University of Oregon
School of Architecture and Allied Arts

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture
(231 quarter credit hours)

Master of Architecture
Track I (non-architecture degree + 144 quarter credit hours)
Track II (pre-professional degree + 87 quarter credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
6 March 2013

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

Table of Contents

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team found the Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture programs at the University of Oregon to be within a vibrant learning environment. The strengths within the program include the following:

A. The faculty is dedicated to teaching, research, and mentorship. They exhibit diverse work in their academic research and professional practices in Eugene and Portland campuses.

B. The staff is experienced, dedicated, knowledgeable, and accessible.

C. The students are energetic and are strongly involved in school-wide leadership.

D. The alumni and local professionals are proactive on the school's behalf, and they are supportive of the School of Architecture and Allied Arts' programs through internships and participate in studio reviews.

E. The culture of the studios and the student body is very positive. The pass/no pass grading and vertical studios support a spirit of self-initiation, collaboration, and experimentation which is beneficial to the development of the student educationally, professionally, and personally.

F. This program is internationally recognized as a leader in sustainable practices and education.

G. As the largest graduate program on campus, it has the opportunity to become a leader of defining innovation in the graduate experience on campus. As the program has developed a robust PhD, it should be applauded for maintaining excellence in the accredited architectural professional programs.

2. Conditions Not Met

A. I.1.4. Long Range Planning
B. A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture

3. Causes of Concern

A. There is concern about the relationship between the Eugene and Portland campuses and curriculum. There is a lack of consistency in the courses, apparent discrepancies in the course content, and differences in student expectations. In addition, there is a lack of communication and coordination with adjuncts in Portland. The program seems to rely on GTAs to communicate information from the program to the Portland adjuncts rather than the administration.

B. While the integrated courses have positive outcomes, there is concern about the lack of differentiation of the graduate learning experience and additional expectation in course content.

C. Academic advising seems inconsistent and a clear process has not been developed.

D. Unpaid internships are unethical, raise a concern about consistency with AIA policy, and should not be allowed.

E. There is apparent inconsistency in the delivery of the capstone studios. These inconsistencies include a variation in project complexity and the requirement of a prerequisite seminar for select capstones.

F. There is uncertainty as to whether students have a command of digital technology, its application, and the student's preparation for the profession.

G. While the program has made gains in relation to social equity, there remains a need to improve diversity amongst students, faculty, and staff.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)

2004 Condition 4, Social Equity (M. Arch only): *The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical; and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.*

Previous Team Report (2007): This condition is met but concerns were voiced regarding socio-economic and ethnic diversity.

The climate in the department, school, and university is quite open and tolerant of differences of background, experience, ability, and perspective. Architecture students come from a wide range of backgrounds, especially in the M. Arch. program. The culture of Eugene and the University of Oregon, along with historically progressive features of the professional programs—the Oregon Review and pass/no pass studio grading—make UO a non-threatening and supportive place to study architecture.

Nevertheless, students and faculty in the school and the department are, with few exceptions, ethnically homogeneous. Annual Reports indicate that ethnic diversity has declined in both populations since the last visit. Ethnic minorities now comprise 10% (3 people) of the full time, permanent faculty, compared to 13% (4 people) at the time of the previous NAAB visit in 2001. Student ethnic diversity declined from 23% in 2000 to 17% in 2006. These numbers include foreign students, who comprised 11% and 5% of total architecture students in 2000 and 2006, respectively. The administration and faculty explain this as a result of the lack of diversity in Eugene and Oregon, along with lack of resources (time and personnel) to recruit more aggressively.

Regardless of the cause, the lack of (and decreasing) diversity does not well prepare graduates for practice that is increasingly diverse and increasingly global. The department's self-assessment identifies this as an area of concern, with a goal to "increase the diversity of our community and the perspectives represented...by actively recruiting diverse pools for student applicants and candidates for faculty and staff positions." Up to now, however, the department has relied on university initiatives to reach diverse populations. Students come to Oregon from across the nation; fewer than 40% are native Oregonians. This breadth of reach, in addition to strong graduate programs, presents great opportunities to reach diverse populations and increase enrollment of ethnic minorities.

Architecture faculty salaries remain lower, at every level, than peers on campus and lower than national averages for peers in other architecture programs. In addition, salary compression plagues the department—salary disparity is greater at higher ranks than at the Assistant Professor level. This problem presents particular challenges for attraction and retention of highly qualified candidates and the department has lost key faculty to competitor programs. Discussions with the Dean and Provost, however, indicate recognition of the problem and recent initiatives have begun to address salary equity. External funding and institutional reallocations will benefit senior faculty in architecture, in particular.

2010 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment: This condition is now met.

