July 30, 2015

Eric W. Kaler, President
Office of the President
202 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street, S.E.
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dear President Kaler:

At the July 2015 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the
directors reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the University of Minnesota,
Department of Architecture.

As a result, the professional architecture program **Master of Architecture** was
formally granted an eight-year term of continuing accreditation.

The term is effective January 1, 2015. The program is scheduled for its next visit for
continuing accreditation in 2023.

Continuing accreditation is subject to two reporting requirements.

First, all programs must submit an Annual Statistical Report (see Section 10
of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended). This
report captures statistical information on the institution and the program.

Second, a program that receives an eight-year term of accreditation is
required to submit an *Interim Progress Report* two years after a visit and
again five years after the visit. This requirement is described in Section 11 of
the 2012 NAAB Procedures. The next statistical report is due November 30,
2015; the first interim progress report is due November 2017.

Finally, under the terms of the 2012 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are
required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents
available to the public. Please see Section 5 for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious
hospitality.

Sincerely,

Shannon B. Kraus, FAIA, NCARB, MBA, FACHA
President

cc: Marc Swackhamer, Head
Krista Phillips, AIA, NCARB, Visiting Team Chair

enc.
University of Minnesota
School of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I (pre-professional degree plus 59 credits)
Track II (undergraduate degree plus 90 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
April 15, 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.*
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments and Visit Summary

The visiting team was well received, and we thank everyone involved at the University of Minnesota for making the visit productive and for being such gracious hosts. The School of Architecture has an ambitious and unique architectural education program, and is consistently and rigorously examining the school’s structure and talent resources to refine the level of educational outcomes provided to students within the accredited degree program. The school is part of the College of Design. The high-caliber faculty, leaders, and staff are very passionate about their program and its successes—this comes through in everything the visiting team observed during the accreditation visit. Although the school is in transition (a new head of the School of Architecture was named in the past year, and the transition of the current, longstanding dean of the College of Design is approaching), it appears well-poised to continue its high-level quality education for future generations of architects. Stakeholders for the school were proactive, communicative, and helpful to the visiting team. The school is a strong example of multi-generational professionals who are working together to refine the craft of architectural education for their community, their state, and the profession at large. The school is recognized as a thought leader and is sought after university-wide for its problem-solving skills and ability to implement change through creating alignment—a testament to the strength that architecture can provide locally and globally. The faculty are recognized leaders within the practice of architecture, in addition to being renowned scholars/professors. The visiting team observed architectural education in action that is exploratory, rigorous, forward-looking, and innovative in design and research.

2. Conditions Not Met

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees: The school is not consistently using the required text for all catalogs and promotional materials such as the university course catalog, the website, and digital brochures.

3. Causes of Concern

A. Environmental Systems: The school’s curriculum addresses issues concerning environmental systems in several areas, including an excellent course on luminous and thermal design. The team notes as a cause of concern that this course is neither part of the current required curriculum, nor has it been fully designed as a required course. The team anticipates that the school’s commitment to addressing this issue will lead to a successful resolution.

B. Lack of Replacement of Full-Time Faculty: The recent retirement of several tenured faculty has left a significant gap in continuity and stability in terms of teaching core areas of the curriculum. This has also created a significant service overload for the full-time faculty. Although the dean has announced plans to begin searching for new faculty to fill these open positions in areas aligned with the school’s strategic plan (currently in development), the team urges the school and the college to develop a hiring plan.

C. Funding for School Compared to Peer Departments: The APR provided data that indicates disparities between units of the College of Design using comparable measures (unit
funding per student credit hour). The team recognizes the need for developing means and methods to address the funding gaps between units of the college.

D. **Education in Historical Traditions**: Due to recent changes in the curriculum, some students are not meeting this requirement. The school made a strategic hire in fall 2014, who has implemented a pilot course this spring that appears to cover the requirements of this criterion. However, this course will not be required for all students until fall 2015.

E. **Diversity**: The school has made progress in increasing the number of international students and faculty and in achieving gender parity for faculty and students. Steps must be taken to further increase traditionally under-represented populations among students and faculty in keeping with the university’s diversity goals.

