

**University of Oregon**

**Interim Progress Report for 2015**

***Instructions and Template***

Date submitted to the NAAB: **November 24, 2015**

## **Contents**

1. Instructions and Template Guidelines
2. Executive Summary of the Most Recent Visit
3. Template
  - a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria
  - b. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
  - c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
  - d. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)
  - e. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

# 1. INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

## Purpose

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of interim progress reports at defined intervals after an eight-year or four-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

This narrative report, supported by documentation, covers three areas:

1. The program's progress in addressing not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, or Causes of Concern from the most recent Visiting Team Report.
2. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.
3. Responses to changes in the NAAB Conditions since your last visit (Note: Only required if Conditions have changed since your last visit)

## Supporting Documentation

1. The narrative should describe in detail all changes in the program made in response to not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, and Causes of Concern.
2. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the anticipated contribution to the program for new hires and include either a narrative biography or one-page CV.
3. Provide detailed descriptions of changes to the curriculum that have been made in response to not-met Student Performance Criteria. Identify any specific outcomes expected to student performance. Attach new or revised syllabi of required courses that address unmet SPC.
4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the NAAB team at the next accreditation visit.

## Outcomes

IPRs are reviewed by a panel of three: one current NAAB director, one former NAAB director, and one experienced team chair.<sup>1</sup> The panel may make one of three recommendations to the Board regarding the interim report:

1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR.
2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies but require the program to provide additional information (e.g., examples of actions taken to address deficiencies).
3. Reject the interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year but not more than three years, thereby shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified and a copy sent to the program administrator. A schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an Architecture Program Report. The annual statistical report (see Section 9 of the 2014 Conditions) is still required.

## Deadline and Contacts

IPRs are due on November 30. They are submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report System (ARS). Contact Kesha Abdul Mateen ([kabdul@naab.org](mailto:kabdul@naab.org)) with questions.

## Instructions

1. Type all responses in the designated text areas.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format. Pages should be numbered.
3. Reports are limited to 25 pages/10 MBs.
4. Supporting documentation should be included in the body of the report.
5. Student work is not to be submitted as documentation for a two-year IPR.

---

<sup>1</sup> The team chair will not have participated in a team during the year in which the original decision on a term of accreditation was made.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF 2013 NAAB VISIT

### CONDITIONS NOT MET

<b>2013 VTR</b>
I.1.4 Long-Range Planning

### STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

<b>2013 VTR</b>
A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture

### CAUSES OF CONCERN

<b>2013 VTR</b>
Relationship between Eugene and Portland campuses and curriculum
Lack of differentiation of graduate learning experience and expectation in course content
Academic advising
Unpaid internships
Inconsistency in delivery of capstone studios
Student command of digital technology
Social Equity

### 3. TEMPLATE

**Interim Progress Report**  
**University of Oregon**  
**School of Architecture and Allied Arts**  
**B. Arch. [231 quarter credit hours]**  
**M. Arch. Track I [non-architecture degree + 144 quarter credit hours]**  
**Track II [Pre-professional degree + 87 quarter credit hours]**  
*Last APR submission: September 7, 2012*  
*Year of the previous visit: 2013*

*Please update contact information as necessary since the last APR was submitted.*

**Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located:** [Judith Sheine](#)

**Provost:** [Scott Coltrane](#)

**President of the institution:** [Michael Schill](#)

**Individual submitting the Interim Progress Report:** [Judith Sheine](#)

**Name of individual(s) to whom questions should be directed:** [Judith Sheine](#)

**Current term of accreditation:** 8 year term

Text from the most recent VTR or APR is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

## a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

### I.1.4 Long-Range Planning

*2013 Visiting 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.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** In September 2013 the department began a Strategic Planning process that resulted in a Strategic Plan that was approved by a vote of the faculty in September 2015. The Strategic Plan includes both long-range and short-term plans, with goals, actions and timelines included. The two-year process is described in some detail in the introduction to the Strategic Plan. It involved several faculty retreats, a number of focus groups and a University Program Review (2014-15). The faculty began acting on some of the issues that emerged as early as 2013 and is continuing to address others in the coming year. The Strategic Plan is included in this submission.

### A.9 Historical Traditions & Global Culture

*2013 Visiting 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.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** This is an issue that is addressed in our Strategic Plan. Our core history courses that are required for the B.Arch. students, ARH 314 and ARH 315, are taught by faculty in the Department of the History of Art and Architecture. The faculty teaching those courses undertook an update of them in 2014-15 to include considerable new material on Historic Traditions and Global Culture. Those syllabi are included in this document (please note: the ARH faculty do not include the NAAB SPC in their syllabi). In addition, ARCH 440/540 Human Context of Design, which is required for all B.Arch. and M.Arch. students, was updated in 2014-15 to include additional material addressing global issues, and this syllabus is also included in this submission. The Department Curriculum Committee is charged with taking up a discussion of the History/Theory sequences in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch. programs this year, both in response to the NAAB requirements and in response to our own internal concerns and opportunities, including new faculty personnel in the Department of the History of Art and Architecture.