The 2007 visiting team characterized the climate of the department, school and university as "quite open and tolerant of the differences of background, experience, ability, and perspective." The Report further states "nevertheless, students and faculty in the school and the department are, with few exceptions, ethnically homogeneous." The Visiting Team voiced concern, citing a decline in ethnic diversity in both populations since the 2001 visit.

The UO Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture programs are taught by a single faculty of thirty tenure-related and approximately sixty adjunct members. Since the 2007 visit, faculty diversity progress has been made, based primarily on the addition of three Asian-Pacific Island adjunct faculty members, as well as one Asian-Pacific Island tenure-related faculty member. To date, the diversity profile remains well below the NAAB average but recent salary adjustments and active recruiting and retention processes appear to be making the faculty positions more competitive with other institutions. The team remains concerned about the absence of any African-American faculty in the two programs and recommends that the Program continue to actively seek qualified applicants for tenure-related faculty by supplementing university initiatives.

Gender progress places the Program well above the NAAB average of 26% female faculty members. Thirty-seven percent of the total faculty is female with several members holding university leadership positions. The UO total faculty profile tracks even higher at 47% female members.

State supported universities generally attract a larger number of in-state undergraduates, primarily due to lower tuition costs. This demographic condition changes dramatically at the graduate level where most students are from out-of-state. In the case of Oregon, this is a university-wide problem since the state has a very low minority population. Student enrollment in he B. Arch program is currently at 24% ethnic minority students, fully 7% above the UO undergraduate averages; however, ethnic minority statistics remain 12% behind NAAB averages. It should be noted that NAAB does not publish ethnic enrollment data for B. Arch programs. Female enrollments numbers, however, are approaching 50/50, on track with the Program's stated goal of balanced gender enrollment, exceeding the NAAB average by 9%.

Since the 2007 visit, the Program has implemented several programs aimed at improving social equity in the department including the development of the new School of Architecture and Applied Arts Diversity Plan, formation of a school Equity and Diversity Committee along with fellowship programs that encourage diversity activities. In 2010, the department head received an Innovations in Diversity and Academic Excellence Award from the UO Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity for the project, "Designing Diversity: Linking the University of Oregon Department of Architecture with Historically Black Colleges and Universities." Currently underway, activities include meetings with faculty at HBCUs with accredited architecture programs and inclusion of student research fellowships for HBCU students in the budget of a grant proposal. Visits to Howard, Morgan State and Hampton are scheduled in November.

Further, program funding improvements and fellowship grant opportunities appear to be targeting underrepresented groups. It is important that continued monitoring of the Annual Program Report demonstrates consistent improvement in the profiles.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this deficiency has now been corrected.

2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: *The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.*

Previous Team Report (2007): The reason this criterion is not met is lack of accessibility to the model shop—both physical accessibility and lack of availability during studio hours. The model shop serves as the facility management shop for the A&AA staff during weekday hours and is therefore open to students only in the evening. Specific areas of concern with the shop are inadequate dust collection and tripping hazards.
Given the lack of a properly exhausted spray booth to serve the design studios, the loading dock, stairwells, and hallways are presently used for this purpose—this causes environmental air quality and space problems within the school.

The Portland program will be relocating to a new facility. This is necessary to accommodate the program as it exists presently, as well as to allow for the planned future expansion of the student body. The interdisciplinary access in the new facility is a positive aspect for the program.

The Provost stated that A&AA is at the top of the queue for new facilities at the Eugene campus. This will require space planning and thoughtful preparation for the future in both locations. Improved facilities are necessary for the program to grow and be able to accommodate the required components of the teaching, research and support needs. In addition, a nearby facility has been acquired for interim space.

2010 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment: This condition is now met.

The Department of Architecture is located on the University of Oregon campus in Eugene and at a satellite location in Portland. The 2007 VTR cited the "lack of accessibility to the model shop—both physical accessibility and lack of availability during studio hours" at the Eugene campus as the reason this criterion was not met.

In the fall of 2009, the Eugene Program discontinued the half-time model shop shared with facilities services, replacing it with a 1020 sq. ft. studio shop in Lawrence Hall. The studio shop is in an accessible location adjacent to the loading dock and freight elevator. The shop is equipped with both manual and digital tools. Operational hours coincide with school session hours including evening hours Monday through Thursday and afternoon hours on Sunday. Additionally since 2007, the department's furniture shop has been made available to one or two classes each term. This shop houses the CNC equipment. In addition, the University provides a Craft Center available to all students on a membership basis. Studios with particular emphasis on building may elect to spend their studio support funds on Craft Center memberships.

To properly staff and equip the shop and to improve performance and safety, a new staff position has been created. The fabrication lab technician has been reorganizing and outfitting the shops and developing equipment use protocols, online instructional videos and safety training.

