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1. **Summary of Team Findings**

1. **Team Comments**

   The Team extends sincere thanks to Dean Van Lengen, Associate Dean Sherman, Department Chair Barton, Architecture Director Menefee, as well as associated directors, chairs, staff, and particularly the faculty and students at the University of Virginia School of Architecture for the thorough preparation of program materials, the warm reception and the gracious hospitality that have made our work here over the past several days so rewarding.

   The professional program in architecture at the University of Virginia benefits from clear strengths: Among them, a unique place in the history and culture—not only of Mr. Jefferson's university, but also of the nation. It is a fundamentally strong program, with a rich tradition, abundantly deserving of its national stature.

   The team lauds the program's two new, extraordinary, faculty-designed expansions—and notes their demonstrable impact on faculty, on students, on alumni—and across the university campus. The new construction, long championed by Dean Van Lengen, has lent the program a distinct physical identity, commensurate with, and expressive of, the core values of those it represents.

   Simultaneously, and significantly, the team notes that the program has begun to cement a new national academic identity grounded in the Jeffersonian ideals of citizenship and social responsibility that are the hallmark of the profession. Specifically, the team applauds recent outstanding outreach research efforts on the part of program faculty. These have enhanced the program’s reputation, placing it at the forefront of a new, ethically engaged, socially responsive, activist, interdisciplinary, and entrepreneurial model of professional practice.

   The team particularly credits Department Chair Barton, in conjunction with his administrative colleagues and predecessors, for the sustained academic leadership that has supported and nurtured these remarkable research accomplishments.

2. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit**

   **Condition 7, Physical Resources (2003):** The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning: office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

   **Previous Team Report (2003):** Physical resources remain a substantial issue, even burden, for the program. Several aspects of the facilities are not in compliance with the standards for accreditation, such as faculty office space, adequate seminar and lecture spaces, and an overcrowding of the studio environment that raises concerns of code violations.

   The team is pleased to note that a strategy is in place to address the facilities issues, and that it is a revision from the plan at the time of the 1998 visit. The plan utilizes faculty members from the program to carry out strategic, smaller-scale additions and interventions to the existing building. The team applauds this strategy from several points of view: the design standards are high, the use of program faculty welcome, and the opportunity to demonstrate to the local community the talents cultivated within the program is meaningful.

   Yet the team concurs in its recommendation that this plan must achieve a substantial degree of implementation by the time of the next visit. We encourage the school administration to remain
focused on both achieving this program and promoting the process to the broad constituency of the school as a means of lifting the program to an even higher level.

As a minor point to this issue, the workshop, in particular, needs immediate attention: there are issues of proper working ventilation and adequate working areas around equipment that raise safety concerns. We appreciate the shop director's commitment to safety in a general sense, as is evidenced by his willingness to handle more advanced equipment on the students' behalf due to safety concerns. Yet we note that this involvement also truncates the learning opportunity of the shop, and we advocate for improvements of shop facilities in a manner that encourages student access to all available equipment in furthering the goals of the program.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: Vigorously advocated by Dean Van Lungen and generously supported by President Casteen and Provost Garson, a series of strategic and elegant new additions to Campbell Hall have allowed the program to meet the preponderance of the physical plant challenges identified in the 2003 VTR. The new East Wing, designed by Professor W.G. Clark, adds much-needed exhibition, jury, seminar, and meeting space to the original Belluschi structure. The new wing graciously resolves previous accessibility and way-finding concerns — and serves as beacon for the architecture program on the UVA campus. The South Wing, designed by Associate Dean William Sherman, provides new offices for program faculty adjoining three levels of student-occupied studio space. The resulting adjacencies enrich faculty interaction with students while facilitating school collegiality. Still in progress, a new landscape plan will complete the integration of the program facility to the larger campus. (See also Condition 8, Physical Resources, below)

Criterion 12.11, Non-Western Traditions (2003): Awareness of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2003): With the exception of structural studies of buildings from the Asian area, there is no evidence of use in the core curriculum. Papers and projects that used building types for comparison relied very heavily on Western world traditions. The fact that this criterion was not met is puzzling because it continues a deficiency noted in the 1998 visit and occurs in a school with a substantial program in architectural history.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: As in 1998 and 2003, this Criterion, now re-numbered 13.9, remains Not Met for both the M. Arch. (2 years) and the M. Arch. (3.5 years) Programs (See 13.9, below)


Previous Team Report (2003): Clear delineation of life-safety systems is not evident in the curriculum, either in the design studios or the support courses. The Comprehensive Studio projects presented for the team's review, for example, do not consistently display an awareness of egress requirements; furthermore, the team found no evidence of satisfaction of this criterion in places where it was expected according to the Curricular Matrix, i.e., ARC 823. This represents a cause for concern, given the fact that this criterion was not met in the 1998 report. Given the high degree of sophistication with which other building systems are clearly integrated into the design curriculum, we encourage the program to focus on this criterion for the next visit and demonstrate that it has been addressed directly.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This Criterion is now Met for both the M. Arch. (2 years) and the M. Arch. (3.5 years) Programs (See 13.20, below)
**Criterion 12.30, Program Preparation (2003):** Ability to assemble a comprehensive program for an architecture project, including an assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and an assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

**Previous Team Report (2003):** The team did not find meaningful evidence for the development of a comprehensive program process anywhere in the review materials.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** This Criterion is now Met for both the M. Arch. (2 years) and the M. Arch. (3.5 years) Programs (See 13.16, below)

**[Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated February 12, 2003]:**

Although the team found the professional program in Architecture to be strong, several areas could develop into threats to the quality of the program. Foremost among these is funding. Given the extraordinarily difficult budget circumstances many states, and universities, find themselves in today, the team applauds the efforts of the president, provost, dean, and chair to address the unique circumstances of the School of Architecture and its programs. However, we found the program to be stretched financially in manners that we do not believe can be maintained. Full-time faculty appointments and levels of staffing are the most apparent problems in this regard. Yet issues of providing support to existing faculty members, especially those junior faculty members who must have resources to pursue their research and professional development, are substantial, too.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** Funding and diminished faculty numbers continue to be a concern. (See Causes for Concern and Conditions Not Met, below).

At the same time, the team strongly believes that these difficult administrative circumstances should not be allowed to obscure substantive programmatic discussions, especially those between programs in the School of Architecture. We found that these discussions were taking place within the various programs within the school (including Architecture), but not very effectively between programs, i.e., at the level of the school itself. We encourage the school and its programs to clarify what we call "academic governance," namely what interrelated goals exist among the affiliated programs within the school and how they can be achieved. The issue of outreach, addressed initially in Team Comments, is one such area that the team believes would benefit from this discussion. The place of a required thesis in the M. Arch. curriculum is another. And a third is expanding joint activities and opportunities between programs that are not, perhaps, related as well as one might expect, such as Architecture and Historic Preservation. It is worth noting that the students, in particular, have figured out where interdisciplinary opportunities exist, and have taken advantage of them. We strongly believe that the students must be actively engaged in any process of academic governance that occurs.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** A thoroughgoing curricular review is currently in progress. Nonetheless, aspects of interdisciplinarity, outreach and self-assessment remain a concern. (See notes under Causes for Concern, below)

The team was somewhat surprised to find that two concerns about Student Performance Criteria from the 1998 visit have not been corrected, and we urge the program to focus on these immediately. The team was pleased to see the process that is in place for addressing facilities issues: as we noted in the Team Comment section, there is much to applaud in the process now underway. At the same time, the team notes that the condition for Physical Facilities was unmet in the 1998 visit and remains unmet at this time. We encourage all concerned—university
administration, school administration—to remain focused on this issue and to achieve substantial advancement in facilities by the time of the next visit. We request that the annual reports to NAAB demonstrate clear progress towards improvement of facilities.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: As noted above and in the body of the report below, the preponderance of deficiencies in physical facilities have been met by the additions to Campbell Hall. As also noted above and in 13.9, below, one significant deficiency in the student performance criteria remains Not Met.

Finally, the team noted that the perception of the unique and substantial strengths of the professional program in Architecture could be enhanced within the university community. We applaud the efforts of the dean, in particular, to raise this awareness among key university administrators, and we found clear results from that effort. Yet it is time for others in the program and the school to reinforce that effort: we encourage senior faculty members to make themselves available to serve in university-wide areas of responsibility, and enhance the day-to-day engagement of other disciplines with Architecture in this process. We encourage the provost and the president to include representatives of the School of Architecture in a variety of areas where the demonstration of university citizenship is needed. The team found the talents among program faculty both notable and underused in this regard.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: Valued members of several university committees and task forces, program faculty are well positioned to increase their levels of participation in collegial governance. (See additional notes under Causes for Concern, below).

