

To: UW Graduate School  
From: Ph.D. Program in the Built Environment (non-departmental), College of the Built Environments  
By: Dean Daniel Friedman, College of Built Environments  
Prof. Bob Mugerauer, Director Ph.D. in the Built Environment Program  
Date: January 20, 2009

#### Response to the Report of the Review Committee

Prepared by  
Steven Tanimoto, Professor Computer Science and Engineering (committee chair)  
Kim England, Professor of Geography  
Thomas Hinckley, Professor of Forest Resources  
Charles Eastman, Professor, College of Architecture, Georgia Institute of Technology  
Jacques Giard, Professor, College of Design, Arizona State University  
University of Washington, November 2008.

The Dean of the College of Built Environments, the Director of the Built Environment Ph.D. Program, the Program faculty, staff, and students wish to thank the Review Committee, GPSS, and Graduate School staff for their thoughtful expenditure of energy and their final Report.

Our responses to the particulars of the Fifth-Year Review of the Ph.D. Program in the Built Environment follow. However, as an initial and general point, we find that:

- the perceptions and analyses of the Review Committee and GPSS are fundamentally the same as those of the Program faculty, students, and administration
- the Committee's recommendations are sensible and the Program is ready to carry them out (indeed already is doing so in several instances).

Of course, we appreciate recognition of the many positive aspects of the program, especially its fit with the University's graduate education and scholarly research, its disciplinary diversity and interdisciplinary emphasis, its successes with collaboration and expansion of faculty research agendas (shifting from a historical orientation to professional practice), the strong commitment of Dean Friedman in regard to the Program's role in contributing to the College's and University's goals, and the positive characteristics and achievements of our community of students, faculty, and staff.

To turn to Issues Needing Resolution and Recommendations and Suggestions for change, the following sections are preceded by numbers corresponding to the Review Committee's Report; but we consolidate numbering from the Report's section 5 "Issues needing resolution" and section 6 "Recommendations and Suggestions," thus reordering some responses for the sake of non-repetition. The GPSS observations are not separately noted, but clearly correlate to the listed compliments and concerns—especially concerning financial resources.

## Re 5.1 Financial Issues

### 5.2 Relationship between BE and Faculty Research

### 6.7, 6.8b, 6.9 Recommendations

#### Financial Issues—Research Funding and Student Support

Clearly the most pressing, immediate problem is more adequate financial support for the students, both in terms of the number of students supported and the duration of support during their time here. Sources of funding need to include not only internal funding from the departments, college, and university, but substantial amounts from outside sources (fellowships, research grants, contracts, donors, sponsors, etc.)

We currently are working on the following:

#### Internal Funding:

More TA positions

- Departmental
  - For example, the Urban Design and Planning Department has agreed to open more of its TA slots to the Built Environment Ph.D. students
  - The Construction Management Department should have an increased number of TA positions available in the future with growth of the undergraduate degree program.
  - Landscape Architecture has very few TA positions, but faculty do commit positions to BE students.
  - Architecture provides most of the TA positions and will continue to do so. Since unfortunately they were not able to do so during the Review Committee's time here, the Department Chair and Associate Chair would like to explicitly add the following: "The Department of Architecture's involvement in the program has been significant. Professors Anderson and Prakash have been members of the program's steering committee for the past six years. Professor Anderson has taught one of the three required seminars (BE 551) also for the last six years. Of the two graduates in the program one completed work under the direction of Professor Prakash, with Professor Anderson as a committee member. In addition a number other students in the program are currently working with Department of Architecture Faculty. Finally, the Department of Architecture regularly hires B.E. Ph.D. students as teaching assistants. This year, Ozge Sade, Alex Tulinsky, Tyler Sprague, Nan-Ching Tai, and Paula Patterson have been given teaching assistant positions -- for a total of 11 quarters of support."
- Non-departmental
  - College-wide BE courses offered as the Dean's newly created Vector Studios are explicitly intended to provide teaching and support opportunities for BE students

Tuition waivers: we will continue working with UW Graduate School on programs such as Top Scholar Program

### External Funding:

#### Faculty Research Grants and Contracts:

The faculty continue in their commitment to obtain research grants and contracts to support the Ph.D. students. In addition to the continued, indeed intensified, time-on-task of faculty currently engaged in research, as we enlarge the number of college faculty so engaged the result should be an increase in external support. In addition, as the Review Committee notes, increased “external research support, typically coming through competitively peer-reviewed funding programs would validate the research by faculty and students associated with the program.”