F. **Academic Advising**: The school has taken significant steps to improve student advising since 2009. Most important is the addition of a full-time advising staff position. However, students, staff, and leadership alike indicated a need for improved advising by the faculty to provide more systematic, discipline-specific direction.

G. **Entry Evaluation of Students**: The school has a rigorous system for evaluating the design and critical thinking skills of entering students. With the implementation of a 2-year track in the program, however, it is now necessary to evaluate syllabi for prior coursework in structures, history, and building environmental systems to ensure that all students are fulfilling all program objectives and NAAB criteria.

4. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2009)**

**2004 Condition 3, Public Information**: To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

**Previous Team Report (2009)**: Although the university and college have transitioned to a fully digital bulletin, which includes the exact language required by NAAB, the current Master of Architecture Program brochure does not.

**2015 Visiting Team Assessment**: This condition has been divided into two separate conditions since the last visit: II.4.1 and II.4.2. The school is not consistently using the required text for catalogs and promotional materials (university course catalog, website, digital brochures, hardcopy brochures, etc.) per the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5: therefore, II.4.1 is **Not Met**. The school has made the 2009 NAAB Conditions and 2012 NAAB Procedures available per Condition II.4.2, and this condition is, therefore, **Met**.
2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2009): After review of all the required coursework identified in the APR and Team Room Student Performance Criteria matrices, the team determined that coursework on this subject and content area was not found to adequately address multicultural issues and perspectives commensurate with twenty-first century global experience. The school continues to house content in this area exclusively within elective coursework.

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion (which is now A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture) in ARCH 8255 Design Studio III (Comprehensive Studio). Evidence was also found in ARCH 5410 Architecture: A Global and Cultural History (spring 2015). It is, however, a cause of concern that ARCH 5412 is not available to current students until fall 2015.
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 school’s uniqueness is captured in a passionate mission statement. Two aspects of this mission deserve special mention. First, there is a commitment to addressing the complex grand issues of our time. Importantly, this commitment finds concrete expression in courses throughout the curriculum that engage a broad range of design skills in pursuit of problems with manifold technical, cultural, and ethical dimensions. A second aspect of the school’s mission is a commitment to student empowerment. This is embodied in a unique effort to reserve half of a student’s studies for self-directed choices. In this way, it is felt, students experience freedom to assume authorship over their own educational arcs.

This condition is Met with Distinction.

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 demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2015 Team Assessment: That the school promotes a positive learning environment is confirmed by the fact that students and staff hold a mutual respect for each other. Students encourage and help each other
to maintain healthy lifestyle habits, including effective time management. The GD1 syllabus includes an honor agreement for "pencils down" the night before reviews in order to establish good habits of time management and strong studio values during the first semester. The graduate student handbook also includes evidence of plans for implementing the studio culture and assessment through a Graduate Review Improvement Process (GRIP) survey. These values are encouraged through the studio culture document that is shown to all staff and students, and acts as a framework for beneficial habits and conduct for the professional world. The benefit of the school's ARCH 5621 Professional Practice course is that it reinforces students' professional conduct, which is essential in the professional environment.

Students indicate that an awareness of these objectives is laid out effectively in the studio culture document. The staff monitors the time management of both the faculty and the students to ensure that it meets the standards set forth by the academic policies. The week before spring break, the school hosts a Catalyst week every year in an effort to bring students together for a large team-based project filled with intensive workshops and visiting academics. This serves as an opportunity for students to reflect on how the work will come to bear on their other interests and carry through to the next studio.

Social Equity:

The school policy on diversity is laid out within the APR and is clearly dictated on the school website. Additionally, policies regarding harassment, discrimination, academic integrity, and other multicultural and diversity issues are located on the school website. The school's strategic 5-year plan to increase diversity addresses the issue raised in the 2009 VTR regarding the historic lack of diversity within the University of Minnesota, as well as the plan to increase diversity in the future.

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. 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.