3. Conditions/Criteria Well Met:

1.3 Architecture Education and Students
13.6 Fundamental Design Skills

4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met:

2.0 Program Self-Assessment
6.0 Human Resources
10.0 Financial Resources
13.9 Non-Western Traditions
13.13 Human Diversity
13.25 Construction Cost Control
13.30 Architectural Practice

5. Causes of Concern

Funding: At the University of Virginia, the 2009 Visiting Team found an academically, intellectually, and pedagogically sound professional program in Architecture, now housed in an enviable new facility. However, the team also found substantial evidence that several of the 2003 causes for concern remain. These are, perhaps, even more pronounced today than they were six years ago. Chief among them is funding. The successful completion of the new Campbell Hall construction, coupled with an increasingly difficult economic climate worldwide, has taxed the financial capacity of the School of Architecture. The team commends the willingness of President Casteen, Provost Garson, Dean Van Lagen, Associate Dean Sherman, Chair Barton, and Director Menefee to address the unique circumstances of the School of Architecture and
the professional programs in Architecture. Notwithstanding, the 2009 Team continues to find that the finances of the professional programs are stretched substantially—and unsustainably. As in 2003, faculty appointments, levels of staffing, and levels of financial support for students are the most apparent problems. The programs keenly feel the void left by the recent departure of six valued members of the full-time faculty—two of them key senior faculty colleagues. The resulting gap, and the subsequent reliance on a substantial adjunct faculty compliment, has already hampered the ability of the program to deliver the full range of its required seminar coursework. Equally important, it has impeded the adequate introduction of students to important emerging areas of the academic discipline and the professional curriculum. (See 10.0, below)

**Diminished Faculty:** For a faculty that places commendably high value on a deeply engaged teaching culture, and in a larger academic context that increasingly prizes and seeks to nurture collaborative, interdisciplinary, service-based research across the university campus, the program’s diminished faculty ranks place extraordinary and unsustainable demands on a gifted, energetic and entrepreneurial faculty serving in both academic and administrative roles. (See Condition 6.0, below)

**Student Aid and Minority Recruitment:** Simultaneously, the team notes that open-handed institutional support of student aid and minority recruitment—in the areas of both faculty ranks and the student body—are key components of cementing the program’s stated and long-standing commitment to providing the broadest possible access to the profession. The legacy of Mr. Jefferson is embodied in this commitment, which demands the attention of the program. (See Conditions 4.0 and 10.0, below)

**Curricular Review and Engagement in the University Community:** The team warmly applauds the thoroughgoing curricular review currently underway within the program. In that process, however, it encourages program faculty to think broadly as well as narrowly about its role in the larger university; to facilitate and actively pursue interconnections across the university community and across areas of the professional curriculum; and to embrace the generative potential that new constructive and representational technologies—and new integrative models of interdisciplinary and entrepreneurial research and practice—are bringing to the profession. Additionally, the team urges the program to address the non-western traditions of our discipline through its required curriculum. As in 1998 and again in 2003, that Student Performance Criterion remains not met. (See, among others, Criterion 13.9, below)

**Assessment Mechanisms:** Finally, the team encourages the program to put in place robust internal and external assessment mechanisms. These will render the program increasingly nimble, facilitating its ability to measure its successes against its aspirations, and to identify the broadest possible range of its future opportunities. (See Condition 2.0, below)
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. Arch. (2 years)
M. Arch. (3.5 years)

As noted above, the School of Architecture benefits from its unique place in the history and culture of the University of Virginia. With accredited professional programs of national stature, the School of Architecture enhances the standing and visibility of the University. Recent outstanding outreach research efforts on the part of program faculty have enhanced the reputation of the programs, placing them at the forefront of a new model of professional practice grounded in the Jeffersonian ideals of citizenship and social responsibility that are the hallmark of the profession.

Two extraordinary building additions to Campbell Hall demonstrate a substantial level of university support for the work of the School. The new expansion projects, designed by distinguished members of the architecture program faculty, have lent the School a distinct physical identity on campus. Through their engagement in various aspects of university life, program faculty and administrators are augmenting that new visibility. Faculty serve on university committees and task forces; teach courses in the university curriculum outside the School; have commenced interdisciplinary research with faculty members in academic units across the university; and have accepted leadership roles in shaping key, university-wide environmental sustainability initiatives.

The university administration has expressed a keen interest in engaging the unique skills and perspectives of program faculty and students. The team encourages a continued and increasingly substantive School of Architecture presence in the larger university community.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program’s mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to
the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students' diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Architecture program students are encouraged to develop leadership, communication, ethical, and intellectual skills in required coursework and through a range of optional extramural activities and teaching assistantships. Faculty interaction with and support of students is both strong and appreciated. Socially conscious research projects conducted by program faculty engage interested students in applying their skills in meaningful ways, affording them opportunities to encounter aspects of architectural practice as their own studio projects develop. Asked about their future career plans, many expressed a desire to become educators as well as practicing architects.

Students value the interdisciplinarity of their educational affiliations with departments in landscape architecture history and planning, citing these—and the opportunity to pursue dual degrees—as central to their decision to study at UVA.

The program supports student organizations such as AIAS and NOMAS, and has recently helped organize the Student Association of Graduate Architects (SAGA), a new organization giving voice to the particular interests and concerns of graduate students. In 2004, seeking to emphasize individual responsibility and environmental awareness, architecture students helped found the campus-wide Green Grounds Group around the issues of sustainable planning and design.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program’s relationship with the state registration boards; the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students’ understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through faculty involvement, the architecture program has historically enjoyed a good relationship with the state registration board. The visiting team found evidence that students are aware of the pathway to professional licensure, and that they are exposed to IDP and continuing education through ARCH 848, the professional practice coursework. A member of the Virginia Architectural Registration Board annually presents registration information to students. Additionally, active student organizations regularly create and distribute registration information to the student body.

The team notes that ARCH 848 is offered during the final semester of each M. Arch. program track. Earlier presentation of IDP information might enable students to take fullest advantage of their eligibility to initiate a Council (NCARB) record as early in their education as the third year of the pre-professional program.
1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program's particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects' obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visiting team was encouraged to find that a significant relationship exists between the architecture program and the professional community of Northern Virginia. The program has a good working relationship with practicing architects of the region. A number serve as design jury critics and adjunct faculty members --and students benefit from exposure to practicing professionals in the classroom. Many faculty members are licensed architects and hold memberships in professional organizations such as the AIA. The NCARB Region 2 Director and chair of the Architectural Division of the Virginia Registration Board is a UVA graduate and an active participant in and advocate for the program.

The team found open communication and a shared sense of purpose between the program and regional professionals. This enhances students' academic experiences, fosters opportunity for student internships, and encourages an ongoing dialogue on career development opportunities between students and professionals.

Additionally and significantly, UVA students are exposed to expanded definitions of the profession --and of the role of the architect in society-- through a range of available interdisciplinary program coursework, and through participation in faculty research projects that broaden normative depictions of professional responsibilities in architecture.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.
Through a broad range of exemplary faculty-led community outreach/research efforts, the program in architecture at the University of Virginia emphasizes the imperative of the profession to civic engagement and public service. Social and ecological sustainability, professional activism and environmental awareness are strongly articulated across the curricular offerings of the program.

Such faculty research engagements as the Learning Barge, EcoMOD, Project reCOVER, and Urban Habitats, carried out both locally and abroad, bring students in direct contact with a broad range of public and professional stakeholders. The experiences give them insight to the complex, interdisciplinary, often multi-cultural processes that define architecture as a social art.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty’s, students’, and graduates’ views on the program’s curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program’s focus and pedagogy.

While the self-study prepared by the program includes an ambitious mission statement, the visiting team found only limited evidence of a clearly articulated strategic plan, formulated with broad internal and external input that might serve to guide the school in achieving its mission and in shaping the course of its evolution.

Members of the program faculty appear to see their role primarily as molders of the architecture curriculum. Within that arena, the team found evidence of in-progress faculty discussions respecting various aspects of the professional program. However, the team did not find indication of a documented review process designed to be employed over time with regularity and rigor. Further, the team found little evidence of regular solicitation of external input regarding the program—from alumni, from the profession, or from representatives of the larger academic community. Similarly, a clear, consistent methodology for the collection, analysis and organization of data that can inform effective decision-making was not in evidence.

As noted under Causes of Concern, the team encourages the program to clearly articulate the fullest possible range of its aspirations. Further, the team encourages the program to put robust internal and external assessment mechanisms in place that will render it increasingly nimble, facilitating its ability to measure its accomplishments against its stated objectives, and to identify the broad range of its future opportunities.

