

Name of Institution: The University of New Mexico

Name of Academic Unit: School of Architecture + Planning, Architecture Program

Interim Progress Report

M. Arch

Track I (Pre-professional degree plus 55 graduate credit hours)

Track II (Undergraduate degree plus 102 graduate credit hours)

Please provide contact information for the following individuals:

Program Administrator: John Quale, Director and Professor of Architecture

Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., dean or department chair): Geraldine Forbes Isais, Dean and Professor of Architecture

Provost: Chouki Abdallah, Provost

President of the Institution: Robert Frank, President

Individual submitting the Interim Program Report: John Quale, Director and Professor of Architecture

Name of individual to whom questions should be directed:

John Quale, Director and Professor of Architecture

Year of the Previous Visit: 2012

Current Term of Accreditation:

“As a result, the professional architecture program: Master of Architecture, was formally granted a six year term of accreditation. The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2012. The program is schedules for its next accreditation visit in 2018.”

Submitted to: The National Architectural Accrediting Board

Date: December 12, 2014

NOTES:

1. All sections should be in Ariel 10 pt type. The template indicates what titles or section headings should be in **bold** and what sections should be in *italics*.
2. All reports should be formatted with 1” margins for all edges.
3. Reports should be single-spaced with appropriate spacing between paragraphs.
4. Please use the headers and footers as established in the template.
5. Reports must be submitted in PDF or Word.
6. Reports are limited to 3 MGs.
7. Instructions for submitting supplemental material are appended to that section of the report.

Table of Contents

1. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met
 - a. Condition II.1.1 A4 Technical Documentation
 - b. Condition II.1.1B 7 Financial Considerations
 - c. Condition II.2.2 Professional Degrees and curriculum
2. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
4. Identify & Self Assessment
 - a. History Mission
 - b. Responses to the Five Perspectives
 - c. Long Range Planning
 - d. Program Self Assessment
5. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)

1. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met from the 2012 Visiting Team Report

II.1.1.A4 Technical Documentation

NAAB Team during their visit asked to see evidence of outline specifications, while we had *provided* evidence for this from the previous curriculum, where the course work was done. Actually this course had not been taught for 3 semesters. We acknowledge that we need to address outline specifications in this area. However, we were never told, nor do we agree, that there were any additional weaknesses in the student's technical drawings. In fact there is an inherent contradiction in the Team's assertion that they noted weakness in the student's technical drawings when in Realm B. General they mention "that students develop an advanced skill set when it comes to systems integration, accessibility, life safety and materials," indicating that the Team found the student work to be technically sound.

2014 Program Response:

We continue to assess the best way to integrate the development of an outline specification in a way that will have a meaningful impact on the students. Philosophically, we aren't convinced that is the best format for students to learn about specifying materials. The faculty have discussed this issue in the context of the fact that our curriculum already addresses research into architectural products and materials. In addition, there had never been a concern about the lack of an outline spec assignment in the past accreditations – and the specificity of the requirement is a concern. Another faculty retreat is scheduled for February 2015, and the final response to this concern will be determined at that point. We do not have student work from 2013-14 that address this concern – a similar assignment (not strictly an outline spec) was given in 2013-14, but not collected for this report.

(Note: we do not feel the communication about the need to gather student work during the 2013-14 academic year was adequately communicated to UNM. It is a significant change to previous NAAB procedures. We could have found the information in the amendment to the guidelines document posted on the NAAB website, but we already had the guidelines document, and were not aware that the new amendment to the guidelines document existed. Neither the current or previous director were aware of this change – it is something we would have acted on if we had been told.)

II.1.1.B.7 Financial considerations

This is consistent with the comments at the exit interview. The same course referenced above would have clearly provided these omissions.

2014 Program Response:

After the accreditation visit, we decided to further increase the content focused on cost control in the Professional Practice class, even though it was addressed elsewhere. We did not collect material documenting this in 2013-14 but did collect it from the Fall 2014 class. We added a guest lecture, a required reading and a quiz on the topic. The link to that material plus the revised syllabus is here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/jqznhgn2l8ef18l/UNM%20Interim%20Report%20documentation.zip?dl=0>

II.2.2 **Professional Degrees and Curriculum**

This is consistent with the comments at the exit interview. This amounts to a misunderstanding of the requirement and is easily fixed by changing a number in the course catalog. It is worth noting in reviewing our graduates this semester that all of them met the minimum of 45 credits with other than architectural content.

2. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern from the Most Recent Visiting Team Report

- A. **Graduate assistance.** As first reported by the 2006 visiting team, there continues to be a need for additional assistantships and scholarships at the graduate level to provide for students who wish to continue with the professional degree but do not have the resources to do so.

2014 Program Response:

We continue pursue ways to increase graduate assistantships and scholarships. It should also be noted that students from out of state that receive graduate assistantships are immediately eligible for in-state tuition, which significantly helps these individuals. Our dean and foundation officer are regularly pursuing scholarships, and this academic year to date, we have increased scholarships for architecture students by 10 percent.

- B. **Gender diversity of students.** While the program is largely diverse and, for the most part, consistent with the student body as a whole in most categories, there is a concern with the current gender statistics when compared to those of the UNM student body. As reported on page 73 of the APR, 57.6% of the UNM student body was female for the 2009-2010 school year. The program was 40% female in 2004, and is only 32% female in spring of 2011, indicating a negatively trending concern that is worth further investigation.

