

2004 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

SCHOOL: University of Arizona Completed by: Susan K. E. Moody; David Shirk; Polly McCord

ACSA REGION: EC NE SE SW WC W (circle one)

PUBLIC or PRIVATE (circle one)

STUDENT DATA

For Accredited Programs Only

	<u>4 Year</u> **PreProf	<u>B.Arch</u> Five-year	<u>B.Arch</u> **PostPreProf	<u>B.Arch</u> **PostNonProf	<u>M.Arch</u> Five-year	<u>M.Arch</u> **PostPreProf	<u>M.Arch</u> ***PostNonProf
Full-Time Students	_____	<u>363.0</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Part-Time Students	_____	<u>33</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
FTE Students	_____	<u>381.3</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Arch Design Studio Students	_____	<u>337</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Students Working Part-Time	_____	<u>206</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept.	_____	<u>47</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
African-American Students	_____	<u>5</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Native American Students*	_____	<u>4</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Asian/Pacific Isle Students	_____	<u>18</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Hispanic Origin Students	_____	<u>68</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Women Students	_____	<u>160</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Foreign Students	_____	<u>14</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total Degrees Awarded	_____	<u>35</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Grads. Fin. Estab. No. Yrs.	_____	<u>23</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Degrees Awarded Women	_____	<u>16</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Degrees Awarded Afri-Amer	_____	<u>1</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Degrees Awarded Amer. Ind.	_____	<u>0</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Degrees Awarded Asi/Pac. Isl.	_____	<u>2</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Degrees Awarded Hispanics	_____	<u>5</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score	_____	<u>1180</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Number of Applicants	_____	<u>400</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Number Accepted	_____	<u>173</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Enrollment Target/Goal	_____	<u>175</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Student Studio/Faculty Ratio	_____	<u>12:1</u>	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

**Includes four-year program component of 4+1 yrs. B.Arch degree and 4+2 yrs. M. Arch degree.

***Non-Professional: baccalaureate degree that is not part of an accredited professional program.

FACILITY/RESOURCE DATA

Departmental Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection	<u>17,600</u>	
Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library	<u>35,000</u>	
University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection	<u>30,200</u>	
Total Architecture Collection in University Library	<u>65,200</u>	
Departmental Library Architecture Slides	<u>0</u>	
University Library Architecture Slides	<u>0</u>	
Departmental Library Architecture Videos	<u>400</u>	
Staff in Dept. Library	<u>staffed by</u>	students
Number of Computer Stations	<u>44</u>	
Amount Spent on Information Technology	<u>85,600</u>	
Annual Budget for Library Resources	<u>29,106</u>	
Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University	<u>6,991</u>	
Private Outside Monies Received by Source	<u>615,677</u>	(gifts and scholarships)
Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.)	<u>12,225</u>	
Total Area (Gross Sq. ft.)	<u>43,307</u>	

SCHOOL: University of Arizona Completed by: Susan K. E. Moody/David Shirk/Polly McCord

FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES	<u>Number</u>	<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Maximum</u>	<u>Univ. Avg.</u>
Professor	5	65,984	75,794	82,000	106,679
Associate Professor	3	55,307	60,729	65,652	76,076
Assistant Professor	9	43,929	47,598	52,780	66,218
Instructor	18	32,000	38,000	64,000	41,787

FACULTY DATA

Department Total

Full-Time Faculty	<u>16</u>	NO. FULL-TIME FACULTY CREDIT
Part-Time Faculty	<u>3</u>	
Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty	<u>17.42</u>	
Tenured Faculty	<u>10</u>	
Tenure-Track Positions	<u>9</u>	
FTE Administrative Positions	<u> </u>	
Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm.	<u> </u>	
Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ.	<u> </u>	
FT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects	<u> </u>	
PT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects	<u> </u>	
Practicing Architects	<u>6.75</u>	
FTE Graduate TAs	<u> </u>	
FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk	<u> </u>	
PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk	<u> </u>	
		Ph.D. <u>5</u>
		D. Arch <u>1</u>
		M.A. or S. <u> </u>
		Prof. M. Arch <u> </u>
		B. Arch <u> </u>
		Post Prof. Masters <u>14.42</u>
		Other <u> </u>

