

PUBLIC INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PERFORMANCE (2022-23)

Master of Landscape Architecture | School of Landscape Architecture & Planning

1040 N OLIVE RD | 520-621-1004
CAPLA.ARIZONA.EDU

Our three-year **Master's of Landscape Architecture Degree** (MLA) Program at the University of Arizona is accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB). The MLA Program was last accredited in 2019 and is scheduled for re-accreditation in 2026. Our program has received the longest accreditation periods possible for the last 23 years, with no suggestions for improvement or recommendations from LAAB since 2007. An accredited degree in Landscape Architecture is generally the first step towards [licensure eligibility](#). LAAB accredited programs are required to provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement as determined by the institution or program. This information is intended to help potential students make informed application decisions.

Program Costs*

Estimated Costs for the 2022-23 academic year:

Category	Arizona Resident***	Non-Resident
Tuition**	\$12,348	\$32,290
Room/Board	\$12,250	\$12,250
Books/Supplies	\$1,200	\$1,200
Program Fees	\$3,000	\$3,000

source: <https://financialaid.arizona.edu/cost/graduate-professional>

Computer Requirements

There are computers available in the studio and computer lab, however, they are often used for courses. Students are required to have laptops by the first day of classes. Personal computers must meet specific [computer requirements](#) in order to run the necessary software.

Supplemental Learning & Experiential Learning Opportunities

All students are encouraged to complete an internship while in the program. Faculty advisors work with students to help find an internship that suits their needs.

Study Abroad: CAPLA offers [study abroad](#) opportunities for students who are interested in taking their education outside the United States. In summer 2023, students have the opportunity to participate in Cities of the Future in Germany, France, and the Netherlands.

Faculty Professional Licensure and Certifications

Nolan Bade, Adjunct Lecturer, Licensed Landscape Architect

Kirk Dimond, Associate Professor, LEED AP

Kenneth Kokroro, Assistant Professor, Licensed Landscape Architect

Alexandra Stoicof, Adjunct Lecturer, Licensed Landscape Architect

Mackenzie Waller, Assistant Professor, Licensed Landscape Architect

Bo Yang, Professor, Licensed Landscape Architect, American Institute of Certified Planners

**The majority of our students receive financial support in the form of tuition waivers, fellowships, program set-aside funds, teaching and research assistantships, and scholarships.*

***Tuition includes registration fee, technology/library fee, Recreation Center Bond Retirement fee, Arizona Financial Aid Trust fee, and Campus Recreation Program fee.*

****Our program participates in the [Western Regional Graduate Program](#), where qualified residents from 15 western states pay Arizona resident tuition rates.*

MLA Student Data

Applicants	2022-23	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Number Applied	23	25	29	32	27
Number Accepted	21	22	25	26	21
Number Enrolled	9	13	11	17	9

Retention and Graduation Rates

Entering Cohort	# Enrolled	2nd Year Retention Rate	Graduation Rate within 3 years	Graduation Rate within 4 years
2015-16	13	100%	92%	100%
2016-17	16	94%	88%	94%
2017-18	10	100%	90%	100%
2018-19	9	100%	89%	100%
2019-20	17	100%	84%	n/a
2020-21	11	91%	n/a	n/a
2021-22	13	77%	n/a	n/a
2022-23	9	n/a	n/a	n/a

note: graduation rate is the percentage of the entering cohort.

Number of Degrees Conferred

	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	2017
Number of Graduates	15	9	8	13	12	12

Employment Outcomes: Graduating Class of 2021

Private Practice: 5

NGO/Non-Profit Practice: 2

Unknown: 2

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

I. Assessment Activities

Assessment activities were first utilized during the 2014-15 academic year using rubrics created in spring/summer 2014, which can be found on the following pages. These activities were done following completion of the fall LAR 612 final design studio in the Landscape Architecture Program, School of Landscape Architecture and Planning, CAPLA. The table below displays the findings for each standard.