2015 Team Assessment: The school enjoys a long tradition of contributing to, and participating in, the life of the distinguished University of Minnesota. The recently formed (2006) College of Design, the current academic home of this school's professionally accredited program in architecture, is also home to more than two other units in the college with accredited degrees: Landscape Architecture and Interior Design.

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.

The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2015 Team Assessment:** Students in the University of Minnesota's School of Architecture have shown that they are well prepared to enter the global environment. They receive a diverse education through a large pool of electives taught by faculty with varied expertise. The students described a positive studio culture environment that encourages students to work together and promote healthy lifestyle and time management habits. Students were introduced to the school's student culture document upon the start of their first semester, and faculty have been supportive and accommodating of students' individual needs. Both the teachers and the students hold a mutual respect for each other. Additionally, the students mentioned placing a high value on the goal of learning the practice of architecture, as opposed to only working toward a degree. The school's ARCH 5621 Professional Practice course is successful in its goal of providing students with industry experience, professional connections, and an introduction to the IDP process, according to the students and the faculty.

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).

The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2015 Team Assessment:** The school is commended for its capacity to prepare and support students regarding licensure and the regulatory environment. The school has an assigned full-time faculty representative to support internship development (IDP), as well as a student representative in this capacity. When asked, students readily identified both of these representatives and appeared eager and interested in learning about the licensure and regulatory process. Many faculty are licensed practitioners and are leading by example in their dual roles.

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.

The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2015 Team Assessment:** The team found that the school is responsive to this perspective. The ARCH 5621 Professional Practice course is an exemplary curriculum for engaging students in discussions with professionals and the "flows" of responsibility, finances, information, and leadership as well as the role of research in practice. Students said that they very much appreciated the fact that the faculty are connected to the professional world and have a depth and breadth of expertise. The school demonstrates a commitment to community engagement and a responsibility to the environment through several research centers (the Metropolitan Design Center and the Center for Sustainable Building Research, in particular), community-engaged academic projects, and research that impacts the community.

This condition is Met with Distinction.

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 School of Architecture is committed to engaging broad social and community issues. This is manifest in its community outreach efforts such as the Design Duluth studio, in its promotion of public-interest design, in its in-depth engagement with sustainable-design education, and in the active civic engagement of its student body.

This condition is Met with Distinction.

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 school has reported developing four strategic plans (2010, 2011, 2013, and 2015) since the last accreditation visit (2009), with the most recent being completed in March 2015. While generating this number of plans (or, in this case, some updates) could be construed as a cause of concern, it more aptly reflects related but healthy conditions, namely: a) requests by external stakeholders (university and college leaders addressing changing institutional circumstances and visions), and b) an active reflective/creative internal culture (faculty and curricular aspirations) of continual improvement and change. Importantly, the school has, for some time, propagated a regular and rigorous culture of critical, creative, and open examination of itself and its curricular content and sequence/structure, as well as how it delivers and tracks its effectiveness. In particular, the visiting team commends the school for its data collection from diverse sources; adventurous experimentation regarding curricular format, structure, and sequence; candid reflection on what is working and what is not; and willingness to address all elements again. The school has been clear and compelling in its articulation of the role that the five perspectives play in its long-range planning.

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 meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: It is evident that the program’s processes for self-assessment are intentional, strategic, and purposeful. As noted in I.1.4, Long-Range Planning above, the program is well poised to continue with self-assessment processes that promote the focus, growth, and vitality of architectural education.

This condition is Met with Distinction.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

- Faculty and Staff:
  - 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.  
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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.
  - 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 there is currently no lack of faculty, staff, or administration to support student learning and achievement. However, the recent loss of several tenured faculty has left a significant gap in continuity and stability in terms of teaching core areas of the curriculum. This has also created a significant service overload for the full-time faculty. The adjunct faculty brought in to fill the gaps in the teaching schedule are highly capable and skilled teachers, but they do not adequately offset the service demands and are becoming less available with the upturn in the economy. Although the dean has announced plans to begin searching for new faculty to fill these open positions in areas aligned with the school’s strategic plan (currently in development), the team urges the school and the college to develop a hiring plan.

The team found evidence that the school has adopted the University Equal Opportunity Statement.

