

COVER PAGE



Architecture Accreditation Report 2015

In response to the 2014 NAAB Conditions

Respectfully Submitted by Randall Teal, Head of Architecture Program (208) 885-6781

Degrees Conferred:

B.S. Architectural Studies (128 cr.)

M. Arch (pre-professional degree+ 45 cr.)

Contacts:

Head of Architecture Program: Randall Teal

University of Idaho
College of Art and Architecture
875 Perimeter Drive MS 2451
Moscow ID 83844-2451
p: 208.885.6149
rteal@uidaho.edu

Dean of College: Mark Hoversten

College of Art and Architecture
University of Idaho
875 Perimeter Dr. MS2461
Moscow, ID 83844-2461
p: (208) 885-5423
hoverstm@uidaho.edu

University Provost: John Wiencek

875 Perimeter Drive
Administration Building, Room 105
Moscow, ID 83844-3152
p: (208) 885-6448
provost@uidaho.edu

University President: Chuck Staben

Administration Building, Room 105
875 Perimeter Drive MS 3151
P.O. Box 443152
Moscow, ID 83844-3152
p: (208) 885-6365
president@uidaho.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COVER PAGE

APR - SECTION 1 - Program Description	
I.1.1 History and Mission.....	3
I.1.2 Learning Culture.....	6
I.1.3 Social Equity.....	7
I.1.4 Defining Perspectives.....	8
I.1.5 Long Range Planning.....	13
I.1.6 Assessment.....	14
A. Program Self-Assessment.....	14
B. Curricular Assessment and Development.....	14
APR - SECTION 2 - Progress Since the Previous Visit.....	19
APR - SECTION 3 - Compliance with the Conditions of Accreditation.....	25
I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development.....	25
I.2.2 Physical Resources.....	29
I.2.3 Financial Resources.....	32
I.2.4 Information Resources.....	33
I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance.....	33
II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria.....	34
II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation.....	36
II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum.....	37
II.3.1 Evaluation of Preparatory Education.....	38
II.4.1 Public Information.....	41
III.1.1 Annual Statistical Reports.....	41
III.1.2 Interim Program Reports.....	41
APR - SECTION 4 - Supplemental Material.....	41
• Policies on Academic Integrity	
• Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives	
• UI regarding human resource development opportunities, such as sabbatical, research leave, and scholarly achievements.	
• UI policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty appointment, promotion, and when applicable, tenure.	
• Studio Culture Policy	
• Information resources policies including collection development	
• Institution's policies and procedures relative to EEO/AA for faculty, staff, and students.	
• Response to the Offsite Program Questionnaire (also called the Branch Campus Questionnaire) (See 2015 Procedures, Section 8)	
• Student Progress Evaluation Procedures	
• Faculty CV's	
• Course Descriptions	
• Visiting Team Report from the Previous Visit	
• Annual Reports	
• School Catalog Link	
• SPC Matrix	

Link to Files

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

University of Idaho Architecture Program Report

In response to the 2014 NAAB Conditions

APR—SECTION 1—Program Description

I.1.1 History and Mission

University History

The University of Idaho was founded in 1889 by a statute of the 15th territorial legislature. Commonly known as the university charter, the act became part of the state constitution when Idaho was admitted to the Union in 1890. The university is a publicly supported comprehensive land-grant institution with principal responsibility in Idaho for performing research and granting the Doctor of Philosophy degree. In the original charter, the primary areas of statewide responsibility included agriculture, **architecture**, engineering, forestry and wildlife, mining and metallurgy, foreign languages, and law. Today, with the exception of mining, these programs still exist along with programs in business, science, economics, and education as well as the regional medical and veterinary medical education programs in cooperation with other Pacific Northwest states. University of Idaho is considered a medium sized university with a student body over 11,000 majoring in 124 disciplines. To assist with its statewide mission, the university maintains satellite campuses in Boise, Twin Falls, Idaho Falls and Coeur d'Alene as well as agricultural extension offices in 42 of Idaho's 44 counties.

The University of Idaho's relevance to 21st century higher education is centered around its role as Idaho's flagship research university. Idaho offers many of the state's professional masters and higher degree programs including Law, Engineering, Business and Architecture. Idaho produces more research than all other Idaho higher education institutions combined, and as a result is ranked in the top 16% of American universities by the *Princeton Review's* "Best 368 Colleges."¹ Idaho is also listed in the "Best 100 Values in Public Colleges"² and in the "Top 286 Green Colleges" in *the Princeton Review*.³

Architecture Program

The Architecture Program is housed in the College of Art and Architecture. The college—one of nine colleges at the University of Idaho—has a strong interdisciplinary focus among its six academic programs: Architecture, Art & Design, Bioregional Planning, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, and Virtual Technology & Design. Although the program home is at the main University of Idaho campus in Moscow, it also has two important Boise satellites—the Urban Design Center and the Integrated Design Lab. The former offers the option of a more urban setting for the final two years of the graduate curriculum and affords opportunities for internships in area firms; the latter, offers classes (and work opportunities) in high performance buildings.⁴

Architecture Program History

In the early 1900's students were encouraged to seek special instruction in architecture through the civil engineering curriculum. Professor David Steinman, later to be called the greatest bridge builder in history by biographer William Ratigan, provided students their first instruction in architectural drawing, rendering, classical orders, and architectural design. The 1923-1924 catalog announced the initial architectural degree curriculum that culminated in a four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture degree and a pre-professional curriculum in landscape architecture. The first program head, Rudolph Weaver, former head of the Washington State College architecture program, acted as both University of Idaho Architect and Instructor. In 1925, Professor David Lange took over as department chair, and the next year, Assistant

¹ <https://www.uidaho.edu/about>

² Ibid

³ Ibid

⁴ The majority of students finish their degrees in Moscow.

Professor Grace Zudreele introduced the first course in Interior Decoration in the home economics curriculum. That same year, Theodore (Ted) Prichard, who was to head the department for 38 years, joined the university as an Assistant Professor of Architecture.

Ted Prichard is mostly responsible for establishing the Bauhaus-influenced interdisciplinary curriculum that was adopted by the architecture, interior design and art programs. He initiated this curriculum after returning from a sabbatical leave at Harvard (during Walter Gropius's tenure in the late 1930s), in which he worked closely with Marcel Breuer.⁵ This influence remains: all the professional design programs first year students are required to take art's introductory studio and lecture course, and architecture's Introduction to the Built Environment class. Further, interior design shares many of the same classes with architecture through the second year of their education as well.

The five-year Bachelor of Architecture degree was established in 1956. In 1971, Professor Paul L. Blanton, who served under Ted Prichard for a number of years and received his advanced degree at UC Berkeley under Charles Moore, became head of the Department of Art and Architecture. In the spirit of Bauhaus integration, he worked diligently to guide the transition from department to college in 1981 by establishing the new college as the College of Art and Architecture.

In March 1998, the architecture program was one of the first in the country to change its five-year Bachelor of Architecture degree into a Master's Degree; and during the same year a professional fee was instituted. The fee brought increased resources for the department and continues to be a vital program resource to this day.

In January 2002, under the pressure of financial shortfalls, the college was forced to merge with two other colleges (the College of Letters and Sciences and the College of Mines and Earth Resources) to form a new College of Letters, Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS) with Art Professor Joseph Zeller acting as dean. This new organization was strongly rejected by the alumni, faculty, and students on the basis that it sacrificed the autonomy and integration of the college; thus a two-year lobbying effort to re-establish the College of Art and Architecture followed the establishment of this new college.

In October 2005, the Idaho State Board of Education voted to re-establish the College of Art and Architecture with the understanding that the freshman professional fee would fund the new college administration. This year, also saw the inception of the 45 credit Master of Architecture degree that remains today. The re-established college developed a new strategic plan that fostered design and program integration efforts under the leadership of interim Dean William Woolston. This effort was followed up a year later by the new dean Mark Hoversten who focused on continuing the college's long standing design integration goals by promoting an administrative structure that allowed program heads to work on administrative and curriculum projects more collaboratively.

The Architecture Program's Benefit to the University

One of the primary areas where the activity of the architecture program overlaps the goals of the university is outreach and engagement. The University of Idaho is the state's land-grant research university and thus has a commitment to outreach activities that "serve the state at the same time they strengthen our teaching as well as scholarly and creative capacities."⁶

Architecture's upper division studios have a strong historical record of engagement in community outreach projects. These projects occur in both Moscow and at the Boise Urban Design Center, with projects at both centers reaching-out to small towns and urban areas alike in the Treasure Valley, North Idaho, Spokane and Tacoma. A number of these studios have been run in collaboration with the Landscape Architecture and Interior Design programs. For example, a recent fourth year studio teamed-

⁵ Ted Prichard served the department with distinction until 1967. The university's Prichard Gallery in downtown Moscow commemorates his contributions.

⁶ <http://webpages.uidaho.edu/catalog/2015/sboe-mission-statement---university-of-idaho.htm>

up with the third-year Interior Design studio and worked with the Nez Perce tribe for the re-design of downtown Lapwai, Idaho.

However, outreach is not the only benefit the architecture program has to the university. For example, our presence on campus as a center of design thinking is an enhancement to the make-up and offerings that characterize the University of Idaho, and we also work on developing visions for potential campus projects. Further, our Integrated Design Lab has developed a strong research and outreach track record, bringing external funding to the University and supporting energy efficiency efforts in collaboration with Center for Advanced Energy Studies CAES.

University Benefit to the Architecture Program

Being situated within the University of Idaho benefits the architecture program in a number of ways. First, being a vital piece of the state's premiere institution (and the only credited architecture program in the state) means that our statewide mission is amplified and highlighted; and the respect that is garnered by the University within the state reflects positively on our program. In short, our place within the university adds credibility to our efforts across the state, in both outreach and recruiting, especially with those that are unfamiliar with architecture generally, or our program specifically. Another benefit to architecture is the university's location in a rural community. This location gives us a unique opportunity amongst architecture schools to affect a sparse and relatively poor population—a population that typically does not think of, or benefit from, architecture and design. This is a void we must constantly strive to address. Finally, being situated within a university with a diverse range of programs and academic subjects is boon to our program, because it means that by the time students have been accepted into the graduate portion of our program their breadth of knowledge will have increased tremendously.

Development of Young Professionals

The university learning outcomes set the stage for a course of study that encourages the holistic development of young professionals. They are:

1. *Learn and integrate* - Through independent learning and collaborative study, attain, use, and develop knowledge in the arts, humanities, sciences, and social sciences, with disciplinary specialization and the ability to integrate information across disciplines.
2. *Think and create* - Use multiple thinking strategies to examine real-world issues, explore creative avenues of expression, solve problems, and make consequential decisions.
3. *Communicate* - Acquire, articulate, create and convey intended meaning using verbal and non-verbal methods of communication that demonstrate respect and understanding in a complex society.
4. *Clarify purpose and perspective* - Explore one's life purpose and meaning through transformational experiences that foster an understanding of self, relationships, and diverse global perspectives.
5. *Practice citizenship* - Apply principles of ethical leadership, collaborative engagement, socially responsible behavior, respect for diversity in an interdependent world, and a service-oriented commitment to advance and sustain local and global communities.⁷

These learning outcomes align well with the architecture program curriculum, which aims to foster creative thinkers and community leaders through a course of education that benefits from both the breadth of liberal arts studies and depth of the disciplinary specifics of architectural studies. Breadth begins in the first year where, as noted above, students' first studio experience in the college is in art and is reinforced through the core general education courses that form the foundation of a student's first two years of education. These core classes include two semesters of the university's Integrated Seminars

⁷ <http://www.uidaho.edu/learningoutcomes>

(ISEM) which are small, writing intensive, topical liberal arts courses that focus on areas ranging from the cinema history, to issues of place, to gender and identity, to world music, to climate change and beyond. These diverse beginnings are revisited and reinforced in the architecture graduate program where students are required to take a number of electives both inside and outside the college. The hope is that students will apply the early lessons learned about the benefits of interdisciplinary learning to the specific architectural questions that they pursue, particularly in their final graduate projects. Leading up to this culmination is an array of courses that train the disciplinary depth found in the technical, theoretical, ethical, environmental, social, and creative aspects of architecture. The architecture program also draws upon the university learning outcomes in its planning and assessment (see section I.1.5).

I.1.2 Learning Culture

Students who choose to attend the University of Idaho's Architecture Program regularly comment that they made their decision to come to the University of Idaho, at least in part, based on the welcoming and open atmosphere they experienced during pre-enrollment visits or communications with faculty and staff. The "Studio Culture Policy," adopted in 2009, elaborates and formalizes these general impressions; and a 2014 Alumni Career Survey of CAA graduates suggested that efforts to institutionalize these impressions have been successful. In the survey, 84% of respondents rated their academic experience either "good" or "excellent," and 69% rated their education as either "relevant" or "very relevant."⁸ Critically, 81% of respondents were currently employed; and 86% said they would recommend the college to future students.

Studio Culture Policy⁹

The Studio Culture Policy was updated and renamed "The Learning Culture Policy" in 2010 to reflect the fact that this policy does not just cover design studio; but rather, extends to all facets of the learning environment. The policy is highlighted at the architecture program meeting held on the first day of each semester and is practiced by instructors in all of their courses. The policy is posted on the program website, referenced in all syllabi, and is hung outside studios and in the lobby outside the architecture office. It can be read in full at <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/learning-culture>.

