

Concept Note

Creating a New School:

Integrating the Graduate Program in International Affairs and Milano The New School for Management and Urban Policy

An interim report by the Task Force on GPIA-Milano Integration
December 15, 2009

Michael Cohen (co-chair, GPIA), Stephen Collier (GPIA), Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (GPIA),
Alec Gershberg (Milano), David Howell (Milano), Mark Johnson (GPIA),
Mark Lipton (Milano), and Mary Watson (co-chair, Milano)

This Concept Note summarizes the initial phase of planning for the creation of a new School that would incorporate Milano The New School for Management and Urban Policy, a current division of the University, and the Graduate Program in International Affairs (GPIA), currently located in the New School for General Studies. It reflects discussions that have taken place within Milano and GPIA, in the Office of the Provost, and in the Task Force on GPIA-Milano Integration. It does not yet include input from the full faculties, student bodies, or all relevant members of the administration and staff. The Task Force, Dean, and Provost's Office will need to design and implement a participative process for discussions about the integration with the above groups, including updating the Faculty Senate.

This note presents a series of observations about the existing GPIA and Milano units, and it raises questions that will have to be addressed before key decisions about a new School are made. It is divided into the following sections: background to discussions about a new School; vision and values for forming a new School; strategy and a proposed timeline of steps to be taken, issues of governance and administrative structure; curricular issues; conclusions and issues to be discussed.

I. Background

GPIA and Milano are both successful units in The New School that contain a number of dynamic degree-granting programs at the Master and Doctoral levels. GPIA, currently located in the New School for General Studies, was founded in 2001 with the intention of creating a program distinct from most policy-oriented Schools of International Affairs in its orientation to critical thinking, its focus on constant interchange between academic activity and practice, and its emphasis on development and questions of poverty. GPIA has grown rapidly over the past seven years, with 385 students currently pursuing either a Master of Arts or a Master of Science in International Affairs. This rapid student growth reflects the fact that GPIA has

successfully established and now occupies a distinctive niche in the universe of International Affairs programs in New York, in the United States, and internationally.

Milano, a School that currently operates as an autonomous division in the New School University, was founded in 1975 when the J.M. Kaplan Center for New York City Affairs became the Graduate School of Management and Urban Policy. Milano has offered a changing set of degrees over its history, but it has always been oriented to a heterodox approach that bridges policy and management, and that links the for-profit, government, and non-profit sectors.^{*} Its interdisciplinary academic approach incorporates the fields of economics, psychology, sociology, political science, critical theory, organization studies, and community development. Its particular program mix is not duplicated within any single competitor professional school, but rather includes a deliberate blend of programs typically housed across schools of policy, business, education, government, and arts and science.

Over the past several years, Milano's enrollments have been stable: from 493 students (MS and PhD) in 2002 to 483[†] in the current year. But behind these baseline numbers is a more complicated picture. The MS programs in Urban Policy Analysis and Management, Organizational Change Management, and Nonprofit Management have experienced impressive growth: from 245 students in 2002 to 435 today. Two additional MS programs that were previously the largest with respect to enrollments – in Human Resources Management and in Health Services Management and Policy – are now in the final planned stages of being phased out. The growth in the three continuing MS programs reflects the fact that Milano has an established and successful brand in the universe of management and policy schools and has focused its resources on programs for which there is growing demand.

The creation of a new School that joins GPIA and Milano was first discussed in spring 2009.[‡] A number of advantages of a new entity were apparent to both sides. Milano had previously identified greater emphasis on the international as a way to broaden the scope of its programs. For GPIA, closer connections with Milano promised to open a range of possibilities for improving its offerings in areas ranging from research methods and data analysis to professional education in management and policy. Both units recognized the advantages of scale that would arise from a closer connection. There are inherent limits to units with relatively small faculties (in the case of GPIA 12 FTE, in the case of Milano 16 FTE) in serving students, in creating a stimulating environment for evolving faculty research interests, and in launching new programs, such as the program in Environmental Policy and Sustainability Management currently

^{*} See the report "Milano 2010," attached as Appendix A.

[†] An additional 19 students are registered in Fall 2009 as nondegree, and an additional 27 Ph.D. students are in maintenance of status, bringing the grand total for Fall 2009 to 529.

[‡] See "The Graduate Program in International Affairs: Strengthening Excellence and Sustaining Relevance – Program Strategy 2009-2011," Appendix II.

being rolled out at Milano. It was recognized that greater scale could allow these units to establish a larger and more influential profile in the University, in New York, and in the world.