The team found evidence of a “point” system that maps courses taught, administration responsibilities, and research obligations to create an equitable distribution of work. However, many full-time faculty indicated that they had an “unsustainable service load,” and one even calculated spending 25% more time in meetings than in the classroom. Questions were also raised about the inequity between the 6-hour and 9-hour studio assignments in that they have the same number of contact hours but result in different course loads for the faculty involved.

The IDP Coordinator is Jim Lutz, and his role is well known throughout the college by all students (all of whom are enrolled in the IDP program by the end of their second year). Professor Lutz regularly

---

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.
attends coordinator training and development workshops, and is respected for his passion and dedication to the role.

There is a $2,000/year development fund for all full-time research faculty that can roll over annually up to a total of $4,000. The fund supports travel to conferences and the purchase of resources. This monetary amount, while appreciated, has not seen an increase in 18 years and should be reevaluated for the current economic climate. Some adjunct faculty do not feel supported on a unit-wide level, either in mentoring, job security, or professional development. While some directors may, on a case-by-case basis, provide excellent mentoring for their adjuncts, some adjuncts feel disconnected by not receiving annual reviews and not receiving desired career development advising.

Staff are part of employee peer groups and have training in a variety of subjects. A fund of $2,500 is allocated to staff development annually at the school level; however, because university continuing education programs are free to staff, this fund is not usually used.

In terms of Promotion and Tenure (P&T), the team found evidence in the supplemental materials ("Standards for Promotion and Tenure Required by Section 7.12 of Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure" adopted on March 25, 2008). The policy is very clear, and faculty on the tenure-track feel that they are “set up to win” because of the support and direction of the P&T structure.

- **Students:**
  - 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.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

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

**2015 Team Assessment:** The school’s APR contains relevant information and website pages that explain the process of applying to the accredited degree program, as well as the criteria for evaluation of applicants. Information on academic advising, internship resources, and student/professional societies is provided to the students for academic and professional support. Field trips are utilized within the graduate studios (e.g., ARCH 8253), and students are encouraged to participate in off-campus activities related to the industry in order to support their education. In talking with the student representatives, the team learned that research assistantships are common among the GD2 and GD3 students, as well as the ability to have a professional mentor to aid in industry experience and guidance.

**I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance:**
- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate 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 of an autonomous administrative structure (Figures 1-001, 1-02, and 1-03 in the APR) for the school, college, and university.

- 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: Faculty are involved in a variety of school, college, and university committees and are lauded at the university administration level as creative, innovative, and action-oriented. Student leaders meet regularly with departmental representatives in open-ended discussions and participate in determining the types of studios offered in spring semesters.

1.2.3 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: Studios contain space for student desks and informal critiques and discussions. The computer lab, wood/metal shops, 3D printers, imaging lab, CNC equipment, and virtual reality lab provide ample space for students to create projects. Detailed information regarding the software, hardware, and specifications of this equipment is laid out within the APR. The facilities are accessible and available over a wide range of times, with manageable tutorials and staff help if needed. The Architecture and Landscape Architecture Library is easily accessible and has a large volume of books available to the students at a close location, for which the students stated they are extremely thankful. Approximately half of the bottom floor of Rapson Hall is dedicated to faculty and staff, including offices, conference rooms, and preparation areas.

Faculty and student concerns include the inability to find space to spontaneously meet or engage in lectures during studio hours. The university at large schedules classes far in advance, and it is troublesome for studios to find space to accommodate spur of the moment events. The balconies and inner courtyard of Rapson Hall are not acoustically conducive to presentations or lectures, and present issues with regard to uses such as these. However, the school has acknowledged the issue and is on track to solving it, with a few possible opportunities to explore. The school believes that possible solutions include scheduling/renting classrooms far in advance in order to dedicate them for studio use, retrofitting existing studio space, or redesigning circulation space within Rapson Hall. The upper university administration expressed its willingness to explore experimental solutions to this problem with the school.