2014 Program Response:

Given the relatively small size of our program, it is difficult to take a one-year snapshot of our enrollment of women and discern a trend. However, in the 2013-14 academic year, the percentage of women increased back to 40% of the Master of Architecture students. This is slightly lower than the 44% of women undergraduate students university-wide; for graduate students, there 56% women. While we are pleased we made progress, we are still pursuing the possibility of a 50% / 50% enrollment for women and men. In the past two academic years, the previous Director offered a graduate assistantship to each female applicant accepted into the program. Only 3 to 5 men were given the same offer in the same year. In 2013-14, half of those women accepted enrollment. We are pleased with that number, but will continue to pursue ways to increase our population of women and individuals from under-represented groups. We think a more accurate way to assess gender diversity in New Mexico is to compare us to other professional programs at the University, such as the School of Engineering, which has 21% women, and the Anderson School of Management, which also has 40% women.

One other factor to consider is that our faculty, especially in the upper ranks, is recognized as quite diverse when it comes to gender and racial / ethnic identification. Seven of our full-time faculty (out of 16) are women, including the Dean and one of two Associate Deans for the School. Five of these women are tenured, and three of those five are Full Professors. During the 2013-14 academic year, there was also three male

Full Professors. John Quale, the new director, began the position in August 2014, and became the fourth man, and seventh Full Professor in the program.

There are two untenured full-time women faculty members that are on long-term non-tenure track Lecturer III appointments, which required a national search. One of them is being considered for a promotion within the university's new promotion sequence for non-tenure track faculty. If successful, she will become the first Senior Lecturer in the school, and in the first group of Senior Lecturers at the university.

We also see ourselves as a national leader in serving the Hispanic / Latino community. We are one of the only Research I Universities (under the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Learning system) that is also a Hispanic Serving Institution, as defined by the federal government. This is an important responsibility for us. In addition, we have a larger population of Native students in our graduate and undergraduate programs than most architecture schools in the country.

There is a strong ethic of concern for diversity in our state, our university and our program. We will continue pursue diversity on all fronts.

- C. **Final portfolios.** The design portfolios submitted electronically by students in advance of their final year constitute a remarkable record of work. It's commendable that students maintain and will graduate with such a resource. Our team observed, however, significant room for improvement in clearly communicating the work captured in the portfolios. In most cases, the graphic and written material could have been better distilled and refined. Additional guidance from faculty and practitioners, including actual graphic design professionals, could go a long way toward strengthening this important aspect of the program.

2014 Program Response:

During the last two academic years, the program has changed the faculty assigned to the graduate communications classes, including the addition of a part-time instructor with substantial experience in graphic design and marketing for architecture firms such as Antoine Predock Architect. This has improved the graphic quality of the student's work, but there is still progress to be made. In Fall 2014, another substantial change to the visualization curriculum was approved by the faculty, but that does not fall within this 2013-14 Interim Progress Report, and will be described next year.

3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

Such as:

- Faculty retirement/succession planning

In May 2014, an Assistant Professor chose to leave the university (and academia in general) to return to practice. His line has been held open, and a search will commence in the Fall of 2015, with the expectation that the new faculty member will join the the school in the Fall of 2016.

In addition, the most senior Full Professor in the program has announced his intention to retire at the end of the 2014-15 academic year. Assuming he retires, the 2015-16 academic year faculty search will be focused on bringing two new people, probably Assistant Professors.

Through a national search, a new tenure track faculty member, Brian Goldstein, PhD, was hired during the 2013-14 academic year. He replaces Christopher Mead, an architectural history professor and former dean that had retired two years prior. Goldstein, who received his BA, MA and PhD from Harvard University, officially joined the faculty at the start of the 2014-15 academic year and he already has a book contract in place during his first year on tenure track.

- Administration changes (dean, department chair, provost)

In the 2013-14 academic year, a national search was conducted to hire a new director to replace Geoff Adams, who wanted to return full time to the faculty. On August 1, 2014, John Quale was hired as a Full Professor and Director. Quale came to UNM from the University of Virginia, where he was the Director of the Graduate Architecture Program. He taught at UVA for 14 ½ years. Quale, a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Tokyo and Thomas Jefferson Fellow at Cambridge University, has received numerous design and teaching awards, and is the author of two books.

- Changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures)

There are two tracks in our Master of Architecture degree – a three-year and a two-year track. The last four years, the three-year track has not had full enrollment. New efforts are underway to increase the numbers in that track, bringing it up to the same enrollment as the two-year track.

In addition, our Master of Science in Architecture, a non-accredited degree, has been restructured to more closely align with the research agendas of the faculty. During the 2013-14 academic year, a small group of architecture faculty assessed the MSArch, and created two new concentrations within the degree: Computational Ecologies and Community Health & the Built Environment. This curriculum change request was submitted last year, and only just approved three days before this report was due. We hope to see an increase in enrollment in the program to a minimum of six to eight students within five years.

We will also be contributing to the newly created shared PhD concentrations in the built environment with the School of Engineering, the College of Fine Arts and the Latin American Studies Program. We expect four to six students in the program at any given time.

- New opportunities for collaboration

The new director has transplanted a successful design / build program from University of Virginia to UNM. The initiative, called the ecoMOD Project, creates high performance housing for affordable housing organizations. Renamed ecoMOD Lab, the first course will occur in 2015. Collaborations with the law school and engineering school on the project have recently been established.

- Changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures)

There were not any substantial changes in financial resources in 2013-14, other than a 1% return of funding to the central university by every department and program at the university. The New Mexico economy has not seen the rebound that many other states have seen, so we are expecting another 1% pull-back, and potentially more.

