

April 6, 2010

Site Visit Report

SITE VISIT REPORT

Graduate Program in Urban Planning

School of Architecture, Design & Planning

University of Kansas

Master of Urban Planning

March 1-3, 2010

Part I. List of Site Visitors and Their Affiliations

Chair

Fritz Wagner, Ph.D., FAICP
Dean Emeritus, College of Urban and Public Affairs
University of New Orleans
Presently, Research Professor
University of Washington
Department of Urban Design and Planning
348 Could Hall, Box 355734
Seattle, WA 98195-5734
Phone: 206-543-7459
Email: fwagner@u.washington.edu

Educator #2

Ruth L. Steiner, Ph. D.
Associate Professor
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Florida
PO Box 115706, 431 ARCH Bldg.
Gainesville, FL 32611
Phone: (352) 392-0997, ext. 431
Email: rsteiner@dcp.ufl.edu

Practitioner

David Salazar, AICP
Associate Vice President
Physical Planning and Facilities Management
California State University, Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90840-0127
Phone: 562-985-4131
E-mail: salazar@csulb.edu

Part II. Site Visit Schedule

Monday, March 1st

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------|
| 9:00-9:45 AM | Program Chair Interview | Jim Mayo |
| 9:45-10:30 AM | Dean Interview - John Gaunt | John Gaunt |
| 10:30-11:00 AM | Team Break | |
| 11:00-11:30 AM | Provost Interview | Danny Anderson |
| 11:30-11:45 | Team Break | |
| 11:45- 12:15 Noon | Faculty Interview | Stacey White |
| 12:15 Noon-1:30 PM | Working Lunch and Student Interviews | |
| 1:30-2:00 PM | Associate Dean Interview | Mike Swann |
| 2:00-2:30 PM | Faculty Interview | Kirk McClure |
| 2:30-3:00 PM | Team Break | |
| 3:00-3:30 PM | Faculty Interview | Bonnie Johnson |
| 3:30-4:00 PM | Faculty Interview | Phil Englehart |
| 4:00-5:00 PM | Tour of Facilities | Jim Mayo |
| | Meet Information Specialist (Computers) | Henry Troyer |
| | Meet Director, Architectural Resource Center | Dan Rolf |
| 4:30 PM | Team taken to hotel | Bonnie Johnson |

Tuesday, March 2nd

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------------|
| 9:00-9:30 AM | Part-Time Faculty Interview (Transportation) | Marcy Smalley |
| 9:30-10:30 AM | Review Student Work | |
| 10:30-11:00 AM | Interview - Architecture Department Chair | Keith Diaz-Moore |
| 11:00-11:30 AM | KU Library Bibliographer | Susan Craig |
| 11:30-11:45 AM | Interview - Design Department Chair | Lois Greene |
| 11:45-12:15 Noon | Team Break | |
| 12:15-1:30 PM | Working Lunch with Alumni | |
| 1:30-2:00 PM | Faculty Interview | Daniel Serda |
| 2:00-2:45 PM | Part-Time Instructors | |
| | Interview - Director, Transportation Research | |
| 2:45-3:15 PM | Institute | Bob Honea |
| | Kansas APA Chapter Members and | |
| 3:15-4:00 PM | Employers | |
| 4:00-5:00 PM | Planning Advisory Board Members | |
| 5:00 | Team taken to hotel | Stacey White |

Wednesday, March 3rd

| | | |
|----------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| 8:30-9:00 AM | Team Work Session | |
| 9:00-9:45 AM | Program Chair Interview | Jim Mayo |
| 9:45-10:00 AM | Team Work Session | |
| 10:00-10:30 AM | Dean Interview | John Gaunt |
| 10:30-11:00 AM | Team Work Session | |
| 11:00-11:30 AM | Chancellor/Provost Interview | Danny Anderson |

Part III. A. Site Visit Report Checklist

| CRITERIA and GUIDELINES* | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
|---|-----|---------------|---------|
| 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 | n/a | | |
| 3.4 Governance | X | | |
| Guideline: Minimum 1 Full Professor Rank | X | | |
| Guideline: Minimum 2 Assistant Professor Rank | X | | |
| 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 | | |
| 4.2.2(f) Adoption, Administration and Implementation of Plans | X | | |
| 4.2.2(g) Equity and Social Justice | X | | |

| CRITERIA and GUIDELINES* | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
|---|-----|---------------|---------|
| 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 Negotiation | 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 Plans | X | | |
| 4.2.3(i) Working with Diverse Communities | | X | |
| 4.2.4 Values and Ethics | | | |
| 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 | n/a | | |
| 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 | n/a | | |
| 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 | | |
| 6.5 Advising | X | | |
| 6.6 Placement | X | | |

| CRITERIA and GUIDELINES* | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
|---|-----|---------------|---------|
| 6.7 Financial Aid | | X | |
| 7. Research and Scholarly Activities | | | |
| 7.1 Policy | X | | |
| Guideline: Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Practices and Mission | X | | |
| Guideline: Instructional Load, Release Time and Leave Opportunities | 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 Communities | 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

