

May 24, 2012

SITE VISIT REPORT

School of City and Regional Planning

College of Architecture

Georgia Institute of Technology

Master of City and Regional Planning

March 3-7, 2012

Part I. List of Site Visitors and Their Affiliations

Chair

John R. Mullin, Ph.D., FAICP
Dean of the Graduate School
514 Goodell Building
140 Hicks Way
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003
jmullin@provost.umass.edu
413/545-5271 (voice)

Second Educator

Randall Crane
Professor
Luskin School of Public Affairs
Department of Urban Planning
3250 Public Affairs Building
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1656
crane@ucla.edu
310/951-3576 (Voice)

Practitioner

Jeanette Dinwiddie-Moore
Owner, Dinwiddie & Associates
17 Hillcrest Court
Oakland, CA 94619-2411
dinwidd@attglobal.net
510/531-4150 (voice)

Part II. Site Visit Schedule

Monday, March 5, 2012

8:45 AM-9:45 AM: Bruce Stiftel, FAICP, Professor and Chair, SCaRP; Brian Stone, Associate Professor and MCRP Program Director
9:45 AM – 10:15 AM: Alan Balfour, Dean, College of Architecture
10:30 AM-11:00 AM: G.P. (“Bud”) Peterson, President; Rafael Bras, Provost and Executive Vice President
11:15 AM-11:45 PM: Meeting with APA Chapter Officers:
12:00 PM-1:30 PM: Lunch with Alumni
1:45 PM-2:10 PM: Harley Etienne, Assistant Professor
2:10 PM-2:35 PM: Nisha Botchwey, Associate Professor
Break
2:45 PM – 3:45 PM: Tour of program facilities
4:00 PM – 4:45 PM: Meeting with MCRP students
5:15 PM-6:00 PM: Meeting with area employers:

Tuesday, March 6, 2012

7:45 AM – 8:30 AM Breakfast with Research Center Directors: Catherine Ross, Harry West Professor of City and Regional Planning and Director, Center for Quality Growth and Regional Development (CQGRD), Coordinator Adjo Amekudzi, Associate Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering (representing the Georgia Transportation Institute); David Bridges, Director, Innovation Partners, GT Enterprise Innovation Institute Subhro Guhathakurta, Professor and Director, Center for Geographic Information Systems (CGIS)
8:45 AM-9:45 AM: Review of student work
9:45 AM-10:10 AM: Perry Yang, Associate Professor
10:10 AM-10:35 AM: Michael Elliott, Associate Professor and Associate Director, CQGRD
Break
10:45 AM-11:45 AM: Cognate School Chairs: Daniel Castro-Lacouture, Associate Professor and Chair, School of Building Construction; Karen Gibler, Associate Professor, Department of Real Estate, Georgia State University; Diana Hicks, Professor and Chair, School of Public Policy; George Johnston, Professor and Chair, School of Architecture; Richard Laub, Senior Lecturer and Director, Master of Heritage Preservation Program, Georgia State University; Ryan Rowberry, Assistant Professor of Law, Georgia State University (representing Dean Steven Kaminshine) Katja Weber, Associate Professor and Interim Chair, School of International Affairs Ward O. Winer, PE, Regents Professor Emeritus and Interim Chair, School of Civil and Environmental Engineering
11:45 AM – 1:15 PM: Lunch with Part-time and Affiliated faculty
1:15 PM – 1:45 PM: Jiawen Yang, Assistant Professor
1:45 PM-2:15 PM: Dan Immergluck, Professor
2:15 PM-2:45 PM: Steven French, FAICP, McKenney Professor and Associate Dean for Research
Break
3:00 PM-3:30 PM: Nancey Green Leigh, FAICP, Professor and PhD Program Director
3:30 PM-4:00 PM: Michael Dobbins, AICP, FAIA, Professor of Practice
4:00 PM-4:30 PM: William Drummond, Associate Professor
4:30 PM-5:00 PM: Career Services Staff

Wednesday, March 7, 2012

8:30 AM-9:30 AM: Exit Meeting with School Chair Bruce Stiftel and Program Director Brian Stone
9:30 AM – 10:30 AM: Exit meeting with Dean Balfour
11:00 AM-11:45 AM: Exit Meeting: Provost and Executive Vice President Rafael Bras; Senior Vice Provost Anderson Smith, Academic Affairs; Vice Provost Ray Vito, Graduate Studies and Faculty Affairs; Vice Provost Catherine Murray-Rust, Learning Excellence; President’s Conference Room, Carnegie Building