#### Donor Giving and Sponsorships:

Working in close consultation with the assistant dean for advancement and the Ph.D. program director, the dean proposes to develop and implement a strategic fundraising plan expressly aimed at supporting Ph.D. students. Our college’s donors clearly understand and respond to the need for student scholarship resources. However, our donor base may not fully appreciate the increasing significance of research in the profession, nor the resources required to recruit and support advanced students for the length of work involved. The strategic plan will help introduce to the college constituency the importance of scholarly research to “address issues of broad contemporary concern to the professions and contribute to strengthening the professions and opening new areas for useful [inquiry].”

### Re 6.8 Recommendation

- a) In regard to the recommendation to review procedures for the use of indirect cost return funds, including that “perhaps some (even a small) part of them could be explicitly allocated to fostering development of new research projects, which in turn could convince faculty that initiating new research activities is valued and encouraged—in line with the theme that a good Ph.D. program requires a culture of research and that in turn requires some degree of funding”:

CBE’s current administration deeply appreciates the logic of allocating ICR funds to support the culture of research in the college and supports this principle unequivocally. CBE’s modest annual ICR funds vary: \$123,105 this year; \$141,556 last year; \$119,827 in 2007. The college follows well-established university policy in the distribution of these funds: 30 percent to the principal investigator; 30 percent to the principal investigator’s home department; 40 percent to college (including 10 percent set aside as a discretionary resource to support and seed future research activities). The current dean practices a policy established by his predecessors prior to his arrival in July 2006, which is to use the full college share of ICR funds to support an additional staff FTE in CBE’s computing department dedicated to research activities across the college. The current annual commitment for this position is \$78,084, including benefits, well in excess of the college’s annual share of ICR dollars, e.g. \$49,242 in 2009, \$56,622 in 2008, and \$47,931 in 2007. CBE’s director of computing argues that the loss of this position would seriously reduce the quantity, quality, and timeliness of college-wide computing services, especially to computer-intensive research centers (such as the Urban Ecology research Lab and the Design Machine Group), not to mention general faculty research initiatives. However, given this recommendation, the dean proposes to revisit current ICR policy with the college Executive Committee later this year.

In the development of the Five Year Strategic Plan, we will “define realizable paths for developing research funding: through new areas of activity, collaborative initiatives with other university units, and/or industry related funding.”

b & c) In regard to the recommendation for improved administrative support for college-wide grants and contracts, including shepherding proposals through the university system and for the appointment of an Associate Dean for research:

As part of the college’s long-range strategic thinking, developed in close consultation with the faculty, the dean proposed to dedicate one of two new FTE allocated to the college by the provost in the 2006 dean’s appointment package to fund a new, permanent, tenure-track position, associate dean for research. The college froze its national search for this position in compliance with the governor’s August 15, 2008, statewide budget directive. Moreover, in order to protect CBE’s core mission, this line constitutes a portion of the college’s total proposed budget reductions in each of the 8, 10, and 12 percent models requested by the provost, since the loss of a line not yet filled minimizes the impact on current programs. As we proceed into the next biennium, pending the final outcome of budget negotiations in July 2009, the college will explore alternative ways to use its remaining resources to strengthen research initiatives.

### Re 5.3 Structural Issues

#### 5.4 Communication Issues

#### 6.4 Recommendation

#### Formalizing Dimensions & Communication:

The Program has been successful in its first phase, but has done so as a primarily oral culture—a valid point if not exaggerated. As it enters its second phase, more does need to be formalized in written documents, both to make definitions, procedures, expectations, parameters, etc. clear to the increasing number of participants, and also to ensure consistency and “quality control.” Thus far, in addition to what is available on the web sites and in hard textual format (such as Program requirements, the comprehensive examination protocol, etc.), the Director has communicated information about committee formation, comprehensive examinations, research proposal defense, etc. to the students and faculty involved primarily on a case by case basis and at regular bi-annual student meetings. Again, most information has been available, but we realize that does not mean it is consulted or is perceived to be readily available by students and faculty newly participating. The completion of a *Faculty/Student Handbook* (already underway, a fact somehow not conveyed to the Review Committee) should go a long way to alleviating problems in this area. This shift to a written culture, of course, will include the Review Committee’s specific recommendation concerning “the dissertation proposal phase of the doctoral program [which] needs formal, written expectations (that clarify and lay out that the dissertation proposal, includes a written document, a formal presentation and oral defense which elicits feedback from the all of the student’s committee members).” In fact, such a distinct research proposal phase using this format normally is our current procedure (with the exception that the formal presentation/oral defense has not been public); obviously, however, the process needs to be more formal, explicit, and publically announced in order to be clear and consistently implemented,

thus providing the “written documentation for graduate students ... in line with current and upcoming directions from the Graduate School.”