The Self-Study Report was well written and organized, and provided the program's response to the criteria of the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) regarding the Master of Urban Planning program (MUP). The team conducted interviews during the Site Visit (see schedule) and found that the materials for the Self-Study Report were corroborated. The team learned about the areas of concentrations within the fine internship program that has been developed. We further heard about links with the Kansas City Design Center and the Transportation Research Institute.

Our interviews and review of the Self-Study Report confirm the MUP program's compliance with all but seven PAB criteria. While the team noted several "Partially Met" criteria, it offers a number of recommendations to enhance the program. The MUP Program has continued to make significant progress since its last PAB accreditation review. It has successfully addressed the partially met criteria in the previous review.

Overall, the department provides a positive framework for the MUP program to succeed. The program benefits from positive leadership by the Chair and has the support of the Dean. Employers all have high regard for the program, and have benefited in some tangible way. In addition, the program and its faculty work well in collaboration with each other and other programs in the University, and planning-related agencies throughout the State of Kansas and the Kansas City area.

The students are enthusiastic and positive about the program. The program has increased the standards for admissions, which appears to have improved its quality. Employers were very positive about the students' critical thinking skills, and analytical, written, and verbal communications skills. The student internship program has produced positive results for both the students and the agencies supporting them. The students were highly regarded by the employers we met and were often hired for permanent positions.

The alumni we met were very supportive of the program. A significant number have served and are serving as members of the Planning Advisory Board and are called on as guest lecturers. The Kansas APA Chapter and Kansas City Section members we heard from were also supportive of the program. The association with the practicing planning professionals enhanced and strengthened the program and created employment opportunities for graduates. Moreover, the strong support of the Planning Advisory Board is seen as a very positive force within the department.

In closing, the team found that the MUP program is making appositive strides to enhance its curriculum and facilities within the school and in collaboration with other units in the university. The program was found to have a good balance between theory and practice and is well respected. The visibility of the MUP program and its faculty within the state and metro Kansas City area were noted.

Overall, the MUP program is doing an admirable job in training its students and is serving its constituencies well. It has achieved a fine reputation.

Part III. B.2. Overview – Outcomes Assessment

The team reviewed the department's Outcomes Assessment and believes that they have provided a complete assessment of the program.

Part III. C. 1 Criteria and Guidelines

Met

The following criteria are deemed “met” based on information and evidence contained in the Self-Study Report, and discussions with faculty, students and alumni:

1. Mission, Goals and Objectives

- 1.1 Statement
- 1.2 Focus
- 1.3 Clarity
- 1.4 Academic Excellence
- 1.5 Progress
- 1.6 Dissemination
- 1.7 Assessment and Participation

2. Institutional Relations

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

3. Academic Autonomy and Governance

- 3.1 Administrative Location.
- 3.2 Program Identity
- 3.3 Program Autonomy

This criteria is met based upon the creation of a Department of Urban Planning when the Department of Design was added to the renamed College of Architecture, Design and Planning. This change occurred after the SVR was prepared.

- 3.4 Governance
- 3.5 Participation in Governance
- 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(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
- 4.2.4 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 – need to decide
- 4.2.5 Specializations
- 5. Faculty Resources and Composition**
 - 5.1 Customary Expectations
 - 5.2 Qualifications
 - 5.3 Faculty Recruitment and Composition
 - 5.4 Continuing Academic and Professional Development
 - 5.5 Size
 - 5.6 Concentration of Resources
 - 5.7 Student/Faculty Ratio
- 6. Teaching, Advising and Student Services**
 - 6.1 Teaching Quality
 - 6.2 Faculty Qualifications
 - 6.3 Specializations (Optional)
 - 6.4 Course Scheduling
 - 6.5 Advising
 - 6.6 Placement
- 7. Research and Scholarly Activities**
 - 7.1 Policy
 - 7.2 Quality
- 8. Public and Professional Service**
 - 8.1 Policy – Public and Professional Service
 - 8.2 Quality
 - 8.3 Continuing Education
- 9. Students**
 - 9.1 Quality
 - 9.2 Admission Standards
 - 9.3 Size
- 10. Institutional Resources**
 - 10.1 Library and Information Services
 - 10.3 Computer Capabilities
 - 10.4 Financial Resources – needs definition
- 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

1.8 Mission, Goals and Objectives - Diversity

9.4 Recruitment and Composition - Students

Developing a diverse faculty and student body is a criterion for PAB Accreditation. The team noted that this concern was noted in the prior site visit. While the self-study report describes the recent effort to increase diversity, these efforts have only been partially successful. A female faculty member was hired into a tenure-track position and Hispanic male has been hired into a full-time lecturer position and director of the Kansas City Design Center. While the team fully understands this effort is challenging, we strongly believe that a diverse faculty and student body is essential.

