



MASTER OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE RE-ACCREDITATION

School of Landscape Architecture and Planning
Master of Landscape Architecture Program
University of Arizona
February 16 - 20, 2019

VISITING TEAM MEMBERS

Educator/Team Chair

Arthur Rice, ASLA, FCELA
Professor of Landscape Architecture
College of Design
North Carolina State University

Academic Administrator

Vini Nathan, PhD
Dean & McWhorter Endowed Chair
Dean's Office, College of Architecture, Design and Construction
Auburn University

Practitioner

Whitney Talcott, FASLA
Landscape Architect
NYC Department of Parks

**Master of Landscape Architecture
University of Arizona
Re-accreditation Review
February 16 – 20 2019**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF VISITING TEAM

Schedule for Visit	page 3
Part I: Overall Analysis	page 4
Part II: Assessment of Each Standard	
1. Program Mission and Objectives	page 6
2. Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration	page 8
3. Professional Curriculum	page 12
4. Student and Program Outcomes	page 16
5. Faculty	page 18
6. Outreach to the Institution, Communities, Alumni & Practitioners	page 21
7. Facilities, Equipment & Technology	page 23
Part III: Team Summary of Recommendations Affecting Accreditation And Considerations for Improvement	page 25

Schedule for Accreditation Visit**DAY 1 Saturday, Feb. 16 Travel to Tucson Arizona**

12:30 pm Whitney Talcott arrives
 4:15 pm Professor Art Rice arrives
 10:15 pm Dean Vini Nathan arrives

DAY 2 Sunday Feb. 17

2:00 pm LAAB team meets with Lauri Macmillan Johnson, Director and Professor of the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning at the College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture
 3:00 pm Review of student work and curriculum display
 5:00 pm Team dinner and executive session

DAY 3 Monday Feb. 18

7:30 am Breakfast with Director Lauri Macmillan to review schedule
 9:00 am Meeting with Dean Jeffery B. Goldberg, Interim Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost
 9:30 am Meeting with Dean Nancy Pollock-Ellwand; Dean and Professor of Landscape Architecture
 10:10 am Student led tour of facilities
 10:30 am Presentation of curriculum by faculty
 12:00 pm Lunch with alumni
 1:30 pm Interview with First Year Students
 2:00 pm Interview with Second Year Students
 2:30 pm Interview with Third Year Students
 3:00 pm Meeting with Gail Burd, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs
 3:40 pm Faculty interview: Margaret Livingston
 4:00 pm Faculty interview: Bo Yang
 4:20 pm Faculty interview: Kelly Cederberg
 4:40 pm Faculty interview: Kirk Dimond
 5:00 pm Faculty interview: Travis Mueller
 5:30 pm Team dinner and executive session to review findings

DAY 4 Tuesday Feb. 19

8:20 am Breakfast with Director Lauri Macmillan Johnson
 9:40 am Faculty interview: Philip Stoker
 10:00 am Faculty interview: Gina Chorover
 10:20 am Faculty interview: Helen Walthier
 10:40 am Faculty interview: Shujuan Li
 11:00 am UA campus tour led by students
 12 noon Lunch with School and College Administrators: Rob Miller, Kay Olsen-Brown, Simon White, and Ladd Keith
 2:00 pm Meeting with Kelly Smith, Director of Assessment for the School
 2:30 pm Team executive session

DAY 5 Wed Feb. 20

8:00 am Breakfast with Director Lauri Macmillan Johnson to report on team findings
 9:00 am Meeting with Dean Jeffrey B. Goldberg, Interim Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost to report team findings
 9:30 am Meeting with Dean Nancy Pollock-Ellwand to report team findings
 10:15 am Report of team findings to landscape architecture faculty and students
 Team Departs

PART I: OVERALL ANALYSIS

Introduction

Overall, the University of Arizona's Master of Landscape Architecture is a strong program with a long history of excellence. The program has faced a number of senior faculty retirements in the last few years but has responded well, creating an updated program with an active young faculty core that is building on a strong base.

The program responds to its setting through addressing both the physical and cultural issues facing the region. The program's mission, goals and objectives are in line with those of the university and are very appropriate for a professional school in a land grant institution.