3. Public Information

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program website and all promotional media contain the required language found in NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. There is evidence that faculty and students are informed of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation upon entry into the program.

4. 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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted elsewhere in this report, students, faculty and staff affirm that the UVA program in architecture provides a supportive, respectful environment for learning, teaching, and working. The visiting team found evidence of University policies regarding non-discrimination and opportunity for faculty, students and staff. Students note that faculty and administrators are uniformly responsive to their concerns and involve them in the activities and events of the accredited programs. Student organizations, including chapters of AIAS, NOMAS, and the newly constituted SAGA, receive modest financial support for their activities. The current Dean Search Committee includes several representative members of the architecture faculty as well as an architecture program student.

However, as noted above under Causes of Concern, the student body of the accredited architecture programs is only modestly racially and ethnically diverse. Although the majority of students are women, the architecture program faculty includes few women in its full-time tenured or tenure-earning ranks. None, with the exception of the current dean, has attained the rank of full professor. Similarly, the full-time faculty in architecture includes few ethnic or racial minorities. A review of the annual reports completed by the program since the most recent NAAB accreditation visit demonstrates that this has been consistently the case for some time. Active recruitment, mentorship and retention of minority students—and robust recruitment, mentorship and retention of women and minority faculty—must become program imperatives. These imperatives must be supported through the adequate allocation of financial and human resources.

5. Studio Culture

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.
M. Arch. (2 years)  
[ ]  
[X]  
M. Arch. (3.5 years)  
[ ]  
[X]  

The architecture program recently published a Studio Culture Policy. A small group of student leaders and faculty created the policy through committee meetings in the spring of 2008. While the document included in the APR still appeared to be in draft form (its structure more closely resembles a student handbook than a student-generated vision statement), the team found evidence that it had been circulated and read by the student body. Program administration has committed to appointing a studio culture advisory committee to steward the sustained implementation and development of the policy, although no committee was identified to the team. Notwithstanding, students affirm that the program has long possessed a robust studio culture and that the policy serves primarily to formalize and confirm, rather than establish, its importance.

Students agree that the studio environment at UVA is nurturing and respectful. They cite strong, productive interactions between graduate and undergraduate students as well as between students and faculty. All note that the studio experience is a highly valued aspect of their education.

6. Human Resources

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

M. Arch. (2 years)  
[ ]  
[X]  
M. Arch. (3.5 years)  
[ ]  
[X]  

As noted above under Causes of Concern, the program keenly feels the void left by the recent departure of six valued members of the full-time faculty—two of them key senior faculty colleagues. Only one of those six lines is currently being replaced. The resulting gap, and the subsequent reliance on a substantial adjunct faculty compliment, has hampered the ability of the program to deliver the full range of its required seminar coursework. Equally important, it has impeded the adequate introduction of students to important emerging areas of the academic discipline and of the professional curriculum.

For a faculty that places commendably high value on a deeply engaged teaching culture, and in a larger academic context that prizes interdisciplinary, service-based research across the university campus, the program’s diminished faculty ranks place extraordinary and unsustainable demands on a gifted, energetic and entrepreneurial faculty serving in both academic and administrative roles.
7. **Human Resource Development**

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence that the program supports a robust public lecture series that incorporates presentations by faculty and distinguished guests, including the annual recipient of the Thomas Jefferson Foundation Medal in Architecture. A series of exhibitions, now housed in a new gallery space, has been maintained without interruption.

Sponsored study abroad and domestic travel opportunities have been expanded for students and integrated to the required studio sequence. Travel to Spain was evident in the work presented for all sections of ARCH 602. Optional summer programs have included opportunities for study in China, Jamaica and Italy. The program offers students opportunities to interview for work with national firms, and interested students benefit from participation in an extern program.

Full-time faculty members are apprised of university promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures. Since the previous accreditation visit, two women faculty have successfully applied for promotion to associate professor with tenure. Two assistant professors are currently preparing dossiers for tenure and promotion review, and a third will follow suit shortly thereafter.

Mechanisms for the continued development of tenured and tenure-earning faculty appear to be in place. Faculty is encouraged to pursue research and attend professional conferences through a modest annual research fund and a Small Grants Program provided by the Dean. While the office of the Dean does assist faculty with fundraising for various research initiatives, greater support is needed for the development of faculty research.

Significantly, the program provides only limited development opportunities for its adjunct and contract instructors, several of whom have formed part of the program faculty for many years. Some of these individuals are tasked with the responsibility of delivering significant portions of the required professional curriculum. Compensation, benefits and/or research support that will enable this committed group of individuals to hone skills and remain at the forefront of their disciplinary expertise would be a significant asset to the program.

The program makes professional development opportunities available to its administrative staff specialists, several of whom have taken advantage of these training options. They have gained valuable experience in areas such as grant and proposal writing, both of which have been utilized to advantage by the architecture program.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recent completion of two additions to Campbell Hall provides new exhibition, office, and meeting space for the program, while showcasing the design talents of resident faculty. Faculty and students note that the significance of these two projects extends well beyond the addition of much-needed space. The east addition has created a new campus focal point and a new point of access to the ground floor auditorium at Campbell Hall. The seminar rooms have become popular for meetings on the north end of the UVA campus, improving the visibility of the school within the university—and in the larger community. The south addition has provided new faculty offices in close proximity to studio spaces on three levels of the existing building. As noted by many, the new arrangement has significantly improved contact and dialogue between faculty and students.

Moving forward, the team notes that original lighting throughout the existing Campbell Hall is both inefficient and ineffective. The team further notes that new furnishings would significantly enhance the existing studio space. Judicious replacement of the aging equipment would enable more efficient disposition of existing spaces, while providing necessary storage areas for student work and supplies. The existing fabrication facilities are currently poised to receive new, much-needed equipment. An important planned expansion of those fabrication facilities will advance both student learning and faculty research—and should be actively supported.

Computing assets including computer and scanning capabilities have been enhanced recently, and the program provides a number of quality computer software options. It is imperative that the program continue to regularly expand and upgrade its software and server capacities in order to support impending and ongoing curricular developments.

9. Information Resources

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Connected to the School of Architecture, the Fiske Kimball Fine Arts Library is readily accessible to students and faculty. Print and visual materials in the collection easily exceed the required NAAB minimum standards. The library is in the process of converting a range of reference materials to digital formats in order to optimize the use of existing space and achieve greater operational efficiency. The library is updating its resources to include more digital information services, and substantially expanding its English and foreign language journal subscriptions in response to student and faculty demand.

A new Architecture and Instruction Librarian has recently been hired and is making outreach a priority. In an innovative and popular program, the librarian holds office hours in the graduate studios in order to assist students with on-line research. As a result students learn to access various databases and informational resources in relation to their class work. This directly benefits students and faculty, while forging strong ties between the library and the activities of the program.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted above, under Causes of Concern, the UVA School of Architecture receives funding through state appropriations, institutional funding, and private donations. State appropriations have steadily declined over the past decade, without much advance notice—as have institutional funds. For the moment, the recent expansion of Campbell Hall has exhausted private donation capacity. As a result, the School owes a sizable debt to the university, which stepped in to fund the completion of the building projects.

The immediate impact of these budget reductions is a reduced capability to replace faculty members who have left the school, and subsequently an increased reliance on adjunct faculty to deliver required coursework. Although the school has recently lost six full-time faculty members, it is only able to replace one position this year. The result is a smaller full-time faculty with expanded individual instructional responsibilities and thus less time to allocate for research, study, leadership obligations, and participation in university-wide initiatives and committees.

Reduced funding has also directly affected financial assistance for students, causing some top student prospects to look elsewhere for higher levels of support. It has impacted institutional support for minority recruitment—in the areas of both faculty ranks and the student body. As noted above under causes of concern, the visiting team found current funding levels to be unsustainable for the School of Architecture, negatively impacting every corner of the professional program in architecture.

11. Administrative Structure

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accredits the University of Virginia. The team found evidence that the program in architecture, housed within the Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture in the School of Architecture, has a level of autonomy sufficient to comply with the conditions of accreditation.
12. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program in architecture maintains two curricular paths to the NAAB-accredited professional M. Arch. degree. The team found evidence of the required distribution of curriculum for each program, including the necessary complement of professional studies, general studies and electives.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through SARC 600, ARCH 614, and ARCH 801, all of which include oral presentations and short descriptive writing assignments. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track includes short examples of expository writing in ARCH 612. None of the required coursework includes evidence that students are asked to complete longer research and writing assignments.