This condition is Met with Distinction.
1.2.4 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 school provided appropriate and sufficient information for the visiting team to assess the financial resources for the school’s accredited program. There is evidence of adequate financial resources to support the core professional curriculum, as well as many specialized and elective enhancements to that program. Enhancements and specializations reflect the strengths of post-professional programs, as well as the advanced interests of a diverse faculty. In addition, the college provides important collateral professional programs in Landscape Architecture and Interior Design to further create complementary offerings to students interested in interdisciplinary adjacencies.

In the data provided, the visiting team found a basis for concern regarding what appears to be college disparities in the financial support for its collateral units, based on last year’s financial and student credit hour information (see TABLE 1-11 “Comparative Annual Expenditures” on page 93 of the APR). Using the data provided and building on comments offered by the architecture faculty, the visiting team followed up with direct conversations with both school and college financial officers. There is a disparity between the three primary units in the college. The visiting team recognizes that there may be mitigating circumstances for these disproportions (differing balances of regular and adjunct faculty, differing workload expectations, differing seniority and/or stature of faculty mixes, the amount of faculty-funded research for buyouts, the relative sizes of typical classes in each unit, etc.). A more thorough analysis of these differences may be needed to assess and evaluate the potential inequality of financial support and the relative disadvantage that this poses for the school. The college is still relatively young (9 years old), the academic cultural streams were (and remain) somewhat different, and the degree of fairness was expressed as an architecture faculty concern during this visit. The visiting team heard from administrative and support staff that efforts at fiscal fairness (policy, open communication, and some analytics) have been attempted by the college. Gaining an understanding of any seeming disparities for the school within the college structure is an important factor to address.

1.2.5 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 students have access to information resources through the Architecture and Landscape Architecture Library, which is located on the second level of Rapson Hall and is part of the larger University Library system. Containing approximately 50,000 books, as well as back and current issues of 160 periodicals, the library provides a space for intellectual exploration, individual quiet study, and group instruction. The library is open 65 hours a week to students, seats over 50 researchers, and provides 6 computer workstations. An additional wealth of digital information is found online. “We love having the library in the building,” said students during the all-student entrance meeting.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 3 - INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports: 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 of this condition in the University of Minnesota (UM) APR (revised April 10, 2015), I.3.1, Statistical Reports, pages 98-99.

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.

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

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
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: Evidence provided by the NAAB was located in the NAAB "Team Room" folder (University of Minnesota School of Architecture), and evidence provided by the UM School of Architecture was in the "Supplementary Documents" binder within the team room.

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 exhibit⁴ 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 school's faculty are highly credentialed, have diverse expertise and/or interests, and contribute to a rigorous curriculum and standards (see Part IV Faculty Resumes). However, the visiting team felt that the faculty lacked significant racial and ethnic diversity and the school should expand its effort to increase representation among protected class members.

This condition is Met with Distinction.

---

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 documents required for policy review were found in the team room.
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 team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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 team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II. This condition is Met with Distinction.

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 team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II.

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] Met
2015 Team Assessment: Student work in ARCH 8255 Design Studio III provides evidence of substantial ability in technical documentation, including technical drawing, building system digital modeling, and materials specification.

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: Student work in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II showed substantial investigative skills that were in line with the requirements of this criterion. The school emphasized the ability to analyze case studies, with a strong emphasis on gathering and recording relevant process work involving either a student’s own study or a case study. The work demonstrated an ability to evaluate and apply the relevant knowledge in a manner that meets the requirements.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8255 Design Studio III.

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 team found evidence of this criterion in 8255 Design Studio III (Comprehensive Studio).

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 team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8255 Design Studio III.

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] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Recent changes in curriculum led to some students not meeting this requirement. In fall 2014, the school made a strategic hire, who has implemented a pilot course this spring that appears to cover the requirements of this criterion. However, this course will not be required for all students until fall 2015. The team found evidence of this criterion in ARCH 8255 Design
Studio III (Comprehensive Studio). Evidence was also found in ARCH 5410 Architecture: A Global and Cultural History (spring 2015), which is a pilot history course to be launched as a required course in fall 2015.