A strength of the program is its professional practice focus. Local professionals value the program and feel that students are well prepared to enter the profession. In addition, students are very knowledgeable about the profession and its potential role is shaping the future of their region.

Facilities are in good condition and were expanded and renovated in the early 2000s. Studios are a strong point of the program in the way that they allow students from all years to share the same space and have adequate room for increased enrollments. One special feature of the facility is the Sonoran Landscape Laboratory which is a courtyard expressing the Sonoran ecology and is both a research space and demonstration garden.

It is the opinion of the Team that the Master of Landscape Architecture program is a strong professional graduate program with excellent facilities and a strong and dedicated faculty. Leadership is of the highest quality and the program has productive ties to the professional community, and is valued by the university.

Confirmation that Minimum Requirements for Accreditation are satisfied

1. The program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture".
2. An undergraduate first-professional program is a baccalaureate of at least four academic years' duration.
3. A graduate first-professional program is a master's equivalent to three academic years' duration.
4. Faculty instruction full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:
 - a. An academic unit that offers a single first-professional degree program at the emerging or Initial Accreditation status has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time.
 - b. An academic unit that offers a first-professional degree program at both the bachelor's and master's levels at the emerging or Initial Accreditation status has at least six FTE instructional faculty, five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least two of whom are full-time.
 - c. An academic unit that offers a single first-professional degree program at the continuing full Accreditation status has an FTE of at least five instructional faculty. At least four of these faculty members hold a professional degree in landscape architecture and at least three of them are full-time.
 - d. An academic unit that offers first-professional degree programs at both the bachelor's and master's levels with continuing full Accreditation status has an FTE of at least seven instructional faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture and are full-time.

Program Status	Number of Full-time Equivalent Instructional Faculty	Number of Faculty with a Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture (could be part-time or adjunct)	Number of Full-time Faculty with a Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture
Programs seeking Initial Accreditation			
Single Program	3	3	1
Bachelors & Masters Program	6	5	2
Programs seeking re-accreditation			
Single Program	5	4	3
Bachelors & Masters Program	7		5

5. The parent institution is accredited by a recognized institutional accrediting agency [such as recognition by U.S. Department of Education or Council for Higher Education Accreditation].
6. There is a designated program administrator responsible for the leadership and management functions for the program under review.
7. The program provides a comprehensive public information disclosure about the program's status and performance within a single click link from the program's internet website homepage.
8. A program accredited by LAAB must:
 - a. Continuously comply with accreditation standards;
 - b. Pay the annual sustaining and other fees as required; and
 - c. Regularly file complete annual and other requested reports.

Team's comments confirming that minimum requirements for accreditation are satisfied.

Upon review of the SER and the conclusion of the site visit it was confirmed that all of the minimum requirements for accreditation are satisfied. The program has five full time faculty, all with professional degrees in landscape architecture, complemented by a number of part time adjunct faculty. The University of Arizona is a fully accredited University and the MLA program is directed by a School Director who has appropriate responsibility for the leadership and management of the program. All public information about the program is up to date and clearly conveys the program's

Review of Each Recommendation Affecting Accreditation Identified by the Previous Candidacy Review in 2016

The previous review included no recommendations.

Review of Each Consideration for Improvement from the Previous Review in 2016.

The previous review included no considerations for improvement.

PART II: ASSESSMENT OF EACH STANDARD

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

Assessment:

 X Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: Using a clear concise mission statement, each landscape architecture program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes why the program exists and the needs that it seeks to fulfill. It also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relates to the institution's mission statement?

Yes, the program has a clear mission statement, revised in 2016. It responds to and is very appropriate for the University, College and School context.

B. Educational Goals. Clearly defined and formally stated academic goals reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment: Does the program have stated academic goals and an effective, regular procedure to determine progress in meeting its goal?

Yes, as a part of the strategic planning process specific program goals have been identified. These goals, clearly linked to specific objectives and procedures for reviewing progress, have been developed along with specific targets.

C. Educational Objectives. The educational objectives specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

Yes, the strategic plan includes mission, goals, objectives and outlines the steps necessary to achieve the desired outcomes.

D. Long-range Planning Process. The program is engaged in a long-range planning process.

Assessment 1: Does the long-range plan describe how the program mission and objectives will be met and document the review and evaluation process?