While not the immediate subject if this Focused Evaluation, it is important to note that the Portland program recently relocated to the newly renovated historic White Stag Block, a refurbished 103,000 sq. ft. LEED Gold structure. In 2007, the visiting team was aware of the proposed renovation and we are pleased to see this facility has been delivered as promised. Well equipped shop facilities are now provided for the Portland program.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this

deficiency has now been corrected. Portland program relocated to the newly renovated historic White Stag Block in 2008, a refurbished 103,000 sq. ft. LEED Gold building. The team was impressed with well-equipped shop facilities, the lighting lab and studio spaces for students, and the historic Cottrell House for faculty from Eugene who teach in Portland during the term or visits. The program has made progress to increase the access to the studio shop, laser cutters, and woodworking equipment. The hiring of a fabrication technician has improved the safety and use of the studio shop facilities.

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

Previous Team Report (2007): The previous two reviews by NAAB visiting teams have cited with great concern the below minimum budget support of the program. Although this is primarily exhibited in the level of faculty salaries, it is equally shown in staff support, necessary enrichment programs and student financial support. While the program has maintained a credible status, the growth of the enrollment over the six years since the last visit, the development of the urban center in Portland and the growing importance of the research programs point to the danger of tension, reduction, and retraction from achieving the potential of existing and proposed programs.

Although all financial documents report minimal improvements, limited increases and incentives do not provide the team with confidence of parity within the institution and national community of architecture schools. The maintenance and growth of leadership in the timely issues of sustainable design are severely challenged by the lack of adequate support. While the team is mindful of the problems of funding higher education in the state of Oregon, the current financial state of the program in architecture has reached a critical point that cannot be ignored.

2010 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment: This Condition is now met.

The 2007 VTR points to a chronic under-funding of the Program during the last two visit cycles. Since the FE response states that 85% of the departmental funding is applied to compensation expenses, much of the responsibility for this Condition being "Not Met" lies in the relatively poor average salaries at all levels.

During the time since the APR was prepared in 2006, the Program reports that revenue for the department has increased 33% and a new university budgeting model will give the school more control over their budgeting while allowing direct profit from changes in costs and tuition. Faculty salaries now exceed the average NAAB west region salaries and are close to the NAAB national average. The FE response reports that average salaries for Assistant Professors have increased in excess of 20% since 2007. Additionally, the university has initiated a plan to raise faculty salaries to be more aligned with their AAU comparators, currently exceeding the NAAB average by 20%. A broader understanding of faculty salaries may lie in data associated with instructional cost. Based on figures provided in the Delaware Study of Instructional Costs, the department is spending about 30% more per student than the national average and more per student than the UO programs of law, business, journalism, planning and landscape architecture.

The program continues to enjoy a reputation as a research institution with grant monies supplementing salaries, student fellowships and research assistant positions. Faculty grant applications routinely number around thirty, with a success rate of about one in four. A recent million dollar research grant, shared jointly by architecture and biology, is studying environmental conditioning systems as habitats for microbial growth. Integrated initiatives such as this effort, provides evidence that architecture can contribute to basic and applied research and can compete for research dollars.

One cannot ignore the relationship between financial resources and both social equity and physical resources. The possibilities of attracting and retaining minority faculty members and students are a direct result of competitive salaries, scholarships, and fellowships. Similarly, the demonstrated commitment of the university to the program, as evidenced by the White Stag Block renovation, provides attractive resources and facilities for both faculty and students.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this deficiency has now been corrected.

2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of *parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world*

Previous Team Report (2007): While there are investigations of non-Western traditions in either the architectural history or core required courses.

Oregon is in a geographic situation that might provide opportunities to develop innovative programs to address this deficiency in creative and unique ways.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion is not met. The 2009 Conditions for Accreditation has incorporated this criterion into A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture.

2004 Criterion 13.13, Human Diversity: Understanding of *the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects*

Previous Team Report (2007): This criterion is addressed in the required subject course, The Human Context of Design, primarily related to social activities and issues related to physical ability. Elective studios and subject courses enhance exposure to and/or understanding of diverse and/or non-Western cultures, but there was insufficient evidence found that all students encounter or are held accountable for this material. The school's sensitivity to the human experience in the built and/or natural environment seems to fall short of addressing other than dominant American and/or European cultures, either contemporary or historical. This deficiency is only exacerbated by the lack of cultural and socio-economic diversity found in the department and the rest of Eugene, Oregon.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this deficiency has now been corrected.