- Significant changes in educational approach or philosophy (e.g., new provost = new approach)

There were not any major changes in the educational approach in 2013-14.

- Changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building, cancelled new building)

The FabLab was expanded further to include a new space for metal working equipment.

(NOTE: The following sections have not been edited except to insert the new administrative team.)

4. Identity & Self Assessment

a. History Mission

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

History and Description of the Institution

The University of New Mexico was founded by an act of the Territorial Legislature in 1889. Written into the constitution of the state, and specified by statute, the University of New Mexico “is intended to be the state university.” In 1889, a wealthy patron donated 20 acres located on a mesa two miles east of the village of Albuquerque and built a red brick building. The first regular class matriculated in the fall of 1892. In 1898, the College Department became the College of Literature and Arts, later renamed the College of Arts and Sciences.

In 1933 John Gaw Meem, holder of architectural license Number One from the State, became the University Architect. That same year, UNM received formal approval by the American Association of Universities. Zimmerman Library, designed by John Gaw Meem, opened in 1938.

Since its establishment in 1892, the University of New Mexico has grown from 75 students to more than 26,000 on the main campus. That number swells to 33,000 with the addition of the student population from the branch campuses in Los Alamos, Gallup, and Valencia County, the Graduate Centers in Santa Fe and Los Alamos, and the Taos Education Center. The main campus has the state’s only schools of law, medicine, pharmacy, architecture, landscape architecture and planning, and it awards 83% of the doctoral and professional degrees in the state. The main campus and the branch campuses offer a total of 395 certificate and degree programs.

More than 4,700 students receive certificates and degrees each year, and the majority of our graduates stay in New Mexico, strengthening the state’s economy and improving the quality of life. UNM’s main campus is classified as a Hispanic Serving Carnegie Research Extensive University, one of 89 in the

United States and one of only 6 institutions classified as both a Minority Institution and a Carnegie Research I University.

The recognized colleges and schools at UNM are: School of Architecture and Planning, Anderson School of Management, College of Arts and Sciences, College of Education, School of Engineering, College of Fine Arts, School of Law, School of Medicine, College of Nursing, College of Pharmacy, School of Public Administration, and the University College.

The University is located in Albuquerque, the largest metropolitan area in New Mexico, with a population of close to 900,000. The state population is just over 2,000,000. The campus is in the heart of the city and includes more than 150 buildings on 600 acres.

Institutional Mission

The Board of Regents adopted the following mission statement:

The mission of the University of New Mexico is to serve the educational needs of the citizens of the state.

This mission involves three interrelated dimensions:

1. *The University develops and offers comprehensive educational programs at the associate, baccalaureate, master, and doctoral levels in a wide range of academic and professional fields.*
2. *The University conducts research and engages in scholarly and creative activities to support undergraduate, graduate, and professional educational programs and to create, interpret, apply and accumulate knowledge.*
3. *The University contributes to the quality of life in New Mexico and beyond by providing to the public selected services that are part of, contribute to, or originate from the University's teaching and scholarly activities.*

Key changes and leadership

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 1937 | The first architectural concentration established within the College of Fine Arts. |
| 1947 | A four-year architectural engineering program was approved within the College of Engineering and grew to an enrollment of 70 students. |
| 1956 | A five-year architectural program was established in the Division of Architecture, responsible to both the College of Engineering and the College of Fine Arts. |
| 1960 | The University discontinued architectural engineering and established a Department of Architecture within the College of Fine Arts. |
| 1966 | The five-year professional degree of Bachelor of Architecture was accredited. |
| 1967 | The five-year program was phased out, and the 4+2 program was established. |
| 1968 | The NAAB accredited the Master of Architecture degree. |
| 1969 | The Design and Planning Assistance Center was established. |
| 1975 | The Department became the School of Architecture and Planning as an independent school. The School's first Dean was Morton Hoppenfeld. |
| 1978 | A four-year undergraduate pre-professional degree of Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Design was added. |
| 1980-81 | Don Schlegel served as Interim Dean. |

1981-93	George Anselevicius served as Dean.
1993-97	Richard Eribes served as Dean.
1993-96	Edith Cherry, Associate Professor, became the first Architecture Program Director.
1997-99	Ric Richardson, Associate Professor and Director of Community and Regional Planning served as Interim Dean.
1997-00	Stephen Schreiber, Associate Professor, served as Architecture Program Director.
1999-10	Roger Schluntz, FAIA, served as Dean.
2000-05	Associate Professor Andy Pressman served as Director of the Architecture Program.
2005-10	Professor Geraldine Forbes Isais served as Director of the Architecture Program.
2008-10 2010	Professor Mark C. Childs served as Associate Director of the Architecture Program. Professor Geraldine Forbes Isais was appointed Dean.
2010-11	Professor Mark C. Childs served as Interim Director of the Architecture Program and Associate Professor Geoffrey Adams served as Associate Director.
2011-14	Associate Professor Geoffrey Adams was appointed Director of the Architecture Program.
2013-	Associate Professor Kuppu Iyengar appointed Associate Director
2014-	Professor John Quale, appointed Director of Architecture Program; Karen J. King appointed Associate Director

Currently 146 undergraduate students and 96 graduate students are enrolled in the pre-professional and professional degree programs in the Architecture Program. This number has held relatively constant for the last 20 years.

(NOTE: In the following section, very few changes have been inserted for the 2013-14 academic year. With new leadership, it is expected that more will be reported in future annual reports.)