#### Re 6.1 Recommendation

In regard to the idea of appointing an Associate Director who would assume leadership roles in recruitment, development of written programmatic guidelines, etc. and who would provide continuity for the program in the future is a good one, the dean and program director will continue to explore this administrative enhancement as part of their evolving agenda and strategic planning.

#### Re 6.2 Recommendation

Additionally, it appears that as a small college with fairly dense interactions we have believed that communication has been consistent and effective. That apparently is not the case. We will work to remedy this in many ways. For example, it will be easy to schedule the recommended regular—at least quarterly—meetings of the Dean, the Director, the chairs of the four departments and the Director of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. program in Urban Design and Planning to discuss doctoral education in the college.

Note, in regard to the structural communication issue noted in the Review Committee’s comment Section 4.3 that “Unfortunately, the committee was unable to meet with the Chair or an alternate from Architecture, the largest department within the college.” The Department Chair and Associate Chair add the following in our response: “This is indeed unfortunate as the Department of Architecture has provided strong academic and financial support to the Ph.D. in the Built Environment program from its inception, and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future. The relative lack of communication from the Department of Architecture at the time of the visit resulted from unavoidable circumstances: Both Professors Prakash and Miller were out of town at the time of the visit, and Professor Anderson was teaching in Rome fall quarter.”

#### Re 6.3 Recommendation

In regard to the recommendation that the director and dean “collectively explore productive ways to address the points raised under the section ‘Issues needing resolution’,” specifically that they “develop a jointly written document that provides a strategic plan for the B.E. Ph.D. program for the next five years. It should outline their strategies to address the above stated issues. The document should also contain a jointly agreed-on plan for the future for the B.E. Ph.D. program that speaks in specifics, such as graduate student recruitment, faculty hires, internal and external research support, continued leadership, etc. In part, this is to ensure that as the Program enters its second phase, it is clear on what the Self Study identifies as ‘Future Directions’, that is, “specificity in terms of potential actions, directives and deliverables that could be engaged in order to move the program forward and ensure its longevity, especially given the recently announced budget cuts”:

The dean looks forward to the opportunity to articulate and prioritize the current and future goals of the Ph.D. BE program, in close consultation with its director, steering committee, and faculty leadership; and he will ensure the production of a planning document commensurate with this recommendation in its particulars by the end of AY 2009–10.

#### Re 6. 10 Recommendation

Communication concerning the Program's achievements and outcomes within and outside the university will be improved and made more proactive. For example, we currently are planning a spring research symposium, to be held jointly by the Ph.D. in Built Environment and the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Urban Design and Planning, in which student work would be presented and then materials generated in the process effectively showcased to university, professional, and community leaders.

#### Re 5.3 Structural Issues

##### 6.5 Recommendation

##### Structural Issues

Though it was not proposed as an area for current attention but only commended by the Review Committee for possible examination in the next major review, we want to put on record how problematic the possible merger of the two Ph.D. programs associated with the college (Built Environment and Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Urban Design and Planning) would be.] Such action would, de facto, eliminate one of the programs and yet result in very minimal resource savings. Given the substantial difference in the two Programs' curricula, processes, and goals, it would make little sense to try to absorb the Built Environment Ph.D. into the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Urban Design and Planning. If that had been possible we would not have created the B.E. Program in the first place: it was and remains clear that the flexibility required for the largest number of College faculty (especially those from Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Construction Management) to direct doctoral research cannot be done within the structure of the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Urban Design and Planning—in essence a traditional planning Ph.D. operating within all such required parameters. On the other hand, it would not work to try to absorb the Interdisciplinary Ph.D. in Urban Design and Planning into the very different and flexible structure and curriculum of the B.E. Ph.D. because the latter would not provide the more specific structure or coursework that has led the Urban Design and Planning degree to its success and wonderful record of research support for accepted students. Again, at this point, these comments are only for the record, since the Review Committee raised the issue for possible consideration in the next major review.

It should be noted that the Directors of the two programs are initiating a review and dialogue concerning areas in which the programs can cooperate more effectively and perhaps share or merge specific courses.

