University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
School of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I   (pre-professional degree plus 62 graduate credit hours)
Track II (undergraduate degree plus 65 pre-requisite credit hours and 54
                graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
April 1, 2015

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Team Findings

1.   Team Comments and Visit Summary
The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign School of Architecture has a historic place in the evolution of architectural education in the United States. It has been a leader in the creation and evolution of the profession's development since its first architectural curriculum in 1867. It has continued to host many "firsts" through its long and storied history. The program today recognizes its legacy and strives to continue to build upon it as the 21st century presents the profession with unprecedented challenges. The program is embracing changes to its previous ways of doing things as a work in progress. In that effort, the program seeks to celebrate its past while moving toward a future enhanced by the graduates of its program.

The visiting team was welcomed as critics of and collaborators with the program's efforts through the NAAB accreditation process. The planning for the campus visit and requests for clarification of the information in the APR were quickly and completely responded to and resolved. That spirit of responsiveness, openness, frankness, and cooperation continued upon the team's arrival on campus. Everyone, including the students, faculty, staff, college administration, and university administration, readily shared their points of view and opinions, responded to requests for additional information, and supported the team's efforts throughout the visit. The enthusiasm, support, and desire to improve the program were apparent on the part of everyone we encountered while visiting the campus.

We would like to extend a special thanks to Director Mortensen, Professor Dearborn, and Spring Harrison for their support and responsiveness during the accreditation process.

2.   Conditions Not Met
I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity
I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures
A.4 Technical Documentation
A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
B.1 Pre-Design
B.2 Accessibility
B.5 Life Safety
B.6 Comprehensive Design

3.   Causes of Concern

A. The program is undergoing a great many changes, including:
- The recent adoption of new by-laws governing the program, which supersede its previous 40-year-old by-laws.
- The recent adoption of a revised curriculum framework intending to relocate a majority of the NAAB Student Performance Criteria from the undergraduate program to the graduate program.
- A decreasing student enrollment, coupled with an increased internationalization of the student body.
- A revised graduate admissions documentation process.
- The anticipated financial pressures resulting from reductions in state funds supporting the university system.
- The recent transfer of the program's premier study abroad program from its long-standing base in Versailles to Barcelona.
- The addition of several new faculty members.
- The recent appointment of a new director.

In light of the number and magnitude of the changes being undertaken, the visiting team has several concerns regarding the program's future. The aspirational nature of these changes is indicative of the program's clear intention to maintain its legacy and the high standards it has historically achieved. Without a clearly documented plan that includes milestones to guide the implementation of so many simultaneous changes, neither faculty nor students are certain of their path forward. The program clearly recognizes that these changes are far from complete. Some changes, for example, full implementation of the new curriculum, are not anticipated earlier than the 2016 -2017 academic year. The visiting team has reviewed a limited number of examples of student work that may not be relevant, given curriculum changes immediately on the program's horizon. Other changes have undergone continual adjustment in recent years, such as the School Culture Policy and the by-laws, which raises a degree of uncertainty in the academic community. Other changes have just begun to be implemented, such as the relocated study abroad program and the graduate admissions process, with the result being that their effectiveness is unknown. Therefore, to successfully complete the implementation of this process of change, the following will be required: transparency in decision-making, communication of the progress along the path of change, and the mutual trust and respect that need to be extended to every member of the student body, staff, and faculty.

B. The program's director joined the faculty for a 3-year term less than 1 year ago in this time of great change. The visiting team shares the concern—expressed by members of the academic community—that the director's academic expertise is not within the body of knowledge, skills, or traditions of architecture or its professional practice.

C. The documentation of graduates of the program's non-accredited BSAS degree applying for admission to its M. Arch. program does not record compliance with the SPCs met as a result of the successful completion of that undergraduate curriculum. This documentation process does not parallel the documentation of graduate students applying for admission to the M. Arch. program from other pre-professional degree programs, non-professional degree programs, or other academic institutions. The visiting team is concerned that the graduates of the BSAS program who continue their professional education at the University of Illinois may not have their compliance with the SPCs attained during their undergraduate performance accurately documented. The visiting team is, therefore, concerned that those BSAS students could have their academic advising compromised as the program completes implementation of its planned curriculum change that relocates SPCs from its undergraduate to its graduate program.

4.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2009)

2004 Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment Procedures: *The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.*

Previous Team Report (2009): Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment, is considered "Not Met" based upon the following:

At the school level three committees direct administration, school and academic work. The Executive Committee, elected by the faculty, is the primary advisory body to the director. General faculty meetings throughout the year and seven other faculty committees also participate in various levels of direction and assessment. Student organizations are active and meet under the

umbrella organization Architecture Student Advisory Council (ASAC). Student course evaluations and alumni and professionals also give feedback as to school progress and standing.

While the school has continued to progress and gained benefits from many recent improvements to the educational mission through self-assessment activities, clear strategic planning concurrent with on-going self-assessment activities is not evident. During the past five years, the school has welcomed a new school director, focused change in the curriculum, and moved a part of the program to a new facility for the second year course work to be integrated into one environment, sustained multiple faculty retirements and brought 20 new faculty to the program. Due to the amount of change the program is experiencing, the multi-method self-assessment programs need clarification and focus communicated to both faculty and students. The program should recognize that a focused self-assessment is critical to their long-term success.

The program is moving from one that has been described as a series of silos in the past to one of core integration supported by deep areas of knowledge in the future. It would be helpful to have an articulated plan for that transformation and then assessment of the progress toward achieving that plan. Buy-in by faculty is not universal and the inertia of former patterns is difficult to overcome. This context makes moving forward challenging, yet great strides have been made, enthusiasm among many is high and the likelihood of success in this transformation matrix is probable. A robust self-assessment program will identify where there are challenges to progress, how challenges are addressed and milestones that need to be accomplished along the way.

> **2015 Team Assessment:** The visiting team found evidence that Condition I.1.5, Self-Assessment Procedures continues to be **Not Met** during this accreditation cycle. This team found that many of the issues noted by the 2009 visiting team could be restated. In response to the 2009 team report, the program undertook a comprehensive examination of both its governance structure and its curriculum as described in the 2014 APR and evidenced in the fact that Condition I.1.4 Long-Range Planning is fulfilled for this visit. Identification of a number of challenges and opportunities to improve the program were noted in that process (see pages 31 and 32 of the APR). Revised by-laws and a new curriculum framework were adopted in May 2014, less than 1 year prior to this accreditation visit. The program recognizes that it is still in the process of defining its implementation plan for the new curriculum, which is intended to redistribute many of the SPCs from the undergraduate to the graduate curriculum. This will require the development of several new course offerings as well as the revision of existing offerings. The metrics of success around that effort have not been defined or documented in a way that measures progress toward implementing the revised curriculum. See also Causes of Concern, A., listed above.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design: Ability *to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability.*

Previous Team Report (2009): Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design is considered "Not Met" based upon the following: While great strides in addressing comprehensive design have been made, the Team found the student projects presented did not demonstrate an ability to effectively resolve the myriad of design issues associated with this criterion. For additional comments see "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.