13.2 Critical 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 them against relevant criteria and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through technology and professional coursework, including ARCH 823 and ARCH 848. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track includes examples of exegesis in student work for ARCH 612 and ARCH 624.
13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M. Arch. (3.5 years) students learn freehand drawing skills in the introductory ARCH 501 - 503 courses. Subsequent studios in both of the M. Arch. tracks develop digital representation skills, while supporting continued engagement in an impressive range of freehand skills. Stronger three-dimensional digital modeling skills could assist students in exploring and developing both technical and design aspects of their projects in the advanced studios.

13.4 Research Skills

Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through SARC 600, ALAR 702, ARCH 723 and 823. Students demonstrate an ability to research and synthesize information respecting site, building materials, and systems in their studio projects.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A solid understanding of formal ordering skills was evident throughout the studio sequences of both M. Arch. tracks, from the introductory ALAR 501 to the final studios, ARCH 802/808.

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Well Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Throughout the studio sequence, student work presented for the two M. Arch. tracks amply demonstrates a solid command of design fundamentals. Site analyses are particularly strong in the travel studios.

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through SARC 600 and ALAR 702. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses aspects of this criterion in ARCH 602 and ARCH 624.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through SARC 600 and ARCH 614. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses aspects of this material in ARCH 612.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in 1998 and again in 2003, and as noted above under Causes of Concern this criterion is not met for either M. Arch. track. It is only lightly covered in the introductory SARC 600. The team found insufficient evidence in the required coursework that students continue to develop an understanding of non-western traditions as they move through the program.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through SARC 600 and through those studios that focus on local and regional contexts. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track addresses theory of the vernacular in ARCH 612.

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is primarily met through ARCH 701, ALAR 702, and ALAR 802/808. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 601 and ARCH 602.

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, aspects of this criterion are met through ARCH 701, ARCH 723, ARCH 725 and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 501, ARCH 612, and ARCH 626.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is not met for either M. Arch. track. The material is only lightly addressed in ARCH 823, which is offered in the final semester of the professional curriculum. The team found insufficient evidence of student work elsewhere in the program that illustrates an understanding of the varying issues of diverse people and populations.

13.14 Accessibility

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 701 and ARCH 801. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 601.

13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through SARC 600, ALAR 533, ALAR 725, ARCH 801 and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses aspects of this material in ARCH 626.

13.16 Program Preparation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 801.

13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ALAR 533, ALAR 702, and ARCH 801. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 601 and ARCH 602.

13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 721 and ARCH 801. Additionally, the M. Arch. (3.5 years) track addresses this material in ARCH 624 and ARCH 626.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 723, ARCH 725, ARCH 801 and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 626.

13.20 Life-Safety

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 701, ALAR 702, ARCH 723, ARCH 801, ARCH 802, ARCH 823 and ARCH 848. Additionally, the M. Arch. (3.5 years) track addresses aspects of this material in ARCH 601.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 721, ARCH 723, ARCH 725, ARCH 801 and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses aspects of this material in ARCH 626.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 725, ARCH 801, and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses aspects of this material in ARCH 626.

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 725, ARCH 801, and ARCH 823.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 725, ARCH 801, and ARCH 823. The M. Arch. (3.5 years) track also addresses this material in ARCH 626.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is not met for either M. Arch. track. Fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle costs and construction estimating are only lightly covered in ARCH 848, offered in the final semester of the program.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 723 and ARCH 823. While coursework in each track demonstrates ability in the technical illustration of construction
assemblies and methodologies, the documentation of material selection and installation through outline specifications was limited.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 723 and ARCH 848. The material was also evident throughout design studio projects.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the two M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through ARCH 801.

13.29 Architect's Administrative Roles

Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through coursework in ARCH 848. ARC 626 addresses some aspects of this material in the M. Arch. (3.5 year) track.

13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This material was only minimally found in the coursework of ARCH 626 and ARCH 823. While ARCH 848 presents legal, ethical and professional practice issues, the team found insufficient evidence of student work that illustrates an understanding of basic principles of business operations and office practice for either M. Arch. track.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through coursework in ARCH 848 and supplemented by an annual lecture from a member of the state registration and licensing board. The team noted an exceptionally high student awareness of the Intern Development Program (IDP).

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through coursework in ARCH 848 and SARC 600. ARC 626 addresses aspects of this material in the M. Arch. (3.5 year) track.

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (3.5 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met through coursework in ARCH 848 and supplemented by an annual lecture from a member of the state registration and licensing board.

13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch. (2 years)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Arch. (3.5 years)  [X]  [ ]

For both M. Arch. tracks, this criterion is met primarily through coursework in ARCH 848. Principles of ethical professional practice and civic responsibility are also evident throughout program coursework and studio projects.
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Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Virginia Architecture Program Report.

The University of Virginia was founded by Thomas Jefferson and chartered by the General Assembly in 1819. Mr. Jefferson was elected the first Rector of the Board of Visitors which was then, and still is, the governing body of the University. Two other members of the first Board of Visitors were James Madison and James Monroe. Mr. Jefferson conceived, planned, designed and oversaw the construction of what he called the "academical village", comprised of the Rotunda, the Pavilions with their gardens enclosed by serpentine walls and other buildings which still adorn Virginia's famous Lawn. The curriculum of the new University was designed by Mr. Jefferson as well, and the faculty were of his choosing. The University opened for instruction on March 7, 1825, with a faculty of eight and a student body of sixty-eight. The University was one of the first educational institutions in the United States or Europe which was not founded nor organized by some religious sect. Mr. Jefferson, the author of the Virginia Statue of Religious Freedom, was careful to give the central hierarchical site in his campus plan not to a chapel but to a library, the domed Rotunda.

Instruction was given on an advanced level in eight schools: ancient and modern languages, mathematics, natural philosophy (physics and astronomy), natural history (chemistry and botany), moral philosophy (ethics and metaphysics), anatomy and medicine, law, and engineering. Students were permitted to select whatever subjects they wished to pursue, in any order that pleased them, for as long as they liked. This "elective system" was retained, at least in part, until the end of the century. Mr. Jefferson had opposed the granting of degrees on the grounds that they were "artificial embellishments." However, in 1831 the Rector and Visitors approved granting the Master of Arts degree which remained the primary academic award of the University throughout the nineteenth century. Even today the University awards no honorary degrees, although a yearly medal in Architecture and Law is awarded for outstanding achievement in these fields.

The University of Virginia was also one of the first American universities to establish an Honor System. This system, completely student-controlled and administered since 1842, has been among the University's finest traditions and has provided the basis for a highly responsible system of student self-government.

Enrollment and facilities grew steadily until, on the eve of the Civil War, the University was second to Harvard University in size of faculty and student body. The growth of scientific education marked the decades after the Civil War. The demand for more scientific and professional training generated other changes at the University. Toward the end of the century the original schools of Medicine, Law, and Engineering became independent divisions. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was established in 1904 and the School of Education in 1919. To bring the University into conformity with other institutions of higher learning, the Bachelor's degree was established as a prerequisite for the Master's degree and it became the standard degree of the University in 1899.

Under President Colgate Darden, a former Governor of Virginia, the University's present structure of schools was established. A Department of Commerce and Business
Administration, which had existed in the College from 1920, became a separate entity known as the McIntire School of Commerce in 1952. A Graduate School of Business Administration, the Darden School, was established in 1954. Two other divisions which had existed in various forms since 1901, Architecture and Nursing, attained separate status in 1954 and 1956, respectively. Each of these independent schools has its own dean and faculty, sets its own standards, and recommends its own candidates for degrees. The development of these separate schools in the 1950’s was followed by the doubling of student enrollment and faculty. In the 1960’s the University served as parent institution to four colleges in other areas of the Commonwealth. At the close of the decade the University became fully coeducational. Today the University comprises ten schools with an enrollment of 18,848 - 12,595 in undergraduate programs, 5909 in graduate programs, and 344 in on grounds continuing education.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Virginia Architecture Program Report.

The central purpose of the University of Virginia is to enrich the mind by stimulating and sustaining a spirit of free inquiry directed to understanding the nature of the universe and the role of mankind in it. Activities designed to quicken, discipline, and enlarge the intellectual and creative capacities, as well as the aesthetic and ethical awareness, of the members of the University and to record, preserve, and disseminate the results of intellectual discovery and creative endeavor serve this purpose. In fulfilling it, the University places the highest priority on achieving eminence as a center of higher learning.

