University of Idaho
College of Art and Architecture

2016 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture

(128 credit hours preprofessional degree + 45 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
March 9, 2016

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Table of Contents

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations

The University of Idaho (UI) has experienced significant changes since the last team visit in 2010 and the 2012 focused evaluation. New leadership in the university's central administration and in the architecture program has introduced new visions, organizational structures, and procedures. Some of the initiatives have been prompted by the downturn in the state and national economies. Others have been encouraged by revitalization and refocusing efforts to address present and future needs and demands. The head of the architecture program and the provost were both appointed in 2015. The university president was appointed in 2013. Some programs have disappeared; others have been created. Financial aid sources and tuition reduction programs have changed. New sources of funding and approaches supporting students financially have been implemented. Enrollment has decreased across the campus and in the College of Art and Architecture (CAA).

Student work and conversations with faculty, students, and staff provided evidence of a quality learning environment despite the challenges of the remote campus location and the budget. There is a strong sense of collegiality and optimism in the college. There is also an attitude of doing the most with the available means, and of visioning based on the realities at hand. Students were appreciative of the faculty and vice versa. This collaborative spirit is a manifestation of the following goal of the CAA: to "teach the integrated concepts of art, design, and technology with a focus on cultural and environmental stewardship." The architecture students' work and the scholarly work of the faculty with communities and in support of the natural environment are consistent with this goal.

The team was impressed by the number of students taking advantage of several travel opportunities available regionally, nationally, and internationally. Also of note was the number of students planning to spend the last 2 years of the program at the Boise Center.

Strong programs are in place to increase diversity and inclusion among faculty and students. The team was particularly impressed with the diversity of the faculty, peer-to-peer support, international outreach, and engagement with high school students, as well as the program's work with local First Nations. In the preprofessional and graduate programs in architecture, 36% of the students are women. Currently, no women students in the architecture program are members of a racial/ethnic minority group, nor are there any African American students in the program.

The Urban Design Center (UDC) and the Integrated Design Lab (IDL) at the University of Idaho Boise Center are part of the CAA. These programs are working to open the doors to outreach, education, and research. The IDL undertakes research and outreach primarily in the area of energy efficiency. The UDC provides curricular opportunities for design problems that address possible futures for real communities. Both programs add to the specialization options available to all students in the college and offer unique opportunities for architecture students. They have reinforced integration efforts within the college and expanded possibilities for interdisciplinary work across campus with the College of Natural Resources, the College of Science, the College of Engineering, and the College of Business and Economics, among others.

There is discussion about expanding the presence of UI in Boise and about the role that the architecture program plays in that effort. Since the previous team visit, the CAA has added a Bio-Regional Planning and Community Design (BIOP) program and has established the Center for Resilient Communities (CRC). Limited information on these programs was available.

The team thanks University President Chuck Staben, Provost and Executive Vice-President John Wiencek, Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs Jeanne Stevenson, and CAA Dean Mark Hoversten, all

of whom took the time to meet with us and graciously answered our questions. The team congratulates the head of the architecture program and the faculty for their achievements and dedication, and also thanks the group that organized the review materials to facilitate our work. In addition, we thank the staff that coordinated all the activities of the visit to ensure completion of our tasks. In particular, we thank Sandi Klingler for resolving our day-to-day challenges, Michael McMullin for setting up all the equipment in the team room flawlessly, and Jay Pengilly for facilitating the Sunday visit to the Technical Design Studio he directs, a resource much valued by students and faculty that supports the well-crafted work we saw in the college.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations

SPC B.10 Financial Considerations

SPC D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture

SPC D.3 Business Practices

SPC D.4 Legal Responsibilities

Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2010)

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 (2010): Exact NAAB language per NAAB Conditions for Accreditation (2004) was not found in the Department's catalog and promotional media.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** See assessment in Section II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees. This condition is now **Met**.

2004 Condition 10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2010): The University of Idaho has been subject to economic conditions facing most institutions of higher learning throughout the nation. Since 2008, the university has taken cuts of 6%; an additional budget cut is anticipated in late 2010. The provost believes the magnitude of 2010 reductions will be lower than previous cuts. Thirty-five out of two hundred programs across the university were closed as a result of the downturn. Additionally the provost was forced to sweep lines from units across the university. The Department of Architecture and Interior Design lost two faculty lines. University wide furloughs will impact faculty and staff salaries.

Faculty members are becoming aware of the need to pursue grant opportunities and engage in fund-raising. One faculty member is having considerable success in grant writing; as a result, supports a research center providing services to regional firms in day lighting and energy studies.

A new development officer was hired at the college level to develop private sector interests. While not widely visible to faculty, his focus is long-term relationships to boost donations and support an endowment.

When the Idaho State Board of Education reconstituted the College of Art & Architecture in October 2005, no provisions were made for funding the unit's administration. A professional fee was instituted as a stopgap to fund the dean's office and other departments. The professional fee is assessed to all units in the college except art. This scheme for funding college administration is highly irregular and has created considerable frustration among faculty and students (parents) paying the fee. While this arrangement may very well continue in the short-term, in the long-term more stable, equitable, and conventional methods of funding may be necessary.

The dean's office plans to add an associate dean to complement the college's administrative team. While the NAAB team feels an associate dean will indeed be helpful to assist in the operations of college, funding this position through the professional fee will further stress an already unpopular financial model.

The department chair and others interviewed by the team expressed frustration(s) in obtaining accurate financial information about the college and department. There appears to have been significant turnover in finance administrative staff at the college. Lack of budgetary transparency and accessibility makes it difficult for the chair to plan effectively and for faculty to move forward with initiatives, particularly in times of significant financial distress. This issue contributed to the assessment of this Condition as not met.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** See assessment in Section I.2.3 Financial Resources. This condition is demonstrated.

2004 Criterion 13.12, Human Behavior: *Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment.*

Previous Team Report (2010): An understanding of human behavior is gained in courses Arch 151 Introduction to the Built Environment and Arch 450 Architectural Programming; however, it appears these behavior theories are not emphasized in studio problems or reflected in student work.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now incorporated into Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation, SPC A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity, which is now **Met**. See assessment for SPC A.8.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility: *Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities.*

Previous Team Report (2010): Consistent application of this ability was not found in upper level student design work; concepts are not being reinforced by the faculty.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now incorporated into Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge, SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations, which is **Not Met**. See assessment for SPC B.3.

2004 Criterion 13.16, Program Preparation: Ability to *prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.*

Previous Team Report (2010): Consistent evidence was not found for this criterion in course ARCH 450 Architectural Programming (also ARCH 453 Architectural Design V). Client/user needs and space inventory/equipment requirements appear to be frequently provided to the students by the instructor, or based on precedent. Hands-on programming, integral to a comprehensive design experience was not found.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now incorporated into SPC B.1 Pre-Design, which is **Met**. See assessment for SPC B.1.

2004 Criterion 13.17, Site Conditions: Ability to *respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project.*

Previous Team Report (2010): Students take LArch 383 Architectural Site Design in the third year. It is the team's belief, based on touring studios and discussions with instructors, that site analysis is structured to be part of later-year design studio work. Although the program's APR matrix indicated this criteria is evident in the work of design studios (ARCH 353-354 Architectural Design III-IV, ARCH 453-4 Architectural Design V-VI and ARCH 556 Architectural Design IX), it is not clearly exhibited in final projects. Upper-year design projects are on simple, flat sites, not reflective of the real world (or this region).

Students were observed in studios using site analysis tools to aid in the design of their completed projects; however little of this process is evident in the final design or presentation. There is concern that the later design studio assignments avoid challenging sites and therefore limit opportunities to develop this ability. Consequently it is difficult to determine if the students have achieved an ability in this Criterion. It is not met.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** This criterion is now SPC B.2 Site Design, which is **Met**. See assessment for SPC B.2.

2004 Criterion 13.20, Life-Safety: Understanding of *the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.*

Previous Team Report (2010): Although the program's APR matrix suggests this criteria is best demonstrated by the work of later-year design studios (553, 556, and Professional Practice 575) – it was not clear these projects reflect life safety issues. None of the projects observed included building code information. Several low and high pass design examples from these upper level studios lack acceptable egress arrangements. This may indicate a lack of understanding of basic life-safety concerns such as egress routes and exit separation. Consequently it was difficult to determine if an understanding is achieved in this Criterion.