> **2015 Visiting Team Assessment:** The visiting team found that SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design remains **Not Met** during this accreditation cycle. A number of the underlying SPCs have not been met based upon the student work provided for studio courses Arch 475 and Arch 573. Both courses are noted in the Student Performance Matrix as being

the primary courses where this SPC is to be met. Student work provided for studio courses Arch 476, Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574 did not illustrate achievement indicating that the full range of SPCs required was successfully integrated into a comprehensive solution.

II.   Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission:

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence.

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition I.1.1 is fulfilled through the narrative provided in the APR, pages 6 through 12.

The program is clearly aware of its legacy dating back to 1867, which places it among the oldest architectural programs in the nation. Based on the polytechnic model of education, this program was unique in its focus on building technology and research in the building arts. Those areas of focus continue into the present day and are being augmented through growing interest in building performance, sustainable design, and health/wellness.

In 2010, the program undertook a multi-year process of reflection and evaluation of its place within the university community and the mission guiding its work. This process paralleled the campus-wide assessment, "Visioning Excellence at Illinois," as well as that of the College of Fine and Applied Arts (FAA), of which the program is a part. The resulting vision statement, "Learn from the past. Question the present. Shape the future," serves to honor the program's past accomplishments and propel it into the future. The program's mission is based on the core values of creative inquiry and state-of-the-art research based upon a solid technical foundation and reflective of society's changing goals, beliefs, and resources as described on page 13 of the APR.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
- *Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments, both traditional and non-traditional.*

  Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

  Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff— irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.*

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has not demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program **has demonstrated** that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment as documented in the APR on pages 13 through 17. A Task Force, which was composed of an administrator, several faculty members, and a majority of the students, revised the school's School Culture Policy, which was adopted in May 2010. Cornerstones of that policy are respect, sharing, engagement, innovation, communication, and academic excellence across the program's community. The policy has been broadly shared through digital and print media, posted within the program's facilities, and included in the orientation week program given to incoming graduate students. Further revisions to the School Culture Policy were made in 2011 and 2014 in concert with other policy revisions being undertaken by the program. These revisions have been shared, as noted above.

The team found evidence that the program **has not demonstrated** that it provides a culturally rich learning environment relative to maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students. A Diversity Plan was developed by a committee whose members included faculty, students, and staff, and it was adopted in May 2000. The plan embraces five major principles that are to be activated through nine initiatives as described on page 18 of the APR. The plan is distributed digitally through the program's website. The undergraduate and graduate student enrollment figures provided on pages 97 and 98 of the APR illustrated that diversity decreased between fall 2007 and fall 2012. The ethnic diversity of the faculty has not increased as illustrated through examination of the faculty diversity figures reported in the 2009 APR relative to those reported in the 2013 Annual Report on page 100 of this APR. These figures illustrate that faculty gender diversity has increased by a small percentage, as the number of female faculty has remained unchanged while the total number of faculty has decreased. Additional information for 2014/2015, provided at the request of the visiting team, indicated that the percentage of tenure track female faculty campus wide is 34.2% compared to the Architecture unit's 23.3%. These additional figures reflected multiple years in which the Architecture unit's faculty diversity has been below that of the campus as a whole. The visiting team inquired about specific implementation plans—in addition to the eight Director's Scholarships and the NOMA-sponsored symposium, which both occurred in 2014—to activate the initiatives described on page 18 of the APR. No additional specific actions or plans were described in response to this inquiry, nor was additional documentation about the plans provided.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: *Programs must demonstrate, through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.*

   A. **Architectural Education and the Academic Community**. *That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.[1] In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical, and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.*

   [X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

---

[1] See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

2015 Team Assessment: The school has multiple faculty members with superb national and international academic recognition. The research productivity of this faculty meets the highest standards. Research publications by faculty and competition entries by faculty and students have received multiple national and international awards. Faculty and students present their research at major conferences, such as the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) and the Environmental Design Research Association (EDRA), as described on page 19 of the APR. The recent definition of four distinct program areas (urbanism; health and well-being; detail and fabrication; and building performance) creates numerous opportunities for interdisciplinary education. The fact that graduate architecture students can pursue joint Master's degrees in the areas of Business Administration, Computer Science, Urban Planning, and Civil Engineering attests to how well the School of Architecture is integrated into the university's academic structure.

Faculty, staff, and students make substantial efforts to understand the changing profession of architecture and to foster an encouraging teaching and learning environment. Students contribute to fraternity life through their well-populated Alpha Rho Chi chapter

B. **Architectural Education and Students**. *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices; and to develop the habit of lifelong learning.*

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team led discussions with current undergraduate and graduate students in a very well-attended "student only" meeting. The vision of a diverse program within the School of Architecture has been well received by students. They feel that the curriculum changes made thus far have improved the program. The faculty act in many ways as mentors to students wishing to gain knowledge of a particular topic within the school's program. During the team-led discussions, students remarked that the study abroad programs in place offer them worldly perspective and experiences in architecture. Students feel comfortable that the knowledge learned in studios and the topics discussed in classroom courses prepare them to pursue licensure. The large number of students intending to secure an architectural license quickly upon graduation is demonstrated by those starting their IDP record while in school. The school hosts a rich annual career fair for students, which offers support to those pursuing a professional career. Work documented in Arch 501 illustrates that recent graduates are prepared to make thoughtful, deliberate, and informed choices regarding their future career goals in or around the profession of architecture.

C. **Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment**. *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located; and, prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).*

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: Education, Experience, and Examination have long been the basis for the exclusive right to create the places where we live, work, and play, which society has granted to architects by virtue of licensing our profession. The program introduces its students to these requirements of licensure early in their academic careers in a variety of ways. The program's Architect Licensing Advisor is an active and visible member of the faculty, who shares his

knowledge with both undergraduate and graduate students. The Guest Coordinators in Arch 501 constitute a punctuation point in the program's preparation of students to transition from the Education phase of their preparation to the Experience and Examination phases of the licensure process. An impressive number of students responded that they had begun their IDP records with NCARB during the visiting team's meeting with the student body.