In the past several months, the idea of creating a new School comprising Milano and GPIA has gained significant momentum with the strong support of President Bob Kerrey and Provost Tim Marshall. In September 2009 the Provost charged the Task Force on GPIA-Milano integration – currently comprised of four faculty members from each unit – with advancing a vision and strategy for a new School.

After three months of work, the members of the Task Force continue to find that the case for creating a new School incorporating Milano and GPIA is compelling – but only if undertaken in the context of the right enabling conditions. GPIA and Milano share many values, and have overlapping missions. There is scope for taking advantage of complementarities in our curricular offerings and in our academic and administrative infrastructure. And the creation of a new School would make it possible for Milano and GPIA to leverage scale to create a high quality academic institution with a unique profile. At the same time, our discussions have brought to light a range of questions and challenges. The Task Force has reservations about an arrangement in which a new GPIA-Milano unit would be a “school within a division,” and feels strongly that the success of a new entity merger will depend on the way that it is situated in relation to other programs and administrative entities. The Task Force has also come to understand that the various degree programs that comprise these entities work on different academic and administrative logics, and that student careers span a wide array of professional fields and settings. The rationale for a new entity and the key challenges in ensuring its success are the topic of the remainder of this concept note.

II. Vision and Values

The aspiration in founding a new School comprising Milano and GPIA should be to create a leading academic institution that produces high quality education, research, and public engagement and promotes a progressive agenda driven by a commitment to social justice and a critical perspective on international affairs, urban policy, and management. In its work the Task Force has concluded that this vision for a new School will be informed by a range of substantive orientations and values that GPIA and Milano share. Among these are:

- A recognition that New York – as a quintessential global city and as the home for a vast range of intergovernmental and non-profit organizations – provides a unique space for learning, and an ideal locale for exploring the linkages that a new School would emphasize: between the urban and the global; between the international and the domestic; and between management and policy.

- A belief that critical thinking and the development of practical tools are intimately related and should be integrally linked in academic curricula that explore heterodox approaches to contemporary problems.
- A corresponding view of the role of the university, not only as a place in which theory is produced so that it can be “applied” to practice, but as a laboratory or experimental space in which a dynamic relationship between critical thinking and practice can be fostered. Closely connected to this view of the university is a belief that the classroom is only one site of graduate study and that experiential learning is a critical dimension of the educational process.
- A commitment to progressive values, particularly those of democratic practice, social justice, and environmental sustainability.
- A range of commitments concerning pedagogy and the composition of an educational institution that include: student-focused teaching and personalized faculty engagement with students’ work; making pluralism work by building a genuinely diverse community of researchers, teachers, practitioners, and students.

The Task Force believes that this vision of a new School, and the values and substantive orientations that support it, is consistent with the traditions of the respective programs and of the New School more generally. It is also consistent with the Provost’s vision of a new division defined by a “third space” of theory and practice. That said, true collaboration between existing program areas will not be accomplished swiftly or easily, and a new vision can be defined only incrementally, as the result of an evolving process that can be expected to unfold over a number of years. Thus, the process of creating a new School will also be a process of inquiry, one that should be characterized by integrity and transparency.

But our ambition for this new School goes farther. We hope that creating a fertile home for the graduate programs that comprise Milano and the Graduate Program in International Affairs will ultimately have a profound impact on those who are touched by these programs. Whether their work ultimately involves the analysis of urban programs and public policies; comprehension of complex, seemingly intractable international problems; the formation, management and leadership of organizations; or, the capacity to enhance organizational performance through the delicate process of facilitating change – the foundation for the quality of, and confidence in, their thinking, should be a result of their experiences at this new School.

Learning a heterodox approach to mastering non-dogmatic models for building and leading organizations and changing them when the need arises, understanding international affairs, and internalizing the breadth of analytic thinking required for urban policy analysis are only some of the ways our students should be changed by this

graduate school experience. This new School should help develop professionals and managers who can transform the communities and organizations in which they work. Whatever venue they choose to practice their expertise – perhaps a global development agency, university, government, corporation, or starting their own social enterprise – they should influence others by virtue of that expertise honed through their experiences with this new School.

Ultimately, we wish our graduates to be *original* thinkers, able to approach and frame real problems in ways that no other set of programs, in any other university, can promise. We intend to achieve this in part through the careful leveraging of intellectual assets across a preexisting set of programs that have never taken the simpler, conventional view to graduate education in their respective fields. It can be accomplished through the blending of experienced-based learning in ways that may seem unconventional through the lens of other university programs in these fields. It can be achieved through dialogue with faculty, guest experts, and not the least through dialogue with their fellow students. It must take place in a diverse community dedicated to change agency, with a commitment to addressing social disparities based on race, class, gender, and other categorizations.