Additionally, the University of Idaho recently adopted a Classroom Learning Civility Statement that is now required for all in all UI syllabi. It reads:

In any environment in which people gather [in person or online] to learn, it is essential that all members feel as free and safe as possible in their participation. To this end, it is expected that everyone in this course will be treated with mutual respect and civility, with an understanding that all of us (students, instructors, professors, guests, and teaching assistants) will be respectful and civil to one another in discussion, in action, in teaching, and in learning.

Should you feel our classroom interactions do not reflect an environment of civility and respect, you are encouraged to meet with your instructor during office hours to discuss your concern. Additional resources for expression of concern or requesting support include the Dean of Students office and staff (5-6757), the UI Counseling & Testing Center's confidential services (5-6716), or the UI Office of Human Rights, Access, & Inclusion (5-4285).¹⁰

Both of these policies are communicated via syllabi and assessed as an everyday practice in the classroom. In other words, we consider these policies as the basis of a healthy environment for student and faculty learning and are thus reinforced by faculty continuously—these policies lay the groundwork for positive classroom interaction and professional outreach and engagement. We review the language of the document yearly, and will be assessing its effectiveness again in our fall meetings.

⁸ There were 149 respondents to this survey. Architecture graduates made up 71% of the respondents.

⁹ <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

¹⁰ University of Idaho Classroom Civility Clause, Fall 2014, http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/cae_core/hart/UIClassroomLearning%20CivilityClause.htm

I.1.3 Social Equity

Institutional Initiatives

Historically, the University of Idaho has had a number of leading initiatives and practices that highlight not only its commitment to diversity, but the centrality of diversity to the University's character—the promotion of diversity is part of our mission and obligation as a land-grant university and leading research institution. Some examples of the University's commitment to diversity include the Lionel Hampton International Jazz Festival, the establishment of the President's Diversity Council (PDC), the CAMP program (promoting education for the families of migrant workers), the establishment of resources such as the Women's Center, Multicultural Affairs Office, the LGBTQA Office (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Asexual, and Ally), and the Native American Student Center. Further, the University of Idaho has certificate programs in Global Justice and Diversity and Stratification; and has curricula in Latin American and Native American studies.

One particularly meaningful role the architecture program plays in the promotion of diversity at the university comes in the form of the two architecture professors (Anne Marshall and Román Montoto) who have served on President's Diversity Council continuously since its inception in 2009. One of them, Anne Marshall, also serves on the Faculty Recruitment and Retention subcommittee of the PDC and was instrumental in creating the Dr. Arthur Maxwell Taylor Excellence in Diversity Award in 2013; the first faculty member to win this award was a member of the College of Art and Architecture, Associate Professor Rula Awwad-Rafferty.

Other architecture faculty and student engagements with diversity occur through university events, such as the university initiative called the Vandal Challenge Leadership Conference aimed at recruiting Latino students; as well as more individual initiatives. For example, several architecture faculty have made efforts to recruit students from China, Finland, Thailand, India and Turkey. Anecdotal evidence of diversity from one recent architecture studio: of fifteen students, three were Brazilian, one was Jordanian, two were Native American, two were Latino, and one was hearing and speaking impaired, communicating through a sign language interpreter.

Additionally, the University of Idaho takes issues of Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action very seriously. The university has an Office of Human Rights Access & Inclusion (HRAI) to administer and focus on “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.”¹¹ And, as a device to further 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 this training was tied to the eligibility for raises.

Architecture Program Initiatives

The importance of diversity in faculty and staff cannot be overstated; thus, diversity has been an aim in architecture faculty searches of the last three years. The planning for these hires came directly from discussion in faculty meetings where it was recognized that having just lost two prominent female faculty members (one resigned, one retired), and with one of our two remaining female faculty members approaching retirement age that gender balance must be a program priority. The success of this prioritization effort can be seen in the fact that two of the last three faculty hires have balanced both the gender equity of the faculty and increased our cultural diversity (one hire was a Thai woman, the other a Columbian woman).

¹¹ <http://www.uidaho.edu/Diversity-Human-Rights/Human-Rights-Access-and-Inclusion>

Building a diverse student population in such a remote location as Moscow, Idaho is also critical to the success of our program and it goes hand in hand with our greater recruiting effort (in part, to build our student numbers back to pre-downturn levels). Creative energies in this area are particularly pressing since the University stopped participating in the Western Undergraduate Exchange (WUE)—a program, which allowed students from underserved surrounding states to attend the university for in-state tuition rates. Prior to the end of WUE, it was common to have a large percentage of our student population come from the surrounding states, but after the withdrawal from WUE, our population has increasingly been filled with students from Idaho. This is great for our mission within the state, but not great in terms of fostering more broad-ranging perspectives in our students. Currently, the university is revisiting the decision to leave WUE, which is hopeful; but in the meantime, our program has become more active in recruiting California, Oregon and Washington students, and has also done a good job drawing enrollments from China. We have also made an effort to re-energize our Thailand exchange (2 Thai students attended fall 2015 semester in Moscow). Lastly, we are hopeful that enrollment pipelines to southern Idaho (Boise State, BYU-Idaho) and new exchange opportunities (discussed in more detail in section I.1.5 and I.1.6) will also bring new flows of students into the program.

This kind of enrollment planning generally occurs at the college level (dean and program heads) and takes the form of an ongoing discussion about the effectiveness of certain initiatives in bringing new students to our programs. Some of the events that have been seen to be successful are the Summer Design Week in Moscow, and Design Days held in Boise and Sun Valley. The dean's office keeps records on the matriculation rates from these events, which so far have been high. Finally, as part of this effort, one architecture faculty member has had a portion of his position description written to focus on recruiting.

In terms of long range planning and assessment, recruiting and diversity efforts are key parts of our strategic action plan; for example, Objective A under Community and Culture is “be a community committed to access and inclusion,” and all of the initiatives described above are seen to be meaningful tactics to insure movement towards this goal.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives

The University of Idaho Architecture Program has a small faculty, which allows for fluid communication. This communication happens both organically—through the efforts of the program head to talk regularly with all faculty—and through the formal structure of monthly faculty meetings where plans of action are developed in response to topics of interest, anxiety, and/or strategic value. These meetings are also the place where assessment data, student and visitor feedback, and faculty ideas and concerns are vetted and consolidated. In short, we use our faculty meetings as the primary vehicle for defining learning objectives and developing courses of action for the program. Below we outline the role of five key perspectives in this development.

A. Collaboration and Leadership

Collaboration has long been an important aspect of our program, and historically, architecture students have collaborated with students in both the disciplines of the college, as well as with students of more varied disciplines such as law, environmental science, and mechanical engineering. The most explicit and pedagogically driven collaboration in architecture occurs within design studios at the senior and graduate levels; in these studios architecture students often work in design teams. For example, in the fall semester of 2014 seniors collaborated in teams to design the Schitsu'umsh Cultural Resources Education Center, a facility designed in response to a request from the Coeur d'Alene Tribe; one of the teams won Second Place for their project in the AIA Spokane Student Design Awards Competition. Spring semester of 2014 saw architecture students working in teams on Hammer & Hand's perFORM competition; and architecture and interior design students collaborating on a new government center for the Nez Perce Tribe. Further, at the Urban Design Center in Boise, there are two studios designed to engage projects via interdisciplinary teams of architecture and landscape architecture students. In the future, these studios are likely to include planning students as well (bio-regional planning joined the UDC in fall 2015).

We rely on our graduate students to be leaders in our program. One of the primary places that they practice this responsibility is in their role as graduate teaching assistants for many of the undergraduate courses. We will typically have thirty of these positions in a given year. Graduate students also have leadership opportunities in the vertical design studios. For instance, in one spring semester 2015 studio, graduate students guided site analysis/selection and building program development for the entire studio. Over the past few years it has been a priority to find more avenues for graduate students to take on leadership roles in the program. Other efforts include asking graduates to help set up guest lectures, present research at a graduate research lunch series, and serve on search committees. We feel that these efforts help foster a sense of greater responsibility that comes with the title of "graduate," and help graduate students make positive contributions to the program and serve as role models for the undergraduate population.

However, it is not just graduate students that have opportunities to be leaders, all students have opportunities for leadership by serving as members and officers within our student organizations. AIAS is the primary organization promoting student leadership and collaboration in our program. The AIAS is the largest student organization within the college and provides many volunteer efforts for the college's events. AIAS is also the liaison between architectural students and the professional practice and provides venues for student learning via workshops and lunches that are often focused on software-related skill development. AIAS also plays a central role in setting up and hosting professional interaction for students; in particular, the on-campus firm interviews are always sought after and boast a high degree of actual hires resulting from the process. And, because of the success of this program, it now, typically, the firms that reach out to AIAS (rather than the other way around). It should be noted that over the years, University of Idaho students have been very active in AIAS at the regional and national levels too; they hosted a regional conference in Moscow in 2006 and one of our students, Tyler Ashworth, served as national President of AIAS in 2010-2011.

The other central organization promoting student leadership and collaboration is a college-wide group called the Student Congress of Art & Architecture (SCAA). SCAA consists of elected student representatives from all design studios in the College. The SCAA leaders and representatives meet regularly with the dean and other college administrators to discuss areas of concern and needs of the students. In this way, SCAA serves as a communication link between the college administration and the student body. SCAA also facilitates events, such as portfolio workshops and the Beaux Arts Ball. The group and its leadership is currently comprised mainly of architecture students (the current president of SCAA is an architecture graduate student).

There are a number of other organizations that promote student leadership and collaboration, which have seen fluctuating degrees of activity: Freedom by Design is a group within AIAS that has provided design/build services focused primarily on accessibility and life-safety for local community members; New World Design Build is a group that has engaged in more wide-ranging design build projects in both remote places such as Panama, as well as in locations closer to home such as building a shelter on a local bike trail; and the University of Idaho chapter of the Tau Sigma Delta Honor Society has, from time to time, worked on initiatives to promote academic excellence across the College. Finally, over the years several architecture students have been key members of the University of Idaho Sustainability Center staff.

B. Design

The design studio is central to the learning experience of our students, essential in both the pre-professional and professional curricula, and is meant to foster inspiration and open-minded learning. Through the design studio we strive to create a supportive environment that challenges students to become experts in critical thinking and creative making.¹² Further, as the only architecture program in the state of Idaho, we have a special responsibility to bring design expertise to the state. Thus, our curriculum

¹² In this way, design studio also provides direct overlap with the university learning outcomes, particularly, "*think and create* - Use multiple thinking strategies to examine real-world issues, explore creative avenues of expression, solve problems, and make consequential decisions."

is structured around the idea that design is *the* fundamental knowledge of architecture, a knowledge that is enabled by increasing levels of technical expertise, an eye towards theoretical inquiry, and a commitment to critical reflection and analysis. Our curriculum aims to train these abilities by attuning students to the complexities of the world around them and a rapidly changing profession by engaging them in assignments that challenge them to define problems with precision and craft solutions that exhibit both beauty and social responsibility.

Studio projects focus on a wide variety of conceptual, theoretical, and methodological approaches to architectural design. Earlier studios focus on design fundamentals and design process; later studios layer in the technical know-how being learned simultaneously in the non-studio courses of the curriculum. Service-learning and outreach projects occur in upper-level studios and are an excellent vehicle for challenging students with design concerns specific to a variety of economically, culturally and socially diverse populations. As mentioned above these studios are also valuable for their collaboration opportunities with students from other disciplines.

The studio curriculum depends upon a few variants of faculty mentorship. The second year studios are normally coordinated by one to three full-time faculty members with each section assigned one paid graduate teaching assistant.¹³ This arrangement (faculty+teaching assistants) ensures consistency, direction, and expertise (faculty), while providing more hands-on assistance for students (ta's). In the third year and fourth year studios, instructors are either full-time faculty members or practitioners. In the graduate level, the studio instructors are generally restricted to tenured or tenure-track faculty who, with the help of a number of supplemental courses, assist graduate students in developing their own architectural interest areas and research agendas.¹⁴ In order to insure the freshness of the design conversation, the architecture program regularly invites practicing architects, outside scholars, and accomplished artists and designers to serve on studio reviews, competition juries, and to participate in the lecture series.¹⁵

Students' design work is also supported by the research centers and labs within the architecture program: The Computer Studio, Technical Design Studio, and Design Resource Center provide valuable tools for design exploration and development; and the Center for Resilient Communities at the Moscow campus, and the Urban Design Center (UDC) and the Integrated Design Lab (IDL) at the Boise campus are research centers where advanced students have opportunities to work side-by-side with faculty on projects that highlight the research aspect of design—from day-lighting studies and design competitions, to small community redevelopment and post occupancy evaluations.

Finally, we believe critical to becoming a good designer is developing a far-reaching worldview. Therefore we offer a variety of study abroad opportunities:

1. The first opportunity is the three international summer design programs led by University of Idaho faculty—China, Rome, and the United Kingdom. Students at the end of their third year of the curriculum can participate in design studios in China or Rome; the UK Program primarily serves graduate students.
2. The second opportunity for international experience happens via student exchange agreements between the architecture program and international universities. Those agreements allow our students to study six months to one year in architecture schools in Thailand and Finland. Another agreement is in the works with a university in Turkey.
3. The third opportunity (taken by fewer students) is to participate in the University's study abroad programs. These include placements in Europe, Asia and Latin America.

¹³ Second year studio instructors will also typically recruit one or two more for-credit teaching assistants.

¹⁴ An additional degree, the Master of Science in Integrated Design, provides an opportunity for a cohort to delve into more focused research in building science and sustainability, historical preservation, urban design, and digital design.