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 team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II and ARCH 8255 Design Studio III.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** The team found ample evidence of the Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation criteria throughout the coursework. Early exercises develop an integrated approach to design, beginning with very fundamental exercises in the undergraduate program and building to greater complexity and quality through the Master’s program. The approach to the curricular structure demonstrates an ethic involving an integrated approach to education that is clear throughout the entire curriculum. Students are required to communicate ideas in written, verbal, visual, and model-based forms, thereby acquiring skills along the way through direct instruction in a studio-centric environment.

**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] Met
2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this SPC in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II.

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] Met

2015 Team Assessment: In their required second-year ARCH 8253 Design Studio II course, students are given a lecture on accessibility and are required to present final plans that conform to ADA regulations.

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: Being attentive to sustainable design issues is a point of pride for the architecture program. Conservation of resources and the creation of healthy environments are core values within the school’s curriculum. This commitment is actualized in a strong lecture course in lighting and thermal design, and finds enthusiastic expression in required studio design work at all levels. This condition is Met with Distinction.

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: Final presentations for third-year design studio projects (ARCH 8255) include careful site designs. The importance of this element of design is underscored by the inclusion of landscape architecture students on each student design team in one of the sections. Attention to site design, although evident in student work, would benefit from additional presentation of the environmental and engineering dimensions of site and landscape design through lectures.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Presentations in the third-year design studio (ARCH 8255) showed evidence of attention to life-safety issues.

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.5. Investigative Skills  B.4. Site Design
B.5. Life Safety

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The curricular philosophy of the school encourages integrative design thinking throughout the curriculum. In their first semester, students address the full range of design concerns, from concept to technical detail. The required third-year studio (ARCH 8255) meets the formal requirements of this SPC as currently taught, and the teaching of the requirements of this criterion will only improve with the addition of a parallel course in environmental technology in fall 2015. Attention to site design, although evident in student work, would benefit from additional presentation of environmental and engineering dimensions of site and landscape design through lectures.

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: Evidence of this criterion was found by the team in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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 school's curriculum addresses environmental system issues in several areas, including an excellent course on luminous and thermal design. This course will form the basis for a required course in environmental systems to be offered concurrently with the third-year comprehensive studio in fall 2015. We note, as a cause of concern, that this course is neither part of the current required curriculum, nor has it been fully designed as a required course.

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: Evidence of a robust required structural curriculum can be found in ARCH 5561 Building Tech 1-Structures and ARCH 5564 Building Tech 4-Advanced Structures.

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 requirements for the building envelope systems criterion were found in the assignments in ARCH 5563 Building Tech 3. An understanding of the principles of building environment systems and associated assemblies was observed. These principles included aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, fundamental envelope performance, and energy and material resources, which were found within the case studies and construction site visits.

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 requirements for the building service systems integration criterion were found in the school’s assignments in ARCH 5563 Building Tech 3 and its predecessor class, ARCH 8254 Technical Applications in Design. An understanding of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems was discussed in case studies and construction site visits. Students demonstrated comprehension of system integration between mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems within service areas. Building security was not mentioned within the evaluated student work.

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: ARCH 5562 Building Technology 2 is an excellent course that addresses issues of materials systems analysis and integration from historic, conceptual, and technical perspectives.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Integrated building practice is a strength of the educational program at the School of Architecture. Studios address a broad range of design and technical issues from the very beginning. There is a “comprehensive studio” quality in required studios in the first, second, and third years. Faculty make a determined effort to coordinate technical courses with design work. This effort culminates in coordinated instruction of the third-year studio by faculty teaching both design (ARCH 8255) and environmental technology (ARCH 5550).

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 evidence of a culture of collaboration in the school, on many levels and in many venues, is ubiquitous. From the highly shared curricular structure, to the formats for teaching, to the sharing of roles and responsibilities, collaboration is used to achieve higher quality and more responsible integration of diverse perspectives and demonstrates to students the value and benefits of shared professional efforts. This role modeling then translates into numerous course requirements and considerable instructional time invested in teaching and acquainting students with the value of collaboration, from the introduction of the curriculum in GD1 (ARCH 8251) to many studio options offered through GD3 (ARCH 8255). In many of these venues, students are also taught to evaluate themselves and each other regarding their skills and successes with collaboration.