The scores are based on a three-point scale:

- 3 - Exceeds requirements
- 2 - Meets requirements
- 1 - Unsatisfactory

Learning Outcomes - Rubric	Fall 2019 n=7	Fall 2020 n=8	Fall 2021 n=16	Fall 2022 n=10
Student Design and Planning Skills and Solutions				
Design Programming	2.5	3.0	2.7	2.6
Design Research	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.6
Design Synthesis and Evaluation	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7
Student Design Implementation Skills				
Construction Standards and Guidelines	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.7
Construction Concepts and Techniques	2.5	3.0	2.6	2.7
Construction Processes and Performance	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.5
Student Design Communication Skills				
Content	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.6
Organization	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.5
Presentation Delivery and Mechanics	2.5	3.0	2.8	2.6

Every year graduating students complete an exit survey where they give feedback on the program and rate their skills on various learning outcomes. They have the option to rate their confidence in their skills/knowledge as: Not confident; Somewhat confident; Confident; Very Confident.

Learning Outcomes - Student Exit Survey 2022	Students' Confidence in their Skills/Knowledge:		
	Not Confident	Somewhat Confident	Confident or Very Confident
Student Design and Planning Skills and Solutions			
Design Programming	0%	27%	73%
Design Research	0%	18%	82%
Design Synthesis and Evaluation	0%	9%	91%
Student Design Implementation Skills			
Construction Standards and Guidelines	0%	50%	50%
Construction Concepts and Techniques	18%	27%	55%
Construction Processes and Performance	18%	32%	50%
Student Design Communication Skills			
Content	0%	18%	82%
Organization	0%	18%	82%
Presentation Delivery and Mechanics	0%	0%	100%

II. Learning Assessment (3) Rubrics

Rubric for Assessing MLA Students' Design and Planning Skills and Solutions

Dimensions	Design Programming	Design Research	Design Synthesis and Evaluation
3 - Exceeds Requirements	The student has identified goals and objectives, and a detailed list of project requirements including site function, human activities, and conceptual frameworks. The student has clear and well developed design intentions that include a purpose and scope of work.	Background research including site inventory, site analysis, socio/cultural analysis, literature and case reviews as well as sources of creative inspiration are sound and clearly presented. The student has made excellent use of this background research as a basis for complex design decisions that are programmatically appropriate.	The design demonstrates excellent understanding on how programming and research are applied in the development of landscape architectural solutions at all scales. The student develops alternative design concepts that can be evaluated within the parameters set by the program and research. The design demonstrates innovative thinking in place making, and form giving.
2 - Meets Requirements	The design program is adequate but is not fully developed and may include some deficiencies or errors that make the final design less effective. Incomplete aspects of the program do not interfere with overall understanding of student design intentions.	The background research is adequate but is lacking some components that may have improved the design. The analysis is acceptable and includes the most important considerations.	The design demonstrates sound understanding of programming and research in the application of solutions that are reasonably justifiable but is lacking in some aspects of site organization. The design solves most problems but may have technical errors. The design is adequate but not highly unique to the conditions.
1 - Unsatisfactory	The design program lacks important information on requirements; goals and objectives are not clearly articulated and they do not create the foundation for concept development.	The background research lacks important critical data and the analysis is difficult to understand. The background research guides the design in an inappropriate way.	The design is programmatically flawed or is poorly executed. The design does not satisfy the project goals, objectives, or requirements and does not make adequate use of background research. The student has not made clear justification for the final design. The design does not follow basic design doctrines.