Part III. A. Site Visit Report Checklist

CRITERIA and GUIDELINES*	Met	Partially	Not
1. Mission, Goals and Objectives			
1.1 Statement	X		
1.2 Focus	X		
1.3 Clarity	X		
Guideline: Specific Objectives	X		
1.4 Academic Excellence	X		
1.5 Progress	X		
1.6 Dissemination	X		
1.7 Assessment and Participation	X		
1.8 Diversity		X	
1.9 Educational Outcomes	X		
2. Institutional Relations			
2.1 Opportunities within the Institution	X		
2.2 Contribution to the Institution	X		
3. Academic Autonomy and Governance			
3.1 Administrative Location	X		
Guideline: Department or School	X		
3.2 Program Identity	X		
3.3 Program Autonomy	X		
Guideline: Administrator's Reporting Pattern	X		
Guideline: Independent Entity	X		
3.4 Governance	X		
Guideline: Minimum 1 Full Professor Rank	X		
Guideline: Minimum 2 Assistant Professor Rank			
3.5 Participation in Governance	X		
Guideline: Responsiveness	X		
3.6 Program Leadership (Administration)	X		
4. Curriculum			
4.1 Relation to Mission, Goals and Objectives	X		
4.2 Components: Knowledge, Skills and Values			
4.2.1 Human Settlement	X		
4.2.1(a) Social Sciences	X		
4.2.1(b) Environmental Sciences	X		
4.2.1(c) Design Arts	X		
4.2.1(d) Legal Studies	X		
4.2.2 History and Contemporary Planning Practice	X		
4.2.2(a) Purpose and Meaning of Planning	X		
4.2.2(b) History of Urban Planning	X		
4.2.2(c) Economic, Social and Political Institutions	X		
4.2.2(d) Methods and Tools	X		
4.2.2(e) Creation, Use and Knowledge of Plans	X		

CRITERIA and GUIDELINES*	Met	Partially	Not
4.2.2(f) Adoption, Administration and Implementation of	X		
4.2.2(g) Equity and Social Justice	X		
4.2.2(h) Environmental Planning and Resource Assessment	X		
4.2.3 Practice of Planning	X		
4.2.3(a) Problem Solving Skills	X		
4.2.3(b) Research Skills	X		
4.2.3(c) Written, Oral and Graphic Communication Skills	X		
4.2.3(d) Numerical Reasoning and Computation Skills	X		
4.2.3(e) Collaboration, Mediation, Interpretation and	X		
4.2.3(f) Creation of Plans, Programs and Projects	X		
4.2.3(g) Anticipation of Future Changes	X		
4.2.3(h) Techniques for the Adoption and Implementation of	X		
4.2.3(i) Working with Diverse Communities	X		
4.2.4 Values and Ethics	X		
4.2.4(a) Discriminating Among Competing Goals	X		
4.2.4(b) Forms of Decision Making	X		
4.2.4(c) Social, Historical and Ecological Legacies	X		
4.2.5 Specializations (Optional)	X		
5. Faculty Resources and Composition			
5.1 Customary Expectations	X		
5.2 Qualifications	X		
Guideline: 5.2.1 Educational Diversity	X		
Guideline: 5.2.2 Educational and Professional Attainment	X		
Guideline: 5.2.3 Practitioners	X		
Guideline: 5.2.4 Adjuncts, Lecturers and Guest Speakers	X		
Guideline: 5.2.5 Planning Predominance	X		
5.3 Faculty Recruitment and Composition	X		
5.4 Continuing Academic and Professional Development	X		
5.5 Size			
Guideline: One Degree: Minimum of Five FTEs	X		
Guideline: Two Degrees: Minimum of Seven FTEs	X		
5.6 Concentration of Resources	X		
5.7 Student/Faculty Ratio			
Guideline: Graduate Program: 10:1 students/faculty	X		
Guideline: Undergraduate Program: 15:1 students/faculty	X		
6. Teaching, Advising and Student Services			
6.1 Teaching Quality	X		
6.2 Faculty Qualifications	X		
Guideline: Continuing Association	X		
Guideline: Core Curriculum Teaching	X		
6.3 Specializations (Optional)	X		
6.4 Course Scheduling	X		
Guideline: Regularity of Offerings	X		

