# 2006 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

SCHOOL:__ University of Arizona          completed by: Susan K. E. Moody, Assistant Dean

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

PUBLIC or PRIVATE   (circle one)

## STUDENT DATA                                        For Accredited Programs Only

| | 4 Year **PreProf | B.Arch Five-year | B.Arch **PostPreProf | B.Arch **PostNonProf | M.Arch Five-year | M.Arch **PostPreProf | M.Arch ***PostNonProf |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Full-Time Students | | 407 | | | | | |
| Part-Time Students | | 23 | | | | | |
| FTE Students | | 417 | | | | | |
| Arch Design Studio Students | | 188 | | | | | |
| Students Working Part-Time | | 50% | | | | | |
| Outside Stud. Serv. by Dept. | | 55 | | | | | |
| African-American Students | | 8 | | | | | |
| Native American Students* | | 5 | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Isle Students | | 19 | | | | | |
| Hispanic Origin Students | | 75 | | | | | |
| Women Students | | 172 | | | | | |
| Foreign Students | | 14 | | | | | |
| Total Degrees Awarded | | 33 | | | | | |
| Grads. Fin. Estab. No. Yrs. | | 23 | | | | | |
| Degrees Awarded Women | | 12 | | | | | |
| Degrees Awarded Afri-Amer | | 0 | | | | | |
| Degrees Awarded Amer. Ind. | | 0 | | | | | |
| Degrees Awarded Asi/Pac. Isl. | | 2 | | | | | |
| Degrees Awarded Hispanics | | 3 | | | | | |
| Min Req. SAT/ACT/GRE Score | | 1110 SAT | | | | | |
| Number of Applicants | | ~375 | | | | | |
| Number Accepted | | 184 | | | | | |
| Enrollment Target/Goal | | 192 | | | | | |
| Student Studio/Faculty Ratio | | 12 to 1 | | | | | |

*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 | 0 |
| Total Architecture Collection in Departmental Library | 0 |
| University Library LCNA or 720-729 Collection | 48,000 |
| Total Architecture Collection in University Library | 100,500 |
| Departmental Library Architecture Slides | 0 |
| University Library Architecture Slides | 0 |
| Departmental Library Architecture Videos | 400 |
| Staff in Dept. Library | students |
| Number of Computer Stations | 45 |
| Amount Spent on Information Technology | 100,000 |
| Annual Budget for Library Resources | 36,500 |
| Per-Capita Financial Support Received from University | 95,000 |
| Private Outside Monies Received by Source | 350,000 |
| Studio Area (Net Sq. ft.) | 12,225 |
| Total Area (Gross Sq. ft.) | 43,307 |

# 2006 NAAB STATISTICAL REPORT

SCHOOL:___ University of Arizona          completed by Susan K. E. Moody, Assistant Dean

| FULL-TIME FACULTY SALARIES | Number | Minimum | Average | Maximum | Univ. Avg. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Professor | 8 | 80,450 | 93,010 | 117,750 | 108,404 |
| Associate Professor | 1 | 66,900 | 66,900 | 66,900 | 73,562 |
| Assistant Professor | 6 | 51,000 | 53,650 | 63,546 | 62,730 |
| Instructor | 2 | 44,690 | 48,070 | 51,457 | 48,507 |

## FACULTY DATA

| | Department Total |
|---|---|
| Full-Time Faculty | 17 |
| Part-Time Faculty | 21 |
| Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Faculty | 28 |
| Tenured Faculty | 8 |
| Tenure-Track Positions | 6 |
| FTE Administrative Positions | 4 |
| Faculty Engaged in Service to Comm. | 25 |
| Faculty Engaged in Service to Univ. | 20 |
| FT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects | 10 |
| PT Faculty who are U.S. Licensed Registered Architects | 17 |
| Practicing Architects | 30 |
| FTE Graduate TAs | 4 |
| FT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk | 15 |
| PT Faculty Avg. Contact Hrs/Wk | 4.5 |