Rubric for Assessing MLA Students' Design Implementation Skills

Dimensions	Construction Standards and Guidelines	Construction Concepts and Techniques	Constructions Processes and Performance
3 - Exceeds Requirements	The student has a substantial understanding of construction theories and models relevant to landscape architectural practice. The student's design work demonstrates advanced knowledge of design implementation principles and strategies can serve as a basis for complex design decision making and analysis regarding appropriate construction methods.	The student's design demonstrates technical accuracy and innovation in the construction of the built and natural environment. The student is able to synthesize diverse aspects of site construction including grading and drainage, earthworks, vegetation, material layout, fabrication and installation, and structural elements into comprehensive complex landscape architectural plans. The student has developed multiple alternative concepts and provided substantial documentation and justification for material selection, site engineering, and design details.	The student is able to prepare construction documents and specifications that are environmentally sound and socially equitable. Student plans have a high level of site performance as demonstrated by best practices for sustainable landscape architecture. Plans demonstrate a high level of professionalism in terms of creative innovation, construction methods, site engineering, and documentation.
2 - Meets Requirements	The student has sufficient understanding of construction standards and guidelines and is able in most cases to utilize correct models for design implementation. Aspects of the student construction plans may need to be adjusted for accurately.	The student's site engineering plans and construction plans are primarily technically accurate and understandable to reviewers. Most of design variables are coordinated into a cohesive plan. The construction techniques are feasible but in some cases students may need to make minor adjustments to their approaches.	The student is able to prepare construction documents and specifications that demonstrate a good level of understanding on landscape architectural design implementation methods. Plans consider performance standards but are not comprehensive. Students have missed construction components that should have been considered.
1 - Unsatisfactory	The student has not demonstrated understanding of fundamentals of site engineering and landscape architectural construction standards.	The student's design implementation concepts are not well developed and their construction methods and techniques would fail if implemented in the built environment.	The student's construction documents and specifications are incomplete unreadable, and inaccurate. Information is not clearly labeled.

Rubric for Assessing MLA Students' Design Communication Skills

Dimensions	Content	Organization	Presentations Delivery and Mechanics
<p>3 - Exceeds Requirements</p>	<p>The student is able to go beyond the focus of the design content by demonstrating how the design concept and related ideas fit into a wider context of landscape architectural theory and practice. The student provides in- depth detail on design content through drawings, written descriptions, and verbal presentations that demonstrate fluency in landscape architectural scholarship and design doctrines.</p>	<p>The student presents clear design processes used in design ideation and development. Digital media, hand drawings, written programs, and design descriptions, are expressed clearly and presented in organizational graphic sequences that provide reviewers with a comprehensive understanding of developed design concepts as well as design and evaluation processes.</p>	<p>The student is exceptionally competent in articulating design doctrines through design representation tools and methods. The student produces accurate and evocative drawings, uses highly skilled language arts, and delivers verbal presentations such that reviewers are engaged by the work. The student is able to hold the attention of reviewers and present design intentions, processes, and content clearly. The graphics, written text, and verbal presentation could be used as a model for other design presentations.</p>
<p>2 - Meets Requirements</p>	<p>The student demonstrates thorough understanding of the design content and is able to respond readily to relevant questions. The student presents design processes and concepts clearly but missed opportunities in the communication of some design components. Ideas may have been presented verbally but not graphically.</p>	<p>The student followed logical steps according to design processes as a way to present design schemes and ideas. The graphics, written materials and verbal presentation is clear and easy to follow and thus the design concept is reinforced. The layout of the design graphics could be more comprehensive.</p>	<p>The student design work and presentations can be easily understood; design intentions, concepts, and schemes are reasonably clear, but some aspects of the design are not completely articulated or are not accurately represented. Additional visual material may be needed to aid in design explanation; verbal presentations are adequate but not compelling to the reviewer.</p>
<p>1 - Unsatisfactory</p>	<p>The student demonstrates only a minimal knowledge of the design information needed to communicate his/her ideas and has difficulty answering questions related to design content.</p>	<p>The student fails to communicate a clear design process and the design is not well articulated through graphics, text, or verbal presentation. The design organization is unclear and appears incomplete.</p>	<p>The student communications are difficult to understand. Most visual images are poorly executed, incomplete, or distracting. Verbal presentations are hard to hear and follow. The student does not engage the audience.</p>