¹⁵ List of visiting critics and lecturers:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

These programs expose students to important social and cultural conditions and landscapes, attune them to design in a global work environment.

C. Professional Opportunity

Professional opportunity has been the highlight of The College of Art and Architecture's signature event—its annual *Inspiring Design Futures* one-day symposium.¹⁶ The event showcases college alumni who, emboldened by the critical thinking and creativity fostered by their design education, have successfully engaged in an array of careers both within and beyond the professions of design. In addition to these speakers, times are set-aside for students to discuss their portfolios with visiting professionals, and a special session is devoted to career building skills.

Mainstays for highlighting professional opportunity within the curriculum are our outreach studios, which often feature professional opportunity by connecting students with future community partners;¹⁷ and the Professional Practice class, which introduces students to issues germane to the profession. The latter informs students about the number of career paths within the profession itself and is also used to inform them about the procedures of IDP (see section I.2.1 for more on IDP). Additionally, the Boise Professional Practice students take advantage of their locale by getting local practitioners involved in class activities, inviting them to give lectures and interviewing them about their professional experience. Boise students also have the advantage of obtaining internships while they are still in school.¹⁸ Internship courses support all students both during the school year and during summertime, and provide academic internship opportunities where interns may earn IDP credit toward professional licensure while simultaneously earning academic credit.¹⁹

Finally, the architecture guest critics series, the college lecture series, the advisory board meeting, AIAS firm interviews, final studio critiques, and various design competitions regularly bring professionals to the campus. For example, third and fifth year students interact with professionals for two design competitions: the Idaho Forest Products completion and the Idaho Concrete Masonry Association competition; and a number of practitioners were given honoraria to facilitate their participation in final critiques at the end of spring semester 2015. Additionally, studio field trips are generally coupled with firm visits when appropriate. The field trips have gone places such as Boise: Hummel, CTA, LCA, CTY, CSHQA; Portland: ZGF, COLAB; Seattle: Mithun, Callison, Collins Woerman, Miller Hull; Chicago: Carol Ross Barney, Krueck + Sexton, Helmut Jahn, Perkins + Will, SOM, Loebel Schlossman Hackle, Gensler; San Diego: Johnathan Segal, Ted Smith, Lloyd Russell, Washington D.C.: SKB; and San Francisco: Perkins + Will.

D. Stewardship of the Environment

The University of Idaho has a reputation for fostering sympathetic relations with the environment. This reputation is cultivated via a number of required courses with foci on sustainable/regenerative design.²⁰ This important theme also recurs throughout the design studio sequence; and the comprehensive graduate studio, Arch 553, often focuses explicitly on low-carbon, low-energy building. Further, we do not take environmental stewardship to occur solely through technological remediation; but rather, it begins

¹⁶ See <http://www.inspiringdesignfutures.org/>

¹⁷ Partners have included: State government agencies such as Idaho Forest Products Commission (IFPC), and Idaho Commerce; Local government agencies such as the City of Lapwai-Nez Perce County, the City of Coeur d'Alene-Kootenai County, the City of Moscow-Latah County, the City of Boise-Ada County and Southern Idaho Rural Development; Industry partners such as Idaho Concrete Masonry Association (ICMA), consulting firms (Taunton Group) and architectural design firms (CTA Architects Engineers, CSHQA, etc.); Nonprofit organizations such as U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC), Urban Land Institute (ULI) Idaho, Idaho Smart Growth, and Preservation Idaho: The Idaho Preservation Council; Native American Tribes such as the Nez Perce and Coeur d'Alene Tribes.

¹⁸ Moscow students are free to do internships as well, but have less opportunity locally. However, it should be noted that D.K. Mullin Architects in Moscow have hired a large number of our students in both permanent and temporary roles.

¹⁹ http://www.ncarb.org/~media/files/pdf/guidelines/idp_guidelines.pdf (page10)

²⁰ These course include: Arch 151 Intro to the Built Environment, Arch 266 Materials and Methods of Construction, LArc 251 Intro to Principles of Site Design, Arch 386 History of Architecture: Modern, Arch 463/464 Environmental Controls Systems I & II with Labs, and Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design

with an ethical position towards the world. The sensitivity, attunement, and awareness that undergird such a position are addressed both in early classes such as the art foundation, introduction to the built environment and second year architecture studios; and are then later reinforced through graduate seminars on topics such as green urbanism, philosophical orientations towards design, globalization, and sustainable community development. Aiding the connection between the ethical and the technical is that fact all of the faculty who teach technical courses also teach design studios. This practice helps reinforce our belief that one should not separate the technical from the aesthetic when thinking about sustainability and the environment.

Students wishing for more depth of technical knowledge in service of environmental stewardship may take a variety of electives at either the Moscow or Boise campus, including seminars on lighting, energy modeling, integrated design, sustainable building evaluation systems, and building performance analysis. The Integrated Design Lab in Boise is particularly geared towards these pursuits, offering architecture and engineering students the opportunity for hands-on experience as employees or interns. IDL Faculty and staff also teach annual elective courses related to integrated design and high performance building and collaborate with Urban Design Center faculty on the required comprehensive design studio.²¹ Further, the UDC offers elective seminars focused on sustainable urban design that help orient students to the challenges of stewardship at both a regional and urban scale (storm water management, economic sustainability, community building, water resources, infrastructure and transportation).²²

Finally, faculty encourage students to participate in collaborative research projects that highlight environmental stewardship such as: designing and constructing a prototype daylit artificial sky, conducting a post-occupancy evaluation on a newly constructed sustainable classroom building, creating a green cities rating system, and working with NASA to improve the performance of a facility in Mountain View, CA.

Lastly, one of our summer study abroad programs—United Kingdom—is centered specifically on an inquiry into European Green Architecture.

E. Community and Social Responsibility

Our program acknowledges that architecture is a profession that has an effect on public health, safety; and impacts the well-being of citizens, community, society, and environment. Therefore, we are committed to developing graduates who are well prepared to be active, engaged citizens, who understand their roles as professional members of society and act with responsibility and integrity toward environment and community. This message is delivered via three main areas of the program: 1. the learning culture, 2. select parts of the academic curriculum, and 3. co/extra-curricular activities.

1. The learning culture of the program (discussed in I.1.2) articulates the need to value sustainability, social and cultural responsibility in design, and foster a collaborative and creative learning environment.
2. The academic curriculum touches upon community and social responsibility in a number of ways. One is via “real world” case studies in required coursework that highlight how design can be used in service of social advocacy—improving the lives of both individuals and communities; and how applied technical systems can be used to provide long-term performance, safety, and cost savings to a community. A second opportunity in the curriculum comes through exposure to professional practice, which helps students understand the various roles of the architect in the society and the ethical responsibility of professional judgment in architectural design and practice. In fact, the demonstration of understanding of ethical standards for architects including the role of

²¹ Courses taught at the IDL include Arch 572 Integrated Design Seminar, Arch 573 Daylight Design and Simulation, Arch 574 Building Performance Simulation for Integrated Design.

²² Courses taught at the UDC include Arch 581 Eco Urban Design and Arch 580 Sustainable Architecture. Comprehensive Design, Arch 563, was also taught collaboratively with faculty from architecture, and the IDL and landscape architecture students.

the NCARB Rules of Conduct and the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct is a key component in the professional practice course's learning outcomes.²³ This emphasis within the curriculum is reinforced by the field trip/firm visits, guest critics series, the college lecture series, the advisory board meeting, AIAS firm interviews, and final studio critiques (mentioned above). Finally, a number of elective seminars such as Universal Design, Identity and Place in Global Space, Cultural Sustainability and the Global City, and Architectural Theory: Modernism/Postmodernism highlight the importance of understanding the theory that underpins these real world concerns.

3. Co/extra-curricular activity is used to help students see how design exists beyond the confines of the classroom. This "beyond" includes: study abroad programs; workshops; guest lectures; social events; as well as more designed extensions of the curriculum. The latter is seen, for example, in service-learning courses, which emphasize, "reciprocity between campus and community."²⁴ The impact of such reciprocity is seen when, say, students work with the City of Boise to explore possibilities for future improvements and in the process gain an appreciation of the interdependence of various local constituencies. Particularly, how the concerns of these various constituencies become critical parameters affecting their design work (i.e. it is not just the designer's "vision" that matters). Co-curricular activities associated with these studios, such as community review meetings, allow students direct knowledge of the economic, environmental, social, cultural, and political complications that exist for any socially minded design project. Another example of this kind of learning occurs outside the curriculum through the Alternate Service Break (ASB)—which helped, for instance, families rebuild or restore sub-standard housing in Pittsburgh.²⁵ Such encounters also help drive home the fact that any citizen who hopes to motivate and inspire others to action must build their leadership skills.

In short, real impact is only possible when one exceeds minimum requirements; thus, pursuing activities that are outside of the curriculum are crucial to becoming community and socially minded, and for defining one's sense of purpose. Here one is not only poised to engage the world, but also lays the groundwork for continuing education and begins to foster a network of support.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning

The program maintains, and continually updates, a Strategic Action Plan that addresses 1.) teaching and learning, 2.) scholarly and creative activity, 3.) outreach and engagement, and 4.) community & culture. An annotated copy of that plan, that includes accomplishments from 2010 – 2015, is linked to this report.²⁶ This action plan is closely allied with the University of Idaho Strategic Plan, which aligns our priorities with the overarching goals of the university. Goals and objectives are developed and refined by faculty approximately every five years in response to input gleaned through the assessment process (described below). Further, many of the objectives and action items respond to the five defining perspectives. For example, our first teaching and learning goal is influenced by a concern to remain current when addressing, particularly, Community and Social Responsibility and Stewardship of the Environment; thus, Objective A is to, "enable student success in a rapidly changing world" by "build[ing] adaptable, integrative curricula and pedagogies." In this way, we use our Strategic Action Plan to link objectives to our work such as: service-learning work (collaboration and leadership, community social responsibility); design-build program (design); guest critic series (professional opportunity); and use of

²³ http://www.ncarb.org/Getting-an-Initial-License/~media/Files/PDF/Special-Paper/Rules_of_Conduct.pdf, <http://www.aia.org/about/ethicsandbylaws/>, The Architecture student's Handbook of Professional Practice, 14th Edition | American Institute of Architects., The Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice, 15th Edition | American Institute of Architects.

²⁴ <http://www.uidaho.edu/servicelearning/community-partners/whatiservicelearning>

²⁵ Architecture student Scarlett Matthews participated in this trip during the Spring of 2013.

<http://www.uidaho.edu/current-students/department-of-student-involvement/volunteer-center/asb>

²⁶ <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

assessment to track progress on “site integration” (stewardship of the environment). Using the action plan in this manner helps us to both record successes and identify where improvements are needed.

The action plan evolves in response to feedback solicited through various processes. These processes include the accreditation cycles, strategic initiatives of the college, our annual assessment process, less prescribed observations of, say, student work or student attendance at guest lectures, and through anecdotal evidence (information or requests from students for example); we also get feedback from our advisory board members, guest critics, practitioners, and students about our strengths and weaknesses. And finally, information is also gleaned during the yearly faculty evaluation process. During this process the head of the program reviews student teaching evaluations, faculty CV’s and work samples, and uses this information to pinpoint areas of distinction and deficiency for each faculty member and course. Responses to any of these points of information usually occurs via discussion in faculty meetings, with an individual or a committee following up on actionable items—engaging in research and development, and ultimately bringing forward recommendations for evaluation and implementation. Data is recorded and documented through the assessment process, meeting minutes, and committee (or other) reports.

An example of how this process dovetails with other institutional planning initiatives is when it became clear that adding the landscape architecture program to the UDC in Boise would be advantageous. When the moved forward to press for new positions in landscape architecture and bioregional planning, to enrich the program and alleviate the load on the one tenure track architecture faculty member who worked alone in Boise for the first ten years of the UDC. In this way, we moved the UDC forward.

I.1.6 Assessment

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

Progress Towards Strategic Goals and Objectives

Assessment and planning go hand in hand and are often difficult to separate from one another. Ideally they form an ongoing feedback loop that allows us to critique the program and curriculum and make both large changes and incremental improvements geared toward building a stronger and more dynamic course of study. Self-assessment occurs at all levels at the university—from the university accreditation visit in the spring of 2015, to periodic external reviews at the college level (for example the External Program Review that occurred in Fall 2014), to program-driven internal studies, and program accreditation processes. These processes are intended to provide a broad view of program strengths and weaknesses, make recommendations about the future directions of a program, and to situate a program within the larger mission of the university.

The University of Idaho requires all programs to report on their self-assessment efforts through a yearly cycle of faculty and student evaluation, followed by faculty discussions of assessment criteria, followed by the posting of changes to assessment criteria (if any) to the university assessment site. Criteria are required to be linked in with the University of Idaho’s Learning Outcomes that are outlined above in section I.1.1.²⁷

Our self-assessment procedures, some of which are elaborated upon in the next section include assessing progress against program level goals and objectives through the process administered at the university level; this process involves making annual reports about progress toward specific goals and objectives derived from our strategic action plan. Further, this assessment process requires the use of direct and indirect measures to assess progress toward goals, and encourages reflection and re-

²⁷ <https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/ira>

evaluation by the faculty. This university process has been effective in helping us make progress upon our big picture goals, particularly, our curricular goals.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development

Curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty. The last major change to the curriculum came in 2005 when the program was growing and we extended the M. Arch from 30 to 45 credits. Since then several small changes were made in response to critical assessments. For example, we added the programming course to address an earlier NAAB report, and we changed our digital sequence based on the limitations of an earlier model. To some degree this relative stability indicated things within the curriculum were working well; however, it also indicated a degree of comfort in “business as usual” that we wanted to address. Thus, in order keep the curriculum vital, we have been more aggressively critiquing what we do.