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is now incorporated into SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations, which is **Not Met**. See assessment for SPC B.3.

2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control: Understanding of *the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating.*

Previous Team Report (2010): This topic is offered in ARCH 575, Professional Practice. The reviewer did not find evidence of it in the course syllabus.

Evidence of this subject is found in ARCH 504, Situational Prototyping, Architecture & the Law; however it is not a required course.

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is now incorporated into SPC B.10 Financial Considerations, which is **Not Met**. See assessment for SPC B.10.

Previous FE Team Report (2012)

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 (2012): The FE team reviewed recruitment materials, catalogues, and online information. The required language is present. Although the team was able to find the information online, it was a difficult process. The University of Idaho revised the linkage to the material as a response to our concern. The materials now have a direct link from the architecture home page.

2016 Team Assessment: See assessment in Section II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees. This condition is **Met**.

2004 Condition 6, Human Resources: *The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.*

Previous Team Report (2012): Since the 2010 NAAB visit, one faculty member in interior design has been added and one member in architecture has departed. Since the faculty cross-teach, the net has remained the same. The architecture program is searching for a replacement to the individual who resigned. The concern remains regarding the faculty-to-student ratios. The FER states in pre-professional undergraduate design studios the ratio is

1:25, and in the professional studios 1:15. The September 12, 2012, memorandum states the overall ratio of full- and part-time faculty to students is 1 to 17.2 and tenured and tenure-track faculty to student ratio is 1: 21.4. That memo also states the design studio ratios remain per the FER. There still seems to be some confusion regarding ratio determination given a faculty that has crossover with interior design. Also, the number of enrolled students in the architecture program has decreased over the past two years, which changes the ratios per the September 12 memorandum.

The VTR stated, "Subjects taught by adjuncts or non-tenured faculty can affect quality of curriculum delivery and isn't recommended." The FE team was confused by this statement and finds the mix between full-time faculty and adjunct/part-time faculty as outlined in the September 12, 2012, letter satisfactory.

Advising loads remain on the high side with each faculty member advising 25-30 students. No advising staff has been added since 2010. This is not overly burdensome in the FE team's opinion. The number is therefore not the critical issue. Demonstrated effectiveness of the advisement needs to be the issue of the next NAAB visit.

Release time has increased over the past two years, but travel support has diminished.

The FE team finds this issue to remain consequential and requiring monitoring over the next four years.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** See assessment in Section I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development. This condition is demonstrated.

2004 Condition Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2012): The FE team found the financial resources for the architecture program to be improving. Funding mechanisms have been changed both at the state level and within the college. The expenditure per student has increased from $3,200 in 2010 and 2011 to $4,600 in 2012. This may still be low, especially given the proposed 2013 budget that indicates a 5.6% decrease. In addition, development funds have not met the budget, and due to the departure of the advancement officer and the redefinition of the position as director of strategic initiatives, the goals will most likely not be met in the near future as well.

The team's conclusion is that changes in funding for the architecture program are headed in the right direction, but have not reached the point where resources are adequate to meet needs.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** See assessment in Section I.2.3 Financial Resources. This condition is demonstrated.

2004 Condition Administrative Structure: *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). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

Previous Team Report (2012): The FE team was concerned regarding this item after reading the FE Report, which discusses reorganization within the college and contains the following statements, "These changes impact the Architecture and Interior Design programs to a greater extent than originally anticipated because it essentially splits a highly intertwined Department into two programs. We are now working together and as separate programs to fully understand the implications of the change, and find ways to efficiently coordinate our many shared courses and responsibilities while redesigning our internal administrative structure…
The impact of the new structure on College efficiencies has not yet been documented, but should be evident in the 2013 budget."

The response to our request for additional information contained in Diane Armpriest's memorandum of September 12, 2012, addresses the administrative structure changes:

"I believe the changes have, for the most part, been effective. Collegiality and collaboration across the college has increased while all programs are being funded to a slightly higher level than in past years. The Architecture and Interior Design program chairs, working with our administrative assistant, have developed, an operational strategy based on new dynamics and implementation is going well."

The letter also addresses improved relationships with the dean and more integration within the college.

Continued monitoring would be advisable to understand the long-term outcomes.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** See assessment in Section I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance. This condition is described.

III. Compliance with the 2014 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: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program's benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2016 Analysis/Review: The University of Idaho was founded in 1889 and opened classes for enrollment in 1892. It is a publicly supported, comprehensive land-grant institution and is the state's flagship research university. Architecture was among the areas included in the original university charter, and, today, the CAA offers the only NAAB-accredited program in the state.

The first architecture degree curriculum was established in 1923. In 1927, a Bauhaus-inspired interdisciplinary curriculum was adopted, which culminated in the establishment of the CAA in 1981. A 5-year Bachelor of Architecture degree was established in 1956. In 1998, the B. Arch degree was replaced by an M. Arch, which remains today. In 2002, the CAA was "forced to merge" with two other colleges in response to university and state budget reductions. After active lobbying efforts by faculty, students, and alumni, the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) re-established the CAA in 2005. Dean Hoversten was appointed in 2007.

In 2005, the SBOE also approved an increase in the professional fee charged to full-time and part-time students enrolled in some of the CAA programs. This fee is charged on a semester basis over and above general tuition and fees. However, art and design students did not have to pay the professional fee. The fact that this professional fee paid for the newly re-instated college administration, and that it was not charged equitably to all students in the CAA, became a point of contention. This was noted in the 2010 VTR. Also mentioned in that VTR was the fact that, in 2010, the SBOE approved a request from the CAA's dean to "extend the professional fee to all students." It was at that time that the college structure became one administrative unit "for efficient management" and flexibility "delivering integrated and interdisciplinary teaching and research." In 2014, with the support of the students, the dean requested a 4% increase in the professional fee to "defray the rising costs of equipment in the computer studio and the technical shop." At that time, the professional fee represented 17.31% of the CAA's total budget. The students brought their concerns about the fee to the attention of the team, but, presently, the fee is not a major issue.

Integration and collaboration with other programs within the college characterize the current professional curriculum in architecture. All CAA majors are to be engaged in studio-based learning, which addresses real-world problems that are connected with communities and clients. The college's goal is to educate all of its graduates to become "creative, collaborative leaders, both within and outside their disciplines," who are "well prepared for the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary practice." The college's mission echoes the university's areas of distinction. This involves interdisciplinary research, and service to businesses and communities, while advancing diversity, citizenship, and global outreach, with the aim of propelling the state of Idaho toward global success, creating a sustainable American West, and addressing the "most challenging issues" facing the United States.

The university describes the M. Arch as a "seamless" Bachelor of Science/Master of Architecture 6-year program. It prepares graduates for careers as licensed architects, as well as careers in community design, urban design, consulting in energy and lighting, sustainable development, and related fields. Collaboration within the college allows architecture students to study alongside art and design, interior design, landscape architecture, and virtual technology and design students. All college majors are required to enroll in three courses that develop foundational skills and knowledge. In addition, the UDC, the IDL, and the CRC expand and focus architecture graduate students' professional knowledge. The CRC collaborates with the College of Natural Resources and the College of Science. Most recently, the CAA added a BIOP program, which brings the areas of architecture and landscape architecture together with agricultural economics, rural sociology, civil engineering, and geography, among other areas.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2016 Analysis/Review: The Learning Culture Policy was updated in 2010. It encompasses all facets of the learning environment and communicates policies regarding "mutual respect and civility." The policy's message is conveyed via syllabi and online, and, according to the APR, is practiced daily in the classroom. While the policy is effective at addressing the learning environment within the classroom, there is work to be done educating students to achieve a healthy school-life balance and establish habits that lead to general health and well-being. Some students interviewed by the team were having difficulty achieving balanced school-life workloads. Many students are working long hours and raising families in addition to studying full time.

The team witnessed a strong sense of collegiality among CAA students and faculty. The faculty, students, and college administration agree that the program "does more with less" than most of their peer institutions. Students and faculty exhibit pride in their work and efforts, and they have an entrepreneurial spirit that pervades the program. The CAA dean sets aside $1,800 per faculty member to cover discretionary travel and encourage professors to participate in conferences, and to achieve publication of their research in top-tier scholarly journals.