The department should continue to enhance recruitment. They should explore opportunities to work with other academic units on the campus, such as the Marketing Department, to put together a marketing plan that the department and the Planning Advisory Board can implement. As a part of the recruiting effort, the program should enhance the website to more clearly define its unique aspects. The use of social media (Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.) should be explored.

1.9 Mission, Goals and Objectives - Educational Outcomes

While the program conducted a survey of its alums, no other forms of measurement, such as focus group and exit interviews, were in evidence. Furthermore, the team does not believe that the comprehensive exam, with its use of the multiple choice format, is an adequate measure of educational outcomes. Students and alums shared this concern.

4.2.1(b) Environmental Sciences

Environmental science is not adequately reflected in the core; it is only in the environmental and land use specializations.

4.2.3(i) Practice of Planning - Working with Diverse Communities

While the needs of diverse communities are discussed in a variety of course, no evidence was presented that the department is working with diverse communities.

6.7 Teaching, Advising and Student Services - Financial Aid

While the program's website and prospectus provide information regarding financial aid opportunities, the team could find no published criteria for allocating such aid.

10.2 Institutional Resources - Physical Facilities

The faculty offices and student computer facilities are adequate for the program. However, the plans for the Galloway Center need to be implemented in a timely manner. This center is important for improving *esprit de corps* and student recruitment.

Part III. C. 3 Criteria and Guidelines

Not Met

There are no unmet criteria.

Part IV. Strengths of the Program

The team found the following program strengths:

- The program serves the needs of the Kansas City region and the state of Kansas.
- The faculty is highly collegial and work together to make the program work.
- The department has a good distribution of ages of faculty with two full professors, one associate professor and one assistant professor. They have strong leadership and an ongoing mentoring program to ensure career advancement.
- The department has a committed, accessible, conscientious, knowledgeable and helpful faculty.
- The program has been elevated to a department in the school.
- Curriculum is well-organized with a wide variety of courses that build upon one another.
- The program has well-defined concentrations with a systematic development of specialized knowledge.
- The program's admissions procedures have been strengthened; admitted students are better prepared for the program.
- Advising is sound and the faculty provides information on job prospects to the students.
- The students are well-educated, technically sound, and prepared to be good communicators. They have the potential to make a difference in the field.
- The department provides financial resources for tenure-track faculty to attend one conference per year
- The internship is well-organized and provides great opportunities for students to learn about real-world planning issues.
- Students indicated the internship was an integral part of the program that distinguished it from other programs in urban planning.
- The department's internship is an essential component of the program that prepares student for the real world in which they will apply their knowledge and skills.
- The employers that we met with were very positive about the student's critical thinking, and analytical, and written and verbal communication skills.
- The alums are enthusiastic and active, and are giving back to the department in a variety of ways including teaching as adjuncts and guest lectures, providing internships students, and participating in the Professional Advisory Board and fundraising activities
- The department has support for research, especially from the Transportation Research Institute (TRI).
- Students showed interest and active participation in the activities of APA-Kansas and the Kansas City section.
- We found evidence of interest on the part of other academic units to work with the department. This presents many opportunities for the departments.
- The school has strong computer and library support.
- The department's prospectus and student handbook provides comprehensive and

complete information on the program.

- The Professional Advisory Board has become an integral part of the department's outreach to the profession. They have formalized the relationship and are taking a stronger role in assisting the department in meeting its goals.

Part V. Recommendations for Improvement

A. Partially Met/Not Met Criteria

1.8 Mission, Goals and Objectives - Diversity

9.4 Recruitment and Composition - Students

The enrollment decline presents a real challenge to the department that could put pressure on its already scarce resources. The department has taken several steps to enhance its recruitment even as they have improved the quality of its student body. These two may be in conflict with each other. The department should continue and expand its efforts to recruit a diverse, and talented pool of applicants.

