Benchmark Comparison

The Historic Preservation Program at the University of Florida is unique in the country for its interdisciplinary structure that spans throughout the college and across the university. As such it is able to offer students in a wide variety of disciplines access to the courses, programs, field schools that make up the expansive historic preservation education. At the present, students in the Master of Historic Preservation degree track take five core courses in the major, two courses in history, and the rest of their studies in approved electives that will be used to focus a career in the field. At the present time these include anthropology/archaeology, architecture, building construction, cultural tourism, interior design, landscape architecture, law, museum studies, and urban and regional planning.

In addition, the program offers an Interdisciplinary Certificate and Concentration to those students who take masters in the above disciplines. The College of Design, Construction and Planning has a growing number of PhD candidates who are pursuing their studies in historic preservation, and whose backgrounds are from a variety of disciplines.

In order for it to maintain this truly interdisciplinary approach, the program must be aligned with no particular unit or discipline, but remain closely connected to all of them on a parallel and direct partnership basis. At the present time, the program uses a "pod concept" of structure with joined courses and faculty under a director who reports to the dean of the college. There are a number of examples of this clustering in place at the UF at this time, including the Interdisciplinary Ecology Graduate Program in the School of Natural Resources and Environment.

Although the University of Florida is exceptional in the amount of cross campus affiliation with more disciplines than any other program of its kind in the US, several peer programs operate under the same structure. Columbia University's program is a self contained unit under the College of Architecture, Design, and Historic Preservation. Each unit has a director that reports directly to the dean. Although not as interdisciplinary as UF's program, students take courses in historic preservation, as well as art history, and either design, planning, conservation and history.

Texas A&M's program is located in a center that is autonomous from any of the College of Architecture's units, and several other universities follow that model, including the University of Pennsylvania. These centers report directly to the dean of the college.

The most similar program that parallels the UF model is the Historic Preservation Program at the University of Oregon. The program is a stand-alone unit within the School of Architecture and Allied Arts.

The director has budgetary decision-making powers, including the hiring of adjunct faculty for specific courses. There is a faculty advisory committee that helps decide admission, requirements and general issues.

According to the interviews conducted in the benchmarking process, the programs in the design fields such as architecture or planning (as in the case of Cornell) were not as successful in recruiting faculty, students and partners in the interdisciplinary fields that historic preservation requires. If these programs are lodged in a specific unit, the HP program does not have the flexibility, funding, and the array of faculty that would make it interdisciplinary. Cornell's program in historic preservation is actually a Master of Preservation Planning and not a Master of Historic Preservation. The program is known as having a planning emphasis. Similarly, the University of Texas program is in the School of Architecture and is looked upon by prospective students as one that emphasizes design. The strength of the University of Florida's preservation program is truly "interdisciplinary" and this reputation would be lost if the program was linked to a specific discipline.

In all cases, if the historic preservation program is joined with a particular unit, it suffers in its relationships with other units, drawing perceptions of separateness that do not give other units incentives to support the program, either with faculty, students, or competitive resources. The historic preservation program depends on faculty and courses taught in each of the other five units of the college. It would be easy—in this time of budget constraints and priorities—for a unit that does not have the same relationship with historic preservation to eliminate service courses and faculty participation required for the Master of Historic Preservation degree.

It is also natural for "design" to be the driving force for resources in design schools and it is telling that in cases all over the country, historic preservation is short-changed when aligned to these kinds of programs.

A non-aligned historic preservation program is, by default, potentially aligned with all the units in the college and other partner units campus wide. At the present time, the historic preservation programs in the College of Design, Construction and Planning are attracting students through the perception of the multi-disciplinary educational advantages that parallel the discipline and practice of the profession in the field.

The very growth of the historic preservation programs at the university over the last five years has been due in part to its interdisciplinary nature. The perception that this would change if combined with one specialized unit could impact recruitment and hamper the program's continued growth.

The goals of the program are to increase that emphasis since it is our uniqueness. The program is now uniquely situated for interdisciplinary work and seeks to encourage campus-wide collaboration. The program will continue to draw upon existing faculty and courses in all units of the college at an equal level, and will enhance each of the other disciplines by drawing on its own resources and making partnerships which will benefit all.