Our desire to create this experience – and to offer the promise of profoundly changing the way students think about their worlds as they complete their respective degrees – will not be an easy one to achieve. We are proposing a road not only less travelled but one that will also be more difficult to navigate for some students. We therefore intend to seek out students who do not want a simple toolkit for analyzing policies, or single discipline-based models for conceptualizing international affairs, or simple formulae for managing and leading. We will be looking for exceptional thinkers, perhaps non-traditional learners; we will seek out students from around the globe whose values and thirst for knowledge and understanding match ours.

III. Strategy

The fact that Milano and GPIA already share some common values and substantive orientations – and that the existing degree-granting programs within these units are, to some degree, already animated by a shared vision – has important implications for defining the strategic priorities of a new School. At least in an initial phase, the strategy need not focus on adding new educational “products” or defining a new market niche, but should focus on strengthening what each unit already does well. For at least the next academic year, all existing degree programs in each unit, and their requirements, should remain unchanged. Nor is it necessary to take on the full range of strategic questions all at once. Given the current success and continuing growth of the programs that will comprise a new entity, there is scope for developing a staged approach to tackling key strategic questions, and for allowing strategic priorities to evolve over time.

In this light, several categories of strategic decisions might be distinguished – each of which corresponds to a time-frame within which they have to be addressed. Each will require resources in the form of financial support and intensive engagement from the Office of the Provost.

Immediate: The following strategic issues will have to be dealt with quickly, preferably in the next few weeks.

- **Dean Search:** More focused work should begin very soon on defining the profile of a new Dean for the School, taking into account issues such as professional background and academic stature. The emphasis should be on finding an individual who is not content to manage existing units but is committed to the prospect of building an academic institution that is new and truly distinctive.
- **Board of Governors:** It is the view of the Task Force that the Milano Board of Governors has played an invaluable role for Milano over many years, and that GPIA has suffered due to its lack of a Board or Advisory Committee. Serious thought should be given to the creation of a new Board of Governors for this new entity.
- **Participation and Feedback:** The Task Force, Dean, and Provost's Office will expand the opportunities for faculty, students, staff, and administrators to participate in discussions and provide input about issues relevant to the integration.

Year Zero (completion by June 30, 2010): The following issues will have to be addressed prior to the beginning of operation of the new School, and – in most cases – prior to the installation of new leadership.

- **Governance and Administrative Structure:** Key decisions will have to be made about the governance and administrative structure of a new School. Decisions this year should focus on the organization of programs in the School and not on the internal organization of programs, which should remain stable in the immediate term.
- **Budget and Investments:** The Task Force and key members of the administration and budgeting leadership of both Milano and GPIA should work with the Provost's office to identify immediate and medium term issues regarding the School, begin to develop a strategy for Year 1 and beyond, and specifically cost out some of the changes anticipated by the integration. This is necessary to get a sense of the level of both needed investment and areas of cost savings that will need to be achieved for the integration to get off to a successful start.

- **Branding:** Investment is needed to transform a vision and shared values into a clear identity and brand. Care should be taken to define a new brand in such a way that does not diminish but rather amplifies the valuable existing brands of GPIA and Milano in their respective fields. This branding exercise should extend to serious consideration of the new School's name.
- **Admissions and Recruitment Strategy:** A new admissions and recruitment strategy needs to be developed during the spring of 2010 to be aligned with the identity of the new School and to be used starting July 1, 2010 to publicize the school, attract applicants, and admit students for January 2011 and September 2011.
- **Public Image:** Concrete steps should be taken to create a public image on the basis of a new brand and identity. This process will require commitment from the office of Communications and External Affairs to devote significant resources to creating a new website and other public materials, and to articulating a fund-raising strategy.

Year One (July 1, 2010 - June 30, 2011) should be devoted to an assessment of new work programs, structures, and strategies in order to permit fine-tuning and further consolidation of what is working and strengthening areas needing improvement. This task should be the work of a new leadership team.

Years Two and Three (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2013): In a subsequent stage, longer term issues such as a faculty hiring strategy and curricular or programmatic changes should be considered.

IV. Governance and Administrative Structure

Among the most significant decisions to be made in "Year 0" are those concerning governance and structure. It is assumed that the Task Force will formulate recommendations for governance and structure with guidance from the Office of the Provost.