Yes, the plan clearly describes the steps necessary to meet the program mission and objectives and the program has a process for documenting and review of progress.

Assessment 2: Is the long-range plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

The plan was developed over the past accreditation period and presents reasonable methods for advancing the program in its educational context. A process is in place for reviewing progress.

Assessment 3: Does the self-evaluation report (SER) respond to recommendations and considerations for improvement suggestions from the previous accreditation review and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

The previous accreditation review did not include any recommendations or considerations for improvement.

E. Program Disclosure. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, objectives, educational experiences, accreditation status, student achievement, program costs for a full-time student for one academic year, estimated housing costs per year, average costs of books and materials per year, student retention and graduation rates, number of degrees per year, percentage of students with timely graduation (master's students graduating within 4 years and/or bachelor's students graduating within 6 years).

Assessment: Is the program information accessible and accurate?

Yes, program information is available and accurately describes the basic aspects of the program. Overall, the program web site is adequate but does not present the school's and program's clear and distinctive mission in a clear manner.

F. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

1. The program should consider elaborating on and expanding its web site's description of the program's mission, goals, and regional focus.

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration

The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.

Assessment:

Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program.

Assessment 1: Is the program seen as a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Yes, the Master of Landscape Architecture program is a discrete and identifiable program in the School of Landscape Architecture and Planning in College of Architecture Planning and Landscape Architecture.

Assessment 2: Does the program administrator hold a faculty appointment in landscape architecture?

Yes, the School Director is a Professor of Landscape Architecture.

Assessment 3: Does the program administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program? (Where the program administrator is not the primary administrator for the academic unit, such as a landscape architecture program within a multidisciplinary department or school, the landscape architecture leader has the authority to significantly influence the management of resources, including budget, faculty review, Tenure and Promotion outcomes and the direction of the program.)

Yes, within the operating structure of the College the School Director, who acts as program coordinator, has the authority to exercise leadership and management functions related to the Program. The School Director works with the faculty to establish policies for the expenditure of the program budget. In addition, the School Director oversees class scheduling and the assignment of program resources to achieve the goals and objectives of the program.

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences, computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Yes, all tenured and tenure track faculty have received adequate start-up funds and additional travel support to attend academic conferences.

Adequate support for grant development and administration is available through the University's Engineering Research Services. It appears that this arrangement has been very successful. In addition, faculty and students have adequate IT support and faculty computers are replaced on a regular basis.

Assessment 2: Is funding adequate for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc?

There is funding available for student support from the College and School. At this time, it seems to be adequate and has recently been increased in an effort to build student enrollment in the program.

Assessment 3: Are adequate support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

Yes, the mission of the program is well supported by a strong support staff.

C. Commitment to Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment: How does the program demonstrate its commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

The University, College, School and Program express a strong commitment to diversity. At this time, there is an appropriate gender mix in both the faculty and student populations. However, the student body does not represent the diversity of the region. Efforts are being made to recruit a more representative student body but at this time the efforts have not had the desired effect.

D. Faculty Participation. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of resources and do they have the responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Yes, the faculty regularly meets and works together to determine resource needs and curriculum content. This collaborative atmosphere is encouraged by the existing physical environment that puts the faculty in close contact with the program administrator and colleagues, allowing for numerous informal discussions in support of ongoing activities.

Assessment 2: Does the faculty participate, in accordance with institutional guidelines, in developing criteria and procedures for annual evaluation, promotion and tenure of faculty?

Yes, procedures are clear and the faculty are appropriately involved in the processes. However, the implementation of policies seems to be inconsistent, resulting in variations in the effectiveness of the mentoring process.

Assessment 3: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

Faculty are generally aware of university policies, expectations and procedures. A process for faculty mentoring is in place; however, it appears that faculty would benefit from a more structured mentoring process.

E. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship and to be actively involved in professional endeavors such as presenting at conferences. The faculty FTE (full-time equivalent) shall be assessed by the institutional culture for faculty development across the closely related academic units (such as other departments and programs within a college). The workload (number, type and sizes of courses assigned) and responsibilities (such as a split of time for teaching, research and service activities) for a typical tenured or long-term faculty member within the college should be considered the template for assessing the FTE resources assigned to the landscape architecture program. Where landscape architecture faculty have their responsibilities split between programs (such as bachelor's and master's or between landscape architecture and another discipline), the FTE assessment must be prorated.