Appendix 3: National Benchmark Data: LA+ URP Matrix

W. Dukes, C. Gurucharri, Z. R. Peng

Benchmark Matrix

Programs	Why Merge	Programs offers	Administrative Structure	Budget	T&P	Faculty size	Students
University of Texas	Not a merger, but a new LA program within the School of Architecture	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate Program in Community & Regional Planning, 2. Graduate Program in Landscape Architecture, 3. Graduate Program in Urban Design, 4. Graduate Program in Sustainable Design, 5. Graduate Program in Historic Preservation, Undergraduate Programs, and other programs	Dean, and Program Directors	Dean	School-wide guideline	LA: 4; Planning: 13	LA: 40 Master students; Planning: 60+ Master students, no undergrads
Texas A&M	To have a bigger voice at the College of Architecture	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bachelors of Science in Urban & Regional Science 2. Bachelor of Landscape Architecture 3. Master of Landscape Architecture 4. Master of Land Development 5. Master of Urban Planning 6. Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Science 	Department Head and Program Coordinators	Department Head	Initially separate, recently uniformed	LA: 12, Planning: 22	400+ students

<p>Kansas State University</p>	<p>Planning and Landscape Architecture merged in 1995</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate only: 4+2 Masters Program, 2. All students enter as freshman in a common "Environmental design" curricula, 3. ARC, IND and LAE second year in discipline, 4. Last four years are in the Masters Program 	<p>Department Head that reports to the Dean</p>	<p>Managed by Department Head</p>	<p>Provost wanted one set of criteria - It took many challenging years to develop a joint set</p>	<p>LA: 16 Planning: 5.5</p>	
<p>Arizona State University</p>	<p>New University President</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Graduate and Undergraduate 2. BS in Design, Arch. Studies 3. BS in Landscape Architecture 4. MARCH 5. MA/MBA (bus. admin) 6. MLA 7. MSBD (building design) 8. MSUD 	<p>School Director reports to the Dean</p>	<p>Managed by Department Head</p>	<p>Have one set of criteria</p>	<p>LA: 6 Arch: 20 Last three hires have dual degrees</p>	
<p>Clemson University</p>	<p>LA program started in 1988 and was imbedded in ARCH. Planning alone since 1968, based in physical planning</p>	<p>Original structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Master in City & Regional Planning 2. BLA <p>Revised structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MLA 2. Master in Historic Preservation 3. Master in Real Estate 4. Ph.D. 	<p>Program Directors in charge of teaching assignments and curricular issues</p>	<p>Chair managed budget and physical planning</p>	<p>One set shared between units</p>	<p>LA: 12 Planning: 8</p>	

Kansas State University - Department of Landscape Architecture, Regional and Community Planning

Dan Donelin, Department Head since 1995

The merger of Landscape Architecture and Regional and Community Planning at Kansas State has been fraught with difficulties. The biggest challenge of their merger is the joint T & P criteria. The Provost insisted on joint T & P criteria, which took many years to develop and was a difficult process. The department has 21.5 faculty, 16 in landscape architecture and 5.5 in planning, so the T & P votes are done at a 3:1 ratio. Other challenges have been a Ph.D. versus a Master as a terminal degree for faculty and not having a common definition of what research is.

The department head did not feel that the merger offered any curricular advantages. Landscape Architecture students take one planning course and planning students take three landscape architecture courses. He also felt that the merger did not increase collaborative faculty research. While the program is ranked in the top ten in the country, the department head attributes this to the strength in their construction curricula.

Clemson University - Department of Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture

Dan Nadenicek, Past Department Head

The merger of the Department of Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture at Clemson University was easier because the merging units were not departments. The Chair is responsible for the budget and physical planning, while program directors are in charge of teaching assignments and curricular issues. Unlike Kansas State, the merger has increased opportunities for more collaborative research and has enhanced scholarship. The joint T & P process has worked between the units. Their T & P guidelines focus on nationally significant and peer reviewed work, while the product itself does not matter.

The department head thought that the merger was generally successful. He believes that much of the success depends on personalities. From a curricular standpoint, commonalities need to be found to offer joint courses and that this is where efficiencies are found, not by reducing FTEs. A track like Urban Design could be an important common thread.

Arizona State University

Ken Brooks, Director of School of Planning and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

In the past decade, Ken Brooks has witnessed more landscape architecture and planning programs merge than separate, but “most have been more like living together than a marriage and very few were shotgun weddings like Michigan State.”

