University of Idaho

Interim Progress Report for Year Two

Instructions and Template

November 30, 2018

Contents

1. Instructions and Template Guidelines

2. Executive Summary of the Most Recent Visit

3. Template

   1. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

   2. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

   3. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)

   4. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

1. INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

Purpose

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of interim progress reports at defined intervals after an eight-year or four-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

This narrative report, supported by documentation, covers three areas:
1. The program's progress in addressing not-met Conditions or Student Performance Criteria from the most recent Visiting Team Report.
2. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.
3. Responses to changes in the NAAB Conditions since your last visit (Note: Only required if Conditions have changed since your last visit)

Supporting Documentation

1. The narrative should describe in detail all changes in the program made in response to not-met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria.
2. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the anticipated contribution to the program for new hires and include either a narrative biography or one-page CV.
3. Provide detailed descriptions of changes to the curriculum that have been made in response to not-met Student Performance Criteria. Identify any specific outcomes expected to student performance. Attach new or revised syllabi of required courses that address unmet SPC.
4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the NAAB team at the next accreditation visit.

Outcomes

IPRs are reviewed by a panel of three: one current NAAB director, one former NAAB director, and one experienced team chair.[1] The panel may make one of three recommendations to the Board regarding the interim report:
1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR.
2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies but require the program to provide additional information (e.g., examples of actions taken to address deficiencies).
3. Reject the interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year but not more than three years, thereby shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified, and a copy sent to the program administrator. A schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an Architecture Program Report. The annual statistical report (see Section 9 of the 2014 Conditions) is still required.

Deadline and Contacts

IPRs are due on November 30. They are submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report System (ARS). Contact Ellen Cathey (ecathey@naab.org) or David Golden (dgolden@naab.org) with questions.

Instructions

1. Type all responses in the designated text areas.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format. Pages should be numbered.
3. Reports are limited to 25 pages/10 MBs.
4. Supporting documentation should be included in the body of the report.
5. Student work is not to be submitted as documentation for a two-year IPR.

---

[1] The team chair will not have participated in a team during the year in which the original decision on a term of accreditation was made.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF 2016 NAAB VISIT

CONDITIONS NOT MET

2016 VTR
Part II: Sect. 3-Evaluation of Preparatory Education

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

2016 VTR
B.3   Codes and Regulations
B.10 Financial Considerations
D.1   Stakeholder Roles in Architecture
D.3   Business Practices
D.4   Legal Responsibilities

3. TEMPLATE

Interim Progress Report
University of Idaho
College of Art and Architecture
Master of Architecture (128 credit hours preprofessional degree + 45 graduate credit hours)
Year of the previous visit: 2016

Please update contact information as necessary since the last APR was submitted.

Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located: Dean Shauna Corry

Provost: John Wiencek

President of the institution: Chuck Staben

Individual submitting the Interim Progress Report: Randall Teal, Head of Architecture Program

Name of individual(s) to whom questions should be directed: Randall Teal

Current term of accreditation: 8 year

Text from the most recent VTR or APR is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

1. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

B.3 Codes and Regulations

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found inconsistently in student work prepared for Arch 553 Architectural Design VII. The work did not demonstrate that all students have the required ability. The application of life-safety knowledge is very sparsely evident in studio work. Evidence demonstrating code compliance with respect to accessibility was found in the work generated for Arch 556 Architectural Design IX, but not with respect to life safety and fire safety.

The APR indicates that Arch 575 Professional Practice is to provide the level of understanding needed for application in the design studio. Student work demonstrating an understanding of the criterion was found in the work generated for the course section offered on the Moscow campus only.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: We have moved to make explicit and consistent the expectation of both life & fire safety and accessibility in the structure of our 553 studios; further, we have coordinated the goals of the Boise and Moscow sections. I heavy included syllabi and assignment sheets highlighting areas of the courses where this content is delivered.

B.10 Financial Considerations

2016 Team Assessment:

Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not consistently found in student work prepared for Arch 575 Professional Practice. The section of the course taught in Moscow provides evidence of student learning in construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, and building costs, but there is little to no evidence that students understand project financing methods and feasibility. Students are adept at all levels of understanding regarding the life-cycle costs of materials and the environmental and ecological costs of materials, but there is insufficient evidence demonstrating that they understand the application of the life-cycle costs of building materials in a market analysis, or in a way that would satisfy meeting this criterion.