	<u>FT</u>	<u>PT</u>	<u>Tenured</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Assoc.</u>	<u>Assist.</u>
African-American Faculty	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Native American Faculty*	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Asian/Pacific Island Faculty	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>1</u>
Hispanic Origin Faculty	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Women Faculty	<u>5</u>	<u> </u>	<u>1</u>	<u> </u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

Conditions not met

Condition 3. Public Information

The program has generally moved from printed promotional and catalog material to on-line electronic sources. The last printed copies of such material (Undergraduate Catalog 1998-99 and Graduate Catalog 2001-02) do not contain the NAAB required information. Current electronic documents do contain the NAAB information, but in a version that is several years old and not consistent with the statement as contained in NAAB 1998 Conditions and Procedures. Evidence is not compelling that all faculty and incoming students are furnished with a copy of the 1998 Guide to Student Performance Criteria.

The most recent version of the promotional literature has been updated with NAAB required information, using the exact language found in appendix A-2, explaining the parameters of an accredited professional degree program. All new faculty and incoming students are furnished with a copy of the 1998 Guide to Student Performance Criteria, and the recent 2002 addendum to the same. (A current copy of the Public Information text is available for verification, if required). The School of Architecture website will be redesigned during Summer/Fall 2004 and the electronic information will be updated at that time.

Condition 7. Physical Resources

The current facility is taxed beyond its practicable ability to properly house the current program. Design studio space is undersized by roughly a factor of two, lecture and seminar space is minimal and must be shared with other disciplines, and faculty offices originally designed to house one person now typically house two. There is inadequate studio layout and pin-up space and laboratories are remotely located several blocks away from the main facility. Model building activities frequently occur in an outdoor area adjacent to the building and student project reviews are typically held in corridor space.

In short, the success of the UA SOA program is occurring not because of the facilities, but virtually in spite of them.

The building expansion, which is an officially approved and funded project, is moving ahead according to the following schedule: Design Phase, Development & Construction Documents, June-Dec. 2004; Pricing, Jan.-March 2005; Construction, April 2005-May 2006; University Fit-up, Occupation, June-Aug. 2006; Move-in, Aug. 2006.

The space program of the expansion is allocated as follows: Material Laboratories: 7,000 sq.ft. (additional exterior covered labs: 5,200 sq.ft.); Design Studios: 15,600 sq.ft.; Faculty & Administrative Offices: 4,150 sq.ft.; Class/ Review Rooms: 3,600 sq.ft.; Roof - 13,000 sq.ft. (exterior space, live load compatible for additional Energy and Environmental Testing Labs.) The total conditioned interior space is 30,350 — virtually doubling the capacity of the current physical resources.

The existing building is also scheduled for renovation, but the proposed schedule is contingent upon funding approval: Design Phase, Dec. 2004-June 2005; Pricing, July-Sep. 2005; Construction, March-Oct. 2006; University Fit-up, Nov.-Dec. 2006; Move-in, Dec. 2006.

Condition 11. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The program requires a minimum of 168 credits for graduation. Of these, 122 credits are in architecture courses, which include the Foundation Studios ARC 101 and 102, in the first year of the program. The remaining 46 credits are in general studies and non-architecture electives.

The required minimum architecture credits in the program are 72.6% of the total credits required. NAAB criteria require that no more than 60% of a student's required post-secondary education be devoted to professional studies. The 72.6 actual percentage means that students have little flexibility to pursue special interests or develop academic concentrations beyond the required architectural courses.

This condition was also "Not Met" at the time of the 1998 Accreditation Visit. At that time 69.5% of the required curriculum was in architectural courses.

The School of Architecture Curriculum Committee has finalized a curricular revision reducing the number of required credit hours in Architecture courses in the B.Arch. program from 122 hours to 102 — in response to the condition not met identified above. The ratio of required Architecture credits to total credits is now 102:168=0.607 — almost exactly the 60% required by NAAB criteria.