2004 Criterion 13.22, Building Service Systems: Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems*

Previous Team Report (2007): Evidence of understanding of plumbing and electrical (lighting) systems are found in both 491/591 and 492/592 coursework. Evidence of understanding vertical transportation (showing elevator, stairs, escalators, etc. in plan, diagram, section, and perspectives) is found in 485/585 and 486/586.

However, while some minimal suggestion of presenting code information relative to fire protection was found in Arch 383 and Arch 682 course handout materials, there was no evidence of understanding via quizzes, tests, or projects of communication, security, or fire protection systems in the student work presented.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this deficiency has now been met.

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

Previous Team Report (2007): No evidence has been found of building cost and construction estimating in current required courses.

Some evidence of building cost considerations was found in the lecture material in a class that was required previously, Arch 463/563, in the form of presenting the economic implications of various structural systems, and value engineering presentations and evaluations. This course is no longer required and the same content is not found in any currently required coursework.

> **2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team reviewed the responses to deficiencies identified in the 2007 VTR. The team's assessment is that this deficiency has now been corrected. Evidence is found in ARCH 417/517 Context of the Architectural Profession and ARCH 470/570 Building Construction that students possess the understanding of the financial issues related to project delivery costs, including project funding and cost-benefit analyses.

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Part One (I): Section 1. Identity and Self-Assessment

[X] The programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2013 Team Assessment: The Department of Architecture's mission statement includes "teach the values, knowledge, skills and practices that create better architecture: environments that resonate with people and their cultural, physical and ecological worlds." This is consistent with the University's mission statement and reflects the current policies and outcomes of the department.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which in each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2013 Team Assessment: Relative to learning culture, the environment at the department of architecture is encouraging to the students, staff, and faculty. This requirement is met through the Learning Culture Policy written in July 2012 which addresses the values of optimism, respect, sharing engagement, and innovation. In addition, meetings with faculty, student body, administration, and staff demonstrate a strong relationship between these groups.

The social equity requirement is deemed met. There is statistical evidence that shows an increase in the numbers of minorities within the staff. A grant is being pursued to support the recruitment and retention of diverse graduate students. Enrollment at the University of Oregon has shown improvement in this area

since the last team visit although the total numbers are low. There is a definite need to increase the number of minority students and faculty in the department of architecture.

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

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The academic community of the University of Oregon provides a beneficial context for the pursuit of the study of architecture. The University of Oregon is a world-class research university with nearly 300 academic programs and more than 25 research centers and institutes. The physical campus is alluring with a diversity of building types serving this range of academic programs providing architecture students a significant opportunity to gain exposure to different architectural styles and values. Architecture students are able to pursue minors of significant professional import including Business and Environmental Studies. It is clear from the APR and faculty and student discussions that interdisciplinary relationships are highly valued and leveraged for educational advancement. Notable efforts in this regard include the department's leading role in the Sustainable Cities Initiative and the active participation of faculty in campus planning.

The Portland location provides the program a direct connection to the professional community, including the use of adjuncts in the professional curriculum. The informal relationship with Portland State University holds significant potential and is an exciting opportunity for learning achievement for both universities.

Students play a leading role in developing academic community participation, a fact in which the department, school and university should take significant pride. Architecture students are the major force behind an impressive number and array of interest groups and student organizations. Notable in this regard are their leadership in the international H.O.P.E.S conference which has brought international leaders in the profession to the University of Oregon campus. Additionally, by providing graduate students the opportunities to teach as graduate teaching fellows and research assistants, their learning is enhanced through teaching in a meaningful reciprocity advancing the richness and diversity of thought in the academic community.

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

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The description written in the 2012 Architecture Program Report (pp. 16-17) is accurate and sufficiently meets the condition.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The condition is met. The department's IDP coordinator provides information about IDP and links to NCARB, the Oregon Board of Architectural Examiners (OBAE), licensure, and the ARE. A discussion about IDP is included in ARCH 4/517.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: This section is deemed met. The architecture learning experience leans toward competence in design. The Portland campus employs many practicing architects as adjunct professors, specializing in urban design. Most of these are alumni of the department of architecture. There is strong evidence in the curricula that the department of architecture emphasizes sustainable design and has been nationally recognized in this field of study.

There are also a large number of visiting architects, many of whom are distinguished, who lecture at the department of architecture.

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

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: This section is met through the use of service-based learning and research that is oriented toward benefits for mankind. There is a strong emphasis on sustainability and curricular and extracurricular projects that include annual trips to assist foreign cultures. DesignBridge is a student organization dedicated to public service providing design-build services to community groups. There is also an Architectural Foundation of Oregon's Architects in Schools program. The Sustainable Cities Initiative is an interdisciplinary effort of significance led by the architecture program.