In 2007 the faculty adopted the current mission:

The mission of the architecture program is to investigate critically the architectural systems and social forces that define sustainable built environments both locally and globally, while honoring cultural identities through teaching, research and practice.

Fit with Institution

The Architecture Program is housed within the School of Architecture and Planning (SA+P). We share the fabrication laboratory, computing and printing laboratory, central administration and accounting, classrooms, studios and other facilities with the Landscape Architecture (LA) and Community and Regional Planning (CRP) programs. More importantly, SA+P offers a number of interdisciplinary courses and activities. For example, a spring studio under the auspices of the Design and Planning Assistance Center (DPAC) is co-taught by faculty from all three programs and co-enrolled with students from the three programs. The graduate certificate programs in Historic Preservation and Regionalism, and Town Design offer interdisciplinary courses. Architecture and Landscape Architecture jointly offer "Studio Zero," an intensive introductory studio for incoming graduate students in Landscape Architecture and the 3.5 yr.

M.Arch. Program. The Architecture Program often collaborates with other university units. For example, we offered a graduate studio investigating the design of a health clinic for Silver City, NM in conjunction with the Community Health Program in the medical school.

Holistic Education

In addition to the requirement that all two-year graduate students have completed a bachelors degree from an accredited program, the current curriculum (first offered in fall 2010) requires new courses in sustainability, policy and culture, research, and written communications as well as a set of open electives. We actively engage multiple disciplines both within and outside our program. For example, Levi Romero, a research faculty member in architecture, is a well published and respected poet. Levi was selected as the Centennial Poet for New Mexico, marking the states 100th anniversary and was named the poet laureate of SA+P in 2010

Moreover, our studios and other courses frequently address design problems with community clients offering rich and varied opportunities for interaction and dialog with clients and community groups. In 2006, the DPAC program was awarded an NCARB prize for its work with multiple communities such as Artesia, Belen, and Aztec. We host a regular lecture series which include speakers from a wide range of disciplines.

Studios, lecture courses and seminars make regular use of architectural, regulatory and industry professionals as guest speakers and reviewers imbuing the program at multiple levels with practicumbased learning opportunities.

b. Responses to the Five Perspectives

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community A Robust Range of Scholarship

The program has a long and deep history of the scholarship of community engagement, an impressive group of recent competition winners, robust activity in both publications and professional work, a blossoming program promoting research, and a culture that allows the risk taking necessary to promote and support creative and scholarly exploration.

The Architecture Program provides a course in the University core requirements, Introduction to Architecture (ARCH 121) and offers multiple courses that are open to all university students. One faculty member has a joint appointment with Fine Arts, and another is the Director of the Art | Research | Technology | Science Laboratory. We offer both team taught and co-listed courses within the school. Southwest Architecture and Cultural Landscapes, ARCH 481/581, and Civic Places (ARCH 493/593) for example are co-listed with Landscape Architecture and CRP.

In the fall of 2010, the new Dean developed an internal grant program designed to provide seed money for research and scholarship. Six architecture faculty members received grants from this program in the fall of 2010, and two in the spring of 2010. To compliment this effort, the architecture program has hosted a set of informal talks on various aspects of scholarship such as writing book proposals and applying for Fulbright scholarships. A list of recent students' winning competitions is to be found on our website, as are faculty publications and reviews of faculty work.

Holistic, Practical and Liberal Arts-based Education

The program aims to gracefully balance the broad range of learning necessary to develop professional architects who aspire to be active, engaged, skilled and ethical designers. We craft studio, lecture, and seminar projects to situate architectural design in a broad understanding of contexts including regionalism, the traditions and current dialog of liberal arts, community engagement, and the global histories and current dialog of the profession. Students propose a large variety of independent studies that they work on with faculty such as design-build projects in the FabLab and research into models for post-degree, public service based internships. Additionally, we offer a lecture series, gallery exhibits, school and program colloquia and other fora. These extra-curricular activities include core architectural topics, issues centered in related disciplines, and discussion of the larger cultural context. For example, in the fall of 2010 the lecture series focused on contemporary Indigenous Architecture, and in the spring of 2011 on issues of sustainability. Since the last accreditation visit, the program has hosted scholars whose research and teaching focused on place-based ethnography, poetry, and photography.

We have been actively building cross-disciplinary activities such as “studio zero” (an introductory studio for the entering 3.5 yr. graduate Architecture students along with Landscape Architecture graduate students), the multi-disciplinary DPAC studio, and multi-disciplinary courses offered by the two graduate certificate programs. Additionally, Pearl Hall, our new building, permits studios from all three disciplines to be housed together in a large open studio nurturing informal desk crits, conversations and other interactions across disciplines.

B. Architectural Education and Students

Penitentes and Physicists

The phrase “from penitentes (a traditional lay confraternity) to physicists” (at Sandia and Los Alamos Labs) is sometimes used to evoke the great breadth of cultural realms in the state. UNM is one of the few universities that is both a Research I and a Hispanic Serving Institution. We have a remarkably diverse student body, faculty, and community. This diversity includes not only different cultural heritages, but also students who are the first in their family to attend college, exchange students from across the world, the children of rural ranchers, former service members and students with former careers in physics.

The environment that results from this mix itself prepares students to work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are valued. The everyday workings of studios, study groups, celebrations and collaborations in such a community provide learning opportunities. Teaching practices and the curriculum refine these “environmental” learning opportunities. A focus on “the work and the craft,” developing lifelong lines of inquiry, open discussion, modeling disagreement without being disagreeable, and seeking modes of constructive criticism are teaching practices that the faculty actively discuss and deploy.