Current revisions to the curriculum have come in direct and indirect response to our assessment efforts over the past several years; however, they extend beyond our formal assessment process (which may say something of the limitations of formal assessment for design) and depend upon on-going evaluation and discussion. In other words, we believe frank and frequent conversations that aim to ascertain correspondence between the student work, the goals of the program, the state of the profession and the world it exists within are the most critical tools in understanding the efficacy of a curriculum. For example, it was by this method that we discovered that the way BIM training was being delivered contributed to a misuse of BIM as a design tool, which was yielding less iterative and less responsive solutions in studio work.

The curricular assessment/alteration process relies on a positing of general ideas for curricular alteration (from faculty), coupled with strategies aimed at utilizing our resources as well as possible. That is, improving the curriculum is based, in part, upon both the way current required coursework aligns with the strengths of individual faculty members, and how particular untapped strengths within the faculty prompt curricular innovation. These internal questions are combined with external influences, such as climate change, to fuel curricular evolution. Possible alterations to the curricular offerings and/or structure are vetted through faculty discussion and planning, rising to the level of a faculty vote on specific changes. The proposed alterations are then assessed and/or ratified at the level of the College and University Curriculum Committees.

One of our on-going internal evaluations of curricular efficacy has been our annual assessment of Arch 353 and Arch 553 (studios that are 2 years apart in the curriculum). This particular assessment cycle is intended to track significant issues related to student learning in the design studio. At the final reviews for these studios, scoring surveys are distributed to critics (faculty, outside guest critics, and graduate teaching assistants) who are then asked to assess specific criteria such as Design Communication, Human Behavior, Precedent Studies, Site Integration, Accessibility, Life Safety, Design Integration, and Critical Thinking. This streamlined survey was implemented in response to a previous iteration (prior to 2012), which proved to be cumbersome (15 criteria) for reviewers and resulted in little meaningful information. While the updated criterion have provided some insights and sparked critical discussion—in particular for the Human Behavior criterion—our efforts toward program assessment have also been limited by some flaws in the method (i.e. outside reviewers misunderstandings of the scale, not enough time allowed for evaluation, etc.). Thus, we are currently exploring ways to better account for the diversity of opinions and specific interests and to better direct the assessors’ expectations.²⁸ One helpful addition to this process in 2014 was having all faculty come early to the Arch 553 studio final review for an open conversation about the strengths and weaknesses of the work. This event also fostered some good discussion about the types of projects that would be most appropriate for this studio and its goals. We will continue this aspect of the assessment and seek out other complimentary procedures to our current process.²⁹

²⁸ Ultimately, we also hope to address a broader range of courses beyond studio in this cycle.

²⁹ We will also be getting a fresh set of eyes to oversee our assessment procedures with a new faculty member taking over assessment leadership in the spring.

TABLE: CURRICULAR ASSESSMENT ROLES and RESPONSIBILITES

Members	Roles	Responsibilities
Univ. Curriculum Committee	Outline Univ. of Idaho Learning Outcomes that inform assessment outcomes	Oversees curriculum assessment through Assessment Outcomes reports
NAAB Constituents NAAB Accreditation Team	Outline Student Performance Criteria that informs program's assessment outcomes	Assess effectiveness of program's work during accreditation visit
Architecture Faculty	Provide faculty feedback on student work. Set studio learning outcomes that inform assessment outcomes.	Formally assess studio work and discuss outcomes. Provide new outcomes based on discussions in 2-3 faculty meetings.
Grad TA Students	Provide student feedback	Formally assess 3 rd year studio work during crits and help grade class projects.
Washington State Univ. Architecture Faculty	Provide faculty feedback from the perspective of an outside accredited program	Attend 2 nd – 6 th year crits. Provide formal assessment when invited.
Community College Architecture Faculty	Provide faculty feedback from the perspective of a pre-architecture program	Attend 2 nd – 6 th year crits. Provide informal assessment.
College Design Faculty	Provide faculty feedback from the perspective of an allied design program	Attend 1 st – 6 th year crits. Provide informal assessment.
Arch and Building Professionals	Provide professional feedback	Formally assess Comprehensive Design Studio projects and competition projects in 3 rd and 5 th Year studios.
Assessment Coordinator	Coordinate and report on assessment matters	Report to faculty formal assessment outcomes and submit reports to the university.

Architecture License Exam

Architecture License Exam (ARE) results and graduate surveys demonstrate that the University of Idaho architecture students are well prepared for the demands of the exams. Architecture Record Exam statistics show that over the past six years, an average of 31 Idaho graduates per year take the license exam. For a cohort of 45 graduates a year, this is encouraging. Over the past six years, Idaho graduates scored 3% higher than the national average; and for the past three years have outscored Cal Poly San Luis Obispo in the majority of exams. Idaho results also compare favorably with Ivy League results. Other highlights over the past six years: Idaho grads scored 9% higher than the national average in Site Planning and Design; 6% higher in Building Systems; 5% higher in Building Design and Construction Systems and 4% higher in Programming Planning and Practice.³⁰

³⁰ <http://www.ncarb.org/ARE/ARE-Pass-Rates/Pass-Rates-by-School.aspx>

Strategic Actions Resulting Planning and Assessment

The annotated Strategic Action Plan outlines how we respond to goals and objectives, and the following narrative describes, in detail, some of the progress our program has made towards both immediate and multiyear objectives, as described by in the Strategic Action Plan (see the footnote associated with each section for the explicit connections that are not stated otherwise). The narrative also provides some insight into the manner in which we think about these objectives.

One of our primary tactics for continuous improvement is to use small changes to maximal effect. Not only does this approach allow things to *actually* get done, but it also tends to make the most of what is present and available. In other words, rather than relying on strategies of institutional and departmental “visioning” as the primary mechanisms to be aspirational or forward-looking, we believe that it’s also critical to execute significant acts that bring visions to fruition. And, critically, that significant acts can also serendipitously uncover “visions” that cannot be seen from one’s current perspective.

As designers, we aspire to use design to promote the community of our college and the cultures of our disciplines. For example, in order to address a **community & culture** deficiency we have upgraded studio desks in four studios, made better meeting areas within eight studios, and recently transformed an awkward office-within-an-office into an enhanced lobby/entrance to our main building. This space now features a new student lounge; and, since we do not have an art and architecture library, this space is also used to showcase, and provide access to, a selection of periodicals and library books.³¹ Once fully operational, this gathering place will hold descriptions of all our studios and graduate seminars, making the substance of our program more palpable than its current state of being as an online spreadsheet. Here, as the possibilities for future learning become more real, the culture of the program becomes concrete.

Hiring provides another strategic opportunity. We have had limited hiring opportunities since the last NAAB team visit, but have made the most of them; one of our most recent hires was used to introduce a focus in small community design-build development. The faculty felt this move was important because we value our long standing record of serving a number of economically challenged communities and residents, and communities on two large tribal lands in our remote part of the state. This form of engagement has been a long-standing strength of the program and we want to make it even stronger through project-based work with tangible results. Another hire met a long-standing goal to have our own architecture faculty member teaching structures. Finding a qualified candidate has made it possible to pursue curricular changes that we have been unable to achieve in the past.³²

Another important initiative for the sustained vitality of our **student community** has been the cultivation of enrollment pipelines. For example, we have been working to find ways to streamline a relationship we have with Brigham Young University—Idaho in order to get their both undergraduate and construction management graduates directly into our professional program; we have developed new initiatives including a summer “Design Boot Camp” that provide incentives for transfer students and new graduate students to enter the program. We have been gradually working on similar efforts with several Idaho community colleges. In addition to this tack, we recently established a partnership with Boise State University to offer a Design Foundations program in Boise (though a collaboration between the BSU Art Department and our UDC). All these efforts are aimed at eliminating redundancy in students’ education and at recruitment for our program: providing diversity in our student population, bringing in revenue, and

ARE tables can also be found in our yearly assessment documents:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

³¹ In this way the remodel also addresses a strategy in the **scholarly and creative activity** section: “Establish, renew, remodel, and reallocate facilities that encourage collaborative interdisciplinary inquiry and provide access to information resources and innovative technologies.” and a strategy in the **teaching and learning** section: “Increase educational experiences within the living and learning environments.”

³² These hires help us address a strategy in the **teaching and learning** section: “Develop and maintain a distinctive core curricula that promotes self-discovery via active learning pedagogies, rigorous investigation, and fieldwork as a means of building student achievement, and contributes to the land grant responsibilities of the University.”

improving our standing within the University (increased enrollments is our current President's number one priority).³³

That said, we also think it is important to not have to rely completely on the University for funding. Thus looking towards the future, we have been seeking ways to build, or in some cases re-establish, connections with key alumni in order to grow a community of concerned stakeholders. We hope this will help not only in terms of an increased number of donors, but also providing a cadre of visiting critics and assistants that can help us in establishing partnerships with manufacturers and distributors for both donations of materials and/or equipment; and in building our base of sponsored studio content. Currently, our fall third year studio is set make visits to regional manufacturers of steel and structural pre-cast concrete, which will elaborate and expand existing relationships with the Idaho Concrete Masonry Association (46 years and counting), and the Idaho Forest Products Commission (initiated in 2012). We also believe that academic needs always trump requests from potential partners—partnerships should always be used to raise the academic standing of the school.³⁴

Strengthening and differentiating the graduate program from the undergraduate program is another important initiative aimed at the future excellence of the program that has been on-going for several years. Like many non top-tier 4+2 programs it is difficult to recruit BS Arch students from elsewhere and the standard approaches (i.e. recruiting at student fairs, sending out posters to other schools, etc.), have not been successful. For this reason we have been exploring ways to diversify the graduate program that do not depend on new applications alone. One move is an MOU we are sorting out with the Department of Architecture at the Izmir University of Economics in Izmir, Turkey. Another evolving concept is the idea of an "Erasmus-like" program in the US; thus far, we have the formative phases of an agreement of this nature with the University of New Mexico and the University of Florida.³⁵

An unforeseen "vision"—the 49th Parallel Consortium of Architecture Schools³⁶—arose out of discussions around the ErasmusUSA concept. This consortium is intended to be a vehicle for student and faculty interaction, the sharing of knowledge, and a way to bring attention to the region as a place that holds unique and interesting challenges for architecture and design (i.e. vast distances, winter cities, oil boom, unfathomable landscapes, tribal lands, medium-sized urbanism, rural poverty, rangelands, etc.) The first major unified effort of this group (in process) is a regional journal that will highlight topics listed above and solicit national and international submissions for peer-reviewed content.³⁷ As a sidebar to the consortium, we have been able to improve our connections with Washington State University to share design critics at final reviews and even shared an adjunct structures instructor during 2014-2015.

This point brings up another basic but important tactic used to strengthen the design **community and culture** of a program—prominent guest critics. We transitioned our guest lecture program to a guest critic series when the college was re-established and have been building it ever since. The goal is for all our critics to come not just to deliver a lecture, but to engage students via studio critiques, informal discussions, grad project seminar feedback sessions, *and* lectures. For example, our 2014-15 guest critic series included Nat Chard from the Bartlett, Perry Kulper from University of Michigan, Dorian Wiszniewski from University of Edinburgh, Roger Connah from Carleton University, Sarah Whiting from Rice University and we have another strong slate scheduled for this year.³⁸ Such multifaceted engagement has helped

³³ Acts upon a **teaching and learning** strategy: "Build curricula to support timely degree completion" and a community & culture strategy: "Recruit and retain a diverse student body."

³⁴ Acts upon a **community and culture** strategy: "Increase collaboration with new and unique partners; build strong support from the public sector and private donors to accelerate the attainment of Program goals."

³⁵ Acts upon a **teaching and learning** strategy: "Increase co-curricular opportunities; promote student participation."

³⁶ This consortium includes University of Idaho, University of Calgary, Washington State University, Montana State University, South Dakota State University, North Dakota State University, University of Manitoba, and University of Minnesota.

³⁷ Acts upon a **scholarly and creative activity** strategy: "Partner with other educational institutions, industry, not-for-profits, and public agencies to expand resources and expertise."

³⁸ Our 2015-16 lecture series includes Kiel Moe of the Harvard Graduate School of Design, Alison Kwok of University of Oregon, Bjorn Sandaker of the Oslo School of Design, Steve Badanes from University of Washington, Gary Moyer

breed better understanding and insight into the particular concerns these outside experts bring to our school, and the infusion of ideas has been a great inspiration for faculty as well.³⁹

Challenges Moving Forward

The small size of our school is both a strength and weakness. It is a weakness in that there is less diversity of student body and faculty—by the time a student has graduated they have probably had every faculty member as a teacher multiple times. Another weakness of the small faculty is that there is never the natural flux of people coming and going (one must manufacture this flow). However one of the key strengths of a small program is that it is much easier to make substantive changes to the way things operate. Currently, we are using this strength to address the aforementioned weakness: we have just reworked a number of courses in our curriculum including a redesign of the structures sequence, a rethinking of the way digital tools are taught, and will be adding a class focused on detailing building assemblies, and another aimed at familiarizing younger students with the role of theory in architecture. We will also be introducing a vertical option studio model at the upper levels to encourage both student choice in instructor and topic, and to promote faculty initiative and innovation. Finally, we are looking at the possibility of making our introductory architecture course into a general education course for the university, simultaneously reducing our students' load as freshmen and educating future non-architects about architecture.