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: Evidence addressing this SPC was found in ARCH 8253 Design Studio II. There is also evidence in other studios at different levels throughout the curriculum.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

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: Evidence meeting the requirements of this criterion is found in ARCH 5621 Professional Practice.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Realm C is well covered in comprehensive ARCH 5621 Professional Practice coursework. Students receive exposure to aspects of these performance criteria in required studio projects and, particularly, in the advanced studios.
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 (WASCO).

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this condition in the University of Minnesota APR (revised—April 10, 2015), II.2 (II.2.1 Regional Framework, page 107).

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 team found evidence of this condition in the University of Minnesota APR (revised—April 10, 2015), II.2 (II.2.1 Regional Framework, pages 108-112) and in additional information supplied directly to the team during the visit.

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 team found ample evidence of curriculum review and development. There is a rigorous review process for proposed courses by the school’s Curriculum Committee, which is made up of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, and student representatives. The first generation of the current curriculum, which was in its nascent stages during the last review, was developed by the junior faculty at the time of its inception (2008). Though there was general faculty buy-in that the old curricular structure was rigid and stale and that change was needed, the new curriculum has created challenges and unintended consequences that the faculty have been addressing in the ensuing years through a variety of adjustments in course integration and sequencing. The faculty should be lauded for their commitment and dedication to the coordination required to achieve such a fully integrated curriculum through an efficient series of courses. However, the faculty are described as “change-weary” and desire a more stable environment in which to evaluate the effectiveness of recent changes.

The underlying part of the curricular structure—a rigorous, integrated, and discipline-specific fall semester followed by an exploratory, self-directed spring composed of two half-semester studios and the week-long Catalyst—is innovative and much loved by the students. It represents the school-wide desire for an interdisciplinary focus without losing the disciplinary core. Additional work could be done to further integrate the expertise of research center program faculty (Center for World Heritage Studies, etc.) into the core curriculum.
Despite its strengths, the current curricular structure has challenges that are keeping it from achieving maximum effectiveness. At this time, two core components of the course content are in flux—history and materials and technology—and are in need of further testing in their proposed positions beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year. There is concern about differentiation between the 9-credit and 6-credit studios. Faculty and leadership are aware of this issue, and are addressing it through the Curriculum Committee. Finally, the current structures for the M. Arch. and post-professional M.S. programs are in conflict due to the lack of elective openings in the fall semester.
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 school has a rigorous system for evaluating the design and critical thinking skills of entering students. With the implementation of a 2-year track in the program, however, it is now necessary to evaluate syllabi for prior coursework in structures, history, and building environmental systems to ensure that each student is fulfilling all program objectives and NAAB criteria.
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] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: The school is not consistently using the required text for catalogs and promotional materials (university course catalog, website, digital brochures, hardcopy brochures, etc.).

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 school has made the 2009 NAAB Conditions and 2012 NAAB Procedures available per the requirements of Condition II.4.2.

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](http://www.ARCHCareers.org)
   - The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
   - Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
   - The Emerging Professional’s Companion
   - [www.NCARB.org](http://www.NCARB.org)
   - [www.aia.org](http://www.aia.org)
   - [www.aias.org](http://www.aias.org)
   - [www.acsa-arch.org](http://www.acsa-arch.org)

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of these resources on the school's website.

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: Public access to APRs and VTRs is on the school's website per the requirements of Condition II.4.4.

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: Public access to ARE Pass Rates is on the school's website per the requirements of Condition II.4.5.
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 Minnesota, APR, pp. 1-4

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)
   Reference University of Minnesota, APR, pp. 5-8

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)
   Reference University of Minnesota, APR, pp. 27-33

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)
   Reference University of Minnesota, APR, pp. 34-42
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

The School of Architecture presented much to admire to the visiting team. We would like to mention a few specific attributes that were met with particular distinction.