Most started out as a cost saving measure but in the end were not. At Arizona State, the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning merged when the Bachelor of Landscape Architecture was a small emerging program. The program worked well while Fritz Steiner was there but not after he left. Then the dean moved the LA program out of planning and in with architecture, where it lost its identity to the architecture program. The situation has improved now that the program has an Urban Design focus and the last three hires have dual degrees.

Ken Brooks believes that to be most successful, mergers need to create a new hybrid with activities that are interdependent, so that without the merged program, new specializations would not exist, such as urban design, environmental studies, housing and community design, etc., where design and policy are intertwined. He also believes that interdisciplinary activities need to be recognized and rewarded.

He recommends that faculty need to identify all common values and develop a shared vision and mission for the program. In identifying their commonalities, it is also important that they recognize their differences. He believes that T & P criteria should not describe performances but instead describe outputs that are beneficial and have contributed to the body of knowledge of their discipline.

In Florida, he thinks we should capitalize on the fact that the state is in the top five in the nation regarding environmental policies and where licensure for landscape architects is more rigorous than most states because of those policies. He sees that we have a unique opportunity to design a program that integrates design with policy and that can better address ways to make a difference in the state of Florida. He believes that this type of program could put us on the map and that University administrators tend to be more amenable to grow and support that kind of program.

Appendix 4: Merger Report on Centers & Research Opportunities

R. Steiner, K. Thompson

MERGER REPORT ON CENTERS & RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

Introduction

The merger of the Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning programs offers expanded opportunities for collaboration by both strengthening existing Centers and by strengthening the collaborative associations that contribute to the formation of new Centers.

Existing Centers between the Units

At present there are four centers that exist between the two programs: (1) the Center for Building Better Communities (CBBC) – Gene Boles is Director; (2) the GeoFacilities Planning and Information Research (GeoPlan) Center – Paul Zwick is Director; (3) the Center for Health and the Built Environment (CHBE) – Ruth Steiner is Director; and (4) TROPARC – Center for Planning and Design in the Americas – Joseli Macedo is Director. These Centers are active on varying levels with project that have benefitted from collaborations between faculty resident in each of the units to be merged.

Existing Centers within the College

In addition to the four centers identified between the units there are an additional four centers housed in the College that provide a range of opportunities for faculty and students to collaborate on projects: (1) the Powell Center for Construction and Environment (issues of sustainability in the built environment), Charles Kibert is Director (2) the Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing (with existing collaborations with the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Bob Stroh is Director; (3) Center for World Heritage Research and Stewardship – Roy Graham is director; and (4) Center for Collective Protection in the Built Environment – Kevin Grosskopf is director.

This document describes the opportunities for collaboration between the two departments; thus, it will focus on the existing centers that are directed by faculty members from one of the two affected departments. In this case, all four of the centers are lead by faculty in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

Opportunities for Collaboration

The role of centers is to support the educational mission of multiple faculty members within the university. The educational mission is supported by involving faculty in the areas of teaching, research and service. In addition, the mission of outreach is an important part of the centers. Each center has its own distinct means of addressing these three areas. For example, the CBBC is more focused on research and outreach, while the CHBE is more focused on research. Initial thoughts about how the centers might support the research, teaching, service and outreach activities of the faculties of a combined Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning are described below.

Center for Building Better Communities

(adapted from the Center's website) The Center for Building Better Communities provides service learning and research opportunities in economic and community development. Current specialization includes Economic Development, Housing, and Historic Preservation. Opportunities exist to merge with scholarship interests in the Landscape Architecture Unit to include Sustainable Communities and the Design and Planning of Community Landscapes at the Regional and Village scales.

Center for Health and the Built Environment

The CHBE is currently preparing a strategic plan as a part of the selection of a new Director. Under the previous Director, the Center engaged in limited activities mostly related to outreach and participation in the University's Healthy Gators Initiative. Under the new Director, the Center is looking to focus more heavily on research. The new Director is participating in two research initiatives across the campus: (1) the formation of a Center on Health Disparities; and (2) participation in a related learning community on childhood obesity. The Center Director recently joined the Healthy Gator initiative. The research initiatives of the center have largely focused on policies and programs that affect the decision of individuals to walk or bicycle. Many opportunities exist to extend this research with faculty from the merged departments. Examples of these collaborations include the design of the physical environment in cities, neighborhoods and rural communities, the health effects of parks and open spaces, reductions in water pollution resulting from green roofs and other forms of low-impact development (LID).