APR—SECTION 2—Progress Since Last Visit

Regarding, deficiencies and causes of concern from the last visit we have done several things to attempt to rectify or improve the issues that the team identified.

Conditions not met:

3.3 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.”

Comment from VTR 2010: “Exact NAAB language per NAAB conditions for Accreditation (2004) was not found in the Department’s catalog and promotional material.”

Response from Program 2015: This condition, now encompassed in *1.2.4. Information Resources*, is being addressed in large part through a number of improvements and revisions to our website. And this past year, the university moved to redesign its entire web presence based on some of the things we proposed for our own site, such as cleaner interfaces, greater ease of navigation, less marketing-driven content, and more functionality. Over this time period, the procedures for updating and revising web information has become much more streamlined. As a result, the general content of our web information has improved, and it has been easier to update broken or missing links to the critical changing information such as ARE pass rates or NAAB conditions. All the links to required information have been updated and are functional.

3.10 Financial Resources

of the University of Oregon, Barbara Ambach from University of Colorado, Clark Stevens of Woodbury University, Deborah Hauptmann of Iowa State University, and Antti Nousjoki of Helsinki-based ALA Architects.

³⁹ Acts upon a **scholarly and creative activity** strategy: “Provide ongoing opportunities for faculty self-discovery and personal and professional growth” and a teaching and learning strategy “Expand opportunities for professional education.”

“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.”

Comment from VTR 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 11/30/10 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 on long-term relationships to boost donations and to support endowments.

When the Idaho State Board of Education reconstituted the College of Art and 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 well continue in the short term, in the long-term amore 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 feels an associate dean will indeed be helpful to assist in the operations of the 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.”

Response from Program 2015: The University of Idaho now levies tuition (rather than fees as in the past) and the State Board has approved a tuition increase every year since the last visit. Further as mentioned in an interim report, art and design majors are now paying the professional fee and full equity among all student contributions to professional fees was achieved in 2014.⁴⁰ In other words, architecture and other design students will no longer shoulder an unfair financial burden within the College. As a point of clarification made in our response to the draft 2009 VTR, the use of the professional fee to pay for the administration of the college was not considered to be a stopgap measure by the State Board of Education. Rather, they approved the fee years earlier because of the comparatively higher cost of art and design education; and the university administration determined that the professional fee would pay

⁴⁰ The student professional fee provides nearly 12% of the college budget

for administrative costs when the college was reconstituted. Further, our previous and current university presidents have both said that the University will not fund the college administration beyond current levels. After six years, it has become clear to most in the college that a transfer of costs for the administrative function of the college to the university will not occur; thus many now recognize that our energies are better spent on pursuing ways forward with this reality, instead of getting trapped in the “if only” of a perceived inequity.

Helping this effort has been the rebound in the financial health of professional practitioners and potential donors. In 2014-15 giving improved, and the Dean had his first million-dollar day. Beyond this gift, there are other promising proposals that will be turned into “asks” shortly by a new development officer who began working with the college this summer. Based on the recent successes, which occurred almost immediately after the arrival of this development officer, we have high hopes for future giving.

Finally, college and university administrators are aware that no more permanent positions can be taken from the architecture program without threatening accreditation. As such, no additional faculty lines have been lost in the architecture program, and funding has been made available to meet all additional teaching needs since the last visit. In addition, one position has been returned to interior design and the college received two new faculty lines from the university to support development at the UDC—one in landscape architecture and one in bioregional planning. This is a huge benefit to this center and improves our ability to provide a more robust and integrated curriculum in Boise.

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.”

Comment from VTR July 2010. An understanding of human behavior is gained in courses Arch 151 Intro to the Built Environment [Envt.] and Arch 450, Architectural Programming; however it appears these behavior theories are not emphasized in studio problems or reflected in student work.

Response from Program 2015: Even before it was rolled into *SPC A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity*, human behavior was the target of on-going efforts to make more explicit some of the practices that are implied in a typical advanced design project. For example, we have been emphasizing diagramming as a means of calling out certain salient features in a design that address these sometimes implicit, sometimes overlooked, areas of design; and making these diagrams part of the final studio presentations. Additionally, we took up human behavior directly in third year studio by developing a housing project that includes a field trip to Portland where students are asked to observe how people use public urban space. In addition, human behavior, cultural diversity, and social equity are also addressed in the revised required site planning class as well as urban theory and fourth year studios.

13.4 Accessibility

“Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities”

Comment from VTR July 2010. Consistent application of this ability was not found in upper level student design work; concepts are not being reinforced by the faculty.

Response from Program 2015: The professional practice course has added 4 class sessions, one major assignment, and quiz/exam questions, aimed more generally at *SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations*, with the intent of helping students gain an ability to analyze and apply zoning, life/safety, and accessibility codes to design projects. The lectures cover the origins and breadth of environmental regulation, and

then focus in on life/safety code (primarily ICC related codes such as the current edition of the International Building Code). The goal of these exercises it to provide students with knowledge and skills that can be applied in their studio projects. That said, there has also been an emphasis on making explicit responses to issues of accessibility in third and fifth year studios. Assessment data indicate overall improvement in this area.

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”

Comment from VTR July 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.

Response from Program 2015: Our programming course has gone through several redesigns to try to better address this deficiency. In particular:

- Each student develops a program document that includes a student assessment of client/user needs and space/equipment requirements. This is a semester-long project and is a significant part of the student’s grade.
- Students discuss client/user needs in greater detail during the class.
- The instructor assigns a project in the class titled “Program Tracing” wherein the students survey a single program type as it has evolved historically. For instance, “Central Library” as a type is examined such that multiple library spatial organization strategies are compared. This gives the students insight into the essential needs/qualities of the program types discussed.
- Impromptu quizzes are given that address questions about client/user needs.

We believe that these efforts have led to significant improvement in students’ ability to engage in programing. In fact, Idaho graduates have scored **4% higher than the national average** on the ARE in Programming Planning and Practice. That said, with programming getting incorporated into *SPC B.1 Pre-Design* and because the programming class had not been directly linked to a required studio project taken by all students we decided to make *B.1 Pre-Design* the main focus of Graduate Project Prep Seminar.

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.”

Comment from VTR July 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 II-IV, Arch 453-454 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 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 demonstrated “ability” in this criterion. It is not met.

Response from Program: *Site Conditions* was an issue at the previous visit because there was not enough diversity of site demands represented in the studio projects. Upon reflection, most faculty felt the deficiency was primarily an oversight on our part in preparing the evidence (we did not select a good range of projects). However, now with site conditions falling under *SPC. B.2 Site Design*, we have taken this failing as an opportunity to review the kinds of sites we typically use in our projects, making a conscious effort to insure a range of different geographic locations for studio projects. “Site Integration” has also been included as an explicit category of assessment between third and fifth year studios. We feel that these measures are having a positive impact, in part, because over the past six years Idaho graduates have scored **9% higher than the national average** in the Site Planning and Design section of the ARE.

13.20 Life Safety

“Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.”

Comment from VTR July 2010. Although the program’s APR matrix suggests this criterion 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 routes and exit separation. Consequently, it was difficult to determine if an “understanding” is achieved in this criterion

Response from Program 2015: In order to address this concern more specifically, and *SPC B.3 Codes and Regulations* more generally, final presentations in upper level studios now include more building code information and life safety response as part of their final products. Further, as mentioned above, the professional practice course has added 4 class sessions, one major assignment, and quiz/exam questions, to help students analyze and apply zoning, life/safety, and disabled accessibility codes to design projects. The lectures cover the origins and breadth of environmental regulation, and then focus in on the current life/safety code.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

“Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating”

Comment from VTR July 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 and the Law, however it is not a required class.

Response from Program 2015: Construction cost control, now incorporated into *SPC B.10 Financial Considerations*, has been taken up directly and explicitly in our professional practice course. There are several direct questions relating to pertinent issues on the exam.

Causes of Concern

3.6 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.”

Comment from VTR July 2010. The team felt the following faculty and staffing issues were causes for concern: the faculty-student ratio of 1:25 for pre-professional design studios was viewed as high, and they recommended that adjuncts and non-tenured faculty not be hired to cover courses as it can affect quality of curriculum delivery.

Response from Program 2015: The faculty student ratio in the second-year design studios continues at a ratio of 1:20 and the ratio for years 3 – 6 is approximately 1:15. A higher ratio for the first two years is common in many programs nationally and provides students an opportunity to “test the waters” to see if this discipline is a good fit for them. However, one of the hidden benefits of the current ebb in CAA enrollments is relief in this area of concern. In particular, this ebb has made it possible to provide faculty release time for research and publications, and has greatly improved faculty perception of their workloads. Regarding adjuncts: the use of adjuncts has allowed us to offer diversity of expertise to the students, thus we see our adjuncts’ contributions as a benefit to our program and have made an effort to make longer term commitments with those deemed most beneficial to the program.

3.11 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.”

Comment from VTR July 2010. The College of [Art and] Architecture is being reorganized from a departmental to a non-departmental unit with the understanding that architecture faculty will continue to determine their curriculum: a discipline head will ensure proper staffing.

An administrative assistant to the dean represents the College of Art[s] and Architecture at the campus-wide associate dean’s council. An associate dean hire is being considered to handle these duties which further stresses the college’s administrative budget. The team felt the changes contemplated to department leadership, administration and financial implications were significant and should be monitored. It is a cause for concern.

Response from Program 2015: The college has been functioning as a single department since 2011. Generally speaking this shift has not been that different than the previous structure. As noted in past reports, the idea for the dissolution of departments was meant to help gain State Board approval for a college-wide professional fee, streamline the administrative structure, and encourage integrated teaching strategies. Although the latter two points have not changed significantly, the phase-in of the college-wide professional fee, and its impact on the CAA budget has allowed us to maintain program autonomy.

There is still no funding available for an Associate Dean, although instead of an administrative assistant attending Associate Deans’ Meetings, program heads within the college take turns attending.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

“Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope

systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies and the principles of sustainability”

Comment from VTR July 2010. The team felt comprehensive design ability was not evident throughout the student’s skill-set development at each year-level. The fact that it was noted as a concern by the previous team led us to re-express it as a cause for concern.

Response from Program 2015: There have been on-going discussions about how to best frame the design problem in our comprehensive design studios, with the goal of having students achieve a more in-depth design development process. The smaller scope/deeper investigation project model now undertaken in this studio has resulted in a more rigorous design investigations and better schematic solutions, allowing students to get into the concerns of design development earlier in the process; and thus, reach more comprehensive solutions in the end. Our faculty feel this mix of design demands is important, because understanding the interplay of forces, ideas, material assemblies and systems throughout the various stages of development best reflects the realities of being a good architect.⁴¹ This notion also appears to be reinforced by NAAB’s shift from the “comprehensive design” designation to *SPC C.3 Integrative Design*, which we practice extensively in Arch 553 Integrated Design Studio and its associated seminar Arch 568 Technical Integration In Design.

APR—SECTION 3—Compliance with the Conditions of Accreditation

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

Faculty Workloads

It is critical, that our faculty⁴² engage in a meaningful mix of teaching, research, and service. To ensure that the balance remains meaningful each faculty member meets with the head of the architecture program in the fall to discuss their role within the program, particularly, their responsibilities in delivering the architectural curriculum. In these meetings, research goals and service assignments are discussed alongside the teaching needs of the program. This discussion is used to develop position descriptions for each individual faculty member. A typical load would see a faculty member teach one to two course(s) and studio per semester, produce two pieces of research (peer-validated), and have two to three service obligations.

That said, it is also typical that workloads will vary amongst faculty. For example, as mentioned above if a faculty member has a book contract they will be given a release from a teaching assignment (assuming there are resources available to support this). Or, another example: an architecture faculty member who does a lot of recruiting has a position description with a lesser research load. Overall, it is critical for the health of the program for there to be a variety of work assignments being taken up across the faculty, because this insures that position descriptions will both reflect a faculty member’s strengths, and fulfill the array of different needs within the program.

Most important to the health of the program is that all of this adds up to a robust professional education. Therefore, in all cases there is great attention paid to the way certain distributions of work will ultimately benefit the students. In other words, because we are a small program we do not have the luxury of overspecialization or faculty who focus solely on their own ends; thus, within our program it is always emphasized that faculty should seek out the overlaps between

⁴¹ Considering the team’s idea that comprehensive design should be more evident at each year-level, in the spring of 2011, the faculty discussed the value of creating additional comprehensive design experiences during the studio sequence. The faculty’s concern is that many of our graduates pursue a broad range of non-licensed, design-related career paths, and that by focusing too narrowly on specific building solutions we could compromise our ability to deliver interdisciplinary and multi-scalar design problems that while architectural, more easily translate to other fields.

⁴² See Faculty Resumes at: <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

their research and teaching so as to create the most mutually beneficial mix for both themselves and for the students. In this way, we try to maximize our resources and expertise.

IDP Administration

The former director of the Boise center served as IDP advisor until the spring of 2013 when she resigned from the university to practice full time. With her departure, a Moscow faculty member, Philip Mead, assumed IDP responsibilities on an interim basis. This fall, the “Architect Licensing Advisor” role is being shared by our professional practice instructors in Boise and Moscow—Kasama Polakit and Ned Warnick respectively. Warnick, who recently attended the San Diego Licensing Advisors Summit, is an affiliate faculty member who practices in Pullman, Washington with Design West Architects. Professor Polakit, is a second year tenure-track faculty working at the UDC. Many of Polakit’s professional practice students are employed by firms, earning IDP credits in the morning while attending class in the afternoon.