Faculty instruction full-time equivalence (FTE) shall be as follows:

- a. An academic unit that offers a single first-professional degree program at the emerging or Initial Accreditation status has at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom is full-time.
- b. An academic unit that offers a first-professional degree program at both the bachelor's and master's levels at the emerging or Initial Accreditation status has at least six FTE instructional faculty, five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least two of whom are full-time.
- c. An academic unit that offers a single first-professional degree program at the continuing full Accreditation status has an FTE of at least five instructional faculty. At least four of these faculty members hold a professional degree in landscape architecture and at least three of them are full-time.
- d. An academic unit that offers first-professional degree programs at both the bachelor's and master's levels with continuing full Accreditation status has an FTE of at least seven instructional faculty, at least five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture and are full-time.

Program Status	Number of Full-time Equivalent Instructional Faculty	Number of Faculty with a Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture (could be part-time or adjunct)	Number of Full-time Faculty with a Professional Degree in Landscape Architecture
Programs seeking Initial Accreditation			
Single Program	3	3	1
Bachelors & Masters Program	6	5	2
Programs seeking re-accreditation			
Single Program	5	4	3
Bachelors & Masters Program	7		5

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15:1?

Yes, student faculty ratios are well within the 15:1 standard.

Assessment 2: Are there sufficient faculty FTE to carry out the mission of the program (such as duties in teaching, research, service, program administration, academic advising, and/or creative professional development).

Yes, with the combination of five full time faculty and a number of part time adjunct faculty there are adequate personnel to carry out all of the functions necessary for a viable graduate program.

F. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

1. Explore methods to increase the effectiveness of minority recruitment and retention to increase the diversity of the student body.

Standard 3: Professional Curriculum

The first professional-degree curriculum shall include the core knowledge skills and applications of landscape architecture.

- a. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first professional degree program at the bachelor's level shall provide an educational context enriched by other disciplines, including but not limited to: liberal and fine arts, natural sciences, and social sciences, as well as opportunities for students to develop other areas of interest.
- b. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first professional degree at the master's level shall provide instruction in and application of research and or/scholarly methods.
- c. A first professional degree at the master's level that does not require all students to have an undergraduate degree before receiving the MLA shall meet the requirements for a and b.

Assessment:

Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and objectives. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program's mission and specific learning objectives. The program's curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students' knowledge, skills, and abilities in landscape architecture.

A. Mission and Objectives. The program's curriculum addresses its mission, goals, and objectives. (This criterion isn't directed towards the evaluation of the Mission and Objectives, but rather on how the curriculum is developed and delivered in carrying out the expectations of the Mission and Objectives.)

Assessment 1: Does the program identify the knowledge, skills, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

Yes, this information is clearly communicated and reviewed on a regular basis by the faculty.

B. Professional Curriculum. The program curriculum is guided by, but is not limited to, coverage of:

- § History, theory, philosophy, principles and values: (design history; design theory; criticism; sustainability, resiliency, stewardship; health, safety, welfare)
- § Design processes and methodology: (critical thinking; analysis; ideation; synthesis; site program; iterative design development; design communication)
- § Systems and processes – natural and cultural (related to design, planning and management): (plants and ecosystems sciences; built environment and infrastructure; human factors and social & community systems; human health and well-being)
- § Communication and documentation: (written communication; oral communication; visual and graphic communication; design and construction documents; numeracy, quantitative problem-solving and communication; community and/or client engagement)
- § Implementation: (construction technology and site engineering; site materials; use and management of plants and vegetation; policies and regulation)
- § Computer applications and advanced technologies: (visualization, and modeling; communication (conceptual and construction drawings), geospatial analysis)
- § Assessment and evaluation: (site assessment; pre-design analysis; landscape performance; post-occupancy evaluation; visual and scenic assessment)

§ Professional practice: (values; ethics; practice; construction administration)

§ Research and/or scholarly methods (for masters' level degree programs): (quantitative & qualitative methods; framing research questions; literature/precedent review; research integrity and protection of human subjects; communication of research)

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum address the designated subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and objectives?