IV.A. The administrative and governance context of a new entity

It is the understanding of the Task Force that the current assumption is that a new GPIA-Milano entity would be housed within a new division whose exact profile and composition has yet to be determined. Although the discussions about this new division have just begun, the Task Force and the members of the Milano and GPIA faculties are concerned that if their integration occurs within the proposed new division, the new entity may not receive the attention it will require to be successful.

The Task Force members agree that an effective divisional framework means that the educational products should be consistent in their qualities and characteristics and that such consistency is the basis for effective policies for management and strategic budgetary allocation. A division should be coherent enough that it can establish clear internal standards for evaluating the quality of academic and professional work that can be applied to faculty recruitment, evaluation, and promotion. The label of “theory and practice” does not yet appear to be specific enough to provide this kind of coherence. We understand that filling out the meaning of this label inevitably will take time. Nonetheless, the Task Force is concerned that an entity that simply subsumes all of the current units in NSGS along with a new GPIA-Milano entity would simply reproduce many of the weaknesses of NSGS. While it is premature to judge the form and operational logic of the new division, the Task Force members feel that the design of this overarching institutional framework will be a major factor in the success of the new School.

IV.B. Principles of internal structure and governance

In relation to the internal structure and governance of a new entity, the Task Force has identified a few broad principles to guide our work.

- Within the School, we anticipate that the Task Force will be engaged in articulating a system of shared governance that will provide for meaningful faculty participation in all major academic decisions (e.g., faculty hires and curriculum).
- We propose that the Dean of the School should work not only with the heads of academic units but also with a governance committee comprised of faculty representatives (an “Academic Council” or some similar name). Faculty representation on this committee should be such as to ensure equity in voice for all academic programs. We suggest that in the first year this committee have an equal number of representatives from GPIA and from the current Milano MS Programs, and one representative of the Doctoral program.
- We propose that questions of administrative structure and governance should be oriented to the goal of allowing full-time faculty to spend a greater amount of their time on teaching, research, writing, and the substantive parts of curricular planning, while spending less time on administrative functions. Therefore, although it is anticipated that certain economies will be gained from the creation of a new entity, it is *not* the conclusion of the Task Force that a reduction in administrative staff will necessarily be possible as a result of the merger. Rather, this is an opportunity to assess staffing needs and to make strategic *investments*.
- We propose that faculty review and promotion processes remain stable through the three year transition phase addressed in this Concept Note. We wish to

ensure that current faculty members working toward promotion or renewal are not subjected to shifting standards created by the transition. This is both a matter of fairness, and a necessary condition to allow for successful faculty continuity into a new entity.

Looking beyond these general orientations, the Task Force has recognized that decisions about governance and structure of a new School must grapple with a number of challenges inherent in joining two entities that, notwithstanding many commonalities, are different in important ways. One relates to the very different existing structures of the two entities. Milano is already a School that is an autonomous division with a Dean and a complex administrative structure, whereas GPIA is a program within a division, with a Director and limited administrative structure. This structural asymmetry has implications for a range of specific issues such as relationship between faculty appointments and degree-granting programs, and distribution of administrative duties. A second challenge relates to very different cultures of governance in the two units. Milano has a long history of a well articulated structure of faculty governance. GPIA has had a relatively informal and collective style of governance and a small staff devoted to internal administration.

A third crucial challenge represents the different strategies for organizational growth pursued by Milano and GPIA. Both programs attract students who – overwhelmingly – desire to be gainfully employed in the field relating to their respective degree. The Urban Policy Program has offered a curriculum designed to provide students with a broad set of competencies; it does not train students for a particular occupation or career. The Nonprofit program, one of the first three offered in the United States and a guiding member in NACC (the body that provides research center and curriculum guidelines), has offered leadership and management education that supports effectiveness in organizations ranging from human services, arts, philanthropy, and social entrepreneurship, among many others. The Organization Change Management program helps develop change leadership competencies in experienced professionals from a wide variety of careers and sectors. All three programs have shown long term growth from 2002 to 2009: Urban Policy from 89 to 174 students; Nonprofit from 122 to 165 students, and Organization Change from 34 to 93 students. Since the inception of the school in the 1970s, other Milano programs have focused on developing new products and entering new areas of related professional fields, broadly defined.

Through its history, it has terminated a number of programs for two reasons. First, in the early 1990s, some programs were terminated when they were deemed too narrow and not of the caliber desired. Second, two programs (Health Policy and Management and Human Resource Management) were terminated recently when enrollments fell and the level of investment required to compete more effectively with other, comparable university programs was considered too capital intensive and unaffordable. Milano decided to cut those programs, invest in what remained, and

expand through product differentiation. It should be noted that those programs were the largest at one time at Milano and represented nearly 800 students combined. Milano has since broadened its degree programs to represent “fields” rather than discrete professions.