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

[X] The programs processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2013 Team Assessment: The department provides information regarding the process, data sources related to long-term planning and discusses the five perspectives within the APR 2012. However, the actual long-range plan and the multiple-year objectives of the program are lacking. This is noted in the APR by identifying that the new department head is expected to develop a long-range plan in 2013. In the teams' various conversations with students, faculty, and administration several points have become clear. First, the changes in leadership at the university level have resulted in an unsettled context regarding direction and resources. Second, these changes appear to be promising in the near future, providing the department a propitious opportunity to engage in this activity. Third, recognized leadership in the area of building sustainability can be enriched and extended through collaborations within the department (areas of social and cultural sustainability) and beyond (e.g. Green Product Design Network), as illustrated by the Sustainable Cities Initiative. Fourth, both the University of Oregon and Portland State University are moving toward independent university boards providing the opportunity to move beyond past political economic challenges and create meaningful collaborations to further each other's missions and strengths, while serving the City of Portland and the State of Oregon.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures*: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
    - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
    - *Individual course evaluations.*
    - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
    - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

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

[X] The programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2013 Team Assessment: The program provided evidence in the APR on pp. 27–31 and during the visit addressing the program's mission, strengths, challenges, and procedures for self-assessment. The team found the self-assessment procedures within the department level are adequate and allied with the school and university's ongoing assessment activities. These activities include: departmental committees, assessment contributed by students and student organizations, teaching evaluation, faculty self-evaluations, appointment, and tenure and promotion evaluations.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The narrative *Human Resources and H.R. Development for Faculty and Staff* is found in the APR on pp.32–52. The team found the department, the school of Architecture and Allied Arts, and the university are committed to provide adequate support for faculty and staff.

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

[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The description written in the 2012 Architecture Program Report (pp. 38-52) is accurate and adequately meets the criteria.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The primary administrative structure is adequate. The department head of architecture is one of nine members of the school's Administrative Council, which includes the dean, three associate deans, and ten department and program heads, including: Art and Architectural History, Art, Landscape Architecture, and Planning, Public Policy and Management. This facilitates discussion of interdisciplinary opportunities. Internally, besides the department head, the administrative structure includes two associate heads (one for student affairs and one for curriculum and curricular innovation), a director of graduate studies, a director of the Portland program and a director of interior architecture.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: Faculty and students have adequate opportunities for engaging in governance. The department has at least 13 faculty committees ranging from curriculum to lectures and exhibitions, and 16 individual faculty service assignments. Student opportunities include the AIAS, the Portland Student Action Council, a graduate student forum and at least 4 departmental committees on which they can serve. The range of departmental service assignments may draw faculty away from the necessary focus on teaching, research, and community service that are core to the mission of the university.

***I.2.3 Physical Resources**: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The narrative *Physical Resources* is found in the Architecture Program Report prepared for the 2013 NAAB accreditation visit on pp. 69–88. The team found that physical resources are adequate to support the program.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: There appears to be adequate financial resources to sustain both the bachelors and masters degree programs. This is a bit difficult to ascertain with confidence as there has been a change in university budget systems within the past two years and an expectation for the emergence of a newer, hybrid budgeting system. The university as a whole employs the RCM model (responsibility centered management) for financial accountability, making each unit accountable for its own financial funds based on their enrollment. Each department is responsible for the allocation of expenses within its department and can move funds as needed. The dean provides the department with an annual base budget allocated from the school's overall budget for each of the department's primary expense categories. Of the budget allocated to the School of Architecture and Allied Arts, architecture

accounts for 35% of the total budget. There is no evidence that financial resources are impinging on student learning and achievement.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: During the site visit on March 1 (Portland) and March 5 (Eugene) 2013 the NAAB Visiting Team found evidence in the Portland and Eugene Program that students, faculty, and staff have convenient and ADA compliant access to the extensive University of Oregon libraries. This includes both the Eugene and Portland AA&A libraries. Additionally, through cooperative agreements and arrangements, the department's programs have access to the Association of Research Libraries. Hours of access (posted) were aligned with the user's needs during weekdays and weekends. Content included relevant, topical, historical, and current literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional architectural education. An extensive collection of first edition large scale drawings, models, and artwork from the school's inception, produced by students, are widely displayed.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

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

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

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

[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2013 Team Assessment: Statistical data as stipulated by NAAB was provided in the body of the APR (pp. 12,14, 34, 39, 41), and in Part 4, Supplemental Information, Appendix 3: Matrix of Teaching Assignments. A subsequent report was received from the provost during the visiting team's entry interview. This report provided updated information clarifying the overall University of Oregon's increase in "Students of Color" - 2006-07 at 12.1% to 2012-13 at 19.5%. However, there was not a breakdown of the "Students of Color" statistics.