CRITERIA and GUIDELINES*	Met	Partially	Not
6.5 Advising	X		
6.6 Placement		X	
6.7 Financial Aid	X		
7. Research and Scholarly Activities			
7.1 Policy	X		
Guideline: Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Practices	X		
Guideline: Instructional Load, Release Time and Leave	X		
7.2 Quality	X		
Guideline: 7.2.1 Link with Teaching	X		
Guideline: 7.2.2 Link to Practice	X		
Guideline: 7.2.3 Dissemination	X		
8. Public and Professional Service			
8.1 Policy	X		
8.2 Quality	X		
Guideline: 8.2.1 Link with Teaching	X		
Guideline: 8.2.2 Link to Professional and Scholarly	X		
8.3 Continuing Education	X		
9. Students			
9.1 Quality	X		
9.2 Admission Standards	X		
Guideline: Previous Performance, etc.	X		
9.3 Size	X		
9.4 Recruitment and Composition	X		
10. Institutional Resources			
10.1 Library and Information Services	X		
10.2 Physical Facilities	X		
10.3 Computer Capabilities	X		
10.4 Financial Resources	X		
Guideline: External Resources	X		
Guideline: Contact with Alumni	X		
11. Administrative and Fair Practices			
11.1 Student and Faculty Grievance Procedures	X		
11.2 Non-discrimination	X		
11.3 Inclusivity	X		
11.4 Accurate and Comprehensive Information	X		
11.5 Confidentiality of Student Records	X		
11.6 On-going Monitoring and Evaluation	X		

*All subjects listed are criteria unless otherwise noted.

Part III. B. 1 Overall Assessment of the Program

Below is the study team's snapshot of the overall assessment of the Program. Please note that the Program has no basic, pervasive problems: It is one of the strongest Programs members of the Site Visit Team (SVT) have ever evaluated.

The Masters of City Planning Program, with few exceptions, can serve as a model of a 21st century Tier One, AAU University's planning Program. In its last accreditation report the SVT found that the Program met all criteria and guidelines. While we have found two criteria that are "partially met," it is the SVT's opinion that this Program has continued to improve and is well positioned to take a place among the very best of graduate planning Programs in the nation. All associated with the Program deserve accolades. There are many parts of the Program that clearly deserve to be considered outstanding. They include the following:

- Its vision, goals and objectives are clear, widely embraced by the faculty, and provide the foundation for critical decisions.
- Its vision is in line with that of the Institute and of the College of Architecture. Indeed its goal to meld an internationally orientated program with a top rated national ranking flow directly from the President's vision through the College to the Program.
- The Program's leadership has embraced the concepts of scholarly excellence, outreach aspiration to the community and the strongest possible professional participation.
- The Program, while having an impressive scholarly orientation, is also strongly committed to APA and AICP.
- The Program's leadership is committed to establishing an input-output-outcomes system of management. While still new, it is on track to clearly show the results of these efforts.
- Following the Institute's growing commitment to a world perspective, its faculty members have been active throughout the globe. What's more, there are now opportunities for students to gain international experiences as part of the Program.
- The faculty continually publish in the best journals, write scholarly works and participate at the highest possible level in their professional associations.
- The Program is considered as being a critical participant in Atlanta's efforts to improve its quality of life. The faculty and students are called on regularly to assist in the city's planning activities.
- The Program has committed itself to social justice planning in Atlanta through its studies and technical assistance. There is even a student-run a program committed to Social Justice that undertakes planning assistance in the City's poorest areas as an extracurricular activity.
- The Program is well recognized within the University. Indeed, one of its studio projects was highlighted by the President in a recent "State of the University" presentation.
- The scholarly visibility of the faculty is steadily improving with several national and international leaders in their fields present and active. Having just hosted the flagship journal in planning for 5 years, the Program will now host the ACSP journal JPER for a term. This remarkable and perhaps unique achievement of a PAB accredited program and signals both a willingness for the senior administration to support scholarly leadership in planning and for the planning faculty to assume that leadership.
- The Program is well positioned to become a national leader on such emerging issues as sustainability, classism and smart growth.

- The Program was recently awarded a national transportation center designation-one of only ten in the nation.

Part III B. 2 Overview-Outcomes Assessment

- The Program has strongly embraced the position of establishing evaluation matrices based upon an “input-output-outcomes” approach.
- In terms of inputs, it has provided extensive evaluative materials on diversity factors for students and faculty members, the quality of students, internship placement, student to faculty ratios, course evaluations and financial assistance.
- In terms of student outputs there is recent data concerning program satisfaction from graduates and alumni.
- In terms of outcomes there is data that analyzes the work of the faculty.