But the momentum for growth at Milano has always been one that is best described as innovating and developing new specialties, concentrations, post-masters certificates and degrees. For example, the new Masters-level program now under development in Environmental Policy and Sustainability Management is a natural outgrowth of the school’s increasing involvement in this field and the ways in which it embraces both policy and management. Rather than offer even more courses in this field and sponsor them out of one program or the other, a decision was made to incubate a new graduate degree.

GPIA, meanwhile, has appealed to students with a broad range of interests in the field of international affairs. Its single Masters-level program encompasses a wide range of possible career paths, and its curricular and academic structures have been much more integrated rather than divided into distinct professional tracks.[§] Correspondingly, GPIA’s strategy for growth has not involved adding new products (degree programs) but improving the quality and scale of its existing MA programs by attracting strong students and adding core faculty with strong backgrounds in the social sciences and field of international practice.

These different philosophies for driving enrollment growth are not inconsequential and may be due, in part, to the differences in age of GPIA and Milano and a number of other variables. But the differing strategies influence the cultures of both academic units. Managing different and linking cultures therefore is a significant challenge as we move ahead.

These divergences do not necessarily suggest incompatibilities; indeed, in many cases the differences point to complementarities and potential future strength. (For example, access to the offerings of Milano’s more focused professional programs would greatly strengthen GPIA.) But they are linked to some anxieties that each side has moving into this process that the Task Force feels are important to acknowledge explicitly.

Faculty members in GPIA are concerned that the Program, which has successfully developed its own brand and profile, will lose its individuality and academic logic within a larger entity. The scope of GPIA’s activities has more resembled that of a school than a department, and its director has had a level of decision-making power and autonomy that does not resemble a department chair. This autonomy has well served the program

[§] The curricula of the GPIA MA and MS degrees do not differ from each other in any meaningful *substantive* sense. In reality, they are a single program with a single curriculum.

which has grown to almost 400 students in eight years. Faculty are concerned that if the head of GPIA were to become only one among a number of heads of degree-granting programs (whether chairs or directors) that an important ingredient of its past success would be undermined. For related reasons, GPIA faculty believe that the new School needs to have a new name which does not include “Milano”, thereby signaling a new beginning and establishing a new brand. GPIA faculty also believe that the new entity needs to have a new Board of Governors which does not simply add people to the Milano BOG, but rather consists of a new set of high profile individuals consistent with the substantive orientation of the new School.

Milano has parallel concerns. The creation of a new School also constitutes a kind of “demotion” in the sense that Milano currently has a Dean who reports directly to the Provost. Consequently, Milano faculty members are concerned that the merger will result in a loss of divisional status and therefore relative autonomy. There is also a concern that Milano’s resources will simply be diluted as they are shared with GPIA, without corresponding gains. Senior administration and faculty at Milano believe that its support infrastructure is currently running at capacity, though it may appear different when compared to the dearth of academic and student support functions on GPIA’s organizational chart. Both GPIA and Milano agree that, while the “infrastructure” models currently exist (e.g., Student Affairs, Career Planning and Development), those functions must be “built out” to adequately serve GPIA. Finally, Milano is concerned that the extensive changes the School conceived and executed as a result of its external review several years ago will now be lost in the integration. Some Milano faculty are concerned that frustration will result as they are asked, once again, to recreate a new School as the finishing touches are just being applied to the last organizational initiative.

These concerns suggest that decisions about structure and governance should carefully balance strategic integration with steps to ensure that the autonomy and distinctive qualities of the various programs that will comprise a new entity are preserved. The Task Force has arrived at a number of initial parameters for thinking about questions of governance and structure in the coming year.

- Whatever administrative and governance arrangements are ultimately defined, integration should not take the form of an “acquisition” of one unit by the other. We should aim to balance strategic integration with substantial autonomy of the existing programs in curricular and faculty development.
- Substantial scope should be given to individual units of a new School to pursue their own strategies of growth and to be organized according to their own logics of governance. At the same time, mechanisms should be created that will allow greater integration – both administrative and substantive – over time, as seems appropriate. The process of integration should also be a process of inquiry that takes place not only over the next several months but over the next few years.

- GPIA and Milano will maintain all existing degree programs, concentrations, and specializations, with current degree requirements unchanged. These programs include a Master of Arts and Master of Science in International Affairs, a Master of Science in Nonprofit Management, Master of Science in Organizational Change Management, Master of Science in Urban Policy Analysis and Management, and a Doctorate in Public and Urban Policy. The new entity will continue to offer the existing Milano post-graduate certificate program in Organization Development. No anticipated changes will affect Milano's plans to roll out a program in Environmental Policy and Sustainability Management in Fall 2010, and new post-graduate certificate programs in Leadership and Change, Sustainability Management, and Community Development Finance already under review by the Provost's office.