## b. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern

- **Relationship between Eugene and Portland campuses and curriculum**

2013 Visiting Team Comments: 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.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** We have been working on improved communication between the Eugene and Portland campuses on many fronts. The central issue concerning differential course content between the two department locations was in the Structures and Environmental Controls courses. These courses are taught in alternate years in Portland and we have made the most progress in the Structures courses. Since fall 2013, we hired a new adjunct faculty member in Portland who now uses the same syllabi as those developed for the Eugene Structures courses. One of the Eugene GTFs runs the discussion section in Portland and all grading is done with the faculty and GTFs in Eugene. In addition, one of the Eugene Structures faculty members makes frequent trips to Portland to coordinate assignments. We are now starting to work on the Environmental Controls classes, with a goal of coordinating the Eugene and Portland courses, similar to what we have done with the Structures classes, in 2016-17, when they will be offered next.

We have closer communication between the Eugene and Portland programs in general now than in 2013. Several faculty members teach classes in both locations and the Department Head and Portland Director are in regular and close communication about course offerings, adjunct faculty and other pertinent issues at the Portland location.

- **Lack of differentiation of graduate learning experience and expectation in course content**

2013 Visiting Team Comments: 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.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** Since the 2013 NAAB visit, the Department has implemented three new graduate specializations (16 credit areas of concentration that appear on students' transcripts as a Specialization): Urban Architecture and Urban Design; Housing; and Interior Architecture. The Curriculum and Graduate Studies Committees are charged with developing additional proposals for more differentiation of graduate course content, starting this year, as it has been an internal concern for some time (addressed in the Strategic Plan). While it is not clear how this concern impacts any NAAB condition or SPC, we do see a need for further differentiation of graduate expectations. When we wrote the report for the University Program Review in 2014-15, we found that in a given quarter about 65% of our graduate students are involved in research projects with faculty through independent studies, which indicated that our graduate students are interested in and benefit from the research areas of the faculty to enhance their professional education. We are continuing to explore a number of ways in which we can enrich and differentiate the graduate experience.

- **Academic advising**

2013 Visiting Team Comments: Academic advising seems inconsistent and a clear process has not been developed.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** In fall 2014 the Department hired a staff member who manages student services and has the primary responsibility for student advising. He works closely with the Department Head and Director of Graduate Studies and also makes several trips each month

to meet with students in Portland (he is also available to them by e-mail and phone). This has vastly improved the quality and consistency of advising in the department.

- **Unpaid Internships**

*2013 Visiting Team Comments:* Unpaid internships are unethical, raise a concern about consistency with AIA policy, and should not be allowed.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** The Practicum course syllabus has been rewritten to make it explicit that students assigned to a Practicum in an office cannot do any work that is for billable hours. We have worked closely with the AIA Southwest Oregon chapter to craft the Practicum to conform to AIA standards and believe we have now addressed this issue ethically. The syllabus for the Practicum course, ARCH 409/609 is included in this submission.

- **Inconsistency in delivery of capstone studios**

*2013 Visiting Team Comments:* 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.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** We have been addressing the issue of the relative complexity of projects in the capstone or “terminal” studios. The faculty discussed this issue after the NAAB visit and the Head discusses the issue with faculty as they develop their terminal studio proposals; in general, the complexity of the projects is much more consistent. We are scheduled to start a discussion about the terminal studios at the next faculty meeting (Dec. 8, 2015) in which we will address the issue of the prerequisite seminars, as well as issues involving scheduling and student placement.

- **Student command of digital technology**

*2013 Visiting Team Comments:* There is uncertainty as to whether students have a command of digital technology, its application, and the student’s preparation for the profession.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** We have made some progress in this area, and have plans for more, as noted in our Strategic Plan. We started closely coordinating the introductory digital media class with the concurrent introductory design studio in 2012 in the B.Arch. program and in fall 2014 for the M.Arch. program. In addition, we now offer two or three design media courses each year in Eugene and one in Portland that emphasize digital tools, and at least three courses each year in Eugene and two in Portland that focus on Building Information Modeling (Revit). We are now seeing a far greater command of digital media technology evident in student design presentations than we did two years ago.

- **Social Equity**

*2013 Visiting Team Comments:* While the program has made gains in relation to social equity, there remains a need to improve diversity amongst students, faculty, and staff.

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** The percentage of underrepresented minorities has been steadily increasing in our professional programs, from 22.4% in fall 2011, to 25.3% in fall 2014. Both the University and the Department have been engaged in recruiting efforts to increase minority enrollment in our programs. Since fall 2013 the department has been participating in College and Career Fairs in Boston, Chicago and at the annual NOMA conference, as well as the ACSA Virtual Expo. We have also made our portfolio requirements for admission much more flexible, to encourage students who do not have art classes or access to digital graphics programs to apply. Our students have recently formed a student group called STAnDD that focuses on issues relating to women and minority groups in the



profession. That group has organized panel discussions and speakers focused on those issues, funded by the ASUO, the UO student organization that distributes funds to student clubs.