The coordinators of each stream of curriculum met with the other faculty who participate in that stream, and built consensus for the following: the required advanced elective in each stream (ARC 471, ARC 461, ARC 497, ARC 481), the required Architecture electives (6 credit hours), and the Capstone Seminar elective (ARC 496) are released to become free electives in any discipline offered by the University of Arizona. Of the 20 credit hours released to free electives, 12 must be taken as upper division credits.

This action allows the development of a minor focus within each student's program of study, but does not require it. Students may continue to choose electives offered by the School of Architecture. While this action may have the result of slimming down the number of offerings of Architectural electives, it would simultaneously allow the Director more freedom in granting releases from teaching for development of research agenda, tenure and promotion activities, and sabbatical leaves.

This revision was circulated on April 11, 2004, to the entire faculty of the School of Architecture, and did not generate negative responses. The faculty approved the revision unanimously at its meeting of May 10, 2004. The revision is now moving forward to the University Undergraduate Council for approval, and then to Curriculum and Registration, to make the official changes to the Architecture program requirements. The expected date for implementation of the revised curriculum is Fall 2005.

Criterion 12.28 Technical Documentation

Evidence is lacking that each student, working in teams of six, acquires the ability to produce a complete set of technical documents.

The faculty member that teaches ARC 441 – Construction Documents is well aware of this observation, and discussed the matter with the Visiting Team during the Site Visit.

The number of students working in a group has been cited incorrectly. The students have traditionally worked in groups of four. Due to the numeric breakdown of the class, there are occasionally two groups of five — never groups of six. There are a series of checks and balances in place that ensure that the students gain exposure to production of the full set. The sets are graded at 10%, 35%, 60%, 99%, and 100% via submissions. The title blocks, which every drawing is required to have, indicate the people who have worked on individual sheets. The instructor, to assess whether or not students are gaining the required knowledge base and skill set at each increment, checks the individual sheets. The students receive a grade for the submission as a whole, and they receive an individual grade at each submission. In addition, at each submission the students fill out a form, which requires them to evaluate their performance as well as the performance of each student in the group. These two elements are utilized as indices in the course exercise to determine whether or not students are performing to requisite levels.

Criterion 12.29 Comprehensive Design

Because of the variable scope and scale of individual studio projects, evidence is lacking that every student meets this criterion. The Capstone Studio, cited as playing a major role in meeting this criterion, allows a student to select a highly theoretical or philosophical problem with no assurance that they have, or will, complete a comprehensive architecture design problem within the 5 year program's duration.

It was indeed improper to designate ARC 452 – Capstone Studio as a vehicle to satisfy this criterion, this was acknowledged by the Director in his discussion with the Visiting Team. ARC 452 has evolved to a dual track. Option 1, Autonomous Project: Students who want to pursue an individual project, such as a “thesis”, must earn that right through submission of a feasible proposal and then proceed to work with an advisory committee in the fall term in ARC 498 – Senior Capstone, and fully develop it in the spring term in ARC 452 – Capstone Project. Option 2, Directed Studio: Students not interested or ready to pursue a “thesis”, will still enroll in ARC 498 – Senior Capstone, as an independent study not necessarily related to the subsequent spring studio, and enroll in ARC 452 – Directed Studio options. The Comprehensive Design criterion will no longer be part of ARC 452 due to the diversity of topics, scope, and options.

The following studios have now been revised and adjusted to meet Criterion 12.29 Comprehensive Design: ARC 301 – Land Ethic, ARC 302 – Tectonics, and ARC 401 – Technical Systems — this allows a gradual development of the criterion in the evolution of projects from simple to complex. In ARC 301, it will be done through the complete design of a dwelling that satisfies site/environmental, programmatic and technical/constructive requirements. In ARC 302, it will be done through the design of a small building that satisfies programmatic, material/structural and enclosure/environmental requirements. In ARC 401, it will be done through a more complex building through integration of programmatic requirements with material/constructive and environmental controls/life safety systems.