NO. FULL-TIME FACULTY CREDENTIALS

| | |
|---|---|
| Ph.D. | 3 |
| D. Arch | 1 |
| M.A. or S. | 0 |
| Prof. M. Arch | 8 |
| B. Arch | 0 |
| Post Prof. Masters | 5 |
| Other | 0 |

| | FT | PT | Tenured | Prof. | Assoc. | Assist. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| African-American Faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Native American Faculty* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian/Pacific Island Faculty | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hispanic Origin Faculty | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Women Faculty | 4 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |

*Include Eskimos and Aleuts

School of Architecture, University of Arizona                                    11/14/06
Response to Program Deficiencies
Deficiencies identified in the Visiting Team Report, September 17, 2003 —
and to NAAB Response to the University of Arizona 2004 Annual Report. *

**Section Two (A):**
**Response to Deficiencies**

*Condition 3.        Public Information*
*The program has generally moved from printed promotional and catalog material to on-line elec-*
*tronic 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 doc-*
*uments do contain the NAAB information, but in a version that is several years old and not consis-*
*tent 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.*

*\*To complete reporting on this condition, provide in the next annual report copies of the publication*
*information regarding accredited programs with the correct language from both print and electronic*
*formats.*

The most recent version of the promotional literature and the website have been updated with
NAAB required information, using the exact language found in appendix A of the current Condi-
tions. Both website and print materials are included.
All faculty members receive a copy of the current Conditions for Accreditation – Section 3.13 Stu-
dent Performance Criteria annually.
All students, including incoming Freshmen, are furnished during the fall semester with a copy of the
Conditions for Accreditation – Section 3.13 Student Performance Criteria.

*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 per-*
*son 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.*

*\*Continue reporting on progress with the new building expansion and future renovation.*

The College has nearly completed construction on two projects to provide better facilities to its stu-
dents, faculty and staff:  a $9.4 million Expansion encompassing 33,020 square feet – virtually
doubling the capacity of the current physical resources – to be completed in December 2006; and a
$3.1 million Remodel of the existing Architecture Building to be completed in Summer 2007. The

Expansion includes Material Laboratories (7,000 sq.ft. for wood, metal, concrete, glass, and ceramics with additional 5,200 sq. ft. of exterior covered labs), Design Studios (15,600 sq.ft.), Faculty & Administrative Offices (4,150 sq.ft.), Class/ Review Rooms (3,600 sq.ft.), and Roof (13,000 sq.ft. of live load-compatible exterior space for additional Energy and Environmental Testing Labs as well as a proposed "green roof" pending future funding). The Expansion also integrates the graduate School of Landscape Architecture, and with it, laboratories and facilities open to the School of Architecture including a wetlands garden and a three-story "green wall" covering the southern façade. The Remodel includes enlarged and enhanced College administration offices, a renovated Sundt Gallery (including new lighting and mechanical systems, roof, and floor), an enlarged computer laboratory, as well as renovated and upgraded design studios and offices. See Appendix for detailed drawings of the new construction.

## 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.*

*\*Continue reporting on the implementation of the proposed curriculum revision to allow greater elective choices and to meet the NAAB percentage of professional credits.*

As reported last year, the School of Architecture Curriculum Committee, with approval of the Faculty as a whole, 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 102:167=0.611 — almost exactly the 60% required by NAAB criteria. The implementation of the revised curriculum became effective in the Fall 2004 and continues today.

**PRE-PROFESSIONAL PHASE**

| Fall 1st Year | # units | Spring 1st year | # units |
|---|---|---|---|
| ENGL 101   Freshman English | 3 | ▫ENGL 102   Freshman English | 3 |
| MATH 110   College Algebra | 4 | PHYS 102   College Physics | 3 |
| *   **OR**   MATH 112   College Algebra | (3) | PHYS 181   Physics Lab | 1 |
| MATH 111   Trigonometry | 2 | ▫+ARC 102   Foundation Studio 2 | 4 |
| ▫+ARC 101   Foundation Studio 1 | 4 | ***Elective – Tier 1 TRAD or INDV***        *3* | |
| *Elective – Tier 1 INDV or TRAD* | *3* | | |
| (Foreign Language Deficiency ) | (4) | (Foreign Language Deficiency ) | (4) |
| | 15 or 16 | | 14 |