D. **Architectural Education and the Profession**. *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities; and to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.*

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The program is preparing its M. Arch. graduates to enter practice and respond to the complexities of practice in the 21st century. The examination of and revisions to the program's governance and curriculum, as described in the APR, pages 23 to 34, represent a clear intention to make the revisions needed to keep the program relevant and prepare students to address the unknown issues they will encounter throughout their careers. Technical performance issues and the craft of building have long been the foundation of the program. As seen in the syllabi and student work for the courses addressing the Student Performance Criteria in Realm B, the program is integrating advances in building technology and design to maintain those traditions. Preparing for the leadership, collaborative, and business roles that architects must assume as part of the AEC industry is the focus of Arch 501.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good**. *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation, and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.*

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The students and faculty are eager to address environmental, health, and social challenges confronting society through architectural design and research. The program's four entries in the Solar Decathlon Competition, and its application for a fifth entry, are outstanding examples of the program's contributions to raising public awareness of sustainability and the possibilities of low-energy housing. The students and faculty exhibited a keen awareness of architecture's opportunities and its obligation to address societal issues, including diversity and social justice. Student work presented in the design studio and team room, such as the Arch 572 Haiti Studio, shows the faculty's and students' high ethical and social ambitions. The program's focus on Action Research presents additional strong evidence of developing mechanisms for engaging a broader range of communities.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.*

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program **has demonstrated** that it engages in a regular and robust process that fulfills Condition I.1.4 as documented in the APR on pages 23 through 27. This process includes considering the program's place in the college and the university in order to align with their goals while maintaining an appropriate focus on its goals. The refinement of the program's vision statement, "Learn from the past. Question the future. Shape the future," is further evidence of that focus. These efforts have led to proposed curriculum changes that have not yet been fully implemented.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*
▪ *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
▪ *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
▪ *Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
▪ *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
  ○ *Solicitation of faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning, and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
  ○ *Individual course evaluations.*
  ○ *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
  ○ *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*
The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

[X] The program's processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program **has not demonstrated** that its processes meet Condition I.1.5 as documented in the APR on pages 27 through 34. The program has defined its objectives and assessed its challenges. While the program's Curriculum Committee members include students to assist in the evaluation of courses, few other inputs appear to be utilized. The campus-wide Instructor and Course Evaluation System (ICES), the Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL), the "Teachers Ranked as Excellent by their Students" list, and the Chancellor's Senior Survey are available inputs that can be used, but there is no evidence that they are regularly consulted. The student meetings with the director and the "Quipit" forums that include students and faculty, which are held periodically throughout the academic year, are additional opportunities for input, but there does not appear to be any documentation of these discussions that can be referenced in the assessment process. There is no discussion in the APR of regular, documented input to the assessment process from practitioners or alumni. No specific implementation plan with milestones is used to evaluate progress toward achieving the program's goals or the many changes that it currently has underway. See also Causes of Concern, A., listed above.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:
▪ *Faculty and Staff:*
  o *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies, which may include, but are not limited to, faculty and staff position descriptions.[2]*
  o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
  o *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure, and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

[X] Human resources (faculty and staff) are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program **has adequate** human resources to meet Condition I.2.1 for faculty and staff as documented in the APR on pages 34 through 49. Campus-wide policies for faculty appointments, the tenure and promotion process, and annual evaluations are listed on the Office of the Provost's website. In its by-laws, the program provides additional information on its specific tenure and promotion processes and visiting/adjunct appointments. The APR includes, on pages 39 to 45, an impressive list of financial support opportunities for faculty development. The faculty members are satisfied concerning financial support and grants available for conference travel, research, and creative work. The UI's Office of Diversity, Equity, and Access provides a full palette of resources related to Equal Employment and Affirmative Action.

The faculty-student ratio in studios is 14 to 67, which is within an acceptable range to achieve the program's mission.

The program's Architect Licensing Advisor, Lee Waldrep, is widely known among faculty and students, and gives presentations in Arch 501 and Arch 231.

▪ *Students:*
  o *An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to, application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshmen, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.*

---

[2] A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

[X] Human Resources (students) are adequate for the program

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program **has adequate** human resources to meet Condition I.2.1 for students as documented in the APR on pages 49 through 55. Student admissions policies and procedures, including those regarding financial aid, are clearly documented on the website.

The Associate Director for Graduate Studies (currently, Clinical Associate Professor William Worn) provides primary advising for Track II M. Arch. students. Carl Lewis, an Academic Professional, provides primary advising for Track III M. Arch. students. Two staff members in the Graduate Office support Professor Worn and Mr. Lewis, but do not provide advising. Enlisting the support of additional faculty within specialty program counseling is needed to increase the effectiveness of these advising efforts. A particularly helpful effort to assist international students in succeeding in the program and becoming more integrated into student life was begun by way of a survey in 2014.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance:
▪ **Administrative Structure:** *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.*

[X] Administrative structure is adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program has an administrative structure that is **adequate** and appropriate to meet Condition I.2.2 as documented in the APR on pages 55 through 60. The College of Fine and Applied Arts is home to the program and six other units. Both the university structure and the college structure afford the program the autonomy and resources that are adequate to lead and administer the program. The program's by-laws, adopted in spring 2014, are further evidence of the program's autonomy in determining its own governance and in its willingness to take advantage of that opportunity.

▪ **Governance:** *The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.*

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the program has a governance structure that is **adequate** and appropriate to meet Condition I.2.2 as documented in the APR on pages 60 and 61. The program's by-laws, adopted in spring 2014, provide clarification of this governance structure and define its processes. Elected committees, standing committees, and ad hoc committees are enabled through these by-laws, defining a total of 10 committees. All members of the academic community—students, staff, and faculty—can participate in the committees' activities.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:*
▪ *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.*
▪ *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
▪ *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

[X] Physical resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Condition I.2.3 Physical Resources are **adequate** as noted in the APR on pages 61 through 74. Additional evidence was seen in the resources found on the website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/ welcome/facilities and through a review of the facilities during the accreditation visit. Desk replacements (190 constructed in the program's fabrication shop on campus with student help), an ongoing maintenance and facilities upgrade plan, and a feasibility study, including library areas and IT infrastructure upgrades, illustrate the program's efforts to keep pace with programmatic changes. Fabrication facilities, and printing, scanning, and similar support facilities are readily accessible to the studio spaces.

I.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

[X] Financial resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Condition I.2.4 Financial Resources are adequate as noted in the APR on pages 76 through 93. While the continuous decreases in the state budget, gifts and endowments, and scholarships and fellowships are challenging, the program and the college have clearly defined processes to adjust to these decreases. The college's dean is utilizing increased transparency and more robust communications in the budgeting process to more fully engage the architecture program's administration and faculty. The increased faculty participation in the development of the budget results in their greater understanding of the budget's implications and achieving budgetary targets. The college and program also discuss how to increase financial revenue, for example, by increasing non-major teaching, offering more online courses, and developing more interdisciplinary projects.