The results of its assessment are quite telling. Our summary is the following:

- The students are quite satisfied with the quality of their courses and the preparation of the faculty.
- The faculty members have a strong record of achievement in terms of scholarly outcomes.
- The local chapter of the APA is quite pleased with the Program’s involvement in local activities.
- While working hard to be a comprehensively diverse program, it has not achieved this goal.
- While its co-op placement program is effective, it needs attention in terms of its size, financial management and the responsibilities of students.
- The placement of students appears to be ad-hoc and based on faculty contacts rather than from the University’s placement service.
- The students are finding jobs but they are largely local. While we understand that Atlanta is a great place to live and work, and many students are hired by local employers, only one-third of the recent graduates secured jobs outside of Georgia which is somewhat lower than one would expect of a nationally orientated university.

Part III. C. 1. Criteria and Guidelines MET

The following criteria were assessed as fully met by the Site Visit Team (SVT) based on evidence contained in the Self-Study Report and information obtained during the Site Visit (SV).

1. Mission, Goals and Objectives

- 1.1 Statement
- 1.2 Focus
- 1.3 Clarity
 - Guideline: Specific Objectives
- 1.4 Academic Excellence
- 1.5 Progress
- 1.6 Dissemination
- 1.7 Assessment and Participation
- 1.9 Educational Outcomes

2. Institutional Relations

- 2.1 Opportunities within the Institution
- 2.2 Contribution to the Institution

3. Academic Autonomy and Governance

- 3.1 Administrative Location
 - Guideline: Department or School
- 3.2 Program Identity
- 3.3 Program Autonomy
 - Guideline: Administrator's Reporting Pattern
 - Guideline: Independent Entity
- 3.4 Governance
 - Guideline: Minimum 1 Full Professor Rank
 - Guideline: Minimum 2 Assistant Professor Rank
- 3.5 Participation in Governance
 - Guideline: Responsiveness
- 3.6 Program Leadership (Administration)

4. Curriculum

- 4.1 Relation to Mission, Goals and Objectives
- 4.2 Components: Knowledge, Skills and Values
 - 4.2.1 Human Settlement
 - 4.2.1(a) Social Sciences
 - 4.2.1(b) Environmental Sciences
 - 4.2.1(c) Design Arts
 - 4.2.1(d) Legal Studies
 - 4.2.2 History and Contemporary Planning Practice
 - 4.2.2(a) Purpose and Meaning of Planning
 - 4.2.2(b) History of Urban Planning
 - 4.2.2(c) Economic, Social and Political Institutions

- 4.2.2(d) Methods and Tools
- 4.2.2(e) Creation, Use and Knowledge of Plans
- 4.2.2(f) Adoption, Administration and Implementation of Plans
- 4.2.2(g) Equity and Social Justice
- 4.2.2(h) Environmental Planning and Resource Assessment
- 4.2.3 Practice of Planning
 - 4.2.3(a) Problem Solving Skills
 - 4.2.3(b) Research Skills
 - 4.2.3(c) Written, Oral and Graphic Communication Skills
 - 4.2.3(d) Numerical Reasoning and Computation Skills
 - 4.2.3(e) Collaboration, Mediation, Interpretation and Negotiation
 - 4.2.3(f) Creation of Plans, Programs and Projects
 - 4.2.3(g) Anticipation of Future Changes
 - 4.2.3(h) Techniques for the Adoption and Implementation of Plans
 - 4.2.3(i) Working with Diverse Communities
- 4.2.4 Values and Ethics
 - 4.2.4(a) Discriminating Among Competing Goals
 - 4.2.4(b) Forms of Decision Making
 - 4.2.4(c) Social, Historical and Ecological Legacies
- 4.2.5 Specializations (Optional)

5. Faculty Resources and Composition

- 5.1 Customary Expectations
- 5.2 Qualifications
 - Guideline: 5.2.1 Educational Diversity
 - Guideline: 5.2.2 Educational and Professional Attainment
 - Guideline: 5.2.3 Practitioners
 - Guideline: 5.2.4 Adjuncts, Lecturers and Guest Speakers
 - Guideline: 5.2.5 Planning Predominance
- 5.3 Faculty Recruitment and Composition
- 5.4 Continuing Academic and Professional Development
- 5.5 Size
 - Guideline: One Degree: Minimum of Five FTEs
 - Guideline: Two Degrees: Minimum of Seven FTEs
- 5.6 Concentration of Resources
- 5.7 Student/Faculty Ratio
 - Guideline: Graduate Program: 10:1 students/faculty
 - Guideline: Undergraduate Program: 15:1 students/faculty