IDP updates are given yearly to the Professional Practice classes in both Moscow and Boise by Idaho State Architect Licensing Advisor Steve Turney of ZGA Architects in Boise. In the fall of 2013, a national IDP representative provided updates in an open forum to all students on the Moscow campus.

Faculty Development

Faculty development has two critical paths, one that involves staying abreast of current trends in *architectural practice* and the procedures of licensure; the other involves staying active within the particular venues and organizations that support each individual’s academic investigations of the *architectural discipline*.

Since not all faculty practice we rely on several critical connections to the profession to insure that we are informed about the challenges practitioners are currently facing. One of the most enlightening connections between our faculty and the profession comes by way of our Advisory Board. This body visits campus one to two times a year and is a font of knowledge about current issues and opportunities in practice. Two particular kinds of information that come from this group are especially useful to us: 1.) what types of skills employers are currently looking for in graduates, and 2.) what kinds of deficiencies they are seeing in recent job applicants.

Another, excellent point of connection with the profession is through AIA Idaho, particularly the Central (Boise) chapter. The architecture program head makes several trips to Boise a year and meets with the current Central Chapter AIA President on about half these visits; the program head will also typically attend two AIA meetings to both get updated on recent issues and to present current information about the architecture program. Further, the Central Chapter AIA President generally comes to Moscow one to two times a year to meet with students and faculty. These interactions—in both Boise and Moscow—are mutually beneficial in terms of keeping the respective parties current on the other’s dealings and goals, and allow discussion about ways we can better serve one another. Other points of contact between the faculty and the profession, regularly occur through discussions and critiques with our visiting critics, and for many, at ACSA Conferences which often have a strong NAAB component to them. And as noted in I.1.4C, many faculty members also take students to visit architectural firms as part of their studio field trip experiences and these visits also contribute understanding about the current issues of practice.

In terms of individual development in pursuit of specific research agendas, our faculty is quite active in attending professional conferences. Further, faculty generally attend conferences to present work; which is to say, not only do they get the benefit of the content of the conference, but many also take the opportunity to get peer feedback on their own work. It must also be noted that there are a wide range of venues in which individuals pursue their research; both the college and program support this diversity of approach and the variety of mechanisms that contribute to faculty and staff development.

One of the most direct mechanisms for support of faculty and select staff (such as the directors of our Technical Design & Computer Studios) is through annual research/travel allowances. These funds are aimed to support travel expenses, registration fees, and/or equipment purchases associated with the pursuance of conference presentations, conference and symposium attendance, publications, creative works, continuing education workshops, and personal research projects.

The College also provides selective financial support for faculty through the “Dean’s Travel Fund,” and “Paul G. Windley Faculty Excellence and Development Award.” The competitive application process for the Dean’s Travel Fund leans toward supporting junior faculty members who are in the early stages of their academic careers (although is not limited to just these faculty). Whereas the \$1000 Windley Award, “recognizes three consecutive years of excellence in faculty scholarship and provides support for continuing scholarly activities in written research and dissemination.”⁴³ And as noted above, reduced teaching loads within the program have also been an effective mechanism used to assist professional development of faculty.

Another traditional mechanism for professional development is the sabbatical. According to the University of Idaho’s Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH):

Members of the UI faculty with tenure at the time of sabbatical leave, and the rank of senior instructor or above, or the equivalent of such rank, may be granted sabbatical leave after six full academic years of service at UI or after six full academic years have elapsed since the faculty member’s most recent sabbatical leave at UI.⁴⁴

According to the FSH, the purpose of a sabbatical leave is to enhance the faculty member’s value to the university through “1. Research, scholarship, or study intended to result in publication or invention, 2. Refresher courses or a program of study, work, or travel designed to keep the faculty member abreast of the latest developments in his or her area of specialization, or 3. Work toward an advanced degree.”⁴⁵

Sabbatical is generally granted to faculty who have worked with the program head and dean to develop a proposal that benefits both individual and university (i.e. it is only a moderately competitive process).

For a “list of past and projected faculty research (funded or otherwise), scholarship, creative activities by full-time instructional faculty since the previous visit,” please visit:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/9vh35mqgotuhn2k/Faculty%20Research%20Matrix.doc?dl=0>

Student Support Services

The University, the College of Art and Architecture, and the Architecture Program provide consistent support for student success. This support takes many different forms including: academic advising, support for student organizations and activities (financial and advising), student travel assistance, scholarships, teaching and research assistantships, lectures and exhibits, internship opportunities, summer study programs, faculty-led fieldtrips, and other alternative learning opportunities.

University Services & Support

The University offers assistance to students through its various student service offices and centers: Counseling & Testing Center, Career Services, Office of Disability Support Services, Writing Center, Office of Multicultural Affairs, Tutoring & Academic Assistance Program, and

⁴³ Taken from the email call for applications.

⁴⁴ <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3720.html>

⁴⁵ <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3720.html>

Office of Dean of Students. Those offices and centers provide important and necessary services, information to students, and meet a wide variety of needs across campus.⁴⁶

Academic Advising

In the architecture program, academic advising begins for all prospective students at recruiting events and when they make their first visits to the campus. There are several sessions in the fall and spring semesters when the faculty recruiter and student ambassadors meet prospects and their parents to provide useful information regarding curricula, program details and opportunities, campus life, and professional outlooks. After a student is enrolled, the program recruiter continues as their academic advisor through the first year. The faculty recruiter also teaches newly enrolled students in their first architecture class, Introduction to the Built Environment; this role allows consistent contact with all new students and provides opportunities to make periodic announcements about critical deadlines, matriculation considerations, and career paths. After the first year, individual faculty members take over from the faculty recruiter, providing advising for 10 to 35 undergraduate students at least once per semester. During the advising meeting, the faculty member discusses the curricular process, helps students with course choices, and offers career advice. This time is meant to ensure students are on the right track in terms of both career and degree path.

Advising for graduate students begins with applicants' admission and continues with an orientation before the fall semester starts. Students continuing on to the graduate program from our own undergraduate program continue with their assigned undergraduate advisor. After the first year of the program, the major professors for the graduate project take charge of the primary mentoring role with students. However, because of the small size of our program it is not unusual for students to confer with multiple faculty members on their plans of their study and career trajectories. The graduate program coordinator initially advises all graduate students coming from elsewhere and those continuing on as needed.

Finally, although technically a recruiting effort, the "Summer Design Week" is a college-wide one-week program for high school students, which helps students find a good fit between their educational objectives and their university studies.

Student Organizations

As described in section I.1.4, both undergraduate & graduate students in the program have ample opportunity to participate in professional organizations, honors societies, and other campus wide activities. There are four official student organizations for architectural students within the College: Student Congress, AIAS, Freedom by Design, and New World Design-Build.⁴⁷

Student Travel and Field Trips

The Architecture Program has a long history of supporting opportunities for students to travel both domestically and abroad. Travel funds are set aside each year in the program budget to assist faculty and student trips. Typically, each faculty member is allocated \$700—\$800 per semester to lead student field trips for their studio projects. In addition to the coursework related fieldtrips, the architecture program also financially supports student trips to AIAS national and regional conferences and events; and this year offered sponsored slots to students for the Idaho Heritage Conference (meeting on campus).

Student Research, Scholarship and Creativities

Architecture students frequent the university's major research event, the Innovation Showcase. In 2014, Amelia Marek won the First Place Award for "Undergraduate Research Poster", and Ciera Shaver won the Second Place Award for "Graduate Disciplinary Presentations." Additionally,

⁴⁶ <http://www.uidaho.edu/DOS>

⁴⁷ See I.1.4 A. **Collaboration and Leadership** for a longer description of the organizations.

students of the Architecture Program helped to co-organize the University of Idaho President's Sustainability Symposium in both 2011 and 2013.

Internship and Career Development

Students are encouraged to take internships and start their IDP credits when they are in school. Advising about internships and IDP starts at the first year of students' college education during Arch 151 Introduction to the Built Environment and continues through the Professional Practice course. Further, the College Advisory Board visits offer a regular opportunity for students to interact with professional architects and designers (many Advisory Board members say this interaction is the highlight of their meeting). This connection is reinforced via the studio field trips/design firm visits mentioned above, providing students with first-hand experience of professional practice and a means of initiating potential internship connections.

Importantly, through both directing work inquiries from potential employers to qualified students and the AIAS interview process the program has consistent history of connecting students with job opportunities at design firms such as Callison, ZGF, NBBJ, Mithun, Olsen Kundig, Collins Woerman, YBA Architects, ZGF, Integris, ALSC, as well as all the major firms in Boise.⁴⁸ Since 2012, we have also developed collaborations with several design firms in China and six recent graduates have completed their internships at WDCE, a Beijing-based architectural design firm.

We also maintain a bulletin board in the Art and Architecture South building lobby (outside the architecture office) where recruiting posters from various firms and calls for applications are listed. Finally, AIAS and the College Student Congress regularly sponsor spring portfolio reviews to better prepare students for securing positions in firms and for matriculation to graduate schools; and AIAS offers software mastery seminars and LEED workshops to better place students in the workforce.

I.2.2 Physical Resources

The majority of the architecture program facilities are located on the Moscow Campus; however, there are two educational/research/outreach facilities in downtown Boise, Idaho.

Main Campus, Moscow.

In Moscow, the College of Art and Architecture facilities are located advantageously in the heart of campus near the university classroom center, the library, administrative offices, recreational facilities, and the University Commons. Students, staff, faculty, and resource centers for the college are housed across seven buildings. Two gallery spaces, three critique spaces, a technical shop, design resource center, and computer studio also supports college units. The buildings are:

- **Art and Architecture South (AAS)** is the home of the office of Architecture and Interior Design programs, and the public face of the Architecture Program. It houses third, fourth and graduate studios with students assigned to individual workstations. Most of the faculty offices are located in this building. Art classrooms, offices and studios and a computer lab occupy the first floor of this building.
- **Art and Architecture North (AAN)** houses first and second year studios. The students in these studios are provided with "hot desk" space and individual lockers. AAN and AAS are adjacent to each other and connected by enclosed walkways.
- The **AAN Annex** is where the technical shop is located (more detail is provided below). It also houses a multi-media critique space.

⁴⁸ Most graduate students based in UDC at Boise work in a professional office as part-time interns while completing the program.

- **Art and Architecture (AA)** houses the College Office, the Design Resource Center and one college seminar room. It also is home to programs in Landscape Architecture, Bioregional Planning and the office of the Art and Design program. During summer 2015, Interior Design studios and faculty offices transitioned into this building as well.
- **Art and Architecture Interior Design (AAID)** had housed the interior design studios and faculty offices until Summer 2015. This building is now being transitioned to house design build courses offered by both architecture and interior design as well as architecture faculty offices.
- **Ridenbaugh Hall:** holds two galleries/critique spaces.
- **GAS House:** holds individual studio spaces for art graduate students and art faculty.

All studios, offices and critiques spaces have wired and wireless internet connectivity. Critique spaces are located near the studios and are used for faculty and guest critic reviews of in-progress and completed student work.

Technical Design Studio⁴⁹

The **Technical Design Studio (TDS)** is a student access shop that serves all students in the college. The TDS provides a collaborative environment for the development of material literacy and process knowledge. The TDS provides a full complement of power and hand tools for the manipulation of wood, plastics and composites. In addition to traditional shop tooling, it also holds digital fabrication equipment, including CNC milling, laser cutting, and 3D printing.

College of Art & Architecture students are introduced to the TDS in their first semester at the University of Idaho as part of Art 121, a college core class. The students are given safety training in addition to an introduction to shop capabilities and procedures. Following this training, the students execute an entry-level shape and form project in the shop. Additional training modules such as architectural model building, digital fabrication techniques and art framing are taught as needed in following years.

Shop staff provides user assistance, training and supervision while offering users an extensive knowledge of materials, tools, processes and safety. The shop is fully staffed sixty hours each week and is only available for use when shop staff is present.

Design Resource Center⁵⁰

The **Design Resource Center (DRC)** houses a comprehensive collection of leading industry periodicals as well as material and product samples to keep students, faculty and staff current on the latest developments in the interior design, architecture, and related design industries. Over the past few years, the DRC has expanded to include more architectural materials and products, and is developing an interdisciplinary design teaching and learning resources to support curriculum across the college.

Computer Studio⁵¹

The Computer Studio provides digital technology resources for students of the college. It is typically open 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, and a minimum of four hours per day on the weekends. Late passes are available to students who need to work in the studio after-hours.