IV.C. Key questions for decision about internal structure and governance

In light of these orientations, major decisions in the initial period (Year 0) should focus on the arrangement of academic programs within a new School – not with changes that are internal to degree-granting programs. Most crucial among these are the following.

Structure of Academic Programs At the current time, Milano has an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, two Chairs of its program groups, each of which oversees degree-granting programs, and a Director of its doctoral program. GPIA, meanwhile, has a single Director, an Assistant Director for Practice, an Assistant Director for Administration and Student Affairs, and five Concentration Chairs. The most fundamental question to be addressed in the coming year concerns how this existing structure will be modified to fit the existing degree-granting programs into a new entity. At least three proposals have emerged from discussions on the Task Force:

1. Retain existing structures of the two units, with two Milano Program Groups (policy and management) in one unit, and GPIA in the other. In this variant, the position of Director in GPIA would become the Associate Dean or Director of International Affairs, and the Dean position in Milano would become either the Associate Dean or Director of Policy and Management.
2. Make the current Milano program groups (Policy and Management) independent and directly subordinate to the Dean, such that there would be three units – GPIA and two Milano Program Groups – each headed by a Director or Associate Dean.
3. Create a structure in which each degree-granting unit (GPIA, each of Milano's four masters programs, and the doctoral program) would report directly to the Dean.

It should be noted that each of these alternatives is consistent with, but does not require, a single Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (see below).

Beyond the degree granting programs, at Milano there are current and planned post-graduate certificate programs and an existing executive education program that will be continued. We propose that the existing post-master's certificate in Organization Development and the new post-master's certificates currently under development in Community Development Finance, Sustainability Management, and Leadership and Change be housed in the programs to which they are related. Further, we propose that the Tenenbaum Leadership Initiative will remain under the auspices of the organizational change management program. It is possible that a center for executive education, and/or graduate programs target to executives, should be developed.

An Associate Dean of Academic Affairs In Milano's current structure an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs is responsible for a range of issues such as aspects of academic planning and management of part-time faculty. At GPIA these issues are managed at the Program level. A decision should be made about whether the new School should have an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs with this profile.

Academic Appointments, Reviews, and Promotions Currently, academic appointments in GPIA are made at the program level, while academic appointments at Milano are made at the level of the School as a whole (and thus are not affiliated with a specific degree-granting program). Decisions will have to be made about whether academic appointments will be made at the level of the School or sub-units of the school (degree-granting programs, or another sub-unit).

Corresponding provisions will have to be made concerning decisions about faculty reviews, renewals, and promotion. We strongly suggest that during the three year transition phase faculty currently appointed to both units are reviewed under existing program and divisional standards and processes. This is necessary to ensure that evaluation is consistent with the expectations set by the programs and divisions in which these faculty members have been working.

PhD Program The creation of a new School provides an important opportunity to expand and strengthen the existing Milano PhD program through the integration of GPIA faculty. This expanded program would require that over time appropriate administrative arrangements would have to be made such that faculty from all academic programs in a future School could be affiliated with the PhD program, depending on the relevance of the faculty member's professional work.

Structure of Administrative Offices At the present time, Milano has an administrative structure appropriate to a School, including an Associate Dean for Administration, an Associate Dean for Student Services, an Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and two

Program Managers who support the chairs of Milano's program groups. GPIA's administrative support is provided primarily by an Assistant Director whose responsibilities encompass some functions that are covered in Milano by the Associate Deans and the Program Managers. Other functions now carried out by Milano administrators are managed for GPIA at the divisional level in NSGS. Therefore, a range of decisions will have to be made about the redistribution of functions among the division, school, and program levels in a new entity.

It is assumed that many or all of Milano's current School-level offices (e.g., Student Services, Career Services, Administration, and Academic Affairs) will remain School-level offices in the new entity, while others may be assimilated into divisional offices. Many decisions about the distribution of administrative functions in the School will therefore depend on the administrative structure of the division as well as on decisions about the academic structure of the new School, discussed above.