Moscow, Idaho, is relatively isolated, and the number of professionals in the immediate surroundings is small. Consequently, concerted efforts are made to offer students and faculty sufficient opportunities to travel internationally, nationally, and regionally. The team heard from students and faculty that traveling expanded their world view and research. The program offers study travel opportunities in Rome, London, and various cities in China. Travel also takes place to surrounding cities in the Pacific Northwest, such as Spokane, Seattle, and Portland, and to San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and other cities. The majority of the students interviewed by the team expressed interest in practicing outside of Idaho, or abroad.

The architecture program's position within the CAA encourages interdisciplinary interactions among art, interior design, and landscape architecture students, which the dean, faculty, and students define as a core component of the CAA's overall value. In a poll conducted during our student meeting, all students indicated that they have taken classes outside the architecture program within the CAA.

Students are engaged in the AIAS and Freedom by Design chapters, and have attended national events, such as Grassroots conferences, and regional AIAS conferences. The CAA has supported these efforts with the funding available, or it has helped direct students to funding sources. The program has a history of student opportunity within the AIAS, with the 2010 AIAS national president, Tyler Ashworth, coming from UI.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2016 Analysis/Review: The APR notes that recruitment and diversity efforts are key parts of the program's strategic action plan. One of the plan's goals is to **"**be a community committed to access and inclusion." The APR includes a discussion of the recent efforts to conduct ongoing recruiting to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students. The annotated strategic plan made available to the team establishes goals, objectives, and strategies and proposed deadlines up to fall 2015. The plan describes the Design Bootcamp, the Summer Design Week, the enrollment pipelines, and the assignment of one faculty member to support the program's efforts to recruit and retain a diverse student body. The team was not provided with measures of success or any other information specific to the architecture program regarding projections for the next two accreditation cycles.

There are 14 full-time faculty (counting the landscape architecture and interior design cross-over, the UDC faculty member, and the IDL director) and 2 part-time affiliate faculty members. Thirty-five percent of the full-time architecture faculty members are women: one is a tenured full professor, two are associate professors (one tenured and the other tenure-track), and one is a tenure-track assistant professor (two, if the interior design faculty member who teaches the second-year design studio is included). This closely mirrors the percentage of women students in the preprofessional and M. Arch programs: 36%. However, among the total number of M. Arch students entering the program, the percentage of women is higher: 50%. As a result of faculty hires since the last visit, the number of women, Asian, and Hispanic/Latino faculty members has increased.

As reported in the APR, the architecture program's faculty and student engagements involving diversity occur though university events. An example is the university initiative called the Vandal Challenge Leadership Conference, which is aimed at recruiting Latino students. More individual initiatives include efforts by several architecture faculty members to pursue the recruitment of students from China, Finland, Thailand, India, and Turkey. The program is also working with high schools in disadvantaged areas and in local First Nations. One recent architecture studio provided anecdotal evidence of diversity: in a group of 15 students, 3 were Brazilian, 1 was Jordanian, 2 were Native American, 2 were Latino, and 1 was hearing-and-speaking impaired, but was able to communicate through a sign-language interpreter. The Annual Statistical Report provided to the team showed that the program's undergraduate student population is more ethnically diverse than the graduate population. For example, at the undergraduate level, 11 students are Hispanic/Latino, while, at the graduate level, there are only 2 from this ethnic group. In the team's meeting with the program's and the CAA's IT manager, Michael McMullin, and the architecture and interior design administrative assistant, Sandi Klingler, these staff members described accommodations provided to students, such as an interpreter courtesy of the University's Office of Disability Services. Mr. McMullin described modifications that he made to a computer to serve a student's specific needs. The team observed a poster listing diversity resources posted in the architecture building. All course syllabi included a statement referencing inclusiveness in the classroom.

The APR identifies campus-wide initiatives, including the President's Diversity Council (PDC); the CAMP program (promoting education for the families of migrant workers); resources such as the Women's Center, Multicultural Affairs Office, and LGBTQA Office (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Asexual, and Ally); and the Native American Student Center. The APR also identifies University of Idaho certificate programs in Global Justice and Diversity and Stratification, as well as courses in Latin American and Native American studies.

The program has made significant strides with respect to increasing diversity, particularly in recruiting and retaining Latinos and members of First Nations. However, challenges remain. The team noted in particular that there are no African American students in either the preprofessional or graduate programs.

No women are reported as members of a minority group in the NAAB accredited M. Arch program. Women represent only 36% of both the preprofessional program and the graduate program.

The majority (71%) of the M. Arch degrees in the last year (NAAB ARS 2015) were awarded to men.

The APR describes the University's Office of Human Rights Access and Inclusion (HRAI) as administering "practices that make all members of the University of Idaho community feel welcome, wanted, accepted, respected, and supported." The HRAI website makes clear that these practices are aimed at "access and inclusion in all aspects of the university." To facilitate awareness of HRAI and issues related to EEO/AA, the university requires all faculty and staff to engage in "Inclusive Workplace Training." This past year, the training was tied to the eligibility for raises. In the team's meeting with the CAA staff, Kim Osborne confirmed that an affirmative action coordinator works on all hiring. The team had access to the university's Civil Rights and Diversity Policies and Procedures document.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

- **A. Collaboration and Leadership.** The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.
- **B. Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.
- **C. Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.
- **D. Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.
- **E. Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to

positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2016 Analysis/Review: There is a strong, energetic learning culture at the University of Idaho CAA. In the architecture program, students work collaboratively as teams in design studios to develop design options, and they are also expected to produce individual work. Students reported that they cross-fertilize ideas as they assist each other with technical issues and discuss design approaches in the studio.

Graduate student teaching assistants demonstrate collaborative and leadership skills in the studio environment. These teaching assistants "double-back" and support the academic progress of entry-level students, which strengthens the learning culture of the program. In the team's conversations with the students, it was revealed that they feel part of a culture of design within the program, where design is discussed across year levels very freely. There is a lot of peer-to-peer learning across studio levels. In the team's meeting with the students, they suggested that more interaction was needed between the first 2 years and the third and fourth year. They told the team that the graduate teaching assistants are helping connect the year levels.

The faculty was remarkably positive about their work together, and they were clearly less competitive and more collaborative than might be expected in a small program with limited resources. Some studio courses are team-taught, and cross-fertilization demonstrated in student work from those studios is very strong.

The team found that, early on in the design studios, design is valued highly. Simple exploration is not left at a perfunctory stage, but is informed by technique, craft, culture, and many other influences and aspirations. What is refreshing and unusual about the design culture at UI is the sheer strength of the work, which is often expressed with heavy timber structures that are large and dynamic. Yet, care and dexterity are also evident, and there is not the typical amount of SketchUp, or Rhino "hype." Designs start strong and become more and more complex and informed as they progress through the upper-level studios. Significant travel and observation of other sites and cultures is expected of the UI students, and it pays off beautifully. A multi-cultural faculty guides students to far-away places every year, which allows students from a rural small town program to benefit from a global experience. This allows students to expand their perspectives in order to become more cosmopolitan and extrospective in their work.

The faculty and student work delivers a strong environmental message and commitment. Most projects at every level demonstrate responsibility for natural resources and regenerative design. The IDL at the Boise Center offers singular expertise in daylighting, health in environments, and overall high-efficiency energy performance. Many faculty members are LEED-accredited, and energy modeling is found in a number of courses.

The learning culture's valuing of social and cultural responsibility in design is demonstrated by materials available in the library, advertisement of diverse cultural events on architecture building posters, and faculty research in this area, including Anne Marshal's study of the architecture of local Tribal Nations. Sustainability is pursued in the work and research of the IDL. The UDC is not currently offering professional services to the community. However, it aspires to do so. Faculty did not identify current professional development activities in this area, although several mentioned that they are interested in undertaking these types of activities in the future.