The University of Virginia seeks to achieve its central purpose through the pursuit of the following specific goals:

- To offer instruction of the highest quality to undergraduates from all walks of life, not only by transmitting established knowledge and skills, but by fostering in students the habits of mind and character required to develop a generous receptivity to new ideas, from whatever source; a disposition for applying the most rigorous criticism to all ideas and institutions, whether old or new; an ability to test hypotheses and re-interpret human experience; and a desire to engage in a lifetime of learning.
- To sustain liberal education as the central intellectual concern of the University, not only in the curricula of the College of Arts and Sciences, but also as a foundation for the professional undergraduate programs.
- To educate men and women for the professions in certain undergraduate and in graduate programs leading to degrees in the School of Architecture, Business Administration, Commerce, Education, Engineering and Applied Science, Law, Medicine, and Nursing.
- To lead in the advancement and application of knowledge through graduate study and research and to disseminate the results among scholars and the general public.
- To attract and retain eminent faculty in order to provide the highest quality of instruction and leadership in research.
- To seek the ablest and most promising students, within the Commonwealth and without; and, in keeping with the intentions of Thomas Jefferson, to attend to their total development and well-being, and to provide appropriate intellectual, athletic, and social programs.
To strive for diversity in the student body and in the faculty and to promote international exchange of scholars and students.

To provide for students and faculty an atmosphere conducive to fellowship and understanding and to their constructive participation in the affairs of the University and the community at large.

To expand educational opportunities for persons with special challenges such as minority status, physical disability, ethnic heritage, or insufficient financial resources.

To engage in research in the medical sciences and to provide innovative leadership in health care and medical services in the local community, the Commonwealth, and the nation.

To offer to the local community, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the nation the various kinds of public service and intellectual and cultural activities which are consonant with the purposes of the University.

To provide continuing education programs of the highest quality to the Commonwealth and the nation.

To cooperate with and assist other colleges, educational institutions, and agencies, especially in the Commonwealth of Virginia, by making available to them the facilities of the University and the experience and counsel of its members so as to contribute to education in the Commonwealth and beyond.

To establish new programs, schools, and degrees, and to undertake such research as the needs of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the nation may require.

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Virginia Architecture Program Report.

In 1817, Thomas Jefferson proposed an idea that he had conceived as early as 1781 that the study of Architecture and the Fine Arts be included in the curriculum of the University of Virginia. Architecture as a course of study was to be placed in the School of Mathematics, and the Lawn, with its various orders of classical architecture, was to serve as an instructional model for the student body. It was not until 1919, however, that a School of Fine Arts was established by a gift by Paul G. McIntire. That fall, Dr. Sidney Fiske Kimball, architect, historian, and authority on Jeffersonian architecture, was appointed professor and head with Stanislaw Makielski as Instructor in Architecture. The School provided a B.S. in Architecture degree and graduate architectural coursework. Initially there were eleven students housed in Hotel E on the Range. The Alpha Rho Chi architectural fraternity was established in 1922, and the School graduated its first students in June of 1923.

The successor to Kimball as head of the School was Joseph Hudnut, who had taught art history courses during the summer of 1920 and was an expert on Georgian architecture. During his tenure, the School was moved to Fayerweather Hall, and a cooperative program with Harvard University was instituted whereby graduates of Virginia could obtain a Master of Architecture degree after two years instead of the more common four. Enrollment increased to 253 students during the 1925-26 sessions. The third architect to direct the School was Alfred Lawrence Kocher. He, like Hudnut, was a scholar of American architecture who later embraced modernism.

In 1928, Edmund S. Campbell, Dean of the Beaux Arts Institute of Design in New York, was appointed head of the School. The five-year professional degree program was started in 1949. In 1953, Thomas K. Fitzpatrick was named Dean upon Campbell's death. Architecture was separated from Art in 1954. Preservation studies were emphasized, and
the Thomas Jefferson Medal in Architecture and Professorship were co-founded with the Thomas Jefferson Foundation to bring leading scholars and architects to the School.

In 1968, J. Norwood Bosserman was named Dean of the School of Architecture. A new building, Campbell Hall, was completed in 1970, and programs in Architecture, Architectural History, Landscape Architecture, and Urban and Environmental Planning were formalized. In the same year, the University embraced co-education, and the first female students were admitted to the School. With a new facility and four strong departments, enrollment grew to 550 students with over 60 faculty members.

In 1980, Jaquelin T. Robertson was appointed Dean. The Institute for Environmental Negotiation, affiliated with the Department of Urban and Environmental Planning, was established in 1981. Subsequently, a certificate program in Historic Preservation was initiated that engages students from all the school's disciplines, and in 1988 a Ph.D. program in Architectural History admitted its first students.

Following Robertson's retirement in 1988, Harry W. Porter, Jr. was named Interim Dean; he was appointed Dean in 1989. His tenure saw further expansion of the influence of the School of Architecture, both within the University and nationally. Daphne Spain was appointed Acting Dean in January, 1994, with William A. McDonough becoming Dean in September, 1994. His emphasis on sustainable development resonated with similar interests in green approaches among a number of faculty.

Karen Van Lengen, a practicing architect from New York, and Chair of the Department of Architecture at the Parsons School of Design, was appointed Dean of the School of Architecture in July, 1999. In 2003, the Department of Architecture joined with the Department of Landscape Architecture with the goal to develop new approaches to the construction of the contemporary built environment. Van Lengen has overseen the fundraising and design development for substantial additions to Campbell Hall designed by members of the School's faculty. This new facility will be occupied in the summer of 2008.

In 2003, the Department of Architecture and the Department of Landscape Architecture agreed to merge and form a single department. The new Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture offers an undergraduate pre-professional degree in architecture, and minor in landscape architecture, and accredited graduate professional degrees in architecture and landscape architecture.

**Chairs of the Department of Architecture:**
Frederick Doveton Nichols (and Carlo Pelliccia) 1967-1970
Robert L. Vickery (and Carlo Pelliccia) 1970-1976
Michael J. Bednar (and Carlo Pelliccia) 1976-1978
Michael J. Bednar (and Robin D. Dripps) 1978-1980
Bruce Abbey (and Robin D. Dripps) 1980-1985
Bruce Abbey 1985-1987
Robin D. Dripps 1987-1988
W. G. Clark 1988-1989
Kenneth A. Schwartz 1989-1994
Peter Waldman 1995-1998
Judith Kinnard 1998-2003
Craig Barton 2007-present
4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Virginia Architecture Program Report.

School Mission As noted in the School of Architecture web-site the mission of the Architecture Program is as follows:
The University of Virginia, since its founding by Thomas Jefferson, has supported a public mandate to educate and develop our democratic culture. As part of this larger mission, the School of Architecture focuses on analysis and design of the public realm, or the "Architecture of Urgent Matters." Just as democratic culture is a dialogue and cooperative effort of individuals, design in the public realm is a discussion and joint effort of individual disciplines. The School of Architecture composed of four well-defined disciplines — architecture, landscape architecture, history of architecture, and urban and environmental planning — promotes design as a conscious act, which may be associated with the public realm and the values of that culture. Its curriculum places special emphasis on the following themes:
The deployment of a system of practical ethics in the design and planning processes as a method for evaluating choices and their consequences for the man-made and the natural environment.
The promotion of community-based design and planning that gives voice to all cultural and economic groups.
The critical study of the history of architecture and culture as both a discipline and as a foundation for developing innovative design responses in contemporary life.
Aesthetic applications of technological innovations especially related to the general study of ecology and sustainable environments.
Emphasis on study abroad and a multi-disciplinary approach to history, design and planning to prepare professionals and scholars for participation in a global design culture.

M.Arch. Program Mission
As noted in the School of Architecture web-site the mission of the Architecture Program is as follows:
The University of Virginia, since its founding by Thomas Jefferson, has supported a public mandate to educate and develop our democratic culture. As part of this larger mission, the School of Architecture focuses on analysis and design of the public realm, or the "Architecture of Urgent Matters." Just as democratic culture is a dialogue and cooperative effort of individuals, design in the public realm is a discussion and joint effort of individual disciplines.

Architecture and Landscape Architecture share a design ethic that critically engages three areas of design research:
- the interdependence of cultural forces and ecological processes
- the ethical choices inherent in the discipline of construction
- the implications of emerging technologies for the design of spaces, sites and systems
These issues are developed across the scales and resources of each discipline through student and faculty work in parallel, collaborative and multi-disciplinary studios and seminars. As these threads of design investigation interact, new poetic possibilities emerge that are visible in the products of our unique perspective.

In the design of buildings, landscapes and urban infrastructure, working simultaneously at the scale of the hand and that of the city, we share the responsibility for creating a stimulating and sustainable setting for the development of diverse cultural expression. We work close at hand and travel great distances, from Charlottesville, Washington and New York to Barcelona, Venice and Beijing. We apply our hands to the making of things, open our minds to the voices of multiple communities and extend our reach in a network of collaborations across the university and beyond. We study the dynamic fullness of the sites we enter, taking seriously our power to reveal and transform them.

