

## **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"> <li>1. Graduate Program in Community &amp; Regional Planning,</li> <li>2. Graduate Program in Landscape Architecture,</li> <li>3. Graduate Program in Urban Design,</li> <li>4. Graduate Program in Sustainable Design,</li> <li>5. Graduate Program in Historic Preservation,</li> </ol> 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"> <li>1. Bachelors of Science in Urban &amp; Regional Science</li> <li>2. Bachelor of Landscape Architecture</li> <li>3. Master of Landscape Architecture</li> <li>4. Master of Land Development</li> <li>5. Master of Urban Planning</li> <li>6. Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Science</li> </ol>	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"> <li>1. Graduate only: 4+2 Masters Program,</li> <li>2. All students enter as freshman in a common "Environmental design" curricula,</li> <li>3. ARC, IND and LAE second year in discipline,</li> <li>4. Last four years are in the Masters Program</li> </ol>	<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"> <li>1. Graduate and Undergraduate</li> <li>2. BS in Design, Arch. Studies</li> <li>3. BS in Landscape Architecture</li> <li>4. MARCH</li> <li>5. MA/MBA (bus. admin)</li> <li>6. MLA</li> <li>7. MSBD (building design)</li> <li>8. MSUD</li> </ol>	<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"> <li>1. Master in City &amp; Regional Planning</li> <li>2. BLA</li> </ol> <p>Revised structure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MLA</li> <li>2. Master in Historic Preservation</li> <li>3. Master in Real Estate</li> <li>4. Ph.D.</li> </ol>	<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