Yes, the curriculum addresses all critical subject matter and is organized in a way that reinforces learning. The curriculum is more structured in the earlier years to ensure a strong knowledge base and includes the necessary flexibility toward the end of the program to allow individual development and exploration.

Assessment 2: Does student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to enter the profession?

Yes, the work shows a clear progression in learning and at the most advanced levels exhibit the knowledge and content necessary to enter the profession.

Assessment 3: Do curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

Yes, there are sufficient program opportunities for students to pursue academic interests and alumni are actively employed in the profession. Interviews with employers also reinforce the perception that students are well prepared to enter the profession.

C. Syllabi. Syllabi are maintained for courses.

Assessment 1: Do syllabi include educational objectives, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?

Yes, syllabi are well done and appropriate.

Assessment 2: Do syllabi identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to successfully complete the course and advance in the curriculum?

Yes, this information is appropriately included.

D. Curriculum Evaluation. At the course and curriculum levels, the program evaluates how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning objectives in a timely way.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate and document ways of:

- a. *Assessing students' achievement of course and program objectives in the length of time to graduation stated by the program?*
- b. *Reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?*
- c. *Maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and values of the profession?*

Yes, student achievements and the effectiveness of curriculum delivery are regularly assessed by the faculty. Students are familiar with new technologies and emerging methodologies, theories and values of the profession. The School and program have also devoted staff resources, trained in assessment, to ensure that the process is well done and is done in a way that most benefits the program.

Assessment 2: Do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses and curriculum?

Yes, through an annual learning outcomes surveys and more standard course evaluation methods.

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in co-curricular activities, internships, off campus studies, research assistantships, or practicum experiences.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide opportunities to augment the formal educational experience and document them?

Yes, the program includes a number of field trips, site visits, community-based outreach projects and internships in addition to other formal educational opportunities.

Assessment 2: How does the program identify the objectives of co-curricular activities and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?

Given the small cohort size, the faculty and school director are able to meet with students regularly and discuss outcomes to determine if these programs and activities are successful. In general, students have indicated that they are very satisfied with, and see the value of, these additional experiences.

Assessment 3: Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

Yes, the students have opportunities to present to their classmates in addition to less formal methods of sharing information.

F. Coursework (Bachelor's Level). In addition to the professional curriculum, students also pursue coursework in other disciplines in accordance with institutional and program requirements.

Assessment: Do students take courses in the humanities, arts, technologies, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences or other disciplines?

N/A

G. Areas of Interest (Bachelor's Level). The program provides opportunities for students to pursue special interests.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, certificates, minors, etc.

N/A

Assessment 2: Does student work incorporates academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

N/A

H. Research/Scholarly Methods (Master's Level). The program provides an introduction to research and scholarly methods.

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum provide an introduction to research and scholarly methods and their relation to the profession of landscape architecture?

Yes, research methods are incorporated in a number of the required classes and expressed in studio projects. In addition, a required master's thesis report reinforces earlier course work in this area.

Assessment 2: Does the program demonstrate that theses or terminal projects exhibit creative and independent thinking and contain a significant research/scholarly component?

Yes, the master's research projects are generally very creative and incorporate a significant research component.

I. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

There are no considerations for improvement for this standard.

Standard 4: Student and Program Outcomes.

The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture.

Assessment:

Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and skills in creative problem solving, critical thinking, communications, design, and organization to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.

A. Student Learning Outcomes. Upon completion of the program, students are qualified to pursue a career in landscape architecture.

Assessment 1: Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?

Yes, and this is reinforced by comments from local professionals.

Assessment 2: Do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's learning objectives, including critical and creative thinking and their ability to understand, apply and communicate the subject matter of the professional curriculum as evidenced through project definition, problem identification, information collection, analysis, synthesis, conceptualization and implementation?

Yes, student interviews and course work clearly demonstrate that learning objectives are being met. In addition, it is possible to see significant progress through the years of the program leading up to the production of the master's thesis/report. The local professional community feel that the education the students are receiving is of the highest quality and prepares them for productive careers in the profession.

B. Student Advising. The program provides students with effective advising and mentoring throughout their educational careers.

Assessment 1: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic development?

Yes, at this time, students are well advised. Students feel that the faculty are very available and provide excellent advising. This availability is promoted by the physical structure of the college, creating a close proximity of faculty and program offices to the studio space.