No evidence was found indicating that students enrolled in the Arch 575 course taught at the Boise Center are asked to demonstrate an understanding of this criterion.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: The next 4 SPC's not met were largely caused by a lack of consistency between the Moscow and Boise sections of Arch 575 . In particular, the structure and content of the well-established Moscow section was not properly adopted or followed by the Boise section. In order to insure consistency, we are now offering ARCH 575 from the Boise campus with a new instructor. It is taught in-person in Boise by an adjunct faculty member who is a working professional (as opposed to the former more research-oriented faculty member). The course is connected to students in Moscow via live interactive video. In this way, Boise and Moscow students all have the same content delivered and this content is based on the Moscow 575 course that the team reviewed and assessed positively during the 2016 visit. Response specific to SPC B. 10: A demonstration of understanding financial considerations for the practice of architecture and the design and construction of a project is required in the following modules in Arch 575: Week 5 – Pre Design, Week 7 - Contracts and Types of Project Delivery Mechanisms, Week 8 - Types of Business Organizations, Week 10 - Legal & Ethical Responsibilities, Weeks 11 & 12 - The Business of Architecture, Week 13 - Insurance, Disputes & Claims. A thorough understanding of financing associated with project development was required in: Assignment 3, the Firm Profile, the Mid-term-Response to an RFP, Assignment 4 The creation of a Profit & Loss (P&L) statement, Assignment 5 Creation of an Invoice, and the Final - Presentation/Interview to win a project.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not consistently found in the work reviewed. The criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. This course is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means.

In the version offered on the Moscow campus, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated in the final exam for the course, a quiz, and Assignment Four: Response to a Request for Qualifications. However, at the Boise Center, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated inconsistently in the students' final reports.

This SPC is also identified as being met in the work produced for Arch 453 Architectural Design V. Roles in a multi-disciplinary team are described in a project brief. Student understanding of this criterion is inconsistently demonstrated in the projects presented.

The Arch 454 Architectural Design VI and Arch 554 Architectural Design VIII studios, as well as Arch 483 Urban Theory and Issues, include aspects of this criterion in project briefs and other materials. However, student understanding is inconsistently demonstrated in the student work.

Interaction with stakeholders is not well documented. Work that offered some evidence was the Broadway Corridor in conjunction with the South Boise neighborhood association.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: Arch 575 focuses a great deal on project stakeholders in the practice of architecture: who they are, how they influence a project, and how the student can expect to eventually interact with such stakeholders. We hosted guest speakers such as: an owner of multiple buildings, a developer, entitlement expert, civil engineer, mechanical engineer, insurance agent, product representative, several practicing architects, a landscape architect and marketing professional. A demonstration of a thorough understanding of how project stakeholders interact was required in the Mid-term - Response to an RFP, and the Final-Presentation/Interview to Win a Project. The students had to provide information on their team—including consultants and engineers—and experience with previous similar projects for both of these assignments in Arch 575.

D.3 Business Practices

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found consistently in the work reviewed. This criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed only in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. This course is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means.

Students enrolled in the Moscow version of the course demonstrated an understanding of this criterion in a quiz, an exam, and Assignment Three: Firm Profile, Assignment Four: Response to a Request for Qualifications, Assignment Five: Project Interview, and Assignment Six: Cost Estimate/Billing. However, students enrolled in the Boise version of the course demonstrated an inconsistent understanding of the criterion in their final course reports.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: In Arch 575, students demonstrate an understanding of their eventual role in the practice of architecture through the following assignments: Mid-term - the Response to an RFP, Assignment 3 Creation of a Firm Profile, Assignment 4 Creation of a Profit/Loss (P&L) Statement, Assignment 5 - Creation of an Invoice, Final - Presentation/interview to win a hypothetical project.

D.4 Legal Responsibilities

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found consistently in the work reviewed. The criterion was identified in the Student Performance Matrix as being addressed only in Arch 575 Professional Practice, a required course. Arch 575 is taught on the Moscow campus and at the Boise Center. Each version of the course includes lectures and readings that address this topic, but demonstration of an understanding of the criterion is achieved through different means.