6. Teaching, Advising and Student Services

- 6.1 Teaching Quality
- 6.2 Faculty Qualifications
 - Guideline: Continuing Association
 - Guideline: Core Curriculum Teaching
- 6.3 Specializations (Optional)
- 6.4 Course Scheduling

Guideline: Regularity of Offerings

6.5 Advising

6.7 Financial Aid

7. Research and Scholarly Activities

7.1 Policy

Guideline: Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Practices and Mission

Guideline: Instructional Load, Release Time and Leave Opportunities

7.2 Quality

Guideline: 7.2.1 Link with Teaching

Guideline: 7.2.2 Link to Practice

Guideline: 7.2.3 Dissemination

8. Public and Professional Service

8.1 Policy

8.2 Quality

Guideline: 8.2.1 Link with Teaching

Guideline: 8.2.2 Link to Professional and Scholarly Communities

8.3 Continuing Education

9. Students

9.1 Quality

9.2 Admission Standards

Guideline: Previous Performance, etc.

9.3 Size

9.4 Recruitment and Composition

10. Institutional Resources

10.1 Library and Information Services

10.2 Physical Facilities

10.3 Computer Capabilities

10.4 Financial Resources

Guideline: External Resources

Guideline: Contact with Alumni

11. Administrative and Fair Practices

11.1 Student and Faculty Grievance Procedures

11.2 Non-discrimination

11.3 Inclusivity

11.4 Accurate and Comprehensive Information

11.5 Confidentiality of Student Records

11.6 On-going Monitoring and Evaluation

Part III. C. 2. Criteria and Guidelines Partially Met

The following criteria were assessed as fully met by the Site Visit Team (SVT) based on evidence contained in the Self-Study Report and information obtained during the Site Visit (SV).

1. Mission goals and Objectives

1.8 Diversity: While the Program has worked diligently to create a more diverse student body, and has made some progress since the last review, more work is needed. It is critical that it place renewed energy in its endeavors. As a first step, it is strongly recommended that it develop a program in connection with its three HBCU neighbors to attract Atlanta-based diversity students to the Program. This effort should be of the highest priority.

6. Teaching, Advising and Student Services

6.6 Placement: With the exception of the Co-op Program and the ad hoc efforts of the faculty, there is little attention to student placement on the part of the Institute's Placement Service. For a program that is, in the SVT's opinion, close to becoming one of the very best in the nation, it will have difficulty in obtaining an alumni presence that is truly national unless it gains professional assistance.

Part III. C. 3 Criteria and Guidelines Not Met

The Program has met or partially met all criteria and guidelines.

Part IV. Strengths of the Program

- The Program is closely aligned with the vision, mission goals and objectives of the University. There is an almost seamless flow from the senior administration to the dean and the Program. Moreover, the interaction is both top down and bottom up.
- The Program, through its outreach and studio work, is well-integrated in an ad hoc manner into the planning world of Greater Atlanta. This integration ranges from faculty work to classroom exercises, technical assistance and the volunteer activities of the students.
- Its location in the Institute enables the Program to draw on a wide range of affiliated disciplines ranging from architecture and urban design to building technology.
- Its faculty, regardless of rank, continues to be actively involved in grant writing, scholarly research and professional association work.
- The Program has added new strength through the recent hiring of two new faculty who help to make the faculty more diverse, contribute to the Program's healthy cities and community development efforts and continue the Program's high quality scholarly output.

Part V. Recommendations for Improvement

Other Areas of Enhancement

Introduction: We offer the following as our thoughts on how an excellent program can continue to grow and prosper in the coming years. We hope our thoughts are helpful.

Civic Engagement

The Program, as previously noted under “Strengths”, has had a long term involvement with Greater Atlanta. However, it is on an ad hoc basis. It has the potential for centralizing all of its efforts into an “Atlanta Compact.” By combining the technical assistance of the faculty, the work of its centers, studio and classroom activities, faculty and student research into a coordinated, sustained manner, the results could be most powerful. Further, by forming an advisory committee consisting of city and regional officials, the private sectors and the University administrators, its present “points of light” could become a “beam” on the most critical planning issues facing the city and region. All of the pieces seem to be in place. It only needs to be coordinated.