The university and the program have numerous opportunities for student financial support in place, such as the honor programs, scholarships, tuition waivers, and assistantships described on pages 87 through 93 of the APR.

The college realized that—compared to other peer architecture programs—there was a salary gap that was inhibiting faculty recruitment and retention as described on page 80 of the APR. The program was given additional funds and increased flexibility with some existing funds to mitigate this imbalance while building the faculty. Two faculty lines have been protected. These lines are to be filled upon complete implementation of the revised graduate and undergraduate curriculum changes underway.

I.2.5 Information Resources: *The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Condition I.2.5 Information Resources are **adequate** on pages 93 through 96 of the APR and through a review of the facilities during the accreditation visit. Additional evidence was found on the website at http://www.library.illinois.edu. A new librarian had joined the program just a few weeks prior to the visiting team's arrival on campus.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 3 – INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports[3]: *Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.*

- *Program student characteristics*
  - *Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).*
    - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
    - *Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.*
  - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.*
    - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.*
  - *Time to graduation.*
    - *Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.*
    - *Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.*

- *Program faculty characteristics*
  - *Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.*
    - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
    - *Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.*
  - *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
    - *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
  - *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
    - *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
  - *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

[X] Statistical Reports were provided and provide the appropriate information.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that Condition I.3.1 is **Met** through a review of the Statistical Reports provided. Visual resources to support this conclusion were found on the website at https://uofi.box.com/s/ 6wmsd4sb6e0ycbnwlb3pu9ylf5lopzpc and noted in the APR on pages 96 through 101.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: *The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the* NAAB Responses *to the annual reports.*

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

---

[3] In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses *to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the* Focused Evaluation Program Report *and* Focused Evaluation Team Report*, including appendices and addenda, should also be included.*

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Condition I.3.2 Annual Reports are **provided and appropriate** through a review of the Annual Reports provided in the team room, noted in the APR on pages 96 through 101. Additional evidence was found on the website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation and noted in the APR on page 101.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: *The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history, and context of the institution.*

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit[4] that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Condition I.3.3 Faculty Credentials are **provided and appropriate** through a review of the faculty credentials noted on pages 102 and 103 of the APR, documents provided in the team room, additional information requested by the visiting team while on campus, the faculty exhibit, and information on the website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/faculty.

---

[4] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3.

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the Policy Review condition is **Met** through a review of the websites noted on pages 103 and 104 of the APR, documents provided in the team room, and additional information requested by the visiting team while on campus.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE
CRITERIA

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: *The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.*

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

- *Being broadly educated.*
- *Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.*
- *Communicating graphically in a range of media.*
- *Recognizing the assessment of evidence.*
- *Comprehending people, place, and context.*
- *Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.*

A. 1. **Communication Skills:** *Ability to* **read, write, speak, and listen effectively.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.1 Communication Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 577 and Arch 501 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Evidence was also found in Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 573.

A. 2. **Design Thinking Skills:** *Ability to* **raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.2 Design Thinking Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 577, Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and Arch 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room and in Arch 502/556.

A. 3. **Visual Communication Skills:** *Ability to* **use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.3 Visual Communication Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and Arch 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 4. **Technical Documentation:** *Ability* **to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.**

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.4 Technical Documentation criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in either Arch 475 or Arch 573 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 5. **Investigative Skills:** *Ability to* **gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.5 Investigative Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and ARCH 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 6. **Fundamental Design Skills:** *Ability to* **effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.6 Fundamental Design Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 577, Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and Arch 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 7. **Use of Precedents:** *Ability* **to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.7 Use of Precedents criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 577, Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and Arch 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 8. **Ordering Systems Skills:** *Understanding* **of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.8 Ordering Systems Skills criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in Arch 577, Arch 571, Arch 572, Arch 573, and Arch 574 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 9. **Historical Traditions and Global Culture:** *Understanding* **of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the**

Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

 [X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found that the A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture criterion is **Not Met** in Arch 577, Arch 573, Arch 475, or Arch 210 as noted on the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. A review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work provided did not demonstrate that the traditions and culture of either the Eastern or the Southern hemisphere was addressed.

A. 10.   **Cultural Diversity*: Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the A.10 Cultural Diversity criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binder for Arch 577 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

A. 11.   **Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**
[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the A.11 Applied Research criterion is **Met with Distinction** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work for Arch 544, Arch 558, Arch 559, Arch 593, Arch 594dd, Arch 594gds, and Arch 595in as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Every graduate student is required to take a minimum of one of these elective courses.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The curriculum addresses the broad range of critical thinking, representation, and communication skills required to succeed in architectural practice. Students completing the M. Arch. program are well prepared to participate in architectural teams within offices and contribute to the design, representation, and completion of projects.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, *Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally, they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:*

- *Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.*
- *Comprehending constructability.*
- *Incorporating life safety systems.*
- *Integrating accessibility.*
- *Applying principles of sustainable design.*

B. 1. **Pre-Design:** *Ability* **to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.**

 [X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.1 Pre-Design criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binder for Arch 572. Some student work did illustrate that students acquired these skills as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In response to the team's request for additional evidence, the program indicated that not all graduate students were required to enroll in Arch 572. Perhaps as few as 85% of the students were enrolled in this course.

B. 2. **Accessibility:** *Ability* **to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities**.

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.2 Accessibility criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. Evidence in student drawings was inconsistent in demonstrating that accessibility and inclusive design issues are consciously or critically addressed in students' design solutions. This SPC was also **Not Met** in the 2009 accreditation cycle.

B. 3. **Sustainability:** *Ability* **to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.**

 [X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.3 Sustainability criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for

Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Evidence was also found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. Elective courses Arch 594dd, Arch 594gds, and Arch 595in allow students to deepen their knowledge of sustainable design issues.

B. 4.   **Site Design:** *Ability* **to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.4 Site Design criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Additional evidence was found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574.

B. 5.   **Life Safety:** *Ability* **to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.**

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.5 Life Safety criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for courses Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. Evidence in student drawings was inconsistent in demonstrating that life-safety provisions, including door swings, exit stair layouts, areas of refuge, fire sprinklers, and fire rated assemblies, are often considered in the studio courses.

