

**Academic Program Review
Community and Regional Planning Department
Response to APR Report**

The CRP faculty thanks the Academic Program Review (APR) team for a productive process and thoughtfully engaging with program. We submit this response.

Criterion 1: Program Goals (Met)

The APR team identified strengths in the MCRP program. We agree with the assessment and continuously to work to strengthen the program while retaining its core as a community-based, social justice oriented degree with four concentrations.

The largest identified weakness was the lack of similar focus in the BAEPD program. The faculty agrees with that assessment. We used the fall 2017 retreat to re-envision the BAEPD program to reflect the faculty's expertise and passion and develop a vision for the program. This led to a significant curriculum revision that changed the major courses, removed a series of requirements, aligned the curriculum to focus on social change grounded in place, brought each faculty member into a teaching role, and revised the description. This also will remove redundancy that some BAEPD students feel when they enter the MCRP program. The CRP department established a BAEPD/MCRP shared credit program that went into effect in Fall 2017 to make a pathway from the BAEPD to the MCRP.

Criterion 2: Teaching and Learning Curriculum Strengths and Weaknesses (Met)

The APR team commented that the MCRP program was focused and there was adequate coverage of all concentrations. The faculty agrees and, at the same time, we have discussed ways to better integrate the concentrations and offer courses to serve more than one concentration.

The APR team identified challenges with the BAEPD program. First, the program relies heavily on part-time instructors and lacks full-time faculty members in core courses. In the current revision mentioned above, all faculty members will be teaching a core BAEPD course or a course that fulfills a requirement (for example, students take two social change electives among 3-4 options, and these courses are taught by full-time faculty members).

Second, the dual 400-500 level courses satisfy neither the BAEPD students nor the MCRP students. The faculty has decided to stagger key courses that have been the most troubling (so that they are offered for undergraduate students one year and graduate students the following year). In addition, new courses have been added as part of the BAEPD curriculum revision that are only for undergraduates so the dual level courses will be a smaller part of their overall curriculum. While there will still be dual level courses, the number has been reduced. Within allowable resources, the faculty intends to continue to reduce these courses.

The APR team identified two other challenges. The first is that the profile and resources dedicated to RCRP are insufficient. This issue is on the faculty's agenda to discuss further.

Second, that CRP's undergraduate minor and accredited professional graduate degree have been insufficiently marketed. The faculty lead by Moises Gonzales is developing a recruitment strategy for the BAEPD program and minor. We have updated the description as part of the curriculum revision. The School of Architecture and Planning is also developing new materials to better depict the program, and the Department is working to get more information about students and student work on the website.

Criterion 3: Teaching and Learning Continuous Improvement (Met)

The faculty agrees with the APR team assessment. We are discussing our assessment processes to be sure they provide us useful information. Revisiting the Strategic Plan is on the faculty's 2018 agenda.

Criterion 4: Students (Met)

The faculty is focused on recruitment of diverse students for both programs, and increasing the size of the undergraduate program in order to maintain the moderate size of the graduate program. As suggested by the APR team and in response to the identified shortcoming, we will approach Native American Studies and Chicana and Chicano Studies programs to encourage enrollment in our minor and as a pathway for recruitment to the MCRP program (as well as other majors that attract diverse, social justice oriented students). We also have a graduate minor and intend to develop a recruiting plan for the minor. We agree that the student advising is excellent. We agree that we have strong relationships with our alums but we continue to maintain and strengthen these relationships.

Criterion 5: Faculty (Met)

The faculty shares the APR team's concerns that limited resources could adversely impact the department, specifically because it faces potential retirements in the upcoming years. We are grateful to have the opportunity to hire a new faculty member this year after Ric Richardson and Jose Rivera retired during the last two years. Moises Gonzales also earned tenure last year. However the faculty is very aware that newly tenured faculty members can be 'stuck in rank' if they become overburdened with administrative work and do not have adequate time for research as associate professors. While we strive to ensure that service and new course development is fair and fairly recognized in workload, it is still challenging given limited budgets.

Criterion 6: Resources and Planning (Met)

The faculty shares the APR team's concerns. After the APR team's visit, the CRP Department hired Pamela Houston as an Admin 3 to support the department but Pamela Houston left recently. We have been given permission to hire a replacement and the search is ongoing.

The question of funding is unresolved. We are dedicating a small amount of funding from the CRP endowment to support student travel, and we have used this to support course expenses. There is an ongoing need for resources to support community-based field courses. While at times

these can be funded by a community partner, CRP's commitment to address pressing issues means that we do not only work with those who have funding. Faculty members obtain limited external funding that supports students and courses.

The School of Architecture and Planning (through Angela Pacheco, the undergraduate advisor, and Tim Castillo, Associate Dean for Outreach) has been visiting and reaching out to some high schools. CRP continues to work with them to develop compelling ways to showcase the BAEPD major. We are also working with different universities to develop transfer agreements into the BAEPD major. We have established transfer agreements with CNM, the University of New Mexico, Gallup (which has a relatively high percentage of Indigenous students) and Navajo Technical University. Travel and recruitment funding are ongoing needs.

Criterion 7: Facilities (Met)

The faculty agrees that overall we have high quality facilities. Ongoing budget pressures makes maintaining up-to-date computer labs a challenge. iD+Pi has adequate research space. RCRP has adequate space for now but, as RCRP grows, this may be a challenge. The studio space is an ongoing challenge and at times project-based CRP courses are held in classrooms rather than studio because the studio is not well designed for the community-based work and group projects. CRP and Architecture have agreed to work collaboratively to ensure that CRP studios receive adequate studio space but this does not resolve the problem with the type of space available. This is an ongoing concern.

Criterion 8: Program Comparisons (Met with Concerns)

The faculty shares the APR team's concerns about faculty salaries and pay equity. While we recognize UNM and the School of Architecture and Planning have made attempts to address inequities, it is still unresolved. This lowers faculty morale. Professional development support is also limited.

Criterion 9: Future Directions (Met with Concerns)

As stated above, the faculty intends to review and assess the strategic plan in 2018. This will include an assessment about what has been achieved, ongoing initiatives, and new goals. The one main concern raised was the proposed PhD program. The APR team stated that the PhD program was framed as based within iD+Pi, and potentially titled the PhD in Indigenous Placemaking. As of now, iD+Pi is not a degree granting unit so it would have to be within a department or designed as an interdisciplinary degree. A PhD in Indigenous Placemaking has been discussed but there is no consensus at this time on the specific focus or title. The faculty will consider the APR team's concerns in further discussions.