1.9 Mission, Goals and Objectives - Educational Outcomes

The team believes that the department should re-examine the structure of the comprehensive exam with its use of the multiple choice format. The department should search for other means of ensuring that all students integrate all areas of planning into a final capstone experience. This could be accomplished through minor changes in the Implementation courses or revisions in the Comprehensive Exam. Additionally, the department should expand or be more explicit about its forms of measurement.

4.2.1(b) Environmental Sciences

All students should be required to learn to environmental science concepts as a part of the core courses.

4.2.3(i) Practice of Planning - Working with Diverse Communities

The department should seek to work with diverse communities in its Implementation courses.

6.7 Teaching, Advising and Student Services - Financial Aid

The department should develop and publish the criteria for receiving financial aid on the website and in the prospectus.

10.2 Institutional Resources - Physical Facilities

The plans for the Galloway Center should be implemented as soon as possible.

B. Other Areas of Enhancement

Though an already strong program, the team identified several opportunities for enhancement. The department should consider several opportunities to enhance its program in a ways that leverages its location within a School of Architecture, Design, and Planning. They could

- enhance the focus on historic preservation.
- offer a Master of Urban Design that would be offered for mid-career people at the Edwards Center.
- examine joint courses with Design and Architecture, such as site planning and urban history.
- explore interdisciplinary project or studio in collaboration with other units in the school (KCDC, Design) and other units in the university (e.g., business, transportation, and public administration).
- explore the creation of a school-wide curriculum committee to examine opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration in both teaching and research.

These opportunities, especially the historic preservation, offer opportunities to raise funds from major donate and further coordination with the Departments of Architecture and Design.

The department could enhance its already-strong connections to other units in the University including Civil Engineering – transportation, and the University’s sustainability initiatives. In particular, the department could hire a transportation planning faculty member to reinvigorate that specialization. They could continue to explore other opportunities to collaborate with the Department of Civil Engineering and the Transportation Research Institute (TRI). The TRI’s Strategic Plan identifies several research areas that overlap with the research and teaching of the department, including: (1) propulsion/vehicle technologies and alternative fuels; (2) transportation safety, security, human factors and socio-political-economic concerns in the transportation systems; and (3) transportation infrastructure life extension. These research areas overlap with existing research being conducted by faculty members in the department and offer additional opportunities for research generation and collaboration. The efforts in alternative fuels also dovetail with broader research initiatives related to energy independence and sustainability.

The department should explore a few changes to its curriculum to enhance an already strong program.

- While the specializations adequately build specialized knowledge, this may be at the expense of providing an opportunity for generalized and integrative knowledge of planning. Therefore, the program could consider offering a generalist planner option.
- The department could consider offering a study abroad opportunity through the University of Kansas or other universities. This would enhance the educational opportunities of students and increase the elective and core courses available in the summer.
- The department could consider formalizing the internships requirement for all students.

The department could consider developing its own alumni association that works as an extension of activities of Planning Advisory Board.

Part VI. Addenda

A. Student Composition Data: Fall 2009

| STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM | ENROLLMENT STATUS AND GENDER | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| | Full-Time | | Part-Time | | Total |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| U.S. White | 19 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 29 |
| Black | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Foreign | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 22 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 34 |

B. Faculty Composition Data:

| FACULTY IN THE PROGRAM | TEACHING STATUS AND GENDER | | | | | | Total |
|------------------------|----------------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | Full-Time in Planning Unit | | Part-Time in Planning Unit** | | Adjunct | | |
| | Male | Female | Male | Female | Male | Female | |
| U.S.* White | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 |
| Black | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Native American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian American | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Foreign | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 13 |

C. AICP Membership: Full-Time Faculty – 1; Adjunct Faculty – 5; Total - 6

D. Teaching FTEs: A full-time teaching load:

| | FACULTY MEMBER NAME | TEACHING FTE |
|----|---------------------|--------------|
| 1 | Black, Alan | 0.25 |
| 2 | Englehart, Phil | 0.75 |
| 4 | Grube, Mike | 0.25 |
| 5 | Johnson, Bonnie | 1.00 |
| 6 | Luckey, Donna | 0.25 |
| 7 | Mayo, James | 0.75 |
| 8 | Miller, Charles | 0.25 |
| 9 | McClure, Kirk | 1.00 |
| 10 | Nimz, Dale | 0.25 |
| 11 | Serda, Daniel | 1.00 |
| 12 | Smalley, Marcy | 0.50 |
| 13 | White, Stacey | 1.00 |
| | TOTAL TEACHING FTEs | 7.25 |

E. Student/Teaching Faculty Ratio: 30 fulltime + (.5)(4) part-time = 32/7.25 = 4.4