B. 6.   **Comprehensive Design:** *Ability* **to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:**

A.2. Design Thinking Skills	**B.2. Accessibility**
A.4. Technical Documentation	**B.3. Sustainability**
A.5. Investigative Skills	**B.4. Site Design**
A.8. Ordering Systems	**B.7. Environmental Systems**
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture	**B.9.Structural Systems**
B.5. Life Safety	

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.6 Comprehensive Design criterion is **Not Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 573 and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. In addition, evidence was not found in studio courses Arch 571, Arch 572, and Arch 574. A number of the underlying SPCs required of this SPC were **Not Met** as noted, resulting in student drawings that were

inconsistent in demonstrating that these design issues are consciously or critically addressed. This SPC was also **Not Met** in the 2009 accreditation cycle.

B. 7   **Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* **of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.7 Financial Considerations criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

B. 8.   **Environmental Systems:** *Understanding* **the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.8 Environmental Systems criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 341, Arch 342, and Arch 475 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Graduate students who cannot demonstrate achievement of skills reflecting this criterion in their undergraduate program are required to take Arch 573.

B. 9.   **Structural Systems:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.9 Structural Systems criterion is **Met with Distinction** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 502 and Arch 556 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Elective courses Arch 544, Arch 558, Arch 559, and Arch 593 allow students to deepen their knowledge of structural systems design issues.

B. 10.   **Building Envelope Systems:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.10 Building Envelope Systems criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 475 and Arch 573 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Graduate students who cannot demonstrate achievement of skills reflecting this criterion in their undergraduate program are required to take Arch 573.

B. 11.   **Building Service Systems Integration:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.11 Building Service Systems Integration criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 341, Arch 475, and Arch 573 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Graduate students who cannot demonstrate achievement of skills reflecting this criterion in their undergraduate program are required to take Arch 573.

B. 12.   **Building Materials and Assemblies Integration:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse**.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the B.12 Building Materials and Assemblies Integration is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 475 and Arch 573 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Graduate students who cannot demonstrate achievement of skills reflecting this criterion in their undergraduate program are required to take Arch 573

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign School of Architecture has a long and storied history of providing students with a solid grounding in the technical skills required to design and deliver projects. The program continues to build on that technical legacy, particularly in the areas of structural design and research.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- *Knowing societal and professional responsibilities.*
- *Comprehending the business of building.*
- *Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.*
- *Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.*
- *Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.*

C. 1.   **Collaboration:** *Ability* **to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.1 Collaboration criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

C. 2.   **Human Behavior:** *Understanding* **of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment, and the design of the built environment.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.2 Human Behavior criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders and the drawings for Arch 342 and Arch 572 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room. Graduate students who cannot demonstrate achievement of skills reflecting this criterion in their undergraduate program are required to take Arch 572.

C. 3. **Client Role in Architecture:** *Understanding* **of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.3 Client Role in Architecture criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work presented in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

C. 4. **Project Management:** *Understanding* **of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.4 Project Management criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

C. 5. **Practice Management:** *Understanding* **of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.**

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.5 Practice Management criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work presented in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

C. 6. **Leadership:** *Understanding* **of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities**.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.6 Leadership criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

C. 7. **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* **of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations,**

> **professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.7 Legal Responsibilities criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

    C. 8.   **Ethics and Professional Judgment:** *Understanding* **of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.8 Ethics and Professional Judgment criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

    C. 9.   **Community and Social Responsibility:** *Understanding* **of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.**

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that the C.9 Community and Social Responsibility criterion is **Met** through a review of the syllabi, presentations, and student work in the binders for Arch 501 as noted in the SPC Matrix provided in the team room.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The program relies heavily on a single course, Arch 501, to provide students with learning opportunities in fulfillment of the SPCs required in Realm C. Arch 501 offers a broad range of perspectives regarding those SPCs through the guest lecturers that are invited to present various topics to the students. The opportunity to reflect on those perspectives is reinforced through the online journal that students are required to maintain over the period of the course.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: *The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).*

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.2.1 Regional Accreditation is **Met** through a review of online resources at http://ncahlc.org/component/directory/?Action=ShowBasic&Itemid=&instid=1872&lang=en and as noted in the APR on pages 108 and 109. The university received its last re-accreditation in 2009-2010. It is scheduled for its next review for re-accreditation in 2019-2020.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: *The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.*

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum is **Met** as noted in the APR on pages 114 through 120.The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign offers an NAAB-accredited professional Master of Architecture degree that can be achieved in two ways: (1) students with a non-professional undergraduate degree in architecture may enroll in the four-semester course of study requiring 62 credit hours, or (2) students with an undergraduate degree in a subject other than architecture or from another institution may enroll in a four plus semester course of study requiring a minimum of 122 graduate credit hours.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development: *The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.*

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development is **Met** as noted in the APR on pages 120 through 125 and in evidence provided in the team room.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student's progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student's admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that this condition is **Met** as noted in the APR on pages 125 through 127, in evidence provided in the team room, and in a meeting with the Associate Director of Graduate Programs, Professor William Worn. A formalized review process and documentation process was adopted for use in evaluating applicants for admission to the graduate program beginning with the class entering in fall 2015. This process is primarily focused on the evaluation of applicants who are not graduates of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) program.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees: *In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the* 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix 5.*

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees is **Met** through a review of the program's website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation as noted in the APR on page 127. In addition to the NAAB required text, the program clarifies that its Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) pre-professional degree, Master of Science in Architectural Studies post-graduate degree, and PhD in Architecture degree are not professional degrees, nor are these degrees NAAB accredited.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures: *In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents, and faculty:*
    The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
    The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures is **Met** through a review of the program's website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation as noted in the APR on page 127. Working Internet links to both the *2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* and the *2012 Amended Edition of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* are provided.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information: *In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:*
    www.ARCHCareers.org
    The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
    Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
    The Emerging Professional's Companion
    www.NCARB.org
    www.aia.org
    www.aias.org
    www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information is **Met** through a review of the program's website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation as noted in the APR on page 127. Live Internet links to each of the eight required websites for career information are provided.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs: *In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:*
        All Annual Reports, including the narrative
        All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
        The final decision letter from the NAAB
        The most recent APR
        The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs is **Met** through a review of the program's website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation as noted in the APR on pages 127 and 128. Live Internet links are provided to files containing the 2009 APR, 2009 final decision letter and VTR, 2009 SPC chart, and Annual Reports for years 2010, 2011, 2012, 2013, and 2014.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates: *Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents, either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.*

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that Condition II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates is **Met** through a review of the program's website at http://www.arch.illinois.edu/welcome/accreditation as noted in the APR on page 128. A live Internet link is provided to NCARB's web page, which enables a search for the ARE results for University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign students who have taken the exam.