International Programs

The University, the College and the Program are all committed to internationalization. However, how this will grow in the future is unclear. We have learned that the University is developing strong ties in China, that the Dean has expressed great interest in the Far East and that the University has had a long term relationship in Europe. We have also learned of a recent studio in India and have noted the international activities of several faculty members. However, the activities are largely ad hoc and, as with civic engagement, are more individualistic activities than part of a clear direction. Given that the Program cannot be in all places at the same time, we urge the Program to undertake significant discussion on how it can be most effective in its efforts. This discussion should include, among others, answering the following questions:

- How can it expand its recruiting to attract more international students?
- How can it best serve the students who wish to maximize their education through international involvement?
- Is there a disconnect between the Dean’s direction (Asia) and the desires of the Program?
- Should the Program create strong formal ties with international universities?
- What are the funding requirements?

The Best and Brightest Students

The reputation of the Institute and the Program reflect excellence. The contributions of both are widely respected. The accomplishments of the faculty in research and scholarly writing are excellent. Having written this, and noted the desire of both the University and the Program to enter the position of the very best in the academy, there is a need to address how best to attract the highest quality students.

The quality of the students, based upon their academic records, testing results and accomplishments is quite good. There are also some who are truly outstanding. Nonetheless,

they do not appear to have the characteristics of the highest achievers across the best universities in the United States.

If the Program wishes to constantly improve then it will have to attract a higher quality student. We expect this can be accomplished through national recruiting, improved financial packages (difficult in this time), greater student-faculty recruiting interaction and improved marketing.

We are quite optimistic that this can be achieved: The Program is almost there!

On the Curriculum

The minimum PAB criteria were certainly met. None of our interviews or review of the submitted materials reveals any deficiency regarding quality, goals or components. In addition, the "planning work experience" dimensions of the Program are particularly strong, with what appear to be consistently strong studio/applied group project courses (as well as regular internship placement, noted elsewhere in this document, even as the so-called co-op placements have fallen in number in recent years). Faculty and staff support of applied practice materials, student assessments of these experiences, and feedback from local employers, agencies and community organizations consistently and enthusiastically endorsed these efforts and their results.

Students report that the curriculum is demanding yet appropriately so and rewarding, especially in hindsight. They also report an extremely consistent teaching quality, availability and productivity.

Two issues raised were official program participation in student-initiated neighborhood-based volunteer activities not linked to the classroom, or indeed to faculty, and the variety of concentrations. Regarding the former, our interviews indicated that students were open to greater faculty and associated curriculum involvement in their neighborhood initiatives, especially to the extent that might leave them more sustainable. We do recommend, in the interest of providing constructive feedback beyond the PAB criteria, that the School explore means for leveraging this kind of promising student activity without co-opting it. Mechanisms that provide independent study credit for the experience are just one example.

On the Concentrations

The number of concentrations seems high as compared with other programs of its size. This was similarly raised as an issue in the 2005 review. That said, the School reported it was quite aware of the risks of spreading itself too thin in order to cover so many concentrations, and appears to be both monitoring the situation closely and managing that trade-off successfully. The students did not seem to feel the Program was promising more than it could competently offer. The prospective addition of a new concentration in planning/public health reflects this cautious approach.

There is no deficiency in this category. We do encourage faculty support of student-led initiatives in low-income Atlanta neighborhoods, where doing so does not compromise the integrity or effectiveness or student leadership opportunities of those initiatives. The new federally funded transportation center could additionally leverage several concentrations, such as

economic development and housing/community development, as well as provide planning library resources not now readily available to students. The activities of the School in variants of social justice planning, much of this applied locally, could be made more visible to both prospective students and to the scholarly community.

Faculty Resources and Composition

The faculty are a rich mix of very high academic records and extremely deep practitioner ranks. Further, the strengths offered by the College in urban design -- which requires the availability and interest of urban design faculty in Architecture -- is very high. Junior faculty hires have been strategic and successful on both scholarly and teaching grounds. The diversity of the faculty is quite high, though most minority faculty are at the moment in the untenured ranks. The junior faculty mentoring Program is reported to be unusually systematic.

Class sizes are reasonable, faculty are accessible to students, alum and local constituencies, and the average involvement of the faculty in the community appears very good, and often exceptionally good.

There remain opportunities for cross-campus and inter-university leveraging of teaching resources. We encourage the administration to continue to support these, especially in business, law, education and public health. In addition, while the explicit form of junior faculty mentoring is laudable, we do encourage the Program to continue to ensure that strong junior faculty are supported through the promotion process, both on-campus and in their national and international careers.