V. Curriculum

A major argument for joining Milano and GPIA in a new School relates to complementarities in the curricula of these units. Each program has curricular strengths – in areas such as practice, research methods, and international programs – that could clearly benefit students from the counter-part program. Across the two academic years from Fall 2008 through spring 2010, 99 GPIA students have registered in 29 different Milano courses, while 69 (63 MS and 6 PhD) Milano students have registered across 46 different GPIA courses. While the total numbers are around 10 percent of the respective student bodies, 75 courses have attracted this cross-registration demonstrating the value of an expanding set of course offerings. While we would expect to see more cross enrollment after a merger, the vast majority of students has, and by definition should maintain, substantively different interests, orientations, and goals. Thus the success of the academic programs and their related professional outcomes also requires a commitment to strengthening their differences. This will necessitate a careful balancing act of resource allocation among programs if we expect to maintain and grow student enrollment based on this unique mix.

Closer integration of the curricula of Milano and GPIA programs will be a long-term task for a new School. In the short term, the integration will allow students in both programs much greater ease in learning about and taking courses outside their specific program. In addition, the Task Force sees a number of specific areas in which immediate efforts should be made to more closely integrate the curricula of Milano and GPIA programs.

Quantitative methods Many GPIA students currently take Milano's Quantitative Methods course to satisfy their research methods requirement, and Milano Management students are interested in a more qualitative approach to research methods, which Milano currently does not offer. So there are possibilities for

advancement over the long term. In the short term GPIA is redesigning Research Methods to include methodology, basic “numeracy,” and a range of more practical applied pieces. The new course will be structured as a faculty lecture, with required lab sections led by a research assistant, both meeting weekly for two hours. Lab time will be devoted to analyzing datasets, class discussions, and giving quizzes and exams. Efforts should be made to coordinate this new methods course with the existing Milano offerings.

Practice Approximately half of GPIA students currently choose the “Practice Option” (the other half writing a thesis) to complete their final project requirement, and those would be the students likely to benefit most by the integration’s broader course offerings. GPIA every semester offers courses in Program Development and Project Management, which teaches the project cycle, and the Practicum, where students execute a project for a client organization, and irregularly offers other such applied classes in Monitoring and Evaluation and International Program Management. Milano courses that might expect more GPIA students are Quantitative Methods, Financial Management (Budgeting and Accounting), and the non-profit and organizational management courses. For the Practicum itself, with its constant need for new client NGOs, non-profits, public and private sector and multilateral agencies; the challenge of offering first-rate projects every semester would be greatly alleviated by connections of the Milano faculty, who could also contribute their technical expertise to project supervision.

International Field Program Since its 2002 inception, 403 students have participated in the IFP, of which perhaps less than a dozen have been Milano students. For summer 2010, 11 Milano students have been accepted, and we hope to have significant increases in subsequent summers. There are curricular issues to work out to allow easier Milano participation in the IFP (a 9-credit program that would swallow most electives for Milano students).

Milano International Requirement Milano students must take 3 of their 42 credits as an “international or cross-cultural elective.” The integration will certainly widen those elective choices.

Internships Milano and GPIA’s internship requirements are incongruent and whether they remain so is a longer-term question. Milano students without work experience are required to undertake an internship of 400 to 900 hours, for no credit. GPIA students are not required to do an internship, however they can do so either for credit, after 150 hours, or not. In internship placements and other curricular endeavors, GPIA and Milano students can expect to benefit from Milano’s New York City and GPIA’s international connections. It is hoped that Milano faculty will also teach GPIA Practice courses and supervise projects and IFP countries. Over the longer term, we anticipate that all members of the joint faculties will work collectively on research collaboration, linking

existing degree programs, creating new degree and certificate programs, and other curricular challenges of shaping a new School.

VI. Conclusions and Issues to Be Addressed

This Concept Note has briefly presented the rationale for the integration of the GPIA and Milano, including a vision of the objectives of the new entity, shared values, complementary strengths, strategic considerations, structure and governance, and curriculum. The members of the joint Milano-GPIA Task Force feel that this Note should also raise additional issues whose resolution will be critical for the achievement of these objectives and which may be viewed as enabling conditions for the successful birth and maturation of the new School. These issues are:

- (1) The position of the entity within the proposed larger new division: As noted earlier, both faculties share a concern that if their integration occurs within the proposed new division, there is the likelihood that the new entity will not receive the attention required to be successful. Task Force members agree that an effective divisional framework means that the educational products should be consistent in their qualities and characteristics and that such consistency is the basis for effective policies for management, budgetary allocation, as well as faculty recruitment and promotion. Some Milano faculty members feel that transitioning from their current “divisional” status will reduce their profile and support within the University.
- (2) Establishing critical mass: The establishment of the new entity offers an important opportunity to pull together diverse units working on issues within the University underneath a single organizational umbrella which is primarily devoted to research and teaching. For Milano, there is the desire to maintain units already housed in Milano: The Center for New York City Affairs, the Community Development Finance Lab Project, and the New School coordination role for the Ashoka Changemakers Campus program. There is also Milano interest in regaining prominence in offering executive education and organizational consultation projects. While the current Milano Tenenbaum Leadership Initiative, a \$750,000 grant funded executive education program, is but one example of this, we believe Milano’s past work with international NGOs can be revitalized in the new entity. For GPIA, units to be pulled into the new School may include the Observatory on Latin America, the India-China Institute, the International Center for Migration and Citizenship, and the Transnational Center for Democracy and Society.
- (3) The need for university investment: The pursuit of quality inevitably requires investment. Both faculties believe that this means that the University should identify a set of high profile investments in the new entity which support its new identity and branding while also putting in place key faculty and institutional

resources. This includes locating, for example, the currently vacant endowed ICI chair within the new entity and also establishing some new research centers, such as a proposed center on human security which is being proposed by GPIA faculty.

There is need to determine the appropriate level of administrative and student support for the new School. For example, Student Services and Career Services at Milano cannot immediately serve twice the number of students; nor would we expect that serving twice the number of students would double costs. Therefore, for each key administrative area the Task Force should work with appropriate staff to cost out needs in order to reach broad agreement on the overall size and nature of needed investment. During year 0, a more specific administrative plan for integration, including a costing exercise, should be completed.

As noted above, it is the desire of both GPIA and Milano to offer executive education. This will require a future physical plant that supports these initiatives, which cannot be offered in traditional classrooms or on standard weekly class schedules. In the 1990s, the university built dedicated space for these initiatives at 80 Fifth Avenue but, when Milano was consolidated at 72 Fifth Avenue, these facilities were then reassigned to other units of the university. Further, existing faculty pay practices severely restrict the ability to offer executive programs. Both GPIA and Milano see a critical need for university investment – some of it as initial launch funding, some in the creation of specialized facilities, some in revisiting policies - if the true synergistic effect is to be realized.

- (4) The need for strong immediate university instructions to CEA to actively support branding and naming of the new entity: This technical support in the spring of 2010 is a critical component for the successful launching of the new entity. It will be essential for the recruitment and admission of a strong entering class for fall 2011.
- (5) The need for Admission and Career Services to be focused on both experienced and entry level professionals. To continue to attract experienced students, Admission must develop specific marketing strategies for all programs targeted to this group, as well as strengthen connections with organizations that employ them. There is also a need for a strong, professionally focused Career Services operation that can facilitate employment in the varied areas of student interest. This need is increasingly acute as more full-time, younger students have enrolled in the graduate programs, increasing the demand for career preparation and placement. Based on the considerable success Milano has had with its Career Services operation, we feel strongly that these Career Services must be located at the level of the new School for the entity to be successful.

- (6) GPIA and Milano concerns: As noted above, each unit comes to the process of integration and design of the new entity with its own concerns, based on its respective position, historical experience, aspirations, strengths, and weaknesses. This is intensified by the fact that while GPIA is a program, Milano is currently a division of the University. Despite assertions of “equal status” in entering the process, these assertions do not accurately reflect the actual situation, because, as a division, Milano has a Dean, a Board of Governors, an elaborated administrative structure, with 9 administrative staff to the two in GPIA, who perform a range of “divisional functions”.
- a. Some Milano faculty members are concerned that the merger will result in a loss of divisional status and therefore autonomy. There is a broad concern that the integration will require a sharing of administrative resources and infrastructure with a larger number of faculty and students in a combined entity, and therefore reduce the quality of existing support. Milano faculty believes that maintaining the existing model of administrative support to faculty is necessary to assure time for teaching and research. Finally, there is concern that a patina of “international” at the school will diminish the School’s ability to attract students interested in management and leadership in their respective fields. Some current Milano students, particularly those who do not have significant international interests, have shared concerns about what they fear will become a “loss” of the management and policy school they see reflected in the current name and school’s 30-year alumni history.
 - b. In the case of GPIA, faculty are concerned that the Program, which has very successfully grown in quantity and quality since 2001, and which has developed its own brand and profile, will lose its individuality and academic logic within a larger entity. GPIA faculty believe that the new School needs to have a new name which does not include “Milano”, thereby signaling a new beginning and establishing a new brand. GPIA faculty also believe that the new entity needs to have a new Board of Governors which does not simply add people to the Milano BOG, but rather consists of a new set of high profile individuals consistent with the substantive orientation of the new School.