**PROFESSIONAL PHASE**

| Fall 2nd Year | # units | Spring 2nd Year | # units |
|---|---|---|---|
| ▫* ARC 201 Design Studio 1-*Composition* | 6 | ▫ *ARC 202 Design Studio 2-*Performance* | 6 |
| ▫ *ARC 221 Building Technology 1 | 3 | ▫ *ARC 222 Building Technology 2 | 3 |
| ▫ ARC 231 History 1 | 3 | ▫ ARC 232 History 2 | 3 |
| ▫ *ARC 241 Design Communications 1 | 3 | *ARC 227 Architectural Programming | 2 |
| ***Elective – Tier 1 Gender/Ethnicity*** | **3** | ***Elective - Tier 1 NATS*** | **3** |
| *(INDV or TRAD)* | | | |
| | 18 | | 17 |

| Fall 3rd Year | # units | Spring 3rd Year | # units |
|---|---|---|---|
| ▫ *ARC 301 Design Studio 3-*Land Ethics* | 6 | ▫ *ARC 302 Design Studio 4-*Tectonics* | 6 |
| ▫ *ARC 321 Building Technology 3 | 3 | ▫ *ARC 322 Building Technology 4 | 3 |
| ▫ *ARC 341 Design Communications 2 | 3 | ▫ ARC 332 History 3 | 3 |
| *ARC 326 Site Planning | 2 | ***Elective – Tier 2  INDV*** | **3** |
| ***Elective – Tier 1 INDV or TRAD*** | **3** | OPEN Elective – (level A) | 3 |
| (whichever remains) | | | |
| | 17 | | 18 |

| Fall 4th Year | # units | Spring 4th Year | # units |
|---|---|---|---|
| ▫ *ARC 401 Design Studio 5-*Techniques* | 6 | ▫ *ARC 402 Design Studio 6-*Culture* | 6 |
| ▫ *ARC 421 Building Technology 5 | 3 | ▫ *ARC 422 Building Technology 6 | 3 |
| ▫ *ARC 441 Construction Documents | 3 | ▫ ARC 459 Ethics and Practice | 2 |
| ▫ ARC 471s Urban Form | 3 | *OPEN elective (level A)* | *3* |
| *Elective – Tier 2  NATS* | *3* | *OPEN elective (level A)* | *3* |
| | 18 | | 17 |

| Fall 5th Year | # units | Spring 5th Year | # units |
|---|---|---|---|
| ▫ ARC 451 Design Studio 7-*Research* | 6 | ▫ ARC 452 Design Studio 8-*(Committee)* | 6 |
| ▫ ARC 498 Capstone Research  (452 prep) | 2 | **OR** | |
| **OR** | | ▫ ARC 452 Design Studio 8-*(Structured)* | (6) |
| ▫ARC 498 Capstone Research  (Ind. Study) | (2) | | |
| *Elective – Tier 2 HUM* | *3* | *OPEN elective (level B)* | *3* |
| *OPEN elective (level A)* | *3* | *OPEN elective (level B)* | *3* |
| *OPEN elective (level B)* | *3* | *OPEN elective (level B)* | *3* |
| | 17 | | 15 |
| | | **TOTAL UNITS TO GRADUATE** | |
| | | **166 (min) or 167** | |

OPEN elective (level A)   100 & 200 level courses (lower division)
OPEN elective (level B)   300 & 400 level courses (upper division)

A University Minor consists of a minimum of 18 units, 9 of which must be upper division

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 School Director more freedom in granting releases from teaching for development of research agenda, tenure and promotion activities, and sabbatical leaves.