GeoPlan

The GeoPlan Center is involved in software development and application of GIS technology in urban and regional planning. GeoPlan has been involved in research with civil and environmental engineering, computer sciences, building construction, real estate, landscape architecture, wildlife sciences, geography, ecology, and systems ecology. Currently the GeoPlan Center is involved in the development and management of databases for a variety of research for the Florida Department of Transportation, the National Science Foundation, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the East Central Florida Regional Planning Council. Opportunities for cross-disciplinary research using the GeoPlan Center include large-scale landscape planning, development of database systems and analytical tools for a variety of planning and landscape architecture applications.

TROPARC

(adapted from the Center's website) TROPARC's mission has historically been to develop and advance environmental planning and design in the neotropical region of the America's through research, projects, and education. Through recent initiatives within the College there may be reason and opportunity to expand the focus of this program to include other tropical regions including Indonesia and Northern Australia.

The neotropical world is facing increasing demand for environmental planning and design. Drawing on UF's teaching, research and service experience, TROPARC can play a key role in assisting the region with this expertise. In addition, we are uniquely positioned biogeographically. Florida is the only state in the Continental United States with a tropical climate and the entire state is located in the humid subtropics.

The merger highlights unique opportunities for the Center to expand its service, service-learning, teaching and research offerings through initiatives that combine policy development with the design and planning of the physical environment in the regions in which the Center operates.

Other existing Centers within the College that may additionally offer expanded opportunities for collaboration include:

Powell Center for Construction and Environment

The mission of the Powell Center for Construction and Environment is to foster the implementation of sustainability principles into the creation of the built environment internationally. This includes insuring resources such as energy, water, materials and land are utilized efficiently and that renewable and recyclable resources are emphasized.

In accordance with the mission of the Powell Center to foster the implementation of sustainability principles into the creation of the built environment, activities at the center focuses mainly on the following

- Reclaimed Water
- Building Energy Analysis
- Life Cycle Analysis
- Industrial and Construction Ecology
- Green Building Materials
- Deconstruction and Building Materials Reuse
- Sustainable Architecture
- Urban and Community Planning
- Sustainability Indicators

Shimberg Center for Affordable Housing

The Shimberg Center, working with the UF County Extension Service, has constructed a state wide network of regional Windstorm Damage Mitigation Training and Demonstration Centers. Education and outreach programs are developed for audiences ranging from craftsmen and designers to builders, building officials and the public. Topics include the Florida building code, residential roofing, tree damage, termites, energy, insulation, green construction, indoor air quality, moisture control, HVAC ducting, lighting, window systems, wildlife habitat and lead-based paint.

World Heritage Research and Stewardship Center focuses on the following mission: to create programs, professional projects and public education initiatives in heritage conservation; support conservation objectives through management of resources including historic structures, landscapes, archives, collections, ethnic/ cultural traditions and practices, historical sites, and natural resources; and support public and private groups that work in the heritage tourism and conservation field.

Center for Collective Protection in the Built Environment

The center's mission is to develop technology, planning and design guidance to enhance the Nation's ability to mitigate the consequences of natural and human-caused hazards within the built environment. Among other hazards, the center conducts research on flooding and hurricanes which impact landscape and the built environment. Examples of collaboration may include the use of geospatial technology and other simulation tools to model the impact of these hazards to support future large-scale landscape and urban planning efforts.

Conclusion

Of the eight centers that are currently operating within the College of Design, Construction and Planning, four of these are particularly suited to collaboration between the Landscape Architecture and the Urban and Regional Planning units. At present, these four centers operate at varying levels of engagement with recent changes in at least one (Center for Health and the Built Environment) promising to invigorate activity that may benefit more directly from collaborative engagement between the units. Other Centers within the College are also poised to benefit from combined contributions emerging from the strengthened collaboration anticipated from the merger of the two units.

Appendix 5: DCP Constitutional Issues

R. Macleod

11.14.08

New School Task Force: Constitutional Issues

A review of constitutional issues emerging from the proposed New School combining the existing Departments of Urban & Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture center around issues of representation and administrative structure. The make up of Faculty Council and College Committees are addressed in Article II of the DCP Constitution. Issues of Administrative Structure are addressed in Articles III and IV. The procedures for establishing, ending or consolidating a department or school is addressed in Article IV, Section 4. Issues of Tenure and Promotion are addressed in Article V. The structure of administrative searches (Chair/Director) is addressed in Article VI. Following below are excerpted portions of the constitution with comments and possible concerns listed in red text.