Moreover, the new curriculum includes the “global studio” that focuses on issues of global importance. Additional studios have focused a wide range of issues including a boarding school for children with autism in Tanzania, housing in Ghana, infrastructure for Chicago’s Olympic bid, to name a few.

Participation and Leadership

Our students have multiple avenues for leadership within the American Institute of Architecture Students, Tau Sigma Delta Honor Society, and on professional non-University affiliated boards such as the State of New Mexico Architectural Licensing Board, CSI and ULI. Moreover, many program and school committee have student members. One of our undergraduate students is currently the national director of the AIAS and our chapter is hosting the AIAS West Quad conference this fall, 2011.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment

Lectures and presentations on IDP and registration are included at graduate orientations and in the professional practice course. In the fall of 2010, Harry Falconer from the National Council of

Accreditation Boards visited UNM and made a presentation on IDP and the Regulatory Environment to the entire graduate student body. Professor Dent, the school IDP coordinator, and Tina Reams, the IDP coordinator for New Mexico regularly lecture in the professional practice course.

Our active AIAS chapter has aided students in understanding the transition to careers through an internal mentoring program and informal discussions with alumni. We recently organized panel discussions on alternative practices near the end of spring semester.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession

Our engagement with the profession is multifaceted. As is the tradition in the discipline, we actively involve practitioners in nearly all mid and final studio reviews. As a matter of course we include architects, landscape architects, planners, other designers such as industrial designers, and in appropriate cases medical professionals. Many of our regular and part-time faculty are licensed and active practitioners. Several directors and faculty of the program have held a seat on the board of AIA Albuquerque since the last accreditation visit. For a number of years the Program has co-sponsored lectures with AIA Albuquerque and AIA Santa Fe, the Mortgage Finance Authority, and various local firms. We have hosted CSI, NCARB, ULI and other professional organizations' events. Faculty, of course, also serve on multiple community boards, speak at events, sit on AIA juries, develop and sponsor competitions and otherwise serve as public professionals. Our active AIAS chapter regularly works with AIA Albuquerque chapter.

Clients and professionals present to students in a multitude of courses from professional practice to human factors. When possible we open course lectures and presentations by clients, regulators, and architects to the entire school community. A panel discussion of local owners on the design of "third places" (bars, bookstores, restaurants etc) developed for the fall 2010 Civic Spaces course, and the entire set of lectures for the fall 2010 Contemporary Indigenous Architecture course were held in Pearl Hall auditorium and advertised to the school community, local practitioners, and the nation community of indigenous architects.

We recognize multiple threads of the profession and that this is a time of active restructuring of practice. Thus, we not only prepare students for traditional practice in the required professional practice course and throughout the curriculum, but we provide students with learning opportunities about alternative practices through cross-disciplinary and community-based work with MainStreet and other non-profit practices in the DPAC studio. The FabLab and our emphasis on practices of making support the current rethinking of the architect's role in tectonics.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good

Honing the relationship between architecture and the public good is the substance of current discourse and exploration. We believe that an academic community should be a critical forum for that debate, and our role includes teaching students to be principled members of the discussion. This includes questioning the roles of professionals, honest evaluation of one's own work, a dedication to rigorous practice and the pursuit of knowledge, ethical judgment, and active attempts to articulate a stance towards the public good.

The curriculum embrace content in sustainability, professional ethics, universal design, life-safety, and opportunities for service-learning and engagement with clients. Moreover, a significant portion of faculty scholarship is focused in these areas. For example, Karen J. King, Lecturer III, has lectured in multiple courses and engaged multiple studios on the subjects of inclusive design, co-authored and edited the chapter on inclusive design for the 11th edition of Architectural Graphic Standards, and collaborated on professional projects, surveys and the like.

The Design and Planning Assistance Center (DPAC) has worked with small towns and non-profits for over 40 years focusing on public engagement and the role of design in supporting the public good.

DPAC has been a joint activity of the architecture, community and regional planning, and landscape architecture programs. During the last decade DPAC has been funded by the State MainStreet program to work with communities on the revitalization of their central districts. In 2006, DPAC won an NCARB award for this work. DPAC has also hired students to work with MainStreet and other community groups. Two architecture and two landscape architecture students were paid to work with Professors Mark Childs and Alf Simon, in the spring of 2011, on the design of a set of kiosks and streetscape projects for the Nob Hill Main Street Organization.

In addition to DPAC, other studios have worked with a variety of communities and clients such as the Pueblo of Santo Domingo / Kewa Pueblo, a non-profit theater group, UNM's community health program on the design of a clinic in Silver City, and an arts center in downtown Albuquerque, and with groups advocating for inclusion of robust health centers in high schools.

c. Long Range Planning

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

Process

We are currently in the midst of developing our next long-range plan, and hope to use both the NAAB accreditation and the concurrent UNM program review as means to refine the plan.

During the 2009-2010 school year, an ad-hoc faculty committee interviewed faculty members and wrote a report assembling the interests of the faculty. During the 2010-2011 school year a new ad-hoc faculty committee reviewed this report and developed a framework for a long-range plan. The Five Perspectives, the NAAB requirement for a program diversity plan, and faculty developed categories were used as divisions of this long-range plan. A faculty retreat was then held to prioritize goals, and identify information that needed to be gathered. The results of that work are summarized below. This framework will be the basis of discussion with the Dean and Provost during the University Program Review leading to an action plan that reflects input from the faculty, Director, Dean, and Provost.