⁴⁹ <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/facilities/tds>

⁵⁰ <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/facilities/drc>

⁵¹ <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/facilities/computer-studio-new>

Students have access to the tools and resources they need for classroom and studio projects, including the latest software applications and related hardware often utilized in the industry. There is also equipment for large format printing that is serviced by a monitor. Digital files can be transmitted directly to the lab, and students are able to pay for prints using their student ID cards. Specific resources include the following:

Software

- CAD (Computer Aided Design) – AutoCAD (Autodesk), Revit (Autodesk)
- Modeling/Animation – 3DS Max (Autodesk), 3DS Max Design (Autodesk), Maya (Autodesk), Rhinoceros (McNeel North America), Google SketchUp
- Image Editing – Photoshop (Adobe)
- Page Layout – Illustrator (Adobe)
- Document Layout – InDesign (Adobe)
- Video/Web Development – Premiere Pro, Video Editing (Adobe); Encore, DVD Development (Adobe); Audition, Audio Editing (Adobe); Flash Professional (Adobe); After Effects (Adobe)
- Document Output – Acrobat Professional (Adobe)
- Geographical Information Systems (GIS) – ArcGIS
- Virtual Real-Time Environments – Unity3D (Unity Technologies), Second Life (Linden Labs)
- Access to the entire Adobe CC Suite now on all of our workstations

Hardware

- Computers
 - 9 workstation level computers using the Windows operating system. Workstation hardware is determined by the software it supports.
 - 10 station Mac Lab, with large screen, high power iMacs
- Digitizers –3D Digitizer (2D Digitizer by request in storage)
- Scanners – Multiple flatbed scanners including 11x17” platen transparency support for slides and other transparent original media)
- Printing – Two large format printers (supporting 36” wide media)
- 10 – 11 X 17 laser printers located near design studios and distributed throughout the College (1 in 208-9 AAN, 1 on Second Floor AAS and 1 on Third Floor AAS)
- 7 permanently mounted digital projectors located throughout the college (AAN 203, Red Room, Shop Crit, AA 205 serve Architecture), 4 portable projectors available for checkout by faculty, staff and students.
- 3 Wacom Cintiq digital pen input systems

Digital Learning Resources

- 2 hybrid courses: Arch 520 and Arch 468;
- Online Revit training through Lynda.com.

Changes in Moscow Facilities.

Improvements to the entry lobby were completed at the end of August 2015. The space was established and upgraded to serve as a more welcoming entry for visitors, an information hub for students, and an informal learning and meeting space for all. There are several features that support this informal learning role: reading/meeting lounge, coffee table that holds periodicals in 8 compartments, library book display/check-out, information boards, digital display that has a changing mix of design inspirations, program promotions, and event advertising, and a materials installation that offers information about the role and location of the Design Resource Center.

We are currently in the midst of creating a new design build center. The center will occupy the former interior design building. This move was made possible by the relocation of the interior design program, as well as the Design Resource Center, both of which moved to a more central

location outside the College Dean's Office. The Computer Studio will be moving to this area as well in an effort to shape a "college center." Finally, a series of old lockers were replaced with eight new studio critique tables in 2014 to enhance studio performance by providing areas for small group discussion, and eliminating a site of constant clutter (the lockers).

Boise Campus Facilities

Urban Design Center

The Architecture program has had a physical presence in Boise since 1998. The Urban Design Center (formerly the IURDC) located in the Boise Center has expanded with the addition of a cohort of graduate landscape architecture students starting in 2012. The cohort is expected to grow again with the addition of both a bioregional planning and foundation design track in the fall of 2015.

The original studio space accommodates up to 24 student workstations, a critique space and a staff office. Additional facilities now include two studio spaces (an original one and another one with 12 workstations), a computer lab and printing facilities and equipment, a shared technical workshop with engineering and we are anticipating further changes in the next few years. In fall 2015, the center is expected to relocate to a new space within the same building, which will allow us to consolidate all the scattered facilities into one organized unit with larger studio space, staff offices, meeting rooms, a computer and research lab and a break room. However, the original studio space will be maintained to take advantage of its street frontage for promoting CAA and the architecture program through organized events, workshops, and exhibitions.

IT services are provided by the Boise Center staff and include: internet connections and services to administration and education related activities, one computer lab with two high performance computer workstations for research fully equipped with graphic communications and Geographic Information System (GIS) programs. The center plans to expand the computer lab in the near future.

Integrated Design Lab.

The other physical presence in Boise is a 3,000 square foot laboratory space located in an historic building with deep energy retrofit; the space contains open office and private office test chambers, an overcast sky simulator and heliodon for day-lighting education and research. The IDL also boasts a robust 1000+ piece evaluation measurement and verification tool library. The IDL currently has 11 staff and students in architecture and mechanical engineering to support lab research and development. One tenure-track faculty from architecture directs the lab.

I.2.3 Financial Resources

Financial resources are allocated to the college by the university. The dean then asks for budget proposals from all programs and apportions resources based on the proposals. The architecture program has a fair degree of influence over most expense categories. The categories that the architecture program has the greatest influence over are: faculty travel allowances, studio financial assistance, guest critic funding—our requests in these areas (within reason) are usually granted. Further, we have spending autonomy when it comes to small equipment and supplies purchases, accreditation expenses, and some small facilities improvements (like furniture). Although the budget allocation process is not always transparent, the college has generally been good about honoring most realistic requests for financial support—overall, the architecture program has not found itself with shortfalls or significant deficiencies as a result of the current financial allocation process.

Of note regarding budget transparency: one of the University President's initiatives this year has to do with making the university budget more transparent, this issue will be taken up through the University Budget and Finance Committee in fall 2015. Fallout from this initiative has already found its way into the college in the form of several budget reports by the dean to the faculty and budget discussions at the

college leadership meetings. All program heads are directed to schedule annual line-item budget meetings with the Dean and the college financial tech.

Program revenue comes from three sources: student tuition, student professional fees, and donations. The first two categories are dictated by the State Board of Education whereas donations can be leveraged via our effectiveness in soliciting support. However, even that category remains primarily in under the purview of the college, because although the head of the architecture program has a role in cultivating potential gifts, ultimately the “asks” are made by either the dean or a university development officer.

Financial support for students comes in two primary forms: scholarships and graduate teaching positions. Our program has 12 scholarships available for student awards, which all-tolled amounted to \$37,970 last year.⁵² We also have an array of graduate teaching assistant positions that students can get (typically around 30). These come with a \$1500 stipend, and out of state students get a 50% tuition waiver.

The travel/scholarship assistance funds for faculty and select staff described in I.2.1. represent all the college faculty fellowship and grant offerings.

- **Pending reductions or increases in enrollment:** We are currently experiencing a period of lower enrollments. We discuss our responses to this in I.1.3 and I.1.6. Also, it is worth repeating that the number one goal of our current president (and the president before him) is growing the University enrollment (50% has been the figure given). To date there has been little change in university enrollments (overall enrollments for the university are actually down this year).
- **Pending increases or reductions in funding:** Although lower enrollment means a reduction in professional fees, so far this shortfall has not come down upon the program in any significant way. The college has been trying to increase donor participation as means to supplement this reduction, and the initiative we have taken as a program is discussed in detail in I.1.6.
- **Changes in funding models for faculty compensation instruction overhead or facilities:** There are no changes in models, however, the University of Idaho is currently struggling with the fact that its faculty is paid 14% behind land grant peers and lags 26% behind all Ph.D.-granting Campuses.⁵³ Thus, one of our President’s other priorities is to improve overall faculty compensation. And closer to home, our dean has identified two architecture faculty members, both associate professors, in urgent need of salary adjustments (compression has resulted in their salaries being very close to the range we are now paying incoming assistant professors).
- **Planned or in progress institutional development campaigns that include designations for the program:** none.

I.2.4 Information Resources

The University of Idaho library contains a total of over four million items. This collection includes the resources that are specific to architecture (Library of Congress classification ‘NA’): 7,654 Books, 411 E-Books, 410 Serials, and 73 A/V Materials (mostly DVDs). However, these numbers refer to only what is directly available from our library; university patrons have access to many more materials through the Orbis Cascade Alliance “whose resources exceed 9.2 million titles representing 28.7 million items.”⁵⁴ In addition, the library has many online article and image databases that serve the Architecture Program;⁵⁵ and our program also benefits from an architectural research guide that library departmental liaison, Kristin Henrich, has created.⁵⁶ Henrich also provides workshops for classes and meets individually with faculty and students who request assistance in finding resources for their research projects. The library provides course reserves and e-reserves to support courses; and the library’s Special Collections allows

⁵² <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/scholarship-opportunities>

⁵³ http://idaho-aft.org/?page_id=282

⁵⁴ <https://www.orbiscascade.org/about/>

⁵⁵ http://www.lib.uidaho.edu/find/database_display.html?subject=3&disptype=S

⁵⁶ <http://libguides.uidaho.edu/arch?hs=a>

faculty and students to conduct research using primary sources, including sources about Northwest architecture.

It must also be noted that the library is very good at acquiring new books that are requested by the faculty. In fact, Henrich has always been always proactive about sending requests for new books from our faculty, as well as supplying lists of the new architecture and design acquisitions to the program.

The only significant problem of the library's physical collections is that that are not more visible to students (i.e. they are part of the bigger library collection and not in close proximity to our facilities). The attempt to address this issue is the new architecture program lobby described in I.1.6, and the periodicals available at the Materials Resource Center (described in I.2.2) also help this effort.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance

Administrative Structure⁵⁷

The architecture program is situated within the administrative structure of the greater university, which begins with President Chuck Staben at the top and Provost John Wiencek directly under him. The Dean of the College of Art and Architecture, Mark Hoversten, reports to the Provost. The college office is staffed by two administrative assistants, a financial tech, an assistant to the dean, and a director of strategic initiatives.

The heads of each of the six programs in the college serve together as the academic core team (ACT), which is a direct advisory body to the Dean. ACT meets weekly during the semester. Additionally, each program head is in charge of administering their own program. This includes developing faculty position descriptions, doing faculty evaluation, scheduling classes/teaching assignments, planning budgets—and importantly—providing leadership for their respective programs. For architecture, the latter entails: interacting with alumni and other stakeholders, seeking out and establishing partnerships with other educational institutions, cultivating public sector stakeholder and industry collaborations, providing vision and ideas for curricular development and refinement, faculty hiring, student recruitment and retention, and generally trying to provide the support that fosters a productive and happy faculty. Additionally, the head of the architecture program oversees the Integrated Design Lab in Boise and is a key player in determining the role, function, and direction of the Boise Urban Design Center (the Dean, the Landscape Architecture Head, and the Bioregional Planning Head are the others).

Governance

The shared governance of the institution occurs at a variety of levels. For faculty in the college, influence over decision-making starts at the program level primarily through faculty meetings. Discussion is then filtered into the college processes via dialogue between program heads and the Dean in ACT meetings.

The college interfaces with university shared governance through faculty senate.⁵⁸ Our college elects one senator for a three-year term. The senator shares pertinent information about current issues ongoing at the university with college faculty, and also fields concerns, complaints, and ideas from the faculty of the college, sharing/acting on these through the mechanisms of faculty senate. There are two primary channels of action in senate: One entails senate leadership providing advice and input directly to the provost and/or president; the other involves issues concerning policies, procedures, curriculum, etc., which will come up through senate committees and proceed through a voting process in senate, and then again at the University Faculty Meeting. Decisions are passed on to the State Board of Education for final approval (if necessary).

⁵⁷ See CAAstructure diagram:
<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwfqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

⁵⁸ Currently, the chair of faculty senate is also the head of the architecture program.

The students at the college find their greatest voice through the Student Congress of Art and Architecture (SCAA). Here they discuss concerns and develop initiatives, bringing both to the attention of the dean or the appropriate program head(s).

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria

Link to SPC Matrix:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

Comments on Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions

C1. Research

Research investigation skills are most explicitly demonstrated in our required courses in history, the Graduate Project Seminar, Environmental Control Systems II, Technical Integration in Design and the elective course, Research Methods. However, we believe that research is *fundamental* to all design work. From second year through graduate project, research is emphasized as an integral part of doing quality design. Such research might entail: site analysis, code research, cost analysis, materials exploration, systems efficacy, historic precedent surveys, theoretical argument development, and so on. In short, because of the very complexity of architecture, we believe it critical to understand that every project has some particular area that will need to be investigated, explored, in a word—researched.

Further we also believe design should be understood to be a form research in itself. “Research by design” acknowledges that the non-linearity and intuitive nature of the design process afford a unique means of inquiry; and “design as research” grants that the activity of prototyping—the evaluation of the artifacts that emerge from making—provides valuable inputs into the feedback loop of design thinking. We also think it important that students not only realize these two forms of research are basic to studio practice, but can be utilized in other types of projects—projects that might otherwise be limited by more traditional research methods. We understand the graduate project to have a particular emphasis on the research capacities of design.

C2. Integrative Evaluations and Decision-Making Design Process.

Our program is founded upon the belief that the most important skill a student needs to learn how design can be used to contribute positively to the complexity of the lived world. Beginning in their freshmen studios there is an emphasis on problem diagnosis and concept formation. As students go on they are also taught that every project has a number of critical concerns and vital forces that determine its potentials. In other words, we have few courses that feature technique in isolation; more often technique is practiced in the service of design and always supported by critical thinking.

We also emphasize that design is fundamentally an iterative process, requiring that solutions be posited, as means of further clarifying and evaluating the (provisional) problem stated. In this way, we teach students to account for “multiple systems and variables” and evolve their evaluative criteria as their understanding of these parameters grows. In short, it is only through the wholehearted attempts to “finish”

a project *many times* that one can finally arrive at some semblance of “finish.” In this way, the designer moves through a series of incremental insights about what constitutes “effective implementation.”

In our program, critiques, both formal and informal, are seen to be one of the primary engines that drive integrative thinking and decision-making; which is to say, critiques are always aimed at being pedagogical, and are seen to be a failure if they merely point out flaws (or successes) without critical discussion about how thinking differently about certain aspects of a project can change the way that one thinks about design overall. Critique at the University of Idaho is first and foremost a collaborative process of analysis and speculation intended to help students create work with increasing degrees of creativity, efficacy, and integrity.