III.   Appendices:

1.   Program Information

[Taken from the *Architecture Program Report*, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A.   History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, APR*,* pp. 6-11

B.   History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, APR, pp. 11-12

C.   Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, APR, pp. 23-25

D.   Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, APR, pp. 25-34

2.   **Conditions Met with Distinction**

A.11 Applied Research
B.9 Structural Systems

3. **The Visiting Team**

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
RK Stewart, FAIA, Hon. FRAIC, Hon. JIA, Hon. AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
4030 Powers Circle
Salt Lake City, UT 84124
(415) 250-4849
rks.faia@comcast.com

Representing the ACSA
Ute Poerschke, Ph.D., LEED®AP
Associate Professor of Architecture
429 Stuckeman Family Building
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802-1425
(814) 865-4238
uxp10@psu.edu

Representing the AIAS
Meghan C. Leahy, Associate AIA
4207 58th Avenue
Apt. 10
Bladensburg, MD 20710
(508) 649-5693
m.leahy87@gmail.com

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

RK Stewart, FAIA, Hon. FRAIC, Hon. JIA, Hon. AIA, LEED®AP BD+C   Representing the AIA
Team Chair

Ute Poerschke, Ph.D., LEED®AP   Representing the ACSA
Team member

Meghan C. Leahy, Associate AIA   Representing the AIAS
Team member

Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

School of Architecture

Director's Office
611 E Lorado Taft Drive
117 Temple Hoyne Buell Hall
Champaign, IL 61820-6921

Response to the NAAB Visiting Team Report
School of Architecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
May 28, 2015

Peter Mortensen, Director
Lynne Dearborn, Associate Professor and Faculty Accreditation Liaison

The School of Architecture at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is deeply invested in the accreditation process provided by the National Architecture Accreditation Board (NAAB). The process ensures that our resources, curriculum, and pedagogy are aligned to prepare students for success in their chosen profession. Maintaining this alignment is an ongoing challenge, and the School has historically incorporated findings from NAAB accreditation evaluations into its continuous efforts to sustain excellence in all phases of its operation.

Indeed, findings laid out in the 2009 NAAB Visiting Team Report (VTR) motivated the School's leadership and faculty to undertake two complementary initiatives that are responsive to the interests of all collateral stakeholders in architectural education:

- The School restructured its faculty into Program Areas, each sufficiently stable to exercise responsibility for segments of the undergraduate and graduate curricula, yet flexible enough encourage instructional and research collaborations across program boundaries.

- Within this new structure, it has been possible to undertake curricular revision, the aim of which is to migrate satisfaction of certain NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC) from the four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) degree program into the two-year Master of Architecture (M.Arch) degree program.

The multi-year process of creating Program Areas was completed in Spring 2013 with adoption of new School bylaws. The adoption of new bylaws set the curriculum revision process in motion, which reached a major milestone in Spring 2014 with the adoption of frameworks for revised undergraduate and graduate curricula. The 2014-2015 academic year saw the Curriculum Committee make excellent progress toward new course development within the approved degree frameworks. It is anticipated that complete curriculum proposals will be advanced through college, campus, university, and state approval processes beginning next fall.

At Illinois, as at many public research universities, revising bylaws and curricula is a deliberate process, deliberate in the sense that much deliberation is expected at multiple levels of institutional governance. While such deliberation may at times appear inefficient, it typically delivers results that can be implemented with fidelity to a clear standard of excellence. This has been the experience in the Illinois School of Architecture. And reflecting on this experience, it is

1

certainly fair to attribute a measure of our organizational and curricular progress to the fair and rigorous reaccreditation review delivered by our NAAB Visiting Team six years ago.

The report of the 2015 Visiting Team provides direction for continued improvement of our curricula, and we are grateful to the team chair and team members for their keenest insights. However, as we noted in our response to the draft VTR, we are hard pressed to link some of these insights to facts or context put in evidence in our Architecture Program Review (APR), in the team room and associated exhibitions, and in conversations during the team's site visit. Rather than repeat assertions made in our response to the draft VTR, we are accepting NAAB Director of Accreditation Cassandra Pair's invitation to make this earlier response available to the NAAB Board of Directors. Attached are:

- Ms. Pair's invitation (May 19, 2015)
- Illinois School of Architecture Director's cover letter to response to the draft VTR (April 27, 2015)
- Illinois School of Architecture's response to the draft VTR (April 27, 2015)

In appending our draft VTR response, we call particular attention to our request, unmet in the final VTR, that listed Causes of Concern be backed by evidence, per NAAB's *Procedures for Accreditation* (2012 edition).

We are moved to thank the NAAB board member (Tyler Ashworth, Assoc. AIA) and staff member (Janet Rumbarger, Director, Research and Assessment) who reached out to us on April 16, 2015, for a detailed conversation about our experience as part of this spring's piloting of abbreviated site visits and smaller visiting teams. We trust that they can share with the full board the School's perspective on having been included in the pilot without our full consent. We expect, as well, that they can pass along our sense that constraints imposed by the pilot prevented Visiting Team members from

- fully engaging with our APR and associated documents prior to the site visit;
- observing class and studio meetings in manner that would have illustrated how the ideals expressed in our School Culture Policy are enacted in regular practice; and
- consulting with established faculty groups—such as the School's elected Executive Committee, its appointed Curriculum Committee, and its elected Program Area Chairs—in order to elicit critical perspectives on School operations.

Let us close by stressing one consequence of the Visiting Team's lack of time to consult with established faculty groups. The path forward toward continued curricular development, implementation of new curricula, and evaluation of their effectiveness is well described in the governing documents of the School, as well as those of the College, the Academic Senate, and the University. Moreover, the School's annual evaluation of curricular effectiveness—mandated by our bylaws and undertaken by elected Program Area Chairs in consultation with Program Area faculty—will produce results that will inform the periodic Academic Program Review (http://provost.illinois.edu/programreview/) that is supported by our campus administration. The School of Architecture is scheduled for its program review, complete with a self-study and

external evaluators, in Spring 2018. Meantime, the Program Areas' annual evaluation of curricular effectiveness remains the mechanism by which we affirm that NAAB SPC are met as stated in the SPC matrix included in our APR. Thus, we are confident that BSAS graduates who matriculate to our M.Arch program carry with them competence in SPC areas satisfied during their undergraduate years with us.

On behalf of the students and faculty of the Illinois School of Architecture, and the thousands of alumni in practice who maintain an active interest in the School's success, we thank NAAB, its Board of Directors, and its staff for partnering with us in our effort to realize the School's vision: "Learn from the past. Question the present. Shape the future."