*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.*

*\*Continue reporting on how individual students are evaluated in their ability to effectively produce a set of technical documents while working in a group setting. If this process is deemed adequate, provide the next accreditation team visit with evidence of individual ability for this condition.*

As reported last year, the faculty member who 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 tradition- ally 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 students are required to update a Planning and Utilization Chart at each of the project deadline benchmarks. The bench- marks are consistent with a traditional Design, Bid, Build Owner-Architect Agreement, occurring at 10%, 35%, 60%, 99%, and 100%. The Utilization chart specifies which students have engaged in specific tasks. The sets are graded at 10%, 35%, 60%, 99%, and 100% via formal submission. The title block, which every drawing is required to have, indicates the individuals who have worked on specific sheets. The instructor, to assess whether or not students are gaining the required know- ledge base and skill set at each increment, checks information contained on individual sheets against the Utilization Charts. 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 stu- dents 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 crite- rion, 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 dura- tion.*

*\*Continue reporting on the adoption and effectiveness of the three studios(ARC301, 302, 401) to meet the condition of comprehensive design through simple to increasingly complex projects.*

As reported last year, the Capstone Studio, ARC 452, is no longer the course required to satisfy this criterion. Beginning in the 2004-2005 academic year, the following studios were 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 is done through the complete design of a dwelling that satisfies site and environmental, programmatic and material/constructive requirements. In ARC 302 - Tectonics, it is done through the design of a small public building that satisfies programmatic, material, structural and enclosure/environmental requirements. In ARC 401- Technical Systems, it is done through a more complex public building through integration of programmatic requirements with technic- al, constructive and environmental controls/life safety systems. In ARC 302 and ARC 401 in-depth case studies of internationally commended projects/architects involving investigative project analysis and

documentation inform students about the standards and scope expected in their own design work. (Copies of the respective 2005/2006 syllabi and student work are appended for verification.)

## Causes of Concern

*Condition 5*                    *Human Resources*
*Each full-time faculty member is required to teach two courses per semester, requiring approx-imately 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.*

*\*Continue reporting on the equitable adjustment of teaching loads for faculty research and promo-tion and tenure activities.*

As reported last year in the response to Condition 11, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, the conversion of required electives to free electives has had the effect of a lesser density in the curri-culum, giving more freedom to students, but also giving greater latitude to the faculty to seek teaching releases to pursue research and promotion and tenure development activities. The School Director, with the support of the Faculty Status Committee, and in agreement with the Visit-ing Team Report observation that the curriculum was too dense, has revised the teaching load schedules. Faculty seeking tenure and promotion are given one course release every two years, to allow  preparation in those activities.

This is reviewed annually for each tenure track faculty member.  The School of Architecture Faculty Status Committee conducts an annual Assessment of Progress Toward Promotion and Tenure or an Interim Promotion and Tenure Review.  Reports/recommendations from these assessments are given to the School Director as input into his/her Annual Review Letter and subsequent meeting with each faculty member.  Through this process, any appropriate equity adjustments of teaching loads or other assigned faculty duties are made.

*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 re-source.  In addition, new multiple locations of the holdings of the Architecture Library have signifi-cantly reduced convenience of this access.*

*\*Continue reporting on progress toward creation of a new library facility for which adequate hours can be maintained and provide space to hold the collections in a single location.*

As noted last year, 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 approach for a university project designated as "The Fine Arts Library", which will integrate the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, the Col-lege of Fine Arts, and the Center for Creative Photography separate libraries in a unified single fa-cility to be built adjacent to the Architecture building. Interim operational strategies have included the relocation of the Architecture Library into the Fine Arts Library. This facility is located in the Fine Arts Complex, which is adjacent to the Architecture Building. This interim arrangement offers more space, combined arts and architecture collections, increased staffing, and increased operating

hours over the previous arrangement within the Architecture Building. Last year the Library hired a new librarian to supervise the Architecture collection. Her name is Paula Wolfe.

Campus Facilities and Planning contracted for a Feasibility Study for the Fine Arts Library during the 2003/2004 academic year. This study demonstrated that the site was appropriate for this use and this facility. Recently a Fine Arts Library was approved by the University of Arizona Space and Planning Committee.  This Committee is made up of the Provost, Vice President of Finance and the Senior University Finance Team.  The project is now approved to seek State of Arizona and private sector funding.

### 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.*

*\*To complete reporting on this concern, in the next annual report provide syllabi for the courses identified (Construction Documents and Ethics and Practice) highlighted to show where and how the performance level will be raised from "awareness" to "understanding" of building economics and cost control.*

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.