The curricular commitment to community and social responsibility includes building students' world view through travel programs in China, England, and Italy, and opportunities for study abroad in Turkey, China, and Finland. Most of the studios in both the Boise and Moscow UI locations include real world-based problems, and some are dedicated to generating research and conceptual design to inform community action. Co-curricular and extracurricular activities include an alternative spring break. The APR mentioned a student who used this opportunity to repair substandard housing in Pittsburgh. Participation in the AIAS Freedom by Design program is another example of past involvement in this regard; however, this program is currently not active.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

2016 Analysis/Review: The program provided the team with a copy of its 2010-2015 strategic plan, which describes areas and objectives for program improvement. These include curricular changes, renovation of the architecture building lobby, increased travel funds for faculty, faculty hires, and outreach to increase student enrollment and diversity. Some data was collected; however, the plan does not include ways to measure the goals of the plan. The program's priorities are aligned with the goals of the University of Idaho's strategic plan. An update to the university's strategic plan is currently being discussed, which will result in a revision to the architecture program's plan.

The APR describes the process for maintaining and updating the program's strategic plan. The faculty reviews it every 5 years. The accreditation process, the university-mandated annual assessments, the CAA's strategic initiatives, faculty evaluations, and consultation with the Advisory Board and with the students all contribute to the long-range planning process. The APR explains that the recent changes at the UDC in Boise and the new faculty in landscape architecture and bio-regional planning came about as a result of strategic planning.

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

2016 Analysis/Review: The APR describes the program's assessment process, which is driven by university procedures as well as by college-level and program-level reviews. The CAA went through the university's External Review process most recently in fall 2014, and it participated in the university's regional accreditation process for the spring 2015 visit. All programs are required to submit an annual self-assessment report that includes faculty and student evaluations, and learning assessment criteria. The program's learning assessment criteria must align with the University of Idaho's Learning Outcome Criteria: learn and integrate, think and create, communicate, clarify purpose and perspective, and practice citizenship.

The architecture program's self-assessment, as indicated in the APR and supporting documents, and as reflected in the team's conversations with the various constituencies, considers overlapping the goals of the university in outreach and engagement. It also considers the program's alignment with the university's intent to encourage "holistic development of young professionals" "through a course of education that benefits from both the breadth of liberal arts

studies and depth of the disciplinary specifics of architectural studies." In addition, the program's curriculum directly responds to this holistic approach to education by including the university's Integrated Seminars (ISEM), which are small, writing-intensive, topical liberal art courses, as well as undergraduate and graduate open electives. The program also seeks to become a "center of design thinking."

Finally, annually, the program reviews the students' performance in the final projects for two studios (Arch 353 Architectural Design III and Arch 553 Architectural Design VII). Since 2012, a survey has been distributed to faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and guest critics for these studios, who are asked to assess the projects focusing on design communication, human behavior, precedent studies, site integration, accessibility, life safety, design integration, and critical thinking. The program compares the survey results with the ARE pass rates. Since 2015, before completion of the survey, an open dialogue has taken place among the faculty regarding the weaknesses and strengths of the final projects submitted for Arch 553.

The team had access to the program's August 2016 update to the 2010-2015 strategic action plan. The plan is organized into four main goals: teaching and learning, scholarly and creative activity, outreach and engagement, and community and culture. The plan update outlines specific objectives, actions, and milestones. In addition, the APR I.6.1 Assessment subsection, "Strategic Actions Resulting Planning and Assessment," provides a detailed discussion of strengths, challenges, and opportunities. The plan is aligned with the university's learning outcomes. No specific measures are given for determining achievement of the program's objectives and strategies.

The APR indicates that a major revision of the program's curriculum occurred in 2005 when the number of graduate credits for the M. Arch became 45 in compliance with the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Since then, there have been a number of minor modifications to the curriculum. Some of the changes have dealt with meeting the NAAB Student Performance Criteria and addressing the relationship between student work, program goals, the state of the profession, and the context in which practice occurs. Specifically, a course on architectural programming was added, the digital representation course sequence was modified, and the digital modeling tools used in studios were revisited. There is currently an integrated teaching model in place for the design studio, structures, materials and methods, and representation.

The curriculum is internally reviewed by the program's and the CAA's faculty, as well as by an assessment coordinator. The program seeks feedback from graduate teaching assistants, from peers at the Washington State University architecture program and the Community College architecture faculty, and from architecture and building professionals.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to. academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence to complete the assessment of this condition was found in the APR, in the faculty teaching matrix, on the list of faculty scholarly activities, on the program's website, in other university publications, in the faculty exhibit, and in conversations with the faculty and program administration.

The APR indicates that the faculty-student ratio in the second-year studio is 1:20, and, for years 3 to 6, it is 1:15. The average number of credits per semester taken by architecture students enrolled in the seamless B.S. Arch/M. Arch program is 14; the highest number required is 16. In conversations with the faculty and program administrators, the team confirmed that the enrollment reduction has allowed faculty to pursue research and publishing. Each faculty member meets with the program head at the beginning of the academic year to discuss teaching, research, and service goals. The typical workload is to "teach one to two courses and a design studio a semester, generate two peer-validated scholarly works, and complete two to three service obligations." The APR indicates that, if the resources are available, a faculty member who has received a book contract will be given release time. Also, if a faculty member is assigned recruitment responsibilities, his/her research requirement will be reduced. The list of faculty scholarly activities over the last 6 years indicates that 12 full-time architecture faculty have been actively conducting research, submitting texts for peer review and publication, and writing books. The team had access to the materials published, which were presented in the faculty exhibit. In addition, both faculty and graduate students benefit from the 30 graduate teaching assistantship positions available annually. These provide much-needed financial support to architecture students, add to the tutorial time dedicated to each student in the studios and courses where graduate teaching assistants are assigned, and support the learning culture of the program by increasing contact between undergraduate and graduate architecture students.

Since the last NAAB visit and the FE 2012 report, there have been some role changes and new hires. Randall Teal has served as the architecture program head since 2015. The architecture program head oversees the IDL in Boise, and, along with the CAA dean and the heads of landscape architecture and bio-regional planning, determines "the role, function, and direction" of the Boise UDC. The former program head, Diane Armpriest, is now teaching full time and has been directly involved in developing and teaching Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design, as well as collaborating on the integration of structures and building materials and construction into the third-year studios. One of the new faculty members—Carolina Manrique Hoyos—teaches structures and plays a critical role in integrating structures into the design studio. Another new faculty member—Matthew Miller—teaches building construction and

materials with a focus on "small community design-build development." Design-build is an area that the program is developing.

There are 13 full-time architecture faculty members, counting tenure-track Associate Professor Kasama Polakit and Professor Elizabeth Cooper. Professor Polakit is the director of the UDC on the Boise campus and is a new hire. She most recently taught two graduate design studios in the seamless B.S./M. Arch program, as well as the professional practice course. Professor Cooper was recently appointed director of the IDL in Boise. In spring-fall 2014, she taught two graduate design studios in the seamless B.S./M. Arch. program. Her main responsibilities are with the IDL.

Two faculty members need to be added to the previous number. A landscape architecture faculty member teaches the required LArch 251 Site Design, and an interior design faculty member teaches the required Arch 254 Architectural Design II studio. The APR notes that adjuncts bring "diversity of experience" to the curriculum; however, no adjunct faculty members were listed for fall 2015 and spring 2016. In conversations with administrators, faculty, and staff, it was mentioned that funds for hiring adjuncts are limited. In the past, adjuncts have taught structure courses, materials and methods, and studios. Some of the courses previously assigned to adjuncts are now taught by the two recent hires.

Part-time Affiliate Associate Professor Ned Warnick is the ALA for the students on the Moscow campus, and tenure-track Associate Professor Kasama Polakit serves as the ALA for the Boise campus students. Professor Warnick is licensed in several states in the U.S., and Professor Polakit is licensed in Thailand. Professor Polakit's Arch 575 Professional Practice students on the Boise campus are earning IDP credits. Although Professor Warnick represented the program at the 2015 Licensing Advisors Summit, only Professor Polakit's name appears registered for Boise and Moscow in NCARB's by-state listing of ALAs as of March 8, 2016. The APR notes that Steve Turney of ZGA Architects in Boise, who is an Idaho State Architect Licensing Advisor, delivers the IDP updates to students in Arch 575. Mr. Turney is listed as the ALA for Boise. Five faculty members are licensed architects in the U.S., and three are licensed in other countries.