Mortensen, Peter Leslie

From:	Cassandra Pair <cpair@naab.org>
Sent:	Tuesday, May 19, 2015 2:05 PM
To:	Mortensen, Peter Leslie
Subject:	VTR-Final Draft
Attachments:	Ltr. to Mortensen [FINAL DRAFT].pdf; UofIL Urbana-Champaign VTR_[FINAL DRAFT].pdf

Importance: High

Hello Peter,

Thank you for forwarding what is in fact, a final response to the VTR. Thus, if you would like to attach the said (COF) response to the school's letterhead, please do so. It will then get appended to the final report for the Board to review, at its July meeting.

Cassandra

Cassandra Pair
Director, Accreditation

NAAB

1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
(202)783-2007 o
(202)731-2016 m
(202)783-2822 f
@NAABNews

School of Architecture

117 Temple Hoyne Buell Hall, MC-621
611 Taft Drive
Champaign, IL 61820-6921   USA

April 27, 2015

Cassandra Pair
Director of Accreditation
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ms. Pair,

Thank you for the opportunity to review a draft of the NAAB Visiting Team Report authored by RK Stewart, Ute Poerschke, and Meghan Leahy following their campus visit in late March. We sincerely appreciate their effort.

Per your instructions and guidelines found in NAAB's *Procedures for Accreditation* (2012, Amended), I am submitting requests for the correction of factual errors found in the draft VTR. These requests were formulated after consultation with the School of Architecture's Executive Committee, its four Program Area chairs, and the team that prepared for the accreditation site visit, led by Professor Lynne Dearborn.

Please let me know if you have any questions (pmortens@illinois.edu, 217-333-1330).

Sincerely,

Peter Mortensen
Director

Attachment

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
School of Architecture

Factual Review of NAAB Visiting Team Report
April 27, 2015

I. Summary

This document requests the correction of factual errors in the draft Visiting Team Report.

II. Section 1.2, Conditions Not Met

A.9   Historical Traditions and Global Cultures

There is evidence highlighted in the attached ARCH 210 and ARCH 577 syllabi that traditions and cultures of the Eastern and Southern hemispheres are addressed. ARCH 210 is taken by all M.Arch students who complete the BSAS with us. ARCH 577 is completed by all graduate students in the M.Arch program whether they have completed their BSAS with us or at another institution. Thus, all students earning the accredited M.Arch meet condition A.9.

III. Section 1.3, Causes of Concern

General Observation

In NAAB's *Procedures for Accreditation* (2012, amended), the "Causes of Concern" section of the VTR is described as follows (in Section 5, 4.c.i.3, p. 49):

This is a narrative that describes specific concerns of the team relative to unmet conditions or to conditions that may have been met within the strict definition of the condition/criterion, but for which the team has concerns or questions. This is a numbered list. Each item should have a brief title. It is not necessary for an unmet condition to generate a cause for concern; likewise conditions/criteria that are determined to be met may have also generated concerns within the team.

It is unclear upon what factual basis some causes of concern rest. Following the *Procedures,* a factual basis for these concerns could be established with reference to specific unmet or met conditions, along with the citation of relevant evidence from the School's APR, its Team Room, and Student Exhibit. (For the most part, citation of evidence appears to be absent from the VTR.) Alternatively, causes of concern not linked to specific conditions addressed in the APR could be deleted from the final draft of the VTR.

Subsection A

Please see Appendix A for a detailed response to the causes of concern set forth in Subsection A of the draft VTR. Appendix A was composed by the School's Program Area chairs: Associate

Professor Lynne Dearborn (Health and Wellbeing), Associate Professor Kevin Hinders (Urbanism), Associate Professor Scott Murray (Performance), and Professor Jeffrey Poss (detail + FABRICATION).

Subsection B

Peter Mortensen was appointed Director of the School of Architecture, an administrative role, by the Board of Trustees upon recommendation of the Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts and the Chancellor/Vice President of the Urbana campus of the University of Illinois. The appointment conforms to the *University of Illinois Statutes* (http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/statutes). Mortensen was <u>not</u> appointed to the School of Architecture faculty, as asserted in the draft VTR, for precisely the reason cited: his "academic expertise is not within the body of knowledge, skills, or traditions of architecture or its professional practice."

Subsection C

The cause of concern detailed in this subsection misunderstands policies and processes described in the School's APR, Part II, Sections 1, 2, and 3. Each student who successfully completes the program's non-accredited BSAS degree and graduates with that degree has by virtue of successful completion of the curriculum met the SPCs satisfied through the BSAS curriculum, as noted in Student Performance Criteria Matrix on p. 106 of the APR. Each student who graduates from the School's BSAS degree program and matriculates into the School's M.Arch program understands what requirements they have met in their undergraduate degree and which courses are required and which are elective in their M.Arch curriculum. This is made clear to them during student orientation of their entering fall semester. They then receive advising from either the Associate Director for Graduate Programs and Study or from one of the Program Chairs throughout their time in the M.Arch program. The School's Graduate Office maintains the records of requirements completed for each M.Arch student and students are required to review these at regular intervals throughout their M.Arch program.

IV. Additional Corrections

p. 4   Observation: "Studio Culture Policy" should read "School Culture Policy"

p. 9   Observation: "Studio Culture Policy" should read "School Culture Policy"

p. 10   Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment

Observation: The program's IDP Coordinator is NOT a member of the faculty. Also, what are Guest Coordinators in Arch 501. Do they mean the IDP Coordinator and the Student IDP Coordinator. Also, as of Summer 2014, the proper term is "Architect Licensing Advisor," not IDP Coordinator (see http://www.ncarb.org/Experience-Through-Internships/IDP-Coordinators.aspx#sthash.LDA2fqkN.dpuf).

p. 13   I.2.1 Human Resources

Statement: "The program's IDP Education Coordinator, Instructor Lee Waldrep is widely known among faculty and students, and gives presentations in Arch 501 as well as in undergraduate courses."

Correction: The program's Architect Licensing Advisor, Lee Waldrep is widely known among faculty and students, and gives presentations in ARCH 501 and ARCH 231.

p. 14   2015 Team Assessment

Statement: "The Graduate Officer and his staff of two people provide primary advising...."

Correction: The Associate Director for Graduate Studies (currently Clinical Associate Professor William Worn) provides primary advising for Track II M.Arch students. Carl Lewis, an Academic Professional, provides primary advising for Track III M.Arch students. Two staff members in the Graduate Office support Professor Worn and Mr. Lewis, but do not provide advising.

Appendix A

The elected Program Area Chairs recommend correction of details in section 1.3.A as follows:

Causes of Concern, Subsection A

1. Statement: "The program is undergoing a great many changes...."

    A more contextualized statement would be: The program exists in a time of professional and political change and has experienced decreasing student enrollment, coupled with an increased internationalization of the student body at a time when there are anticipated financial pressures resulting from reductions in state funds supporting the university system.