ARTICLE II – The Faculty

Section 5 – Faculty Council and Committees

A. Faculty Council

2. Governing Rules of the Faculty Council

a. **Membership.** The Faculty Council shall consist of eight elected faculty members apportioned among the academic units on the basis of the number of college faculty in the unit with each unit having at least one member.

Will the make-up of the Faculty Council Change? Will the New School have one or two members? The number of faculty should be reviewed. If two members are apportioned to the New School, will each unit - URP and LAE - elect one representative or will the New School elect two members from the entire School faculty with the possibility of two members coming from one of the two existing departments?

B. College Faculty Committees

All College committees, except ad hoc committees, unless otherwise stated in this Constitution, will be composed of one elected or appointed member from each school or department. Unless specified, all committee memberships shall be for one year.

- 1. College Curriculum Committee.**
- 2. College Tenure and Promotion Committee.**
- 3. College Ph.D. Committee.**
- 4. College Computer and Technology Committee.**
- 5. College Ad Hoc Committees.**

The language “one elected or appointed member from each school of department” would seem to allow membership from both URP and LAE can be maintained. Will there be any concern about the New School having two representatives to other Schools’ single representative?

ARTICLE III- Administrative Structure of the College

Section 3 – Chairs and Directors

Each department and school within the College shall have a Chair or Director. Chairs or Directors shall be appointed by the Dean. Directors and chairs shall serve as the chief academic and administrative officers of the department or school and shall, at the same time hold academic rank in that department or school. A director or chair is responsible to the Dean for the administration of the school or department and is responsible to the faculty for the making and execution of school or department policy.

This matter will be addressed through the administrative structure of the New School. Will it have both a School Director and Department Chairs? How will the structure impact the make up of the Deans’ Administrative Council (Article III / Section 4)? What will be the responsibilities of Chairs and Directors (Article III / Section 3 A-D) should both positions exist in the New School structure?

ARTICLE IV – Schools, Departments, Programs, Centers and Institutes

Section 1 - Departments and Schools

A. The faculty shall be organized into departments and schools for purposes of program development and implementation. The units of the College of Design, Construction and Planning are:

- (1) The School of Architecture,
- (2) The M. E. Rinker, Sr., School of Building Construction,
- (3) The Department of Interior Design,
- (4) The Department of Landscape Architecture, and
- (5) The Department of Urban and Regional Planning.

B. Each college department and school shall have a Chair/Director.

The make up of the College will be revised per the structure of the New School. The New School will be the first DCP School to have multiple Departments within its structure.

ARTICLE V – Tenure and Promotion

The structure of Tenure and Promotion as defined by the relationship between the URP and LAE units within the New School should be an issue of concern. Clarifying the standards and expectations as well as voting mechanisms should be defined in the formation of the New School.

ARTICLE VI – Searches and Appointments

Section 3 – Appointment of Directors and Chairs

Searches for department chairs or school directors shall be started by the dean establish-

ing a search committee in consultation with the department or school in which the faculty

member shall hold academic rank.

Will the Dean continue to initiate searches for both Director and Chair should both positions exist in the New School administrative structure?

Appendix 6: Task Force Time Frame

M. Portillo

New School Task Force Timeframe

September 10	Meeting with Landscape Architecture Faculty to discuss the following issues: Core identity of the department, Potential synergies in the merger Potential efficiencies from the merger Concerns
September 15	Charge to the New School Task force written and distributed to DCP faculty by Dean Silver
September 19	Meeting with Urban & Regional Planning Faculty to discuss the following issues: Core identity of the department Potential synergies in the merger Potential efficiencies from the merger Concerns
September 26	Meeting with the LA + URP Planning Faculties to move the discussion further and define shared potentials and concerns
October 9	Meeting with LA + URP key Staff to discuss the merge and ideas related to Staff roles, preferences, and potentials for efficiencies and concerns
October 14	Meeting with the Dean Chris Silver and LA + URP Faculties To move the discussion further and define shared potentials and concerns
October 21	Meeting with two LA advisory board members on the merger
November 20	Task Force presents report to Dean Silver Distribution will occur to the URP and LA faculties and staff, Faculty Council, DCP faculty