Concurrently the School has been developing a strategic plan. The program long-range plan has and will benefit from the interactive dialog between these two processes.

FRAMEWORK for LONG RANGE PLANNING WITH INITIAL ISSUES (spring 2011)

A. Education and Academic Community

Cultivate a Learning Community within the Program

It is our goal to have all faculty (full and part time, tenured and untenured) feel supported, included and valued. Senior faculty provides meaningful mentorship in varied formats. The development of junior faculty is an important concern and responsibility that is shared by the full faculty. Progress of and expectations for untenured and junior faculty are developed and discussed by the entire faculty. The faculty, in consultation with the director, shall -

1. Develop an updated program document on tenure and promotion.
2. Establish multiple program venues for faculty to share scholarship.
3. Provide electronic access to adopted policy and curricula documents.
4. Develop measures to establish fair and comprehensive workload and leave policies.
5. Develop a program of ongoing education for tenured faculty focused on teaching effectiveness, research skills, and public engagement.

Strengthen the Program's Position in the School and University

It is our goal that the Program will continue to play a vital role in the School and will work to increase visibility within the University. We will -

1. Continue to have faculty serve on University committees regarding the built environment.
2. Continue to work formally and informally with the University Architect and Facilities Management.
3. Balance service assignments to place more senior faculty on University committees.

Strengthen the Program's Contribution to the Community of Architecture Scholars

It is our goal to actively engage the local, regional, national, and international communities of scholars. We will -

1. Support dissemination of faculty scholarship.
2. Continue faculty exchanges with regional programs.

Faculty Diversity

It is our goal to continue to have a robust community of scholars that gains strength and insight from diversity.

1. Work with the School and University to develop a plan to maintain and increase faculty diversity.

B. Education and Students

Define Program Core Lines of Inquiry

It is our goal to define a set of core lines of inquiry and organize faculty research, lectures, exhibits, curriculum, and other activities around these lines of inquiry. Tentatively, we have identified those lines of inquiry as centering on design, sustainability, tectonics, and community engagement. We will :

1. In 2012, hold a retreat to define our collective lines of inquiry and formulate a set of actions around each line. We will consider current faculty interests, regional assets and opportunities (e.g. arid lands, small town urbanism, border issues, indigenous design), and global trends and conditions.

Implement Robust Program Assessment

It is our goal to improve our assessment procedures. We will:

1. Regularly gather data from alumni.
2. Review ARE pass rates.
3. Develop a program specific system of course and instructor evaluation.
4. Develop term-end debriefing/evaluation methods.

Curriculum and Course Development

It is our goal to improve our procedures and policies for curriculum refinement. We will:

1. Investigate offering more cross-disciplinary courses and develop a set of criteria for evaluating these offerings.
2. Work with the defined core lines of inquiry to refine and develop electives, lectures, exhibits etc.

Extra-curricular Development

It is our goal to improve our extra-curricula activities. We will:

1. Improve support for student organizations
2. Develop a 3 year rolling plan and additional funding for student travel
3. Develop a program plan for the lecture series

Financial Support

It is our goal to increase financial support and opportunities for students. We will:

1. Seek to increase scholarships particularly for incoming graduate students
2. Seek to improve funding for GAs and TAs, and establish a course on teaching methods for GAs
3. Seek to establish additional internship opportunities such as our agreement with the National Park Service.

Student Diversity

It is our goal to continue to have a robust community of scholars that gains strength and insight from diversity. We will:

1. Develop tools to regularly assess culturally effective teaching
2. Review studio project types and sites to maintain a well-rounded diversity of cultural landscapes.

C. Education and Regulatory Environment

It is our goal to be active participants in shaping the regulatory environment. We will:

1. Work to reinstate UNM representation on the NM State Licensing Board
2. Seek regular and ongoing faculty representation on a variety of professional boards in addition to the Albuquerque AIA (e.g. ULI, CSI).

D. Education and the Profession

It is our goal to help lead the profession in critical lines of inquiry and education. We will:

1. Seek to improve the attractiveness of our lecture series to local professionals
2. Investigate offering regular symposiums/courses for professionals
3. Seek approval for offering continuing education credits

E. Education and the Public Good

How can we best act as public professionals? We will:

1. Investigate developing a faculty speakers bureau
2. Re-evaluate DPAC's structure
3. Investigate developing courses/research/forums on healthy cities and appropriate technology
4. Consider re-establishing DPAC's annual conference for elected officials

F. Other Responsibility and engagement with OUR built environment.

It is our goal to be active and creative stewards of the school's and university's built environment. We will:

1. Work with the School to develop policies and funding for installations in and around the building.
2. Continue to serve on University committees regarding the built environment
3. Seek opportunities to display student and faculty work around the campus

(NOTE: This next section has been slightly updated for 2013-14)

d. Program Self Assessment

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

The School and the Architecture Program have multiple layers of assessment.

Faculty: Each course is evaluated by students with either a University-supplied IDEA form or an equivalent form developed by the course instructor. (In the Fall of 2014, the architecture program was one of four programs / departments at UNM to test the new fully online teaching evaluations. We haven't seen the results as of this writing – but are hopefully this will improve the teaching evaluation process.) These forms are typically made available to the Director and used during annual faculty evaluations and promotion actions. Additionally, courses that serve as part of the University core have state-wide learning objectives and University reporting methods.

The Director of the program assesses faculty teaching, and the effectiveness of the curriculum through annual faculty reviews, course reviews and discussions with students, faculty, and academic advisors.