The CAA faculty and select staff (such as the directors of the technical design and computer studios) have access to annual research/travel allowances such as the Dean's Travel Fund, which is mainly directed toward supporting junior faculty, and the Paul G. Windley Faculty Excellence and Development Award for continuing work. Faculty with the rank of senior lecturer and above can apply for a sabbatical leave.

Students benefit from opportunities for learning, interaction with the professional community, and internships through the Inspiring Design Futures one-day symposium, which showcases alumni work and brings professionals together to review students' portfolios; the architecture guest critics series; the CAA lecture series; AIAS firm interviews; design studio field trips to firms; final studio and design competition reviews by guest critics; and advisory board visits to campus (one to two times a year). The last two competitions were in partnership with the Idaho Forest Products and the Idaho Concrete Masonry Association. The program maintains close relations with AIA Idaho, particularly the Central (Boise) AIA chapter, whose president visits the Moscow campus one to two times a year to meet with students and faculty.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described

2016 Team Assessment: The APR adequately describes the physical resources available. The CAA complex—consisting of the Art and Architecture North and South buildings, Main Interior Design, the AAN Annex, Ridenbaugh Hall, and GAS House—occupies a central area on campus, which is conveniently reached on foot or through vehicular transportation. The UDC and the IDL, which had been at two separate locations in Boise, are now consolidated in the University of Idaho Water Center facility.

The technical design studio on the Moscow campus is located in the AAN Annex and is accessible to all CAA students 60 hours per week. It provides traditional shop tooling and digital fabrication equipment (including CNC milling, laser cutting, and 3D printing). Students are given initial training on the use of the equipment during their first semester and further instruction on an as-needed basis. The NAAB team was impressed by the material exploration and technical prowess demonstrated by students in the chair fabrication studio.

The Art and Architecture Interior Design Building is being transitioned to house design-build courses and serve as a location for faculty offices. The Student Design Center, located in the main Art and Architecture Building, contains various material and product samples. Students have access to the computer studio and its plotting facilities during the day. A library contains a wide array of design periodicals. A monitor is also available to answer students' questions.

Although some of the Moscow campus buildings are connected, some students said that it was difficult to meet students in other year levels. The faculty and administration see "vertical studios" as a possible solution to encourage students across year levels to meet and work together. The graduate teaching assistantships were also mentioned as a way to bridge the physical separation of students from different years. Most of the architecture studios are housed in the Art and Architecture North and South buildings. The program's administrative suite and most of the faculty offices are in Art and Architecture South.

The entrance hall of Art and Architecture South has been redesigned to become a student lounge. There is a showcase for new art and architecture books and a selection of periodicals at the library. Each student has an individual space to work, has access to WiFi, and has a wide array of technical expertise and support available if they encounter a problem with their laptops. The studio desks in four studios have been upgraded, and space within eight studios has been reorganized to facilitate in-studio discussions and reviews.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: The financial resources for this program include faculty travel stipends of $1,800 per year, studio financial assistance, funding for studio guest critics, and funding for study programs abroad in Italy, England, and China.

The APR indicates that the categories where the architecture program has the greatest influence are faculty travel stipends, studio financial assistance, and funding for studio guest critics. The program has spending autonomy for small equipment and supplies, accreditation expenses, and small facility improvements, such as the acquisition of furniture.

New faculty hires have completed the funded teaching lines, and the reduction in student enrollment has generally allowed for improved teaching/research/mentorship loads per faculty member. One new faculty member seems to have been assigned an overreaching teaching load that is not conducive to effective student learning, but this situation is slated to be rectified in the near future. No concerns were reported to

the team by students, faculty, or staff regarding excessive time demands, the lack of availability to students, or research. It was mentioned that funds are limited for temporary faculty positions and for teaching assistantships.

The APR states that one of the UI president's priorities is "to improve overall faculty compensation." In line with that priority, the CAA dean has identified two architecture faculty members—both associate professors—whose salaries are very close to the range now paid to incoming assistant professors and must be adjusted. The team had no conversations on the subject.

There has been a slight improvement in program enrollment. Initiatives such as the summer Design Boot Camp provide incentives for new and transfer students to enter the program. Additionally, enrollment and outreach can expand thanks to a partnership with Boise State University (BSU) for the purpose of offering a Design Foundations program in Boise through collaboration between the BSU Art Department and the Boise UDC. Other initiatives for recruitment are through the 49th Parallel Consortium of Architecture Schools and other exchange agreements with programs abroad and in the U.S. The CAA is seeking donor participation to support these initiatives. The APR indicates, and the team confirmed during the visit, that donor activity improved at the college level in the 2014-2015 academic year.

As stated in the APR, students receive financial aid primarily in two forms: scholarships and graduate teaching positions. For Idaho residents, the annual cost of attending this degree program is $4,306 for tuition, plus $1,999 for fees. Forty-two percent of the students receive financial aid, 44% get institutional grants, and 60% have student loans. Graduate architecture students can apply for paid teaching assistantships, which include a stipend and a partial waiver of out-of-state tuition. An expense that is not currently covered is regional study travel. Some architecture students do not have funds to pay for field trips for studios and other courses; therefore, they do not travel. There is no formal mechanism for defraying the cost of regional study travel.

While the university's strategic plan aspires to expand enrollment by 50% to improve the educational outcomes for Idaho residents, it is not clear to the team how future enrollment increases will be funded with respect to managing teaching loads and the demands for facilities for the program and the college. While the enrollment goal is not a present concern, there appears to be no clear formula for addressing a more robust student body in the architecture program. One administrator indicated that each student at UI must be underwritten by state funding with a sum larger than the present tuition. Certainly, this program has the potential to attract non-residents and international students by virtue of its affordability. Faculty said that they would welcome a more competitive and robust student body in order to gain, as they said, "critical mass." At the same time, they were relieved not to have the exhaustive teaching loads that went with higher numbers of students. This situation was highlighted by the previous visiting team. One of the reasons given for the lower enrollment numbers was that UI stopped participating in programs that provided tuition reductions to out-of-state students from the region. The university has introduced programs that support a limited number of non-Idaho resident students through reciprocity agreements and scholarships. The number of state resident students has increased.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Architecture students have access to a Design Resource Center (DRC). Within the DRC is the Materials Resource Center (MRC), which has a small periodical collection and a material

samples collection. The computer studio at the DRC is equipped with large-format scanners and plotters, and offers technical support on the use of software. In a meeting with students, the team learned that, although they have access to digital projectors and other presentation devices, the hardware is not up to date with the students' laptops. The plotters in the computer studio are only available during limited hours. The students want to have access to black-and-white large-format printing in the design studio for draft work. Currently, a high-capacity letter-size printer is available to students.

Information resources are adequate and accessible. The team toured the library with the departmental liaison, Kristin Henrich, and was shown the significant architecture book collection and the access to digital databases for architecture. The liaison offers workshops on database use as needed by the architecture faculty and students in support of individual research. It was reported that the budget for new acquisitions has been reduced, but faculty requests are generally fulfilled. Improvements to the centrally located, substantial library building are in process, and upgrades to technical support are in the works.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.
- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

2016 Team Assessment: The APR indicates that the CAA has been functioning as a single department since 2011. It explains that this has facilitated the application of the college-wide professional fee, streamlined the administrative structure, encouraged integrated teaching strategies, and pooled resources. The APR explains that the professional fee has afforded autonomy over the CAA's budget. The dean of the CAA oversees all the CAA programs as well as all the facilities and other resources. The program heads, in collaboration with the dean, are updating the CAA's strategic plan. The dean reports directly to the provost. The architecture program head is currently the chair of the University Faculty Senate and, while in this position, has direct contact with the provost. The CAA faculty has one representative in the University Faculty Senate. Because funding is not available for a CAA associate dean, CAA program heads take turns attending the university's associate deans meetings. There are six program heads, including the architecture program head.

The program head reports to the CAA dean and is responsible for administering the program. The program maintains open communication with the faculty to ensure fulfillment of program goals, while visioning, outreach, and alumni relations are pursued and maintained. The architecture program head oversees the IDL in Boise and participates in determining the role and direction of the Boise UDC, along with the dean and the heads of landscape architecture and bio-regional planning.