I.1.1 History and Mission

A Powerful Mission for the Program: The school's uniqueness is captured in a passionate mission statement. Two aspects of this mission deserve special mention. First, there is a commitment to addressing the complex grand issues of our time. Importantly, this commitment finds concrete expression in courses throughout the curriculum that engage a broad range of design skills in pursuit of problems with manifold technical, cultural, and ethical dimensions. A second aspect of the school's mission is a commitment to student empowerment. This is embodied in a unique effort to reserve half of a student's studies for self-directed choices. In this way, it is felt that students experience the freedom to assume authorship over their own educational arcs.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives

D. Architectural Education and the Profession
E. Architectural Education and the Public Good

Professional and Community Connections: The school leads by example regarding professional engagement and community outreach. Partnerships are created through client-based studios, such as Design Duluth. Highly active professional mentoring of students supports early exposure to practice-based experiences and promotes strong personal relationships between students and practitioners.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures

Rigorous Commitment to Excellence and Change Management: For some time, the school has propagated a regular and rigorous culture of critical, creative, and open self-examination of its curricular content, sequence, and structure, as well as its delivery and tracking effectiveness. In particular, the visiting team commends the school for its data collection, adventurous experimentation, and willingness to address what works and what doesn't.

I.2.3 Physical Resources

Physical Resources: Rapson Hall's fabrication technology and labs resources for students are expansive, available, and up to date. The students have indicated that these resources are a common reason for choosing to attend the school. The Architecture and Landscape Architecture Library is a tremendous and well-loved resource. The books, periodicals, and modern chair collection, as well as the rotating exhibits, surround a space that is conducive to study, quiet reflection, and critical thinking.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials

Faculty Excellence: The depth and breadth of expertise and passionate commitment demonstrated by the faculty are exceptional. Students hold the faculty in high regard and appreciate their ability to provide direct connections to the practicing community. The faculty are in high demand at the university level for a variety of strategic and
developmental initiatives due to their critical, synthetic thinking and their ability and willingness to effect change.

The school leadership is held in particularly high regard, both within the unit and beyond. Colleagues identify the current head of the school as an excellent listener, who creates an inclusive environment, is open to change, and is an outstanding educator.

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

**Integrative Design Thinking:** The school’s curricular approach fosters integration throughout the course structure. Beginning in the first semester, students address the full range of building design concerns, from concept to technical detail. By aligning this curricular structure with a similar framework in the B.S. program, the school demonstrates a level of commitment to a highly coordinated curriculum that is rare. This ethos of integration reveals a passionate commitment to the power of design to address the complex issues facing society today and to the power of building systems, technology, and sustainability to enrich architecture. Additionally, the focus on research through coursework, post-professional degree options, and research centers should be lauded for fostering a student body that understands the opportunity to engage in the development of new knowledge.

B.3. Sustainability

**Sustainable Design Education:** Tackling sustainable design issues is a point of pride for the school. The conservation of resources and the creation of healthy environments are core values within the school’s curriculum. This commitment is actualized in a strong existing lecture course on lighting and thermal design, and finds expression in student design work at all levels. The Center for Sustainable Building Research provides evidence of a commitment to take this goal from theory to action.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, representing the AIA
Krista Phillips, AIA, NCARB
Principal
RIM Architects
645 G Street, Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501
(907) 258-7777
(907) 279-8195 fax
kphillips@rimarchitects.com

Representing the ACSA
Curt Lamb
80 Paul Street
Newton Center, MA 02659
(617) 895-8208
curtlamb@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Connor C. Willey
322 NE Maple Street
Apt. #8
Pullman, WA 99163
(425) 299-6277
connor.willey@email.wsu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Erin Carracher, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP
305 East 1700 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84115
(410) 562-5311
carracher@arch.utah.edu

Non-Voting Member
Garth Rockcastle
Professor
School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 405-5755
gcr@umd.edu
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Krista Phillips, AIA, NCARB
Team Chair

Curt Lamb
Team member

Connor C. Willey
Team member

Erin Carracher, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP
Team member

Garth Rockcastle
Non-voting member

Representing the AIA

Representing the ACSA

Representing the AIAS

Representing the NCARB