Assessment 2: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding career development?

Yes, alumni are actively employed in the profession and the faculty do a good job of helping students to develop an understanding of the profession and career options.

Assessment 3: Are students aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?

Yes, students indicated that one of their main goals is to become licensed landscape architects. They are well aware of the requirements and processes that relate to achieving this goal.

Assessment 4: How satisfied are students with academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

All students expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their academic experience and feel that they are being well prepared to enter the profession.

C. Participation In Extra Curricular Activities. Students are encouraged and have the opportunity to participate in professional activities and institutional and community service.

Assessment 1: Do students participate in institutional/college organizations, community initiatives, or other activities?

All of the students are very involved in the community and the program has a very active student ASLA chapter.

Assessment 2: Do students participate in events such as LaBash, ASLA Annual Meetings, local ASLA chapter events and the activities of other professional societies or special interest groups?

Yes, they have attended ALSA events and are actively involved in a number of activities related to the profession.

D. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

There are no considerations for improvement for this standard.

Standard 5: Faculty

The qualifications, academic position, and professional activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and objectives of the program.

Assessment:

Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to instill the knowledge, skills, and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.

A. Credentials. The qualifications of the faculty, instructional personnel, and teaching assistants are appropriate to their roles.

Assessment 1: Does the faculty have a balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?

Yes, the faculty include individuals with strong practice backgrounds and individuals with doctoral degrees and substantial research backgrounds. In addition, it appears that collaboration among individuals with differing expertise and backgrounds is active and productive.

Assessment 2: Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?

Yes, faculty assignments are appropriate, relate well to faculty expertise and the goals of the program.

Assessment 3: Are adjunct and/or part-time faculty integrated into the program's administration and curriculum evaluation/development in a coordinated and organized manner?

Yes, the program has done a good job of including part time faculty in curriculum planning and evaluation.

Assessment 4: Are qualifications appropriate to responsibilities of the program as defined by the institution?

Yes, the faculty is highly qualified and held in high regard by their colleagues.

B. Faculty Development. The faculty is continuously engaged in activities leading to their professional growth and advancement, the advancement of the profession, and the effectiveness of the program.

Assessment 1: Are faculty activities such as scholarly inquiry, research, professional practice and service to the profession, university and community documented and disseminated through appropriate media such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?

Yes, however scholarship is impacted somewhat by heavy teaching loads. These loads seem consistent with their colleagues in other programs and colleges.

Assessment 2: Do faculty teaching and administrative assignments allow sufficient opportunity to pursue advancement and professional development?

Yes, it is appropriate given the educational context.

Assessment 3: Are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated, and are the results used for individual and program improvement?

Yes, the program has both formal and very active informal evaluation processes. Faculty get sufficient feedback to improve performance.

Assessment 4: Do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc?

Yes, faculty seek and receive funding to travel to conferences that relate to their scholarship. Start-up packages, base technology, and technical support are also adequate to promote scholarship.

Assessment 5: Are the activities of faculty reviewed and recognized by faculty peers?

Yes, the faculty is highly regarded by their peers in the college and university.

Assessment 6: Do faculty participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

Yes, all full-time faculty and a number of part time faculty take on a variety of university service roles and are actively involved in supporting college, school and program operations.

C. Faculty Retention. Faculty hold academic status, have workloads, receive salaries, mentoring and support that promote productivity and retention.

Assessment 1: Are faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition evaluated to promote faculty retention and productivity?

At this time salaries and processes are appropriate and there appears to be no retention issues.

Assessment 2: What is the rate of faculty turnover? How does turn-over impact the program?

Three senior faculty retired in 2015 and since that time there have been a number of hires to replace the faculty and little or no turnover.

D. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

1. Determine the extent to which there is a need to more formalize faculty mentoring to ensure that all faculty are appropriately guided through the tenure and promotion process.

Standard 6: Outreach to The Institution, Communities, Alumni, and Practitioners
 The program shall have a record or plan of achievement for interacting with the professional community, its alumni, the institution, community, and the public at large.

Assessment:

Met **Met With Recommendation** **Not Met**

INTENT: The program should establish an effective relationship with the institution, communities, alumni, practitioners and the public at large in order to provide a source of service learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support. Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts should enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.