The Ph. D Positions

We noted the Program has established a relatively new Ph. D initiative (not subject to PAB review). As part of this effort, it anticipated receiving three new faculty lines. The Program, to date, has not been authorized to fill them. Given the economic climate, this is understandable. However, there is no doubt that a strong Ph.D program adds immense value to masters programs through student interactions and research opportunities. Moreover, we are concerned over the ability of the present faculty to meet the needs of both the master's program and the doctoral program over the long term without these new positions. A plan of phased growth is in order.

Continuing and Professional Education

Given the online capabilities of the Institute, the Program appears to be well-positioned to develop online education opportunities. The offerings could be used in a hybrid manner for its international initiatives with course offerings both abroad (online) and in summer (face-to-face) in Atlanta. Courses could also be offered to support local chapter activities and continuing education for AICP certification maintenance. Under appropriate agreements, many universities across the nation have found online offerings to dramatically expand their reach while gaining a positive financial return.

Conversations with the Other Programs in the College

We recognize that there is often a "looking inward" orientation of planning programs housed in colleges with a wide variety of interests. While the Georgia Tech Program does not fall into this category, there is need to constantly update the Institute leadership, the Dean and the other

department heads on the nature of planning, the accomplishments of the Program and its future direction. In one instance, one of the department heads explained that he really was unclear as to what the planning program was endeavoring to accomplish. In another instance, there was little knowledge of the work that the Program was undertaking in Atlanta. And, in a third, there was a lack of understanding of the best fit for the planning Program in terms of internationalization. It is difficult for us to make a recommendation based on random thoughts. However, positive, clear and transparent discussion of issues with peers and the leadership can be most fruitful.

On the Centers

The Program's centers are outstanding. Having written this, it is essential that they continue to be fully involved with the Program and not become separate fiefdoms. We have observed in other programs across the nation where this has actually happened. We have noted that the transportation center is distant from the building housing the Program and that it has its own library. Great care must be taken to insure that its resources can be used by all students and faculty.

The Georgia Tech Center for Economic Development

We have noted that Georgia Tech is the home of a United States Economic Development Agency University Center. In many places (i.e., Virginia Tech), such centers have close relations with planning programs. Interactions with this center could lead to assistantships and projects of mutual interest.

Advisory Boards

It may be to the Program's advantage to create two advisory committees. The first would be attracted from the Program's large pool of graduates. It would be charged with promoting the Program on a national level and assisting in fund-raising. The second would have a Greater Atlanta orientation and be charged with assisting the Program to develop directions that would best meet the needs of the faculty, students and the Atlanta Community.

Enhanced Marketing and Promotion

It is clear that the Program has had a number of great successes that few planning schools in the country can rival; however, the successes are not as broadly known and published as they should be to provide the School with the level of recognition and prominence that it deserves. The Program needs to be better at telling its story. The marketing of the Program needs to be vastly improved. The potential benefits of a highly developed self-promotion campaign could be tremendous. Greater national recognition of the Program's successes will also avail the Program to a higher caliber of potential students and funders.

Alumni Engagement

The Program has a tremendous resource in its alumni who could provide significant exposure and financial benefits. Its graduates are a "Who's Who of Atlanta movers and shakers." Many of its alumni are now in significant leadership roles. The Program needs to recruit the alumni to serve as ambassadors for the Program and leverage its alumni connections and leadership. For example, with over 1200 alumni through 2010, if 600 alumni connections were to make an annual scholarship pledge of \$50 to the School-this could potentially generate \$30,000 a year to help underwrite student expenses.

Co-ops, Work Programs and Student Financial Support

The Program has a strong employer and alumni base which supports the hiring of planning students. There are some improvements to the Program, the co-op and work programs that could make it more attractive to a larger potential employer base. They include having the students start their internships in the summer as opposed to the fall, and not requiring the full payment upfront and in one lump sum. The Program should explore these improves with its employer support base.

Fund-raising

The Institute's fund-raising efforts focus on large donors. Unfortunately there are few potential donors in the Program that have this characteristic. We believe that this approach represents lost opportunities. We urge the Program and the Dean to work together to determine how best to develop a campaign that matches the "giving" capabilities of its alums.

Diversity

Although the Program has stated that they will implement programs to attract minority students from the HBCUs, no concrete program strategies for accomplishing this objective have been implemented or established. Georgia Tech, as an institution, has recognized the promotion of diversity as an important element in enriching the intellectual and cultural perspective of the education experience and has made diversity management one of its highest institutional priorities by establishing an Office of the Vice Provost for Institute Diversity. Considering that the Program is located in a predominantly minority, metropolitan area with three HBCUs at its back door and considering that the inclusion of minorities and under-represented populations is one of the tenets of the planning profession, and considering that Black and Latino students are underrepresented in the Program, it needs to develop a concerted effort to increase the Black and Latino students and make this a top priority. Conversely, the Program has made great progress in achieving its diversity goals amongst the faculty and has recently hired several young professors who show great promise in continuing the high standards of academic rigor while strengthening and expanding the core specializations of the School with their work in healthy communities, community development, GIS and urban design.