The students are represented by the CAA student congress, which has direct access to the program heads and the dean.

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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 **Professional Communication Skills:** *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 154 Introduction to Architectural Graphics, Arch 204 Media in Architecture, Arch 385 History of Architecture I: Pre-Modern, Arch 386 History of Architecture II: Modern, Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues, Arch 510 Graduate Project Seminar, and Arch 556 Architectural Design IX. Specifically, evidence of graphic skills at a professional level was found in Arch 510 and Arch 556. Evidence of writing skills at a professional level was found in Arch 385, Arch 386, Arch 483, Arch 510, and Arch 556.

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

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 253 Architectural Design I, Arch 254 Architectural Design II, Arch 463 Environmental Control Systems I, Arch 464 Environmental Control Systems II, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 556 Architectural Design IX. Evidence regarding testing alternative outcomes was found in Arch 253 and Arch 254. Evidence fulfilling all areas of the criterion was found in Arch 553 and Arch 556.

A.3 **Investigative Skills:** *Ability* to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 266 Materials and Methods, Arch 385 History of Architecture I: Pre-Modern, Arch 450 Architectural Programming, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 463 Environmental Control Systems I, Arch 464 Environmental Control Systems II, Arch 556 Architectural Design IX, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. Specifically, evidence demonstrating this ability was found in the Arch 266 project, Arch 385 proposal, Arch 450 observation exercises and reports, Arch 453 documentation, evaluations, and prototype development, Arch 463 and Arch 464 case study team work, Arch 556 design booklet and documentation of the design process, and Arch 568 mentor project case studies.

A.4 **Architectural Design Skills:** *Ability* to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 353 Architectural Design III, Arch 354 Architectural Design IV, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, and Arch 556 Architectural Design IX.

A.5 **Ordering Systems:** *Ability* to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 253 Architectural Design I, Arch 254 Architectural Design II, Arch 353 Architectural Design III, Arch 354 Architectural Design IV, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 454 Architectural Design VI, and Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII. Projects where evidence was found included the Downtown Moscow Farmers Market, Moscow Transit Systems, UI International Center, and Schitsu'umsh Cultural Resources Educational Center. Structural and programmatic partis, not prevalent in all projects, were helpful in illustrating the ordering systems. Formal ordering systems, in both 2D drawings and 3D renderings, were strong throughout the majority of the upper-year studio projects. Natural ordering systems were evident in Arch 453, but were not clearly displayed in all projects.

A.6 **Use of Precedents:** *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 353 Architectural Design III, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 510 Graduate Project Seminar, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. Exemplary projects were the Downtown Moscow Farmers Market for Arch 353 and the Lightning Creek Warming Hut for Arch 453. The most effective precedent studies involved creating a visual analysis in the form of overlays and self-constructed diagrams, which were supplemented by a contextual explanation. Some precedent studies included only the identification of projects, not analysis. Work for Arch 568 displayed the most complete precedent studies. They covered design intentions, structure assemblies and details in response to loads, enclosures, services, and systems integration.

A.7 **History and Culture:** *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors..

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion was **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 151 Introduction to the Built Environment, Arch 385 History of Architecture I: Pre-Modern, Arch 386 History of Architecture II: Modern, and Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues. Arch 385 and Arch 386 cover pre-modern and modern history. Students are exposed to a variety of architectural periods, cultures (including Ancient Rome, Ancient Greece, Islam, and the Middle East), and styles, which range from the Bauhaus to Modernism. They are tested through quizzes, worksheets, papers, and critiques related to assigned readings. In Arch 151, students observe their local, vernacular, and regional norms by sketching and taking photos of their environment. In the Arch 385 Archipedia project, students conduct research and document their work through sketches of a historic regional building in Moscow. This exercise effectively encourages students to connect and draw comparisons between the historic architecture locally and the architectural movements across different time periods. In Arch 453 Architectural Design V and Arch 454 Architectural Design VI, students learn about Native American tribes through hypothetical studio projects and community-based studio projects. Also, in Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII, students gain an understanding of the history of the area that a project covers through the perspective of a historian, who addresses the class as a guest speaker.

A.8 **Cultural Diversity and Social Equity:** *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues, Arch 385 History of Architecture I: Pre-Modern, Arch 386 History of Architecture II: Modern, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, and Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII. The UDC in Boise and elective design studios, such as Broadway Corridor Redesign, allow students to conduct design charrettes with community members, such as the South Boise Neighborhood Association. Students present their findings through a detailed visioning study. In Arch 453, students go on field trips to the Museum at Warm Springs (Warm Springs, OR) and the High Desert Museum (Bend, OR). It should be noted, however, that it is not entirely clear that students who choose a particular design studio are uniformly afforded the same chance to engage the community and understand the needs of different cultures. For instance, some design studio projects, such as the Schitsu'umsh Cultural Resources Educational Center in Arch 453, provide a direct introduction to cultural diversity and social equity issues through engagement. In contrast, the Arch 454 Architectural Design VI studios address urban development issues from a hypothetical perspective. Arch 483 focuses on urban issues, and students are required to apply these concepts via an in-depth exploration of the development of a major city. The studios abroad in Italy, England, and China expand students' understanding of the world.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Student work shows a balance of communication skills, design knowledge and skills, history, and theory. There are many opportunities for developing written skills for description, analysis, and interpretation. Graphic and modeling skills using a variety of media are well developed. Investigative skills are integrated into courses across the curriculum. Consideration of a diversity of cultural and social forces, and an understanding of the human dimension of architecture are demonstrated.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately

B.1 **Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 450 Architectural Programming and Arch 510 Graduate Project Seminar. Student work included space programs; careful behavioral, site, and environmental observations; and goals and aspirations for architectural design projects. Pre-design activities were also evident in all student final designs for the design studios: Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 454 Architectural Design VI, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII.

B.2 **Site Design:** *Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for LArch 251 Site Design, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, and Arch 463 Environmental Control Systems I. Environmental issues, values, and specific site analysis and design were very strongly shown in a studio project for an Idaho Native American reservation. It must be noted that, although the APR includes a description of LArch 251 and student work for the course was included in the team room, a course notebook was not available.

The APR explains that the program made a “conscious effort to ensure a range of different geographic locations for studio projects” and that site integration is explicitly required in the assessment of third-, fourth-, and fifth-year studio projects. A diversity of sites was evident in studio work from the second year and the years above that. Furthermore, the APR argues that the site integration effort has directly impacted Idaho graduates’ scores in the Site Planning and Design section, which are 9% higher than the national average.

B.3 **Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found inconsistently in student work prepared for Arch 553 Architectural Design VII. The work did not demonstrate that all students have the required ability. The application of life-safety knowledge is very sparsely evident in studio work. Evidence demonstrating code compliance with respect to accessibility was found in the work generated for Arch 556 Architectural Design IX, but not with respect to life safety and fire safety.

The APR indicates that Arch 575 Professional Practice is to provide the level of understanding needed for application in the design studio. Student work demonstrating an understanding of the criterion was found in the work generated for the course section offered on the Moscow campus only.

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

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 575 Professional Practice (only in the course section taught by Professor Warnick on the Moscow campus).

The students' studio work demonstrates a high level of competence in representing the design work, from site plans, to building 2D plans, sections, and elevations, to perspective sections. The fact that the department has a wood shop that all of the students use and love strengthens the three-dimensional understanding of architectural design throughout the coursework. It is refreshing to see the preponderance of model making throughout the department. Much of it is made of wood and hand assembled.

B.5 **Structural Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 404 Structural Systems I and Arch 367 Building Technology I - Steel. It is also evident in many other courses, including most 500-level studios, for example, Arch 556 Architectural Design IX. The structure course sequence has been redefined and has been consolidated into two courses. Student work for Arch 404, using 3D physical and digital models, was extraordinarily sophisticated.

B.6 **Environmental Systems:** *Understanding* of the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 463 Environmental Control Systems I, Arch 464 Environmental Control Systems II, and Arch 553 Architectural Design VII. An understanding of principles and concepts is developed in the Environmental Control Systems (ECS) course sequence. In the Arch 553 studio projects, student work demonstrates ability in the application of knowledge gained in the ECS courses. This work is exemplary and is found in all studios on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center.