A. Interaction with the Profession, Institution, and Public. The program represents and advocates for the profession by interacting with the professional community, the institution, community and the public at large.

Assessment 1: Are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?

Yes, service learning is a strong component of the curriculum and additional opportunities are also available to the students.

Assessment 2: Are service activities documented on a regular basis?

Yes, service learning activities are well documented but could be emphasized more on the programs web site.

B. Alumni and Practitioners. The program recognizes alumni and practitioners as a resource.

Assessment 1: Does the program maintain a current registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, post graduate study, and significant professional

Yes, a registry of alumni is maintained and updated regularly.

Assessment 2: Does the program engage the alumni and practitioners in activities such as a formal advisory board, student career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education etc.?

The school and program engage alumni in studio activities and informal events. At this time there is no established advisory board; however, the school director meets with alumni informally.

Assessment 3: Does the program acknowledges and celebrates the significant professional accomplishments of its alumni and benefactors?

Yes, this is done on a regular basis.

C. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

1. Consider the creation of a more formal alumni/professional advisory structure.

Standard 7: Facilities, Equipment, and Technology

Faculty, students and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library and other technologies necessary for achieving the program's mission and objectives.

Assessment:

Met Met With Recommendation Not Met

INTENT: The program should occupy space in designated, code-compliant facilities that support the achievement of program mission and objectives. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and objectives.

A. Facilities. There are designated, code-compliant, adequately maintained spaces that serve the professional requirements of the faculty, students and staff.

Assessment 1: Are faculty, staff and administration provided with appropriate office space?

Yes, and the physical arrangement of administrative and office space fosters productive communication.

Assessment 2: Are students assigned permanent studio workstations adequate to meet the program needs?

Yes, and there are both space and facilities to significantly grow the student body and still provide excellent studio space.

Assessment 3: Are facilities adequately maintained and are they in compliance with ADA, life-safety and applicable building codes? (Acceptable documentation includes reasonable accommodation reports from the university ADA compliance office and/or facilities or risk management office.)

Yes, facilities are in excellent condition and compliant with ADA requirements.

B. Information Systems and Technical Equipment. Information systems and technical equipment needed to achieve the program's mission and objectives are available to students, faculty and other instructional and administrative personnel.

Assessment 1: Does the program have sufficient access to computer equipment and software?

Yes, graduate students and faculty have the digital resources necessary to carry out the educational mission of the program.

Assessment 2: Is the frequency of hardware and software maintenance, updating and replacement sufficient?

Yes, faculty computing is replaced approximately every three years and all other studio hardware and software is in good condition and up to date. IT support also seems to be excellent.

Assessment 3: Are the hours of use sufficient to serve faculty and students?

Yes, the building is available 24 hours a day for students and faculty.

C. Library Resources. Library collections and other resources are sufficient to support the program's mission and educational objectives.

Assessment 1: Are collections adequate to support the program?

Yes, the university library system provides a complete collection of both online and physical resources that serve the needs of the program.

Assessment 2: Do courses integrate library and other resources?

Yes, there are ample examples of this in all course work.

Assessment 3: Are the library hours of operation convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?

Yes, in conjunction with online resources library hours are convenient and appropriate.

D. Other Relevant Assessments. Are there other relevant assessments? If yes, explain.

None

Recommendations affecting accreditation:

There are no recommendations for this standard.

Considerations for Improvement:

There are no considerations for improvement for this standard.

PART III: Summary of Recommendations Affecting Accreditation and Considerations for Considerations

A. RECOMMENDATIONS AFFECTING ACCREDITATION

There are no recommendations affecting accreditation.

B: CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Standard 1: Program Mission and Objectives

1. The program should consider elaborating on and expanding its web site's description of the program's mission, goals, and regional focus.

Standard 2: Program Autonomy, Governance and Administration

1. Explore methods to increase the effectiveness of minority recruitment and retention to increase the diversity of the student body.

Standard 5: Faculty

1. Determine the extent to which there is a need to more formalize faculty mentoring to ensure that all faculty are appropriately guided through the tenure and promotion process.

Standard 6: Outreach to The Institution, Communities, Alumni, and Practitioners

1. Consider the creation of a more formal alumni/professional advisory structure.