Students: The program requires a portfolio review of students' work prior to students' final year of graduate study. This review focuses on the student's overall development and ability to cogently represent their body of work and skills. As a whole, the portfolio reviews also inform the faculty and director about the effectiveness of the curriculum. We also have faculty coordinators who work with faculty to discuss and assess coordination between courses.

Curriculum: The curriculum committee is charged with evaluating the overall curriculum and developing recommendations for revisions. They work closely with the director, who is an ex-officio member of the committee. Both evaluation reports and proposed changes are presented to the full faculty for deliberation and approval. Curriculum changes then go through a University process for approval. A major faculty retreat will be held in February 2015 to consider the curriculum of the Master of Architecture program. The director and associate directors are gathering research to prepare for that event.

Program: The University requires an assessment plan, and conducts a program review that occurs on a six year cycle. The University assessment requires development of a set of student learning objectives that fit within three broad University-wide learning objectives, a method of regularly measuring student learning on these objectives, and a process for using this data to inform teaching methods and the curriculum. This plan is an evolving document. In the fall, 2010 the program proposed using the NAAB SLC's and the above noted assessment tools to fulfill the University requirements.

Alumni Survey: The former Interim Director has conducted a survey of alumni to investigate (1) perceptions of critical learning objectives, (2) career paths, and (3) perception of emerging issues. A new survey will be completed in Spring or Fall of 2015. Findings from the survey include:

Demographics of Alumni Replies:

121 replies,
49% M. Arch., 51% B.A.A.;

70% male , 30% female;
20% Hispanic, 4% American Indian, 3% Asian, 2% African American, 7% no answer;
51% registered architects;
47% live in Albuquerque Metro Area, 44% outside of New Mexico

Results of Alumni Survey:

Most Valued Learning at UNM

	highest & 2nd highest		lowest & 2nd lowest	
	#	%	#	%
Critical Thinking	87	72%	14	12%
Fundamental Design	84	69%	16	13%
Graphic Communication	81	67%	13	11%
Verbal Communication	76	63%	21	17%
Bldg. Tech. Knowledge	60	50%	32	26%
Sketching	62	51%	27	22%
Written Communication	57	47%	30	25%
Technical Documentation	54	45%	33	27%
Diagramming	53	44%	25	21%
Computer Graphics	48	40%	45	37%

Most Valuable Professional Development activities the school could offer?

Online continuing education and in-house continuing education had higher positive rating than negative ratings.

How strongly do you believe SA+P should address the following in its curriculum and activities?

Rank Order	# ranking highest & 2nd highest	# ranking lowest & 2nd lowest
Bldg. construction &		
Manufacturing methods	98	9
Healthy Bldg./Cities	95	9
Appropriate Tech.	83	12
Other Environ. Issues	80	13
BIM	79	12
Global Warming	73	25
Other CAD/CAM	70	16
Urbanism	66	21
Regionalism	55	18

Observations from Assessment

Initial assessments of the new curriculum and other changes implemented concurrently include:

Academic Community

Discussions internal to the program and school, as well as a changing climate in the University, suggested that the faculty should both increase its scholarly output and better disseminate the work it develops. The Dean introduced an internal competition to spur scholarship (page 37). Additionally, the former Interim Director hosted a set of faculty meetings on a variety of aspects of research and scholarship such as writing book proposals, applications for Fulbright Scholarships, and budgeting for grants. In order to better display faculty work to the community - (1) the faculty show required for this NAAB visit has been developed since fall 2010 and exhibited in parts as it was developed, (2) an e-gallery program was developed for the electronic notice board to display faculty work, (3) the school web-page was redesigned and a broader spectrum of faculty and student work has been included, and (4) both the Director and the Dean have been working with university public relations staff to increase publicity.

Students

In a series of retreats the faculty conducted a major review and revision of the curriculum to create the program that is now being implemented. This new curriculum is intended to address a number of concerns the faculty had with the previous program of study. Key changes addressing these issues included:

Issue 1: Inherent to previous curriculum's vertical studio organization was uneven experience and ability levels among the students in studios leading to unpredictable gaps and redundancies in each student's progress.

Response: Studios are now taken in a constructed sequence which allows faculty to build on skills developed in previous studios while providing a predictable interface with the non-studio curriculum.

Issue 2: Development of key communication skills were part of the domain of the studio in the previous curriculum. This, combined with the vertical studio organization, led to a patchwork acquisition of these critical skills.

Response: Specific communications courses were introduced to the 3.5 yr. M.Arch. path (and the B.A.A. undergraduate program) to better address the development of graphic, digital, fabrication, writing and speaking skills.

Issue 3: The dilemma of all MArch programs for students with undergraduate degrees in another discipline is that they are simultaneously too long and too short. Even with a seven semester sequence it is difficult to pack in all the coursework necessary to earn a professional degree.

Response: A summer studio was introduced into the 3.5 yr. M.Arch. path allowing these students to graduate 6 months earlier. The summer studio is also available 2 yr. M.Arch. path students providing curricular flexibility and further enhancing cross path engagement.

Issue 4: One of the successes of the previous curriculum was the introduction of a capstone masters studio "Studio M" offered as an option to the previously mandatory Independent Project or Thesis track. This was both a response to student needs and faculty workload. The success of "Studio M" has caused the other two tracks Project and Thesis to dwindle to essentially vestigial status.

Response: The option of conducting a two term studio sequence was introduced in the final year providing opportunities to conduct in-depth architectural studies by bridging the 'investigation/research' studio and the 'masters' studio.