B.7 **Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 553 Architectural Design VII and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. This understanding was also evident in many other courses, including most 400- and 500-level studios. The work generated for Arch 568 was impressive. It required hand-drawn analytical details, where students explained how existing building envelope designs integrate moisture management, structure, and aesthetics on a given project.

B.8 **Building Materials and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 266 Materials and Methods, Arch 353 Architectural Design III, Arch 354 Architectural Design IV, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. In the Arch 553 work, students exhibit a depth of knowledge and integration of coursework from earlier lecture and studio courses, such as those covering structures and environmental control systems. Material selections are well described and are integrated into the project in a way that demonstrates an understanding of place with structural purpose.

The President's House project is a good example of how students in the program consider and understand the ecological and environmental ramifications of building materials—in this case, the harvesting, processing, and manufacturing of wood building materials. This awareness was observed in students' work as they considered materials on a micro or site scale in conjunction with a building's impact on a macro or world scale.

B.9 **Building Service Systems:** *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 463 Environmental Control Systems I, Arch 464 Environmental Control Systems II, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. The Junction Village project (Arch 553: Professor Polakit's studio) is exemplary in showing student understanding of mechanical, plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, and fire protection systems in an integrated design solution.

The grading rubric for Arch 553's final project from the Boise UDC in fall 2015 also shows that students are critically assessed against their ability to demonstrate consideration and integration of building services systems, environmental systems, accessibility, life safety, and site conditions. This reveals a commitment to the requirement that students integrate building systems into design studio solutions, as well as the review of the students' response to the project brief.

Moscow students show strong experience in understanding the integration of building services systems. In the work generated for Arch 568, students demonstrate an understanding of systems integration throughout the entire course instruction, which culminates in the analysis of the systems integration of a single building at the end of the course.

B.10 **Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not consistently found in student work prepared for Arch 575 Professional Practice. The section of the course taught in Moscow provides evidence of student learning in construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, and building costs, but there is little to no evidence that students understand project financing methods and feasibility. Students are adept at all levels of understanding regarding the life-cycle costs of materials and the environmental and ecological costs of materials, but there is insufficient evidence demonstrating that they understand the application of the life-cycle costs of building materials in a market analysis, or in a way that would satisfy meeting this criterion.

No evidence was found indicating that students enrolled in the Arch 575 course taught at the Boise Center are asked to demonstrate an understanding of this criterion.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Student performance in this realm is uneven. Three of the criteria are Met with Distinction, while two are Not Met. One criterion is Not Met due to inconsistent course content in Arch 575 Professional Practice between the Moscow campus and the Boise Center in areas where students must demonstrate competence. This affects specifically the graduate students' studio work, as Arch 575 is taken in the first year of the graduate professional studies.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 **Research:** *Understanding* of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This criterion is **Met with Distinction.** Evidence of this was found in student work prepared for Arch 450 Architectural Programming, Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 464 Environmental Control Systems II, Arch 510 Graduate Project Seminar, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design. Specifically, evidence was found in an Arch 450 project analysis report. It was also found in Arch 464 in collaborative case study quizzes and a mini-case study project. Evidence was found

in Arch 510 in the argument building process and the case studies. It was found in Arch 453 in context documentation and analysis. It was also found in Arch 568 in the materials characterization projects.

C.2 **Evaluation and Decision Making:** *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 453 Architectural Design V, Arch 454 Architectural Design VI, Arch 553 Architectural Design VII, and Arch 510 Graduate Project Seminar.

C.3 **Integrative Design:** *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 553 Architectural Design VII and Arch 556 Architectural Design IX.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The curriculum is set on an overarching goal of design integration. It is demonstrated in the studio work projects generated by teams and individuals from the third-year studios to the final individual studio project for Arch 556 Architectural Design IX.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 **Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not consistently found in the work reviewed. The criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. This course is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means.

In the version offered on the Moscow campus, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated in the final exam for the course, a quiz, and Assignment Four: Response to a Request for Qualifications. However, at the Boise Center, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated inconsistently in the students' final reports.

This SPC is also identified as being met in the work produced for Arch 453 Architectural Design V. Roles in a multi-disciplinary team are described in a project brief. Student understanding of this criterion is inconsistently demonstrated in the projects presented.

The Arch 454 Architectural Design VI and Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII studios, as well as Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues, include aspects of this criterion in project briefs and other materials. However, student understanding is inconsistently demonstrated in the student work.

Interaction with stakeholders is not well documented. Work that offered some evidence was the Broadway Corridor in conjunction with the South Boise neighborhood association.

D.2 **Project Management:** *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. The criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed in Arch 575 alone. This course is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic. Students enrolled in the course on the Moscow campus demonstrated an understanding of this criterion in a quiz, an exam, and Assignment Four: Response to a Request for Qualifications. The students enrolled in the course offered on the Boise campus demonstrated an understanding of this criterion in their final reports.

D.3 **Business Practices:** *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found consistently in the work reviewed. This criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed only in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. This course is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means.

Students enrolled in the Moscow version of the course demonstrated an understanding of this criterion in a quiz, an exam, and Assignment Three: Firm Profile, Assignment Four: Response to a Request for Qualifications, Assignment Five: Project Interview, and Assignment Six: Cost Estimate/Billing. However, students enrolled in the Boise version of the course demonstrated an inconsistent understanding of the criterion in their final course reports.

D.4 **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found consistently in the work reviewed. The criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed only in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. Arch 575 is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means

In the version offered on the Moscow campus, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated in the final exam for the course. However, students taking the Boise course demonstrated an inconsistent understanding of the criterion in the final course reports.

D.5 **Professional Ethics:** *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Arch 151 Introduction to the Built Environment. Additional evidence was found in work reviewed for Arch 575 Professional Practice, but it was inconsistent.

An understanding of this criterion by all students was demonstrated in Arch 151 in the assignment "Presentation of a Published Design."

Arch 575 is taught differently on the Moscow campus and at the Boise center. The version of the course taught on the Moscow campus requires students to demonstrate an understanding of this criterion in a quiz. At the Boise Center, student understanding of this criterion is demonstrated inconsistently in the students' final course reports.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: The program relies primarily on Arch 575 Professional Practice to meet the requirements of Realm D. Arch 575 is taught differently and has different assignments on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Instruction in both locations covers the range of required topics. However, the assignments for the Arch 575 course offered in Boise are not structured in a way that requires students to reliably and consistently demonstrate an understanding of the material covered. This inconsistency results in not meeting Student Performance Criteria D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture, D.3 Business Practices, and D.4 Legal Responsibilities.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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).
2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The University of Idaho is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU). The most recent visit by the NWCCU was in 2015. The letter from the NWCCU was made available to the team via Dropbox.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The degree offered by the University of Idaho's CAA complies with the NAAB nomenclature required for an M. Arch and the minimum number of credit hours mandated by the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* for Preprofessional-plus degrees. The UI architecture program offers an M. Arch degree with a minimum total number of 168 credits hours. The 2016 APR includes a table indicating the minimum credit hour distribution, and the team had access to curriculum path diagrams. There are two main tracks: (1) a 6-year seamless M. Arch, with applications for admission required at the second and third years of the preprofessional degree and the first-year of the graduate degree, and (2) an accelerated version of the seamless professional degree that requires two summers. In their first year, all students in the CAA take the same basic core art courses: Art 110 Integrated Art and Design Communication, Art 112 Drawing as Design Thinking, and Art 121 Integrated Design Process. In Art 121, students are introduced to making in the technical studio. Architecture and interior design undergraduates cross paths in a number of required courses up to their third year. Architecture and landscape

architecture students reunite in the required LArch 251 Site Design and Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues.

Admission to the second-year architecture undergraduate preprofessional program requires a minimum GPA and completion of all first-year pre-requisite courses. Admission to the third-year undergraduate preprofessional program requires submission of a portfolio and an overall assessment of academic achievement. Admission to the first-year graduate program requires application to the university's College of Graduate Studies, a B.S. Arch unofficial transcript or audit, a minimum GPA, and a graduate project proposal statement. The B.S. Arch preprofessional curriculum leading to the M. Arch requires completion of a minimum of 124 credits, of which 9 are open and directed electives at the 200 or above level. The elective credits can be used for an academic minor. This breaks down into 73 credit hours in required architecture courses, 3 required credits in landscape architecture, and 9 credits in elective courses (3 elective credits in CAA areas, with the exception of architecture; 3 credits outside the CAA; and 3 open credits hours). The M. Arch requires a minimum of 45 credits, of which 24 must be at the 500 level; a minimum of 6 credits of architecture graduate electives; and 13 credits in graduate open electives.