In the version offered on the Moscow campus, student understanding of the criterion is demonstrated in the final exam for the course. However, students taking the Boise course demonstrated an inconsistent understanding of the criterion in the final course reports.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: Legal Responsibilities is addressed primarily in the following modules: Week 2 - State & National Licensing Requirements, Week 8 - Types of Business Organizations, Week 10 - Legal & Ethical Responsibilities, Weeks 11 & 12 - The Business of Architecture, Week 13 - Insurance, Disputes and Claims. During class the guest speakers that spoke specifically about legal responsibilities associated with the profession of architecture were: an owner of multiple buildings, a developer, an insurance agent, and a practicing architect who discussed the process of becoming licensed.

Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education

2016 Team Assessment: Specifically, in the case of transfer admissions, the program does not demonstrate how it matches the curriculum's courses to those previously taken by applicants and how it documents the assessments of these courses and students' portfolio work in relation to the NAAB SPC. The program documents the admission of new and transfer students, and the progress of students enrolled in the B.S. Arch and M. Arch degree programs in application and advising forms.

University of Idaho, 2018 Response: Transfer students' courses are matched with courses in the UI curriculum through two means: articulation agreements with other institutions and case by case student evaluations. Since the accreditation visit, our program has developed an articulation agreement with Spokane Community College, is putting the final touches on agreements with BYU Idaho and Portland Community College, and has begun the process with Cascade Community College and Boise State's Construction Management Program. In each case, the respective campuses were visited, and course syllabi and student work evaluated with an eye towards the fulfillment of NAAB SPC's. These on-site visits allowed us to ask better questions of the professors about student work and get a sense of the environment that these students are coming from. Additionally, all transfer students are required to submit a portfolio of work when entering our program. This portfolio is used to determine placement; specifically, whether they need to take our Summer Design Boot Camp, which is an immersive design fundamentals course meant to build basic skills and acclimate students to our program's design philosophy and design processes. Transfer students who hail from outside of these schools are evaluated on a case by case basis, with specific attention paid to course descriptions of any courses that might be substituted for an SPC fulfilling course in our curriculum (since many of our transfer students come from quarter system programs, two to three of their classes may equal one of ours). In summary, transfer student class matching is documented through new articulation agreements and by way of existing University of Idaho individual course articulations. In a case where articulations do not exist, individual counseling meetings with transfer students are undertaken to assess catalog descriptions, syllabi, and, in some cases, student work (beyond the portfolio). The course matching decisions that come from these meetings are documented in a student's "Degree Audit" by way of Substitution/Waiver forms and advising notes.

2. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
Please report such changes as the following: faculty retirement/succession planning; administration changes (dean, department chair, provost); changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures); new opportunities for collaboration; changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures); significant changes in educational approach or philosophy; changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building planned, cancellation of plans for new building).

> **University of Idaho, 2018 Response**: Our Dean moved on at the end of 2016 and the former head of the interior design program, Shauna Corry, has been our interim Dean since then. We anticipate a search for a new dean in the fall of 2019. In the program, we had one faculty in building technology retire and 3 faculty (one in Moscow, two in Boise leave for personal reasons). In Moscow: our technology & design/build instructor Matt Miller left at the end of 2016; we had a successful search in 2017 to hire Scott Lawrence as a replacement; we currently have an open search to replace our retirement, Diane Armpriest. In Boise: we had a successful search during the summer of 2018, replacing Kasama Polakit with Dwaine Carver; we currently have an open search to replace Elizabeth Cooper who will be leaving at the end of December to pursue her PhD in London. We will be hiring an interim director to run the lab until the search is competed. Otherwise, our enrollment has been steady, the curriculum has seen only minor tweaks, and our financial support has been consistent. The primary initiatives we have been working on are facilities improvements, providing more flexibility for students navigating our degree paths (aided by more summer offerings, Boise offerings, and making structures non-sequential), and moving towards a more strategic approach about which courses should be fulfilling NAAB SPC's and which should not (several faculty meetings have been dedicated to this topic).

3. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions
2014 NAAB Conditions

> **University of Idaho, 2018 update:** Not Applicable

4. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

> **University of Idaho, 2018 update:** I have included new faculty and administrator CV's and course information for Arch 575 and the Boise and Moscow sections of 553.