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

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

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The team reviewed the enclosed letter to NAAB (dated 09/04/12) included in the APR (pp. 95). The letter states that it "verify(s) the data submitted to NAAB's annual report submission system by the Department of Architecture at the University of Oregon has been comparable to that submitted by IPEDS and NCES since the 2008 submission cycle."

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The team notes that in the APR (pp. 96) "all of the department's full time, tenure-related faculty have professional degrees in the fields of architecture or interior design and teach studios in addition to non-studio courses in areas of expertise for which they have education credentials or experience." This is substantiated in Part 4: Supplemental Information, Appendix 06, "Matrix of Faculty Credentials."

Furthermore new tenure-track faculty positions are developed to meet evolving curricular needs. Additionally non-tenure track adjunct faculty members contribute additional studio teaching and important subject area expertise. This substantiated in Part 4: Supplemental Information, Appendix 02, "Faculty Resumes."

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

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2013 Team Assessment: Required policy documents were located in the team room and were reviewed by the team and meet the condition.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 284, 430/530, 440/540, 607, 610) and observations of studios and classes demonstrate this ability and sufficiently meet the criteria.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 383, 384, 681, 682) and observations of studios and classes demonstrate this ability and sufficiently meet the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 202, 222, 610, 611) demonstrate this ability and sufficiently meet the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 417/517, 470/570, 471/571) demonstrate this ability and sufficiently meet the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 384, 484, 584, 682) demonstrate this ability and sufficiently meet the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence that the ability to use basic architectural and environmental design principles is found in ARCH 283 and ARCH 680. Principles illustrated include compositional balance, spatial hierarchy, and organization and human movement.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of the ability to comprehend and incorporate relevant design precedents is found in ARCH 430/530; ARCH 484/584. The criterion is met.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of the understanding of the fundamentals of ordering systems is found in ARCH 450/550 and ARCH 491/591. The criterion is met.

A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: *Understanding* of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: While there is evidence of some exposure to these themes in ARCH 201, ARCH 430/530, ARCH 450/550 and ARCH 610, the student work does not illustrate meeting the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This is illustrated primarily in ARCH 440/540 in quizzes and essays, as well as additional evidence in ARCH 430/530.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The criterion is met in ARCH 440/540 and ARCH 491/591.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found evidence of fundamental architectural design skills, critical thinking, and visual communication in digital and traditional media as well as hybrid media. These skills are increasingly developed as the student progresses to higher-level studios. In addition, the vertical studio learning model advances the student's understanding of collaborative learning and displays the program's commitment to design thinking. The program exhibits insufficient evidence to demonstrate student's understanding in the area of historical traditions and global culture.

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the assignments of ARCH 440/540 and ARCH 485/585 and meets the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The ability to design sites and facilities which are accessible is included by reference to universal design in the syllabus for ARCH 384, 440/540, 682/683. The projects in the team room adequately demonstrate an ability to design facilities that are accessible.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Compliance with this criterion appears in design studios ARCH 486/586, ARCH 491/591, and ARCH 492/592.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: There is evidence in ARCH 383, 681, 683 that meets the criterion. The course assignments indicate site inventory and site analysis as key teaching points in the class. Graphic evidence in the presentations exists to demonstrate knowledge and use of these principles.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of life safety exists in student work for ARCH 384, 682, 683 that meet the criterion.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

A.4. Technical Documentation

A.5. Investigative Skills

A.8. Ordering Systems

A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture

B.2. Accessibility

B.3. Sustainability

B.4. Site Design

B.7. Environmental Systems

B.9.Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 485/585, 486/586) demonstrate this ability and adequately meet the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence exists in ARCH 417/517 that meets the criterion. Students possess the understanding of the financial issues related to project delivery costs including project funding and cost-benefit analyses.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of environmental systems including: embodied energy, active/passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting, artificial illumination, and acoustics is well demonstrated in student work from ARCH 491/591 and 492/592.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is well met as evidenced through quizzes and examinations in ARCH 461/561 and through homework and projects in ARCH 462/562.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: ARCH 471 and 571 include specific examples of building envelope systems and the quizzes and tests demonstrate an understanding of applicable performance principles. This criterion is met.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in ARCH 491/591 and 492/592.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 470/570, 471/571) demonstrate this understanding and sufficiently meet the criterion.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The program has exceptional strength in the realm of integrating building practices. Sustainability is the hallmark of the architecture program at the University of Oregon. It appears to permeate most of the classes, and sensitivity to this issue is expected in design. There is evidence in nearly every design studio of the curriculum from organizational charts for sustainability to alternative energy uses such as wind and solar energy. Additionally, the evidence reflects strengths in the areas of environmental systems, structural systems, building envelope systems, and building materials and assemblies. Collectively, these suggest that a platform for leadership in integrated building practices exists in the program and provides significant opportunities for innovation. Accessibility was not clearly illustrated where the program suggested that it would be, which may reflect a lack of coherence in the curricular expectations of these courses.