Placement

The Institute's Placement and Career Services Office does very little to assist the Program. Discussions should be undertaken with administrators to determine the optimal means that students could, first, be placed in local internships and secondly hired for the most challenging and rewarding jobs across the nation. Without gaining assistance and direction from Placement/Career Services, the opportunity of building a national base of students will be more difficult.

Part VI. Addenda

A. Student Composition Data:

	Enrollment Status and Gender				
	Full-time		Part-time		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
STUDENTS - RACE AND ETHNICITY					
US Citizens and Permanent Residents Only					
<i>Race</i>					
White	32	32	2	1	67
Black or African American	5	3		1	9
American Indian or Alaska native					
Asian		2			2
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander					
Two or More Races	3	1			4
Unknown		1			1
Sub-Total (Citizens and Residents)	40	39	2	2	83
Foreign Students	3	7			10
Total Students	43	46	2	2	93
US Citizens and Permanent Residents Only					
<i>Ethnicity</i>					
Hispanic or Latino	1	2			3
not Hispanic or Latino	39	37	2	2	80

B. Faculty Composition Data:

FACULTY - RACE AND ETHNICITY	Teaching Status and Gender						
	Full-time in Planning Unit		Part-time in Planning Unit**		Adjunct		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	
US Citizens and Permanent Residents Only							
<i>Race</i>							
White	6	1	9	4	7	3	30
Black or African American		1	1		1		3
American Indian or Alaska native							
Asian	2		1	1			4
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander							
Some Other Race alone							
Two or More Races							
Unknown							
Sub-Total (Citizens and Residents)	8	2	11	5	8	3	37
Foreign			1				1
Total Faculty	8	2	12	5	8	3	38
US Citizens and Permanent Residents Only							
<i>Ethnicity</i>							
Hispanic or Latino							
not Hispanic or Latino	8	2	11	5	8	3	37

C. AICP Membership

Full-Time Faculty: 3; Part-Time Faculty: 2; Adjunct Faculty: 4; **Total: 9**

D. Teaching FTEs

Please provide the program's definition/formula for a full-time teaching load:

	FACULTY MEMBER NAME	STATUS	TEACHING FTE
1	William Drummond	A	.88
2	Steven French	A	.50
3	Subhrajit Guhathakurta	A	.00
4	Daniel Immergluck	A	.83
5	Nancy Green Leigh	A	.71
6	Catherine Ross	A	.50
7	Bruce Stiftel	A	.30
8	Brian Stone	A	.71
9	Jiawen Yang	A	.75
10	Douglas Allen	B	.25
11	Jennifer Clark	B	.25
12	Richard Dagenhart	B	.25
13	Michael Dobbins	B	.67
14	Ellen Dunham-Jones	B	.13
15	Michael Elliott	B	.71
16	Anthony Giarrusso	B	.67
17	Randall Guensler	B	.50
18	Barbara Lynch	B	.50
19	Michael Meyer	B	.50
20	Harley Etienne	B	.75
21	Subrahmanyam Muthukumar	B	.50
22	Arthi Rao	B	.13
23	Jason Vargo	B	.34
24	Harry West	B	.00
25	Perry Pei-Ju Yang	B	.75
26	Janet Youtie	B	.25
27	Jamie Cochran	B	.00
28	Thomas Debo	C	.38
29	Karen Leone De Nie	C	.13
30	Nickolas Faust	C	.25
31	David Haddow	C	.25
32	Edrick Harris	C	.25
33	Julian Juergensmeyer	C	.13
34	Larry Keating	C	.00
35	Mitchell Moody	C	.13
36	Liora Sahar	C	.25
37	David Sawicki	C	.13
38	Seth Weissman	C	.38
	TOTAL TEACHING FTEs		14.23

E. Student/Teaching Faculty Ratio

Part-time Student FTE calculation: 2 part-time students / 2 = 1.0 FTE

Student/Teaching Ratio calculation:

89 FTE full-time students + 1 FTE part-time students = 91 FTE total students

91 FTE students / 14.23 FTE faculty = 6.39 student/faculty ratio