It is difficult to change the composition of the tenure-track and tenured faculty without new positions. Since 2011, we have only had one tenure-track search, with no prospects for another for at least a year or two. The one search we had was for a faculty member to take over as Director of the Energy Studies in Buildings Laboratory from a very senior faculty member; while the search produced a fairly diverse group of applicants, we hired a white male for this position (the tenure-track line replaced a white female who retired). When we were approved for the search, UO's Academic Affairs sent us an analysis of our department diversity statistics as compared to the available pool of candidates in the U.S. They concluded that while we were low in Latino or Hispanic faculty (we have one Latino faculty member and according to the stats, we should have two), we were otherwise meeting the targets for minority faculty representation based on the available pool in our field and were told that we did not need a minority recruitment plan. However, we certainly plan to make recruiting excellent minority candidates a priority in future searches. The adjunct faculty composition changes annually and we try to recruit a diverse group. We were fortunate to have an African-American female adjunct faculty member join us last year and to continue teaching this year, and have recently recruited several minority adjuncts as studio instructors. We are searching to fill two new staff positions in the department office and are working with the UO Human Resources office to identify qualified minority candidates.

### **c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program**

*Please report such changes as the following: faculty retirement/succession planning; administration changes (dean, department chair, provost); changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures); new opportunities for collaboration; changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures); significant changes in educational approach or philosophy; changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building planned, cancellation of plans for new building).*

**University of Oregon, 2015 Response:** As noted above, we had a successful tenure-track search in 2014-15. Associate Professor Glenda Utsey retired in summer 2015 and we searched for a faculty member in environmental controls and integrated building systems that could take over as Director of the Energy Studies in Building Laboratory from Professor GZ Brown. We hired Associate Professor Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg, who had an impressive record of accomplishment in the Integrated Design Lab he founded and ran at the University of Idaho. He joined our department in fall 2015 (his bio is included in this submission). We anticipate a number of retirements starting in 2018 and are working with the AAA Dean's office and the new UO Administration on planning for new positions focused on identified areas of excellence in our department.

We have had a number of changes in administrative leadership at the university since the 2013 NAAB visit. As noted by the visiting team, the state legislature created independent boards for UO, Oregon State University and Portland State University; these took effect July 1, 2014. President Gottfredson resigned in August 2014. Within a few days, our newly appointed Provost, Scott Coltrane, became Interim President and the School of Architecture and Allied Arts Dean, Frances Bronet, became the UO Interim Provost, with AAA Associate Dean Brook Muller, an Associate Professor in the Architecture Department, becoming Acting, then Interim AAA Dean, when Bronet accepted a position as Provost of IIT in July 2015. Michael Schill became the new UO President in July 2015 and Scott Coltrane returned to his role as Provost. AAA has begun a search for a new Dean, which we expect will conclude with a new Dean for 2016-17.

Our undergraduate enrollment has remained fairly steady, but we had drops in graduate enrollment for the past three years. However, in fall 2015 we have had an increase in graduate enrollment (about 30 additional architecture M.Arch. students), which is very promising. The deficit we have been working with for the past three years has been significantly decreased by this additional enrollment.

We have a very promising new collaboration with Oregon State University's Colleges of Forestry and Engineering, with a newly formed joint National Center for Advanced Wood Products Manufacturing and Design, funded by the Oregon Legislature and the USDA. This effort has brought substantial research funding and two new non-tenure-track research positions into the department and the potential for a joint degree program with OSU.

Plans for a new building for AAA have been in flux for some time and continue to be evolving. It looks like the new plan will include renovation of existing facilities and some additional new construction that is more likely to be successful than the former very ambitious plan that called for the construction of new space for all of AAA. This summer, the university provided funds for converting two classrooms to much needed computer labs and AAA provided funds for upgrades (flooring, shades, wall surfaces, furniture and projectors) for five of our classrooms; these improvements have been of considerable benefit to the department.

#### **d. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions**

**University of Oregon, 2015 update:** Our 2013 NAAB visit was subject to the 2009 NAAB Conditions. The 2014 NAAB Conditions have not changed substantially in content from those of 2009, although there has been some reorganization. However, there are two areas that are significant in the area of curriculum. We welcome the change in the five perspectives and believe that our current programs support them. In particular, as our department has long been recognized as a leader in the area of sustainable design, we are very pleased to see that Stewardship of the Environment is now one of the perspectives and that it has also been incorporated as a student learning aspiration for Realm B. Our Strategic Plan calls for finding even more opportunities to integrate sustainable design practices into our curriculum.

The other area that will affect curriculum is in the creation of Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions, which has replaced what we used to call the comprehensive project. As integrated building systems have been central to our department's approach to sustainable design, we believe we will be able to meet the criteria in this realm in the future, particularly with the addition of our new tenure-track hire. We are continuing to seek additional paths to integrating sustainable practices into all aspects of our curriculum.

#### **e. Appendix** (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

**University of Oregon, 2015 update:**

1. Department of Architecture Strategic Plan
2. ARH 314
3. ARH 315
4. ARCH 4/540
5. ARCH 4/609
6. Kevin Van Den Wymelenberg Bio