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

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

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in ARCH 491/591 and ARCH 417/517. The vertical studios ARCH 484/584 emphasize that the collaborative learning environment is encouraged.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The criterion was met in ARCH 440/540.

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

B. Arch

[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The client's role in Architecture is included in ARCH 417/517 and 440/540. Understanding is demonstrated by quizzes and tests. This criterion is met.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of project management is evidenced in ARCH 417/517. This criterion is met.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met in ARCH 417/517.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 417/517) demonstrate this understanding and adequately meet the criterion.

C. 7. **Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding the architect's legal responsibility to the public and client is demonstrated in ARCH 417/517 and meets the criterion.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment This condition is met and is found in ARCH 417/517 and ARCH 484/584 which describe sensitivity to cultural conditions of the client and within the design program.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The examples of student work (ARCH 417/517, 440/540, 484/584) demonstrate this understanding and adequately meet the criterion.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The conditions for Realm C in general, are all met but none are well met. Information was not as easy to locate and this realm is not as strong as the other realms. Specifically, leadership is not strongly demonstrated in coursework but is plainly present in the student activism in extracurricular activities. There are a number of organizations that have been created by students. DesignBridge, for example, was formed by architectural students and, due to its relevancy and alignment with the program's culture, has been integrated into the curriculum.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this condition being met in the letter of re-accreditation dated July 31, 2007. This was also confirmed on the University of Oregon website.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The Bachelor of Architecture requires 231 quarter credits (154 semester credit equivalent) of which 87 (58 semester credit equivalent) are allocated for General Studies. Students within the B.Arch. engage in numerous minors outside of the department including business, environmental studies, and foreign languages. Other minors within the school include interior architecture, landscape architecture, art history, and historic preservation. The Master of Architecture track I (3+ year) program requires 144 quarter credits (96 semester credits) and the Master of Architecture track II (2 year) program requires 87 quarter credits (58 semester credit equivalent). M.Arch. students apply a minimum of 15 credits to a focus area such as: architectural media, history and theory, craft and fabrication, housing, human and social contexts, sustainable technology, and place and urbanism. Graduate students are eligible to complete numerous graduate certificates including: technical teaching in architecture, ecological design, museum studies, leadership in sustainability, and new media and culture.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The Architecture Program Report prepared for the 2013 NAAB accreditation visit on pp.117-119 describes the process by which the curriculum is evaluated and modified. This condition is met.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The procedures and guidelines documented in the UO Student Orientation, Advising, and Admissions Information sufficiently meet the criterion.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The UO Department of Architecture website sufficiently meets the criterion.

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

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The UO Department of Architecture website sufficiently meets the criterion.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org
The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
The Emerging Professional's Companion
www.NCARB.org
www.aia.org
www.aias.org
www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The UO Department of Architecture website sufficiently meets the criterion.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:

All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The UO Department of Architecture website sufficiently meets the criterion.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The UO Department of Architecture website sufficiently meets the criterion.

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference University of Oregon, *APR,* pp. 1-4

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

Reference University of Oregon, APR, pp . 4-6

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference University of Oregon, APR, pp. 22-26

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference University of Oregon, APR, pp..26-31

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A. A.3: Visual Communication Skills

The mix of media represented in presentations and their high ability level is something the program should take great pride.

B. B.3: Sustainability

The program should be lauded for its continued excellence in the area of sustainable design. The leadership that student organizations exhibit in this area reflects the depth to which this topic is ingrained in the ethos of the program.

C. B.8: Environmental Systems

Student ability demonstrates an exemplary command of the topic. This is clear in regard to daylighting, building performance, passive design, and embodied energy. The Baker Lighting Laboratories and Energy Studies in Building Laboratories are significant resources and are unique assets within architectural education.

D. B.9: Structural Systems

The design orientation of these classes reflect the truest notion of this SPC with its focus on understanding principles with an eye toward application.

E. B.10: Building Envelope Systems

Student work demonstrated an impressive ability to blend performance and aesthetics.

F. B.12: Building Materials and Assemblies

This criterion is inherent throughout the program. A strong emphasis on assemblies is demonstrated in the student work and design-build programs.