In environmental science, the term "ecotone" describes the space of a boundary or edge where two ecosystems overlap, a place of great diversity and enhanced complexity that reveals the sometimes frictional dynamics of the intersecting ecologies. This is our territory, from which we advance the critical significance and catalytic potential of our academic discourse and professional engagement.

B.S. in Architecture Program Mission

The B.S. Arch. program at the University of Virginia seeks to provide a rigorous pre-professional education which combines aspects of a classic liberal arts education with the professional topics that are specific to the discipline of architecture. The program assumes that an architect must be a well educated individual and the student's general education foundation plays an extremely important role in this regard. The pre-professional nature of the program allows students to continue their architectural education at the graduate level with as few as two years required to achieve the accredited professional Master of Architecture degree. Within this context, the undergraduate program provides an opportunity for students to pursue specialized areas of study during their final year in one of the two concentrations: Architectural Design and Architectural Studies. Studios require students to express intentions or propose questions using architectural and urban form to further our understanding of ourselves and the world we inhabit. Students are taught the analytical skills they need to solve complex design problems at different scales. Strong visual and verbal communication abilities are developed using both traditional and digital media. These critical thinking and visualization skills are understood to be of immense value to students regardless of their eventual career path.

5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Virginia Architecture Program Report.

The School continues to attract a gifted, creative, and productive faculty. The Architecture Program faculty is dedicated to providing students with a design education integrating rigorous design standards, technical expertise, and a commitment to sustainable design practices. They continue to make distinguished contributions in creative and scholarly practice and in service to the local community, the University, and nation. These endeavors maintain the School and program's visibility to our academic colleagues and a wider public.
The program's faculty continues to develop collaborative multi-disciplinary opportunities with colleagues in the Landscape Architecture Program as well as those in Urban and Environmental Planning and Architectural History. The number of multi-disciplinary research proposals and projects grows in response to the success of exemplary projects such as the eco Mod, the Learning Barge projects the Campbell Hall building additions projects.

Design work developed by architecture graduate students represents our commitment to combine rigorous architectural design education with opportunities to explore the methods and practices (and complete degree programs) of allied disciplines such as Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning.

**Joint Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture**

In the fall of 2003, the Department of Architecture and the Department of Landscape Architecture were merged into a single joint Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture. The new joint department is comprised of the Architecture Program which has both undergraduate pre-professional and graduate accredited professional degree programs and the Landscape Architecture Program which delivers an accredited graduate degree program in Landscape Architecture. The Departmental merger has been an extremely healthy development for both disciplines in prompting debate about both our common and distinct missions, resulting in a stronger curriculum in both disciplinary and cross-disciplinary terms. In addition, cross pollination at the student level and in faculty research initiatives has been substantial. The new department is led by a department chair (Craig Barton 2007-present), who oversees the work of graduate program directors in Landscape Architecture (Kristina Hill) and Architecture (Charles Menefee), and an undergraduate architecture program director (Michael Bednar).

The merger offered opportunities for multi-disciplinary curricular and research initiatives which could supplement distinguished curricula and pedagogies of the existing undergraduate and professional degree programs. The joint department addresses comments in the 2003 visiting team report (VTR) about "promoting" multi-disciplinary opportunities to enhance the learning environments of our students. Two developments emerging in parallel with this process have also strengthened our program significantly. A group of our alumni founded the Charlottesville Community Design Center (CCDC) with the advice and support of several members of our faculty. The CCDC has proven to be an important vehicle for school/community interaction. Its mission has been further supported by a grant received in 2008 by the Dean's office to fund ten student internships in non-profit organizations, enhancing our support for and student involvement in community organizations, initiatives and projects. The other development is the Eco-Mod design-build project, the design and construction of environmentally responsible modular affordable housing. Three in a series of four funded houses have been completed. A fourth is scheduled to begin construction this spring.

The architecture program faculty believes the graduate and undergraduate programs continue to be robust and effectively address our educational missions. A summary of program strengths and challenges is provided below.

**New Curricular Initiatives 2003-2008**

- *Summer Design Institute*  
  - All students in the 3½ year design program are required to attend an introductory program in the summer preceding their first year in the program. The program and curriculum have been restructured so that they serve as an introduction to students entering both the M.Arch and
MLA programs. The program is co-taught by a member of the architecture faculty and a member of the landscape faculty, and provides an introduction to design emphasizing the synthetic relationship between buildings and landscapes.

- **Core and Option Studios**
  - The studio sequence and curriculum have been modified to strengthen the curriculum of the core (foundation) studio and provide more opportunities for students to enroll in cross-disciplinary option studios. Foundation studios (Arch 601, 602, 701, 801) are with the exception of Arch 602, offered in the fall term. The foundation studios continue to focus on the development of formal design skills, graphics, and representation, the analysis, interpretation and representation of landscapes, infrastructure, sites and buildings, and development of comprehensive building design projects. Options studios are now offered in the spring term. Each spring there are both architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism studios options and students can enroll in any of the studios offered in a given semester.
  - The thesis studio is also offered during the spring semester for students who have completed the Design Research Seminar in the fall and have had thesis proposals accepted by their advisors.

- **Graphic Workshops**
  - Two new courses, ARCH 651 and 652 Graphic Workshops have been added to the fall and spring curriculum. These courses introduce students to both digital and analog representational techniques and supplement the curriculum and pedagogy of the 601 and 602 Foundation studios.

- **Comprehensive Studio**
  - The curriculum has been revised to allow students to complete the required technical curriculum ARCH 624, 626, 721, 723, 725) and develop a stronger base of skills and experience before enrolling in the Comprehensive Studio. ARCH 801 is now run concurrently with ARCH 823 (Building Synthesis).

- **Travel Study Opportunities**
  - International and domestic travel study has become an increasingly important part of the program's curriculum and identity. Practice has become a more global endeavor. It is critical to provide students with experiences beyond the world in which they are familiar and comfortable. Travel study has been one of Dean Van Lenger's priorities, and she has been able to support a number of department initiatives, including the Dew Travel Studio Fund, an endowment providing travel support for architecture and landscape students. Students in the ARCH and LAR 602 studios have used the Dew Studio Fund to support travel to Barcelona. We hope to be able to expand this opportunity to all students and plan to have the 701 studio serve as the site of the future travel program. In addition the Dean has secured funding for the Venice Studio, which is run as a spring option studio and provides students with the opportunity to travel to Venice for approximately one week as part of the development of studio project connected to Venice or the Veneto. Domestic travel has includes travel study visits to studio project sites in Washington, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago and in 2005-06 New Orleans as a part of the New Orleans Initiative described below.

- **New Orleans Initiative**
In 2005 in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, the Dean asked SOA faculty and students to, "...offer our ideas and our expertise to the reconstruction efforts throughout the Gulf region." That year over half of the Department's design studios, "...took on he problems of the region, offering analytical studies along with new ideas and strategies for repairing and rebuilding this region." The volume, Building After Katrina: Visions for the Gulf Coast, documents the work developed that year. A graduate student design team under the direction of Assoc. Professor Maurice Cox received the Merit Award in the professional category of the High Density on the High Ground residential design competition sponsored by Architectural Record and Tulane University School of Architecture. Projects developed by two other design teams directed by Cox were included in an exhibition of selected entrants to the competition.

- Design/Fabrication

- The Architecture Program has over the past five years produced a number of distinguished and nationally recognized design/build initiatives. These include the eco Mod project conceived and developed by Assistant Professor John Quale, The Learning Barge Project developed by Associate Professor Phoebe Crisman, and Project reCover developed by Assistant Professor Anselmo Canfora. All three of these projects have provided for successful multi-disciplinary research initiatives extending beyond the School to other units in the University. The success of these projects is due in part to their ability to engage a diverse audience of university students and faculty.