A bridge between the fourth year and the fifth year—or first graduate professional year—is resolved by integrating students into optional vertical studios. Student placement is based on students' ranking of preference. Records are kept for each student to ensure that they enroll in an optional studio in each of the main categories. High-achieving students can opt to enroll in a vertical studio for the second semester of their third-year studio.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Specifically, in the case of transfer admissions, the program does not demonstrate how it matches the curriculum's courses to those previously taken by applicants and how it documents the assessments of these courses and students' portfolio work in relation to the NAAB SPC. The program documents the admission of new and transfer students, and the progress of students enrolled in the B.S. Arch and M. Arch degree programs in application and advising forms.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The statement on the NAAB-accredited degree is found on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation." It is also found in the University of Idaho General Catalog for 2015-2016. The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The NAAB Conditions and Procedures—consisting of the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Conditions for Accreditation 2009, and NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*—are found on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Accreditation Materials"). The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Information regarding career development is found on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Career Development"). Links to the university's career center page, the CAA's inspiringdesignfutures.org site, and the NCARB IDP and Certification guidelines are provided. The CAA, the program, and the AIAS organize a number of events during the academic year to support paths to internships and mentoring. The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.[1]
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The 2009 and 2016 APRs (the 2016 APR has been mislabeled as the 2016 Annual NAAB Report), the 2010 VTR and NAAB Decision Letter, the 2012 NAAB Focused Evaluation Report, and the 2011 and 2012 Annual NAAB Reports are available on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Accreditation Materials"). The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: A link to the ARE pass rates is available on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Program Evaluation"). The link is under the last bullet item: "Test Scores." Some comparisons between the CAA graduates' ARE pass rates and national averages are briefly discussed in the APR. The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of pre-professional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

[1] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

2016 Team Assessment: A link to information regarding admissions and advising is found on the University of Idaho's CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Admissions"). It provides access to specific descriptions of the M. Arch program on the Moscow and Boise campuses. It also provides instructions to applicants for admission to the second and third years of the program, to those applying for the seamless M. Arch program, and to those applying for a CAA graduate teaching assistantship. Advising information is accessible online via the university's academic advising webpage. Financial aid and scholarship information is available online through the university's admissions webpage, which links to the University of Idaho Division on Finance, and through the CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Financial Aid and Scholarships" for architecture-specific scholarships). The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: As indicated under Condition II.4.6, access to financial aid information and contacts for advice on the topic can be found on the CAA architecture program website under the subpage tab "Accreditation" (see "Financial Aid and Scholarships" and "Tuition and Fees"). Tuition and Fees links to estimates for general university costs (such as tuition/fees, room and board, books and supplies, transportation expenses, and miscellaneous and personal costs), architecture program costs, and laptop computer packages. The link in the APR was not functional at the time of the visit, although the information was accessible to the public online.

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the 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.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: A letter with the required certification from the university's Institutional Research and Assessment Office was provided to the team as a PDF file through Dropbox.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 11, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2012 Edition, Amended).

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The program's previous NAAB team visit was in 2010. In May 2012, the program submitted a Focused Evaluation Report (FER) and received a response from the NAAB in November of the same year. The documents were available to the team through Dropbox. There is no documentation in the APR, FER, or Annual Statistical Reports to the NAAB indicating that interim reports were required.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

SPC A.3 Investigative Skills

SPC A.7 History and Culture

SPC B.5 Structural Systems

SPC B.6 Environmental Systems

SPC B.8 Building and Material Assemblies

SPC C.1 Research

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

Key	
U	Understanding
A	Ability
U A	**Greatest Evidence**

SPCMatrix	NAAB VISITING TEAM 2016 U Idaho Architecture	Critical Thinking & Represent'n	A1. Communication Skills	A2.Design Thinking Skills	A3.Investigative Skills	A4.Arch Design Skills	A5. Ordering Systems	A6. Use of Precedents	A7. History & Global Culture	A8.Cultural Diversity & Equity	Building Practices, Tech Skills	B1 Pre Design	B2. Site Design	B3 Codes & Regulations	B4 Technical Document	B5 Structural Systems	B6 Environmental Syst	B7 Building Envelope Syst.	B8.Building Materials & Syst.	B9. Building Service Systems	B10. Financial Conserations	Integrated Architectural Solutn	C1 Research	C2 Integrated Evaluations	C3 Integrative Design	Professional Practice	D1 Stakeholder Roles	D2 Project Management	D3 Business Practice	D4 Legal Responsibilities	D5 Professional Conduct
Required Classes		A	A	A	A	A	A	A	U	U		A	A	A	A	A	A	U	U	U	U		U	A	A		U	U	U	U	U
Art 121	Integrated Design Process																														
Art 110	Integrated Art and Design Communication																														
Art 112	Drawing as Design Thinking																														
Arch 151	Introduction to the Built Environment																														
Arch 154	Intro to Architectural Graphics																														
Arch 253	Architectural Design I																														
Arch 254	Architectural Design II																														
Arch 204	Media in Architecture (formerly Digital Design for Arch & ID)																														
Arch 266	Materials and Methods																														
Arch 353	Architectural Design III																														
Arch 354	Architectural Design IV																														
Arch 404	Structural Systems I (Formerly RMAT365 Wood Const. Technology)																														
Arch 367	Building Technology I Steel																														
Arch 244	Computer Aided Drafting & Modeling (last taught Fall 2014																														
LArc 251	Site Design																														
Arch 385	History of Architecture I: Pre-Modern																														
Arch 386	History of Architecture II: Modern																														
Arch 453	Architectural Design V																														
Arch 454	Architectural Design VI																														
Arch 450	Arch Programming																														
Arch 463	Environmental Control Systems I																														
Arch 464	Environmental Control Systems II																														
Arch 462	Building Technology II Concrete																														
Arch 466	Building Technology III Masonry/Seismic																														
Arch 483	Urban Theory and Issues																														
Arch 553	Architectural Design VII																														
Arch 554	Architectural Design VIII																														
Arch 568	Technical Integration in Design																														
Arch 575	Professional Practice																														
Arch 510	Graduate Project Seminar																														
Arch 556	Architectural Design IX																														
	SPC Met with Distinction				D				D							D	D		D				D								
	SPC Not Met													N							N						N		N	N	
	SPC Not Met 2nd time													2							2										

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Carmina Sanchez-del-Valle, ArchD, RA, DPACSA
Hampton University
School of Engineering and Technology
Department of Architecture
Hampton, VA 23668
(757) 727-5440
(757) 728-6680 fax
carmina.sanchez@hamptonu.edu

Representing the AIA
Kathleen Dorgan, FAIA, LEED®AP
Principal
Dorgan Architecture & Planning
10 Eastwood Road
Storrs, CT 06268
(860) 487-6740
(518) 469-6464 mobile
dorgan@kdorgan.net

Representing the AIAS
Braham J. "Buck" Berg
311 West 24th Street
Apt. 11F
New York, NY 10011
(917) 749-0176
brahamberg@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Margo Jones, FAIA, NCARB, LEED®AP
Principal Architect
Jones Whitsett Architects
308 Main Street, 3rd Floor
Greenfield, MA 01301
(413) 773-5551 x12
(413) 522-7135 mobile
(413) 773-5552
mj@joneswhitsett.com

Nonvoting member
Eric M Roberts, AIA
7817 Whispering River Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89131
(702) 498-3658
eroberts@sh-architecture.com

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Carmina Sanchez-del-Valle, ArchD, RA, DPACSA — **Representing the ACSA**
Team Chair

Kathleen Dorgan, FAIA, LEED®AP — **Representing the AIA**
Team member

Braham J. 'Buck' Berg — **Representing the AIAS**
Team member

Margo Jones, FAIA, NCARB, LEED®AP — **Representing the NCARB**
Team Member

Eric M. Roberts, AIA — **Non-voting member**