#### Re 6.6 Recommendation

In regard to the Review Committee's recommendation to increase the potential involvement of non-Ph.D. holding faculty in chairing/supervising Ph.D. students (should they want to), we are glad to comply with whatever direction the Graduate School/Graduate Council provide. The current format results from the process of the creation of the Program developed in close consultation with a series of Graduate School administrators—in that process the Graduate School explicitly stipulated that they wanted only faculty with Ph.D.'s to chair Ph.D. committees (though faculty without the Ph.D. could serve on committees). This was explained as part of a policy to strengthen research at the doctoral level. Since we had many very competent faculty members with only the terminal professional Masters' degree, we asked for an exception—the result of which was the understanding that we could petition on a case by case basis, providing

evidence that the faculty member had the same actual level of accomplishment and reputation as those with Ph.D.'s. Thus far we have done so with two senior faculty—both of whom were approved—Professors Jeffery Ochsner and David Streatfield. (See the Appendix below from the original, approved Program Description.) Pending any change recommended by the Graduate School/Graduate Council, this case-by-case approach has worked well so far at the scale of the program, and we can make increased efforts to determine if there are other faculty in this category who should participate in the program, and petition the Graduate School accordingly.

#### Re 11 Recommendation

In regard to the Review Committee's recommendation that the program be reviewed again by the Graduate School in five years—it is not appropriate for the Program to respond to this item.

#### Re 12 Recommendations

As to the Review Committee's proposal that the Graduate School request:

##### a. By February 9, 2009:

- i. The joint report (by the Director and the Dean) regarding future directions for the program that includes specific deliverables
- ii. A five-year fiscal plan in which sources are identified and strategies for approach and mechanisms for rewarding attempts and successes are developed (see 6.7, 6.8 and 6.9)—  
(see response to Recommendation 6.3 above).

##### b. By January 31, 2011:

- i. Evidence of multiple approaches (e.g., proposals) to obtaining funding from a wide variety of sources—we will have done this long before that date.
- ii. At least two more Ph.D. graduates from the program—we certainly will have exceeded this modest goal.

--

#### Appendix

In regard to recommendation 6.6: involvement of non-Ph.D. faculty.

Here is the relevant section of the original Program Proposal, as approved by Graduate School, HEC Board, et al.

The most relevant wording is at the very end—shaded; this was written in close cooperation and with the advice of Dr. John Slattery, then Associate Dean of the Graduate School.

From the approved Program Proposal:

##### A. Faculty Profile

One of the major motives for developing and proposing the Built Environment Program is that the College has a wonderful faculty in which there are many members with Ph.D. degrees who can provide the sophisticated and “longer-term” relationships necessary for sustained work at the highest levels and a vital component in forming research teams and obtaining funding, but who have no opportunity to work with doctoral students. Many of these faculty members have substantial experience supervising and serving on doctoral committees around the world and at

U.W.; almost all of them have the expectation of—even need for—doing so here in the College of Architecture and Urban Planning.

Program Faculty are defined here as those who are able to Chair a student's Doctoral Supervisory Committee. (In order to Chair a student's Doctoral Supervisory Committee, that is to be the student's graduate supervisor and mentor-advisor, faculty "must be members of the Graduate Faculty with an endorsement to chair doctoral committees" [Graduate School Memo 13]. (Note the two "stages" of the process: a Department nominates those who become members of the Graduate Faculty; in addition, the Ph.D. in Built Environment Program would move that particular Graduate Faculty be endorsed to chair committees in that specific program.) In the initial determination of Program Faculty, the criteria we would use in granting someone the endorsement to chair a supervisory committee in the Built Environment Program would be:

- Holding a Ph.D.
- Having demonstrated expertise in the specific major field and/or sub-fields of research
- Currently conducting productive scholarly or research activity in these areas (publications, conference presentations, funded and grant or contract activity, and so on)
- Having a national reputation in the specialty, with recognized accomplishments such that peers would acknowledge appropriateness based on demonstrated competence (rather than the faculty member's terminal degree being the major indicator).
- Having experience on doctoral committees or, for the newest members of the College faculty, showing clear ability to serve in the capacity of Chair
- Evidencing interest and ability to actively contribute to the Ph.D. Program
- Being willing to mentor students and help support their advanced research with research funds from grants or contracts

Given the Governance system (described below in the section on "Administration and Governance"), the Executive Committee and the initial Program Faculty can appoint additional faculty to the Program Faculty. It is expected that this soon will include several senior members from other units at UW, and future additions especially might be appropriate for CAUP faculty who gain the appropriate committee experience, establish a substantial research record, or otherwise develop the necessary credentials. (For example, though faculty without a Ph.D. can have the endorsement to serve as Chair, it is not common. Thus, whereas some of CAUP's 28 faculty with terminal professional Master's Degrees have substantial scholarly or research records, and national or international reputations rather than a Ph.D. [one listing of this set of faculty is presented in Appendix D- Part 4], the issue arises of when it is appropriate for these faculty to receive the endorsement to chair the Supervisory Committee. We propose that though unusual, it could be appropriate when the scholarly record is the same as one would expect of faculty holding the research-oriented Ph.D. degree—bulleted just above.)