- Research Support

- Over the past decade both the University and the School of Architecture have placed increased emphasis on research and its relation to the teaching mission. The Dean developed several opportunities to meet this challenge:
  - 2003—Establishment of a clear research leave policy for both tenure-track and tenured faculty
  - 2003—A competitive small grants research fund to assist faculty in their work (NOTE: SEE SECTION 3.7 HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT P.29 FOR A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROGRAM APPENDIX 1 FOR LIST OF RECIPIENTS)
  - 2003—The establishment of yearly research stipend for tenure-track faculty
  - 2004—Establishment of Research Stipends for Administrative Faculty
  - 2008—Reinstatement of University funded Chaired Professors research funds
  - Fall 2008, the Dean offered a research stipend to all tenured faculty
  - 2004—Dean initiated a Research Symposium Day each semester to encourage a climate of intellectual exchange and dialogue. The symposium is open to all students and faculty at the beginning of each semester. (SECTION 3.7 HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT P.29 FOR A COMPLETE DESCRIPTION OF THIS PROGRAM SEE APPENDIX 2 FOR A LIST OF PARTICIPANTS)
Challenges

The architecture faculty has noted that as we focus on maintaining core strengths the following areas should receive enhanced curricular emphasis:

• A course sequence (required and elective) to develop fluency in Design Computation
• Elective coursework in architectural history
• Contemporary theory and practice

Action Plan

• Hire a full-time faculty member be able to teach course(s) in both design studio and aspects of design computation
• The program faculty is currently reviewing the history/theory and technology course sequences and will make a recommendation(s) about enhancement(s) to these areas.

Faculty

Strengths

The program faculty is nationally recognized for commitment to research, teaching, innovative pedagogies, and the quality of their creative and scholarly work. Recent important projects like

• Associate Professor Phoebe Crisman’s Learning Barge project has received recognition from a number of educational and professional organizations including a 2006 National

• Student Collaborative Design Award, 2007 NCARB Prize, 2007 EPA P3 Competition winner, 2008 AIA Education Award, 2008 ACSA Collaborative Practice Award.

• Assistant Professor John Quale’s eco Mod project has also been widely recognized and has received a 2006 AIA Ecological Literacy in Architecture Education, 2006 ACSA Collaborative Practice Award, 2007 Go Green Honor Award, 2007 AIA Education Honor Award, 2007 NCARB Grand Prize for Creative Integration of Practice and Education in the Academy.

• Additions to Campbell Hall by Prof. WG Clark, (East Addition including new review sequence to main auditorium) Assoc. Profs. Judith Kinnard renovation of the Fine Arts Cafe and William Sherman (South Addition including new faculty offices and classrooms, and Prof. Peter Waldman’ s Eric Goodwin Passage, a memorial to the late Eric Goodwin (BSArch 2002). Please see Section 2.0, Progress Since Last Visit for a detailed list of projects undertaken by Department faculty and students.

• Associate Professor Judith Kinnard and Professor Kenneth Schwartz exhibited submission to 2006 “High Density on High Ground” competition sponsored by Tulane University School of Architecture and Architectural Record.

• Associate Professor Kirk Martini received the Premier Award for Excellence in Engineering Education Courseware for ARCADE (Arcade: Interactive Non-linear Structural Analysis and Animation) by the National Science Foundation and the engineering education courseware industry.

• Professor William Morish was a member of the collaborative THINK team. The team’s submission to the “Innovative Design Competition” for a master plan of the former World Trade Center was selected as a competition finalist.
• Dean, Karen van Lengen's project MIX HOUSE (a collaboration between Dean Karen Van Lengen / KVLA, Joel Sanders / JSA, and Ben Rubin / EAR Studio), published in 2007 edition of DWELL, and exhibited at the Vitra Museum (Weil am Rhein, Germany) in the OPEN HOUSE: Intelligent Living by Design exhibition

• Other endeavors like Assistant Professor Anselmo Canfora's Initiative reCover and Associate Professor William Williams's Dresser Trunk Project are poised to receive similar national recognition.

• In addition several colleagues including Sanda Iliescu, Kirk Martini, John Quale, and Kenneth Schwartz have received university Faculty Teaching Awards.

Challenges

Faculty Growth + Development

• Reduction in number of full-time faculty.
  o As noted in the 2003 APR, the program had 24 full-time faculty and administrators including 18 tenure or tenure-track full-time faculty and 17 part-time faculty. Currently, the program has 21 full-time faculty and administrators and 20 part-time faculty. (NOTE: SEE SECTION 3.6 HUMAN RESOURCES FOR A DISCUSSION OF THE PROGRAM'S FACULTY; SEE APPENDIX 3 FOR A LIST OF FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND DEPARTURES)

• Impending Retirements
  o Seven of the program's fifteen tenured faculty are in an age group where they may retire in the next 10 years. Many play key roles in the curriculum which needs to be factored into a faculty recruitment strategy.

• Recent Faculty Departures
  o A number of tenure-track and non-tenure track full-time faculty have recently left the school reducing the number of full-time design faculty. These departures have reduced the number of design faculty able to enhance existing offerings in design computation.

• Adjunct Faculty
  o We have continued to rely heavily upon adjunct faculty, are retained to teach individual courses and have neither service nor research requirements. This year adjuncts are will hold eighteen of the twenty-nine (or 62%) undergraduate studio positions. While this staffing model may offer the school some financial benefits in terms of reduced staffing costs, the overall effect upon the Architecture Program has not been positive. While we continue to staff all required courses, the number of elective offerings has decreased. There are fewer opportunities for faculty to introduce new courses into the curriculum, because they are already teaching full loads delivering required courses.

• Service + Administration
  o The reduction in full-time tenure track faculty has increased the service load carried by the program's tenured and tenure-track faculty

  o Currently two of the three department chairs, all three program directors, and one of the two school's associate deans are associate professors. Over the past twenty years the department has had five chairs, four of whom have been associate professors and one a full professor. Only one of the four faculty who held this position has been promoted to full professor. The Dean notes that
Department chair positions in other units at the University are typically held by full professors, and recommends that the school move to adopt this model.

**Action Plan**

- Increase full-time faculty through new faculty hires. We are currently conducting a search for up to two tenure-track faculty design positions. One should be a junior faculty position and the other used to retain a new tenured faculty member. State budget cuts forced the department to postpone this search in 2007-08. Impending additional state budgets threaten to prevent the department from searching and filling these positions.

**Students**

Note: A complete description of the department's graduate and undergraduate students is contained in Section 3.6 Human Resources.

**Concerns**

**Graduate Student Support**

Each year the cost of attending graduate programs at the SOA increases, and non-resident graduate tuition has increased by approximately ten percent since 2003. (NOTE: SEE APPENDIX 4 FOR A SUMMARY OF ANNUAL TUITION CHARGES 2003-2006). Increasing the amount and types of funds to support graduate students is school wide priority. In order to continue to attract and retain top students it will be important to increase funds for graduate fellowships, teaching and research assistantships, and travel support.

Between 2003 and 2008 student fellowship monies increased from $210,933 to $416,281. In the same period, the number of students enrolled in the program increased from 66 students in 2003 to 74 in 2008. The increase is due to an unusually high yield of admitted students in 2006, when the percentage of students accepting admission and enrolling doubled. We have however been able to increase the amount of per capita aid available to support graduate architecture students from approximately $3,766/student in 2003 to $5,825/student in 2008. Compared to our competitors this level of support is low.

It is important that we increase both the amount of aid available and the number of students whom we can support (NOTE: PLEASE SEE APPENDIX 5 FOR A SUMMARY OF GRAD. FELLOWSHIP DISBURSEMENT 2003-2008.)

In addition the Dean was able to secure five Graduate Teaching Assistantships (GTA) which carry tuition remission and a stipend and funding to support teaching assistants in our undergraduate technology courses. These GTA's are important tools for both graduate student recruitment and curricular support. The initial proposal sought funding for nine GTA positions and the School received funding for five of the requested positions. GTA's are an important means of supporting our undergraduate curriculum, recruiting graduate students and educating the next generation of faculty. We would benefit from additional five Graduate Teaching Assistantships to help us recruit our top ranked graduate candidates and to help support teaching in our introductory design studios, as well as in our undergraduate technology sequence and design computation courses.

As noted in the previous APR we continue to depend upon by federal work-study wages to fund all other teaching and research support which has unfortunately not kept up with increased demand from both faculty and students. International students are not eligible
for any of the federally supported financial aid programs and as a result are dependent upon fellowship funds. Additional GTA positions will provide more resources to support international students.

**Student Diversity**

Creating and sustaining a diverse student body is a priority of the program and the school. Over the past five years we have worked in a number of ways to build a more diverse pool of qualified applicants, by seeking out minority applicants from strong undergraduate programs with the goal of admitting a more diverse class of graduate students. The results have been mixed.

Between 2005-2008 (the period for which we have comprehensive data) applications to the architecture program have increased by approximately twenty 22%, from a total of 350 applications in 2005 to 427 in last year’s admissions cycle. However, the pool of students under-represented in the discipline (African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Native and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander) has been volatile and has not increased in proportion to the increase in applications. (NOTE: SEE APP. 6 + 6.1 ADMISSIONS REPORTS.)