2. Statement: "The recent adoption of new by-laws governing the program, which supersede its previous 40-year-old by-laws."

    The School's recent bylaws revision aligns with the College of Fine and Applied Arts "College Strategy 2014-17," in which the review and revision of each department's bylaws is encouraged as a means to bring greater clarity and integrity to administrative processes and faculty governance. The adoption of new bylaws is a direct reflection of the School's work to improve itself, and adjust to the changing context of Architecture and the world. This is viewed as a positive step at the university, not a cause for concern.

3. Statement: "The recent adoption of a revised curriculum framework intending to relocate a majority of the NAAB Student Performance Criteria from the undergraduate program to the graduate program."

    Per NAAB's *Procedures*, it was understood that the visit was to focus on evidence of program operations through the time the APR was submitted in September 2014. That said, for testimony regarding curriculum development ongoing this academic year, the Visiting Team could have consulted individuals—such as the Curriculum Committee chair or all members of the Curriculum Committee—for their authoritative characterization of development of new BSAS and M.Arch curricula. Alternatively, minutes of Curriculum Committee meetings could have been supplied upon request.

    The effectiveness of curricula, currently and in the future, is subject to two levels of review. The School's *Bylaws* require each Program Area to "create an Annual Report for the Director and Executive Committee on the curriculum, teaching assignments, and delivery of courses and programs" (V.A.4.b.v). The Director and Executive Committee are responsible for evaluating these reports and seeing that needed curricular improvements are implemented.

    Beyond annual review within the School, academic curricula are subject to periodic assessment as part of the comprehensive Academic Program Review process conducted by the Office of the Provost (http://provost.illinois.edu/programreview/). Architecture's next

program review, which includes a visit by external evaluators, is scheduled for the 2017-2018 academic year.

4. Statement: "A revised graduate admissions documentation process...."

    The current graduate admissions process results directly from NAAB requirements to document SPCs that are expected to be met through pre-professional education. The admissions process has been in place since the spring of 2011 and serves the need to document SPC requirements arising from NAAB. See additional comments under Subsection C, below.

5. Statement: "The recent transfer of the program's premier study abroad program from its long-standing base in Versailles to Barcelona."

    The long-standing director of the School's Versailles Program made a seamless transition to the directorship of the Barcelona Program. The coursework in Barcelona remains under the direction of the School, as does the hiring of faculty and their delivery of course content. The director of the Barcelona Program traveled to Champaign-Urbana during the NAAB team visit and was available for consultation throughout the time the Visiting Team was on campus. The Visiting Team chair initially asked for a meeting with the Barcelona Program director, but later opted not to have the meeting.

6. Statement: "The addition of several new faculty members...."

    The number of new faculty hired since NAAB's last site visit is many fewer than in the preceding term of accreditation. Hiring new faculty is a natural part of the evolution of any academic program. Faculty retire or move to other institutions and this has not happened at an unusual rate in comparison to the prior decade. If anything, this is a healthy sign that even in difficult economic times, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has felt it important to grant hires to the School based on the strength of our student population.

7. Statement: "The recent appointment of a new director...."

    The new director was appointed when the previous director concluded a second five-year term. The previous director's ten years as the School's executive officer is consistent with the two terms that many executive officers on campus can be expected to serve. See Subsection B, below, for additional response.

8. Statement: "In light of the number and magnitude of changes being undertaken...."

    See following editing and commentary:

    ~~In light of the number and magnitude of the changes being undertaken, the visiting team has several concerns regarding the program's future.~~ The aspirational nature of the~~(se)~~ changes **within the Illinois School of Architecture** is indicative of the program's clear intention to maintain its legacy and the high standards it has historically achieved. ~~Without~~

a clearly documented plan that includes milestones to guide the implementation of so many simultaneous changes, neither faculty nor students are certain of their path forward. *(This statement should be struck, as the indicated plan was not requested in advance of the visit. Moreover, as indicated above, it would have been possible to present the Curriculum Committee's curriculum development plan had the committee been consulted. Finally, as indicated above, measures to evaluate the effectiveness of curricula are already in place at two levels—the School and the campus.)* The program clearly recognizes that these changes are far from complete. Some changes, for example, full implementation of the new curriculum, are not anticipated earlier than the 2016 -2017 academic year. The visiting team has reviewed a limited number of examples of student work that may not be relevant, given curriculum changes immediately on the program's horizon. Other changes have undergone continual adjustment in recent years, such as the Studio Culture Policy and the by-laws, which raises a degree of uncertainty in the academic community. (*See notes above: there is no evidence presented by the team that there is uncertainty in the academic community nor was this the topic of any public or scheduled meeting with between the team and those in faculty leadership positions.)* Other changes have just begun to be implemented, such as the relocated study abroad program and the graduate admissions process, with the result being that their effectiveness is unknown. *(See comments above.)* Therefore, To successfully complete the implementation of this process of change, the following will be required: transparency in decision-making, communication of the progress along the path of change, and the mutual trust and respect that need to be extended to every member of the student body, staff, and faculty.

Causes of Concern, Subsection B

1. Statement: "The program's director joined the faculty for a 3-year term less than 1 year ago in this time of great change. The visiting team shares the concern—expressed by members of the academic community—that the director's academic expertise is not within the body of knowledge, skills, or traditions of architecture or its professional practice."

   The above statement does not reflect a concern of the academic community as a whole. This issue was not raised by the Visiting Team or the faculty at the only scheduled meeting between the School's faculty at large and the team (Sunday evening). At no other time was the faculty as a whole or their elected leadership given an opportunity to discuss the Director's role, competence, or performance. This concern should not listed as a part of the VTR as no evidence was requested or collected in a manner consistent with the collection of other evidence as part of this NAAB team visit. The NAAB Visiting Team agenda was created by the NAAB team chair and did not include meetings with the two groups of faculty leaders who represent the faculty and who are identified through a democratic election process, the Executive Committee and the Program Chairs.

   Director Mortensen was appointed to a three-year position by the Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, for the following specific purposes (along with the general leadership and governance of the School):

- Assist and provide leadership in the 2015 NAAB Accreditation.

- Set the School up for a successful external search for Director who is an area-expert and who has requisite leadership skills.

- Assist in the transition and changes associated with the new by-laws and policies and procedures and guide the School in its endeavors to continue to transform these documents to ensure positive outputs within the School and compliance within the University structure.

- He has, to date, performed admirably and remained on task. He represents the School well and consults regularly with the faculty leadership of the school who have area expertise. There is no reason to believe he will not continue to lead and represent the School in a credible manner. There is no evidence that, by his pedigree or other, there exists Cause for Concern.