Causes of Concern

Condition 5 Human Resources

Each full-time faculty member is required to teach two courses per semester, requiring approximately 60% of their time. The balance of faculty time is spent on research and service. The split between these two activities is not equal for all faculty members, which may hinder opportunities for faculty tenure and promotion.

As reported in the response to Condition 11, the conversion of required electives to free electives will have the effect of lesser density in the curriculum, giving more freedom to students, but also giving greater latitude to the faculty to seek teaching releases to pursue research and promotion/tenure development activities. Both the Director and the Faculty Status Committee find that the Visiting Team Report observation, that the curriculum was too dense, generated a definitive advantage in the resolution of this matter.

Condition 8 Information Resources

Although the budget of the Architecture Library is increasing annually, there is a serious concern that physical and fiscal constraints have led to inadequate library hours that limit access to this resource. In addition, new multiple locations of the holdings of the Architecture Library have significantly reduced convenience of this access.

This is still a cause of concern that will remain effective until the question of the library is properly resolved. The Dean has been actively working on a committee selected by the Provost's office to further develop the feasibility of a university project designated as "The Libratory", which will integrate the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, the College of Fine Arts, and the Center for Creative Photography separate libraries in a unified single facility to be built adjacent to the Architecture building — the mechanisms for development and funding of this project are still in the exploratory phase.

Criterion 12.26 Building Economics and Cost Control

There is coverage of this criterion in several course offerings and each correctly designates the performance level of "Awareness." Evidence is lacking regarding how the new performance level of "Understanding" will be incorporated, and future Annual Reports should reference such progress.

The discussion of the upgrading of level of this criterion from "Awareness" to "Understanding" began even before the recent Site Visit. The courses designated to meet this upgraded criterion are ARC 441 – Construction Documents and ARC 459 – Ethics and Practice. The faculty member teaching these courses has revised the pedagogical objectives, methodology, and requirements accordingly.

More specifically, ARC 441 addresses cost control through quantity exercises and fee structuring. The quantities exercises are linked to the submission benchmarks to demonstrate escalation potential and control measures. ARC 459 utilizes a semester long project requiring students to commission the fabrication of a finite constructive element to a specific budget. Interface with fabricators establishes a clear understanding between economic constraint and intention in design.

Criterion 12.27 Detailed Design Development

There are solid courses in materials and components. Proficiency in communicating configurations and assemblies to satisfy building programs is not fully evident for all students in the single course cited as meeting this criterion. Contributing to this condition is the fact that students are permitted choices in the focus of their investigation which might not include building programs.

The course previously designated to meet this criterion was ARC 452 – Capstone Studio; after the Site Visit and the findings of the VTR, this is no longer the case. As already stated in the response

to a criterion not met — 12.29 Comprehensive Design — this designation has now been shifted to Arc 301 – Land Ethic, ARC 302 – Tectonics, and ARC 401 – Technical Systems; the rationale and methodology for satisfaction of this criterion in the respective studios is similar to that already indicated for criterion 12.29.

Criterion 12.31 The Legal Context of Architectural Practice

There is coverage of this criterion in several course offerings and each correctly designates the performance level of "Awareness." Evidence is lacking regarding how the new performance level of "Understanding" will be incorporated, and future Annual Reports should reference such progress.

The discussion of the upgrading of level of this criterion from "Awareness" to "Understanding" began even before the recent Site Visit. The courses designated to meet this upgraded criterion are ARC 441 – Construction Documents and ARC 459 – Ethics and Practice. The faculty member teaching these courses has revised the pedagogical objectives, methodology, and requirements accordingly.

Criterion 12.37 Ethics and Professional Judgment

There is coverage of this criterion in several course offerings and each correctly designates the performance level of "Awareness." Evidence is lacking regarding how the new performance level of "Understanding" will be incorporated, and future Annual Reports should reference such progress.

The discussion of the upgrading of level of this criterion from "Awareness" to "Understanding" began even before the recent Site Visit. The course designated to meet this upgraded criterion is ARC 459 – Ethics and Practice. The faculty member teaching this course has revised the pedagogical objectives, methodology, and requirements accordingly.