In 2006 Dean Van Lengen appointed a school-wide diversity committee and charged them with the task of creating and implementing strategies to diversify the school’s student body. The committee made a series of recommendations including the development of a diversity page on the school’s website, a request for a small operating budget, and appointment of a full-time diversity coordinator. We have been fortunate to hire a new director of admissions who is using the committee’s initial recommendations to shape a plan to recruit minority students. (NOTE: SEE APPENDIX_27 THE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE’S REPORT AND RECRUITMENT PLAN) Among several initiatives, we have invited (and provided transportation for) Hampton University students to attend our graduate Open Houses and provided funds to allow faculty and student to attend the annual NOMA conference. The school’s chapter of the National Organization of Minority Architecture Students have assisted in locating, hosting, and contacting students after admission to encourage them to matriculate here. The school’s African-American faculty, (Barton, Botchwey, Cox, Williams) have been active participants in these efforts.

**Action Plan**

- Collaborate with Development Office to prepare student support proposals for use in the school’s Capital Campaign
- Request University support for a diversity coordinator.

**Administration**

**Dean Search**

This summer Dean Van Lengen announced that she will conclude her tenure as the school’s dean on July 1, 2009. The Provost has convened a search committee which will be chaired by Architecture Professor Edward Ford. The other search committee members include:

Prof. Tim Beatley, Urban and Environmental Planning  
Associate Prof. Cammy Brothers, Architectural History  
Associate Prof. Phoebe Crisman, Architecture
Joan Fry (President's representative)
Lauren Hackney (Student)
Associate Prof. Kristina Hill, Landscape Architecture
Frank Kittredge (Alumnus and member of the School's Foundation Board)
Prof. Paxton Marshall, Engineering
Associate Prof. Beth Meyer, Landscape Architecture
Associate Prof. Louis Nelson, Architectural History
Associate Prof. William Williams, Architecture

The Provost will meet with the committee early in September to review the search process and schedule. More details about the search will be available during the team's visit this spring.
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Marilys R. Nepomechie, FAIA
School of Architecture
Florida International University
Paul L. Cejas Architecture Building 386A
University Park Campus
Miami, FL 33199
(305) 348-1887
(305) 858-0849 fax
(305) 790-8057 mobile
Marilys.nepomechie@fiu.edu

Observer
Mabel O. Wilson, Professor
Columbia University, GSAPP
400 Avery
1172 Amsterdam Avenue
New York, NY 10027
(212) 854-8235
mcw6@columbia.edu

Representing the AIA
Thomas R. Mathison, FAIA, REFP
Principal
Tower Pinkster
678 Front Avenue, NW
Suite 255
Grand Rapids, MI 49504-5323
(616) 456-9944 ext. 241
(616) 456-5936 fax
tmathison@towerpinksster.com

Representing the AIAS
Catherine A. McNeel-Florreich, Assoc., AIA
1765 Hillview Drive
Jackson, MS 39211
(601) 506-0241 mobile
catherine.mcneel@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
James R. Lev, AIA
Architect, Planner
PPSB, MC-800
1501 South Oak Street
Champaign, IL 61820
(217) 244-5095
(217) 244-5775 fax
jrlevaia@aol.com; jrlev@uiuc.edu
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Saturday 3/14 / 2009
Afternoon
5:00pm Team arrives Charlottesville Airport/Taxi to hotels
5:30pm Team-only APR Review, The Colonnade Club
6:30pm Team-only dinner

Sunday 3/15/ 2009
8:00am Team-only breakfast
9:00am Team orientation: Team Room, Program, Facilities, and Research Projects

Introduction of the program and curriculum

Team Room overview and initial review of response to previous VTR with:
Karen Van Lengen, Dean
Craig Barton, Chair Dept of Architecture + Landscape Architecture
Charles Menefee, Architecture Program Director
Elizabeth Roettger, Assistant to Chair
Earl Mark, Chief Technology Officer

Tour of program facilities (Including library, digital/computing labs, shops, fabrication, etc.)
Lucie Wall Stylianopoulos, Head Librarian for Art and Archaeology; collection
management, and strategic planning
Anselmo Canfora, Director of Fabrication Facilities
Earl Mark, CTO

11:00 –12.00 ALAR Faculty Research Projects:
Anselmo Canfora Project reCOVER
Phoebe Crisman Learning Barge
Kirk Martini Arcade
William Morrish Urban Habitas
John Quale ecoMOD
William Williams Dresser Trunk Project

12:00noon Lunch with Program Administrators
Karen Van Lengen, Dean
William Sherman, Associate Dean for Academics
Craig Barton, Chair Dept of Architecture + Landscape Architecture
Charles Menefee, Architecture Program Director
Michael Bednar, Director Undergraduate Advising.
Elizabeth Roettger, Assistant to the Chair
Kristina Hill, Landscape Architecture Program Director

1:00-4:00pm Review of student work, Team Room

4.00pm Team-only meeting with ALAR track, non-track/contract, and adjunct faculty; no
administrators

5.00pm Team-only meeting with ALAR senior faculty; no administrators

6:30pm Reception with SOA faculty, staff, administration, alumni and local professionals,
including CCDC staff

7:30pm Team-only dinner

9.00pm Team meeting
Monday 3/16/2009
7.30am Team-only breakfast
8:00am Breakfast with Chair Craig Barton
9:00am Team-only Entrance meeting with Dean Van Lengen
10:00am Team-only Entrance meeting with Provost Garson
11:00am Meeting with Program Directors in the Department of Architecture and Landscape Architecture:
   Charles Menefee: Director of the Department of Architecture
   Kristina Hill: Director of the Department of Landscape Architecture
   Daniel Bluestone: Director of the Program in Historic Preservation
12:00noon Team lunch with Architecture Program (graduate) faculty
1:00-2:00pm Meeting with
   Associate Dean Elizabeth Fortune, School Budget Officer
   Warren Buford, School of Architecture Foundation Exec Director
1:00-3:00pm Review student work, Team Room
2:00pm Visit studios (602, 702, 802), Campbell Hall 4th Floor
3.00pm Team-only Entrance meeting with President Casteen
4:00pm Team-only School-wide meeting with Architecture students (no faculty, staff or administrators)
5:30 pm Meeting w/ Dean Search Committee Chair, Professor Edward Ford
6.00-7.30pm Review student work, Team Room
8.00pm Team-only dinner
9.00pm Team meeting

Tuesday 3/17/2009
7.30am Team-only breakfast
8:00am Breakfast with Chair Craig Barton and Director Charles Menefee
9.00am Meeting with other School of Architecture Department Chairs
   Participants: Louis Nelson: Chair, Department of Architectural History
   Daphne Spain: Chair, Department of Urban and Environmental Planning
10.00am (A) Meeting with Advising Staff: Student Progression/Admissions/Transfers (G and UG)
   Ellen Cathay, Associate Dean of Students
   Erica Spangler, Director of Admissions/Financial Aid
   Charles Menefee, Architecture Program Director
   Michael Bednar, Director Undergraduate Advising
10:00am (B) Meeting with Program Staff
Lana Elam, Administrator Department of Architecture and Landscape

Architecture
Jenee Libby, Departmental Assistant
Shayla Givens, Academic Service Coordinator
Sharon McDonald, School Registrar
Jake Thackston, IT Systems Manager
Dick Smith, Facilities Manager
Dave Williams, Shop Manager

11:00am Review student work, Team Room

12:00noon Team-only lunch with student leaders
ALAS: (Gennifer Munoz ugrad, Leslie McDonald grad),
Design Council: (Mary Beccia, ugrad)
NAAB Rep: (Ryan McEnroe (grad),
NOMAS: (Shirin Rekaloui, ugrad)
SAGA: (Maressa Perreault, Sam Beall, Randall Winston, Maggie Hansen,
Suzanne Matthew/ grads),
Lunch: Lauren Hackney (grad)

1:00-7.30pm Review student work, visit lecture courses/seminars and Team work session: Draft APR

7:30pm Team-only dinner

9:00pm Team meeting

Wednesday 3/18/2009
7:00am Breakfast available

8:30am Team-only Exit interview in Team Room with Chair Craig Barton

9:00am Team-only Exit interview in Team Room with Provost Arthur Garson

9:45am Team-only Exit interview with Dean Karen Van Lengen

10:30am Exit interview with School community: Students, faculty, staff and administration

Afternoon Team departs
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Marilys R. Nepomechie, FAIA
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA

Thomas R. Mathison, FAIA, REFP
Team member

Representing the AIA

Catherine McNeal-Florreich
Catherine McNeal-Florreich, Assoc., AIA
Team member

Representing the AIAS

James R. Lev, AIA
Team member

Representing the NCARB

Mabel O. Wilson
Observer
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