C3. Integrative Design

Although we believe all architectural projects to have their own specific complexities and therefore their own particular integrative logics, the comprehensive building studio is the most overt didactic vehicle for teaching students to think about integrative design in our program. Here, integrative means developing an understanding of how different systems and scales interact and are affected by the forces of site, program, climate, and user/client and ultimately coalesce as the different assemblies of an architectural whole. The studio functions in this way because it is the one studio that *requires* students to make significant headway with design development and all its necessary interdependencies. Achieving this means that students will need to apply knowledge from all their previous coursework as well as demonstrate an ability with the conventions of construction drawing. Further, emphasizing the expected sophistication of student results, this studio is linked to a required seminar, Arch 568 Technical Integration in Design, which is intended to help students understand and work through the complexities of architecture in terms of inter-reliant building systems and their specific requirements.

Finally, recent curricular changes are also intended to emphasize the importance of integrative design, pointing to the necessary interdependences and complex temporality of architectural knowledge. For example, we have reconceptualized our structures sequence in an attempt to more fully suggest structure be viewed as just one aspect of building construction writ large, which is, in-turn, inseparable from the judgments of architectural design. The introduction of a new building assemblies class in the fourth year (the semester following the structures sequence) is also meant to drive this point (and understanding) home, rounding out the construction suite of Materials and Methods and Structural Systems 1 & 2. In addition to these updates to our curriculum, our new vertical option studios will be administered in such a way so as to require that upper-level students take at least one studio with an urban-scale focus and at least one studio with building-scale focus so that students practice design at these different scales of understanding *and* see the interdependence of the two scales.

Methodology for assessing student work (i.e., “high” v. low pass.)

In assessing student work, the Idaho’s assessment criteria (listed in the formal as evaluation sheets) run from “1” poor (or “F”) work to “5” Outstanding (or “A”) work. Low pass is considered a 3 rating. More specifically low pass work is work that demonstrates the most basic understanding of the challenges presented in an assignment and represents this understanding in the most minimal terms. That may mean, for example, in a studio project the design was thoughtful but the graphics were not refined; or that certain higher-level details were left out; a few areas might not function/perform as promised, but not so many that suggest the overall comprehension/design integrity has been compromised.

High pass work is work that has done the same things but with thoroughness and distinction. This may mean that the work is more complete, better represented, more accurately considered, and/or more revelatory in its content. For example, a detailed section through foundation: in low pass work all the basic elements would be there but it might be graphically lacking, missing a component or two, or be a suspect approach given the demands of the situation; high pass work masters all of these different

aspects of the challenge—it would be a well-considered solution that is both technically complete and graphically strong.

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation

The accredited degree program is part of the University of Idaho, which is accredited by the **Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)**. From the University's website:

The University of Idaho will be visited by a team of evaluators April 20 – 22, 2015 as part of its institutional accreditation process. The University of Idaho is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) and has been accredited by the NWCCU since 1918. The University was most recently reaffirmed in 2012 on the basis of a Year One Evaluation which was expanded to address recommendations of a Fall 2009 Regular Interim Visit.⁵⁹

Most recent accreditation letter from NWCCU:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

Degrees Conferred:

B.S. Architecture (128 cr.)

M. Arch (req.: pre-professional degree+ 45 cr.)

The combination of undergraduate BS Architecture degree and the graduate M. Arch degree results in a minimum of 173 semester credits for successful M. Arch degree seekers. For architecture this breaks down as follows:

The B.S. Arch degree requires a minimum of 128 credits, at least 3 credits of 200-level or above courses taken outside the disciplines of architecture, art, landscape architecture, interior design or virtual tech design. At least 3 credits of 200-level or above courses taken within the disciplines of the College of Art and Architecture and 3 credits of 200-level or above courses in any discipline. (Credits earned in completion of an academic minor may be substituted for these 9 credits)

The M. Arch degree requires a minimum of 45 credits. 24 of these credits must be at the 500-level; others may be from 400-level courses in supporting areas M. Arch Electives: 7 units of credit outside architecture 300 level and above.⁶⁰

The University of Idaho has an undergraduate general education requirement. The UI Core Curriculum requires courses in Communications (5-6 credits), Natural & Applied Sciences (7-8 credits), Math, Statistics, & Computer Science (3-4 credits), Humanities & Social Science / General Core Studies (18 credits—at least 6 humanities and 6 social science), and 36 credits total of core courses. The program's required art foundation adds 6 credits to this total. Finally, at least 3 credits of non-architecture elective coursework is required. The grand total is 45 credits of general studies.

Professional studies in architecture include the sequence of nine architecture studios, supporting lectures and seminars in architecture and required courses in Art, Math, Physics, Renewable Materials, and Landscape Architecture.

⁵⁹ <http://www.uidaho.edu/about/accreditation/Public-Notice>

⁶⁰ See Architecture Curriculum Planning Check Sheet:
<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

Optional coursework includes at least 8 semester credits of electives or an academic minor (18 credit minimum)⁶¹ for the B S Arch degree; and at least 19 semester credits of electives for the M Arch degree. In sum, at least 27 semester credits of optional coursework is required.

Table 1. Minimum Credit Distribution for NAAB-Accredited Degrees

	B. Arch.	M. Arch. (SI)	M. Arch. (preprofessional plus)	M. Arch. (non-preprofessional plus)	D. Arch.
General Studies	45 credits	45 credits	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission
Optional Studies	10	10	10	10	10
Professional Studies	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program
Undergraduate Credits	150	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	120
Graduate Credits	0	30	30	30	90
Total Credits	150	168	168	168	210

Currently, students may pursue all of the credits in Moscow, or may choose to do their final two years in Boise. We are in the first stages of making accommodations so students may take their first two years in Boise as well. Regardless of location, the requirements are the same.

II.3.1 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

At this time, the majority of our graduate students are continuing from the undergraduate program, having earned or nearly completed the BS Architecture (Seamless Admissions). We do also get students who apply to the program from other accredited schools in the US or from international architecture programs, as well as students with bachelor’s degrees in subjects other than architecture who wish to begin graduate architecture studies. The admissions process is different for these three groups of students and is described below.

⁶¹ Many architecture students will pursue minors in within the College, both because of related interests and because our curriculum already requires credits in Art and Design and Landscape Architecture.

Admission Requirements and Policies and Processes of Evaluation

1. Bachelor of Science in Architecture

The University of Idaho has an open admissions policy for incoming first year students. That means any student admitted to the university may select architecture as a major and enroll in the required first year foundations classes. We therefore have two “gates” used to admit students into the pre-professional program. The first year of the pre-professional program starts at the second year, and the final admission to the pre-professional program is in the third year of the program.

We advise all first year students about these policies and their path through the program. Once, they begin the program they are assigned a permanent faculty advisor (during the first week of school). Students are advised that the accredited degree is the Master of Architecture, and that if the student chooses to continue at the UI and complete the B.S. Arch and the M. Arch that it will take six years. (See the Architecture Curriculum Planning Check Sheet)⁶²

Second Year Admissions

After completion of the required first year courses, students apply to the second year of the architecture program. The second year of the program is when students begin architectural design studios. There are two requirements for admission: a minimum 2.5 GPA and completion of the first year pre-requisites, which include both general education and architecture-specific credits. The application is due the last week of classes during the spring semester, and admission decisions are made after the transcripts from spring semester become available (no later than July 1). Admissions decisions based upon a careful review of the online degree audit to verify that required courses have been completed and a GPA of 2.5 or higher has been achieved. In a case where a student has, say, all but one or two requirements completed, or a marginally lower GPA, a more in depth investigation may be conducted; and if appropriate, a plan developed for the completion of the required course(s) while continuing on into second year, and/or advisement that continuing on to the M. Arch will require a GPA of 3.0 or higher. The second-year is a point where students often transfer into the program and their applications are reviewed following the process described below (for more on this topic see Transfer Student Procedures and Placement below).

Third Year Admissions

The third year admissions process is the most critical step for progressing in the pre-professional program and is intended to be an indicator of success for admissions to and completion of the graduate M. Arch degree. At the end of their second year, students are required to submit a portfolio and list of courses completed. Their work to date, including their submitted portfolio, is evaluated by a 2-3-person admissions committee. Their transcript is also evaluated for completion of required general education and professional courses; GPA's are recorded. Scores are then assigned for the portfolio and GPA respectively (with each weighted equally), and the combined score is used to create a ranking of all the applicants. This evaluation results in a certain number of students (usually 30 to 45) being recommended for admission to the third year; this evaluation is then forwarded to the program head as recommendations for admission. At this point any questions or concerns (particularly about borderline students) are addressed. Transfer students also apply at this time. They are evaluated alongside our internal applicants using the same criteria. The process for articulating coursework taken elsewhere is described below.

2. Master of Architecture

The University of Idaho requires a minimum 3.0 GPA for all graduate students, and TOEFL scores from all international students.⁶³

Seamless Admissions

⁶² <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7qwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

⁶³ <http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/architecture/admissions/graduate-admissions>

Students who are completing their BS Architecture at UI are required to both apply to the UI graduate program and provide supplemental application materials to the architecture program. These supplemental materials include: a graduate project proposal, preference for location of study (Moscow or Boise), and plans for completion of the required Arch 554 course. The UI architecture application and the Seamless Admissions application are reviewed and acted on by the graduate program coordinator. Because the students have been enrolled in our own BS Arch program, we are generally assured that the SPCs and undergraduate program requirements have already been satisfied. However, because deficiencies in fundamental skills show up from time to time, we are considering requiring, as part of the basic application package in the future, an “advising portfolio” from all Seamless students, so that any deficiencies might be identified and addressed before they undertake their final graduate project.

BS Arch or Equivalent From Another Institution

Students applying from another academic institution are required to submit a portfolio, resume, three letters of recommendation, an official transcript, a detailed written statement of academic goals and career objectives. TOEFL scores (79 min) are required for international students. As stated above, the portfolio and written statement are essential to assuring that students have satisfied pre-professional requirements (and embedded SPCs) – especially those related to design, graphic representation and writing. In addition, the transcript and GPA serve as measures of proficiency. Any gaps in academic preparation require that additional undergraduate courses be included in the student’s study plan.

Bachelor’s Degree in a Different Field of Study

We typically have 1-2 students per year apply for the graduate program with an undergraduate degree in another field of study. In the past, students have typically been placed in the second year of the pre-professional program to pick up required courses and design studios. However, we hope that the “Summer Design Boot Camp” will offer another path for these students. This course is aimed at developing design skills generally acquired in the first two years of the curriculum with the intent of placing students in the second year or third year, depending on the competencies that are demonstrated by their work. Regardless of how they enter the program, because these students have general education requirements met, they tend to advance quickly through the required courses and are only constrained in their progress toward a graduate degree by required studio courses. However, they can sometimes progress more quickly by taking summer design studios, and we hope that the added flexibility of the vertical option studios will allow for more individualized trajectories. However, if students are interested in pursuing more personalized paths, admission requires a study plan that includes both undergraduate and graduate course requirements.

Transfer Student Procedures and Placement

Students often transfer into the undergraduate program with an AA or AS degree; or with an academic record that includes university-level architecture and general education coursework. Evaluation of transfer credit and advanced placement involve both university-wide and program specific policies.

University policy mandates that transfer students must present a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0 for all college-level study attempted in all accredited colleges attended. Applicants with fewer than 14 semester hours of transfer credit must meet both freshman and transfer admission requirements, including submission of the required test scores. The university has specific articulation agreements with several universities and 2-year colleges with pre-architecture programs, so in these cases required courses are automatically articulated to the UI transcript upon transfer.⁶⁴ If there is no articulation agreement, the Registrar’s Office has developed a series of transfer equivalency guides for the region’s accredited colleges and universities to help departments advise potential transfer students.⁶⁵

At the program level, when there are currently no direct articulations, courses are evaluated on a case-by-case basis. This involves an assessment of course descriptions and, frequently, course syllabi. If

⁶⁴ <https://www.uidaho.edu/registrar/transfer/transfer-pathways>

⁶⁵ Transfer equivalency guides can be found at <http://webpages.uidaho.edu/transferguides/transferframes.html> .

foundation studio(s) and/or graphics courses are in question, a portfolio may also be requested to better assess skills. The goal of these procedures is to assure required course content has been covered previously. Upon completion of the review, the student is provided with an advising checklist that indicates which courses will be applied toward their degree, and the proper course substitution/waiver forms are submitted to the registrar. This information then is made part of the student's official record and is posted to the UI Degree Audit system. Transfer students are advised by the same advisor for at least their first year to ensure a smooth transition into the program.

As mentioned above, students who desire advanced placement in the pre-professional program must apply for second-year or third-year alongside continuing students for the (maximum) 60 positions in second-year and 45 positions in the third-year. Most transfer students are admitted as second-year or third-year students. The Summer Design Boot Camp is also intended to assist transfer students seeking advanced placement.

II.4 Public Information

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

<http://www.uidaho.edu/caa/programs/architecture/accreditation>

III.1.1 Annual Statistical Reports

Uploaded to <http://ars.naab.org>

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

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>

III.1.2 Interim Program Reports

Provided to team by NAAB.

APR—Section 4—Supplemental Material

Policies on Academic Integrity

<https://www.uidaho.edu/studentaffairs/dean-of-students/student-conduct/academic-integrity>

University Assessment Policies and Timelines
<https://www.uidaho.edu/provost/ira/assessment>

Sabbatical Research Leave Policy
<http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/fsh/3720.html>

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines and Policies (more with other supplemental materials)
<http://www.uidaho.edu/provost/policyguidelines/tenure>

All Other Supplemental Documentation
<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/n7gwqfmhn4thfm9/AACwFe3Z0kycHeCV21e9pcO5a?dl=0>