As reported last year, more specifically, ARC 441 addresses cost control through in class fee structuring exercises and independent quantity exercises developed to understand unit pricing indices. The quantities exercises are linked to the submission benchmarks to demonstrate escalation potential as level of detail increases. Control measures are discussed and implemented in two forums; one,  the resolution of the project and documents, two as a primary focus in the lecture content.   Lectures establish an understanding of cost control in the context of varying delivery methods, specifically utilizing AIA documents AIA A201, AIA A191, AIA B901, and AIA B801/CMA. ARC 459 utilizes a semester long project requiring students to commission the fabrication of a finite constructive element to a specific budget. The element is selected from the project completed in ARC 441. The quantity/unit cost increment developed in ARC 441 is used to establish a budget for the element. Interface with the fabricators and limitations set on the fabrication by restricted budgets establish a clear understanding of the relationship between economic constraint and design intent. (Copies of the respective 2005/2006 syllabi and student work are appended for verification.)

### 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.*

*Continue reporting on the three revised courses (Land Ethics, Tectonics and Technical Systems) insofar as they meet the condition of detailed design development. Reporting could be completed by included the syllabi with relevant portions highlighted in the next annual report.*

As already stated in the response to a criterion not met, 12.29 Comprehensive Design, this condition is satisfied progressively in three required studios: in ARC 301, it is done through the complete design of a dwelling that satisfies site/environmental, programmatic and material/constructive requirements; in ARC 302 - Tectonics, it is done through the design of a small public building that satisfies programmatic, material, structural and enclosure/environmental requirements; and, in ARC 401- Technical Systems, it is done through a more complex public building through integration of programmatic requirements with technical, constructive and environmental controls/life safety systems. (Copies of the respective 2005/2006 syllabi and student work are appended for verification.)

### 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.*

*\*Continue reporting on how the two identified courses (Construction Documents and Ethics and Practice) will meet the increased performance level of "understanding" regarding legal context.*

The courses designated to meet this upgraded criterion are ARC 441 – Construction Documents and ARC 459 – Ethics and Practice. In both courses the Legal context of Architecture is addressed through the analysis of specific AIA Contracts and Documents. Case studies are utilized to demonstrate salient aspects of all agreements inherently stated and implied. As stated in the response to Criterion 12.26 specific contracts utilized to underscore the legal context in varying scenarios are AIA A201, AIA A191, AIA B901, and AIA B801/CMA. The other AIA documents are identified and their implications in critical practice outlined. Understanding is demonstrated in testing and in completion of Thorough Code Analysis and Instructive notation included with the Construction Documents completed in ARC 441.   (As per response to Criterion 12.26, copies of the respective 2005/2006 syllabi and student work are appended for verification.)

### 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.*

*\*Continue reporting on how the identified course (Ethics and Practice) will meet the new performance level of "understanding" regarding ethics and professional judgment in its course content.*

As reported last year, the course designated to meet this upgraded criterion is ARC 459 – Ethics and Practice. Understanding is achieved through evaluation of case studies in critical practice and individual work being fabricated. Utilizing four ethical tenets as a governing index *(teleology, deontology, virtue, and contract theory),* students evaluate the work and methodologies of four different practice typologies - Canonical, Critical Regionalist, Universalist, and Applied Technical Research. Each form of practice

and the work generated by the architects representing the typologies provide different complex relationships internally and socially. Each has a divergent economic foundation. By evaluating the practices and work in the context of the four prescribed ethical tenets, the students develop their own ethical indices and professional judgment value scales. The case study evaluation is accomplished in lecture and discussion with testing being utilized as the indicator of understanding. Understanding is comprehensively demonstrated through the critical evaluation of the commissioned fabrication element mentioned in response to criterion 12.31. The students make sequential submissions over the course of the semester, each time evaluating the work, process and social interaction in the context of the ethical tenets. At the completion of the course the students produce a document that indicates the development of critical ethical value and professional judgment. (Copies of the 2005/2006 syllabus and student work are appended for verification.)