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Kenneth Martin, AIA, NOMAC, Principal
The OBSIDIAN Group
1513 Walnut Street
Suite 250
Cary, NC 27540
(919) 380-6700
(919) 656-6474 mobile
(919) 380-6464 fax
kmartin@theobsidiangroup.com

Representing the ACSA
Hsu-Jen Huang, Ph.D.
Savannah College of Art and Design
Department of Architecture
229 MLK, Jr. Blvd.
Savannah, GA 31402
(912) 525-6868
(912) 525-6904 fax
hhuang@scad.edu

Representing the AIAS
Angie M. Tabrizi
802 E. State Street
Apt. 304
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(608) 843-9933
angie.tabrizi@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
John F. Miller, FAIA, Principal
HMFH Architects, Inc.
130 Bishop Allen Drive
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 492-2200 ext. 2115
(617) 876-9775 fax
jmiller@hmfh.com

Representing the ACSA
Keith Diaz Moore, Ph.D., AIA
Associate Dean for Graduate Studies
School of Architecture, Design and Planning
The University of Kansas
1465 Jayhawk Blvd., Marvin 200
Lawrence, KS 66045
(785) 864-5088
diazmoore@ku.edu

Non-voring member
Robert W. Hastings, FAIA
Trimet
710 NE Holladay Street
Portland, OR
(503) 962-2128
hastingsb@trimet.org

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Kenneth Martin, AIA, NOMAC
Team Chair — Representing the AIA

Hsu-Jen Huang, Ph.D.
Team member — Representing the ACSA

Angie M. Tabrizi
Team member — Representing the AIAS

John F. Miller, FAIA
Team member — Representing the NCARB

Keith Diaz Moore, Ph.D., AIA
Team Member — Representing the ACSA

Robert W. Hastings, FAIA — Non-voting member

Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
School of Architecture and Allied Arts

Date: April 29, 2013

Cassandra Pair
Accreditation Manager
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.
1101 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036

We would like to request that NAAB considers making a revision to the Final Draft VTR for the University of Oregon. Specifically, we want to address one issue that was found to be a Cause of Concern by the NAAB Visiting Team:

3. Causes of Concern (p.1)
D. Unpaid Internships are unethical, raise a concern about consistency with AIA policy, and should not be allowed.

Our programs do not sanction or advise students to work in unpaid internships. We do have a Practicum course and we discussed the content of this course with several practitioners to see if it in any way violates AIA policy. In particular, we asked William Seider, FAIA, who is the AIA Northwest and Pacific Region Director and a principal of PIVOT Architecture, a firm that has participated in our Practicum course for at least 20 years, to look into this issue. This is what he sent us:

"As promised, while at Grassroots last week I did have a chance to speak with Jay Stephens, who is the head legal counsel for AIA National. I questioned him about the issue of ethics and the UO Practicum Student program. After describing the program with the following features Jay noted that he did not think that we were violating the AIA Code of Ethics by continuing this Practicum Class participation:

- *Students are enrolled in, pay for and get academic credit for the Practicum Program Class*
- *Students spend time in an architect's office for twelve hours a week through a term period*
- *Students receive no pay or other remuneration from the firms they are assigned to*
- *Students do a variety of assignments while at the firm but that they are not taking the place of a firm employee*

Jay referenced the Rules of the Board for another validation that we are not violating the Code of Ethics or other AIA rule. Here is the referenced paragraph that is used to define the term "working student", especially as it applies to honor and other award winners, but is equally relevant in our question:

> *10.112 Definition and Interpretation of the Term —"Working Students". As used in the Rules of the Board, the term —working students shall not include any individual satisfying the following conditions: (a) the individual is enrolled in a regular course of study calculated to lead to the award of a degree in architecture or other design-related discipline from an accredited educational institution; and (b) the individual is undertaking the unpaid internship for academic credit; and (c)*

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE
210 Lawrence Hall, 1206 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1206
T (541) 346-3656 F (541) 346-3626 http://architecture.uoregon.edu

the educational institution specifies that, in order to receive such academic credit, the individual is permitted to receive no (or only nominal) compensation in connection with the internship; and (d) such arrangement is consistent with the applicable laws and regulations of the jurisdiction (whether federal, state or other) governing the arrangement. The employment of such an individual shall not be grounds for preventing any person from executing any declaration referenced in Sections 2.311, 6.613, 6.715, 10.011, 10.111, 10.31, 10.42, or 10.53 of the Rules of the Board.

In Jay's opinion the Practicum Students in our offices each term ARE NOT "working students" according to the above definition in the Rules of the Board."

We believe that our Practicum course does not constitute an "unpaid internship" and is consistent with AIA policy. We do not have any other program that could be construed as an "unpaid internship," so we would like to request that NAAB accepts that the Practicum course is ethical and is consistent with AIA policy, and that they remove this issue from the list of "Causes of Concern."

Thank you,

Judith Sheine

Judith E. Sheine
Professor and Department Head
Department of Architecture
University of Oregon