Issue 5: In the previous curriculum the faculty recognized that students design studio work was not adequately demonstrating the integration and interdependency of building systems.

Response: The addition of two systems integration courses with the explicit intent of integrating the content of construction, structures and building systems coursework into the design process.

Issue 6: Environmentally responsible design is recognized by the faculty as the most pressing issue of our time and an essential element of a 21st century architectural education.

Response: The addition of two sustainability classes to the curriculum underscores our commitment to the importance of this content.

The program has been in transition to the new curriculum for just one year, as of Fall 2011. Due to details of the transition plan, not all courses have been offered within the framework of the new curriculum (e.g. World Architecture I & II). The transition should be complete by the spring 2012.

Regulatory Environment

We have not noted any significant problems with our efforts to communicate IDP and other professional regulatory issues to students. However, we have increased the number of times and venues for this communication, and we have developed a letter on these issues that is sent to all incoming graduate students.

The best way to help students transition from academia to the profession has long been an active topic of debate, and in our community, like many others, there are a variety of deeply-held positions. This debate has become both more complicated and more urgent during the recession and with emerging alternative modes of practice. We have added a course to the curriculum "Practice and Theory" in the undergraduate sequence, and emphasize multiple modes of practice in "Human Factors." In the spring of 2011, we held a panel discussion with architects who have engaged in "alternative" modes of practice.

Profession

The survey of alumni conducted during the fall of 2010 indicated that our students engage in a variety of professional roles during their careers, including government positions, non-profit roles, and "specialty" roles such as programming and sustainability consulting. A number of courses such as Human Factors and Programming, Professional Practice, and Sustainability actively introduce material that supports the breadth of contemporary professional roles.

The program actively engages the professional community in a number of ways. Over 50% of both the full-time and part-time faculty are licensed and to varying degrees engage in professional practices. Faculty are members of AIA Albuquerque, the local ULI chapter, and other professional organizations and serve on numerous professional boards and committees. We currently have a student member on the State Licensing Board, and have had a faculty member on that board. State legislation reserves a seat on the State Licensing Board for an architect/educator who teaches at an accredited architecture program. The program has put forward a candidate for this position; the current administration has left this state position unassigned.

As the alumni survey results indicate, the program needs to broaden its outreach to alumni and other professionals encouraging them to attend our public lectures, exhibits, and reviews. Progress has been made on this since 2012, and we are working with the Alumni Council more closely on these topics. We should explore the demand, required resources and institutional constraints regarding on-line or in-house continuing education.

Public Good

The program has housed the Design and Planning Assistance Center since 1969. DPAC has had multiple incarnations during those 40+ years. DPAC enjoyed full time faculty directors through 2007. From 2008 to spring 2010, the DPAC director was a research faculty member hired on soft money. Despite the fact that

DPAC conducted a number of successful funded projects, sufficient funding to continue this model were not secured in the requisite timeframe. In fall 2010, DPAC shifted to a studio model led by a multidisciplinary faculty team. As part of the Schools strategic planning process the model for DPAC and community engagement is being discussed/reconsidered.

Alumni survey results suggest that we consider developing initiatives promoting healthy buildings and cities.

Feedback Methods

Just as our methods of assessment occur at multiple scales, our feedback methods happen at multiple levels of the organization.

Student reviews of courses are summarized and compared to normalizing data by the University and returned to faculty and the director. The Director uses this information in annual reviews and promotions. If these assessments suggest issues with the larger curriculum or the learning cultures, said issues will be investigated by the Director and brought to the curriculum committee as warranted.

Students are required to submit a portfolio of their work prior to their final year in the program. This allows the faculty to review each student's overall progress, engage in a discussion with the student about their progress and ambitions.

5. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: This section is not required for programs submitting reports in 2013.)

Following are the major changes to the NAAB conditions that have appreciably affected the program.

A. "Learning culture, studio culture, and social equity are seen as interconnected"**

During the 2010-11 school year, the program appointed a committee to address these new requirements and interweaving of requirements. The culture of the program and school has and continues to focus on the education, scholarship and creative work of the students, faculty and associated community. We have a long and valued history as a community composed of diverse individuals. That diversity includes ethnic and cultural background, nationality, first language, educational background, and scholarly lines of inquiry.

B. "Long-range planning is seen as part of a continuum of activity in which the five perspectives may play a role."**

Prior to this explicit requirement, formal long-range planning was centered at the School level. During the 2010-11 school year, the program appointed a committee to initiate formal program-based longrange planning. The results of the full faculty's review of the long-range planning committee work are reported in the long-range plan section of this study. Concurrently, the School initiated a rewrite of its strategic plan.

Additionally, the University program assessment that is occurring during the same time frame as the NAAB review is designed to produce at its conclusion a set of strategic directions, and may serve as the basis for revisions to our long-range plan that are supported by the School and University and are informed by both accreditation reports.

C. "Self-assessment is linked to long-range planning. Programs must demonstrate that they are engaged in regular, measurable assessment activity and are using the results in their deliberations."**

Self-assessment is conducted at multiple levels: (a) students evaluate each course through a University-wide process that in many cases is supplemented by faculty developed tools, (b) each faculty member reviews their courses, (c) each semester groups of faculty organized by year-level coordinators reflect on learning outcomes and revises assignments, projects and syllabi, (d) the curriculum committee and the faculty as a whole modify the curricula and practices on an ongoing basis, (e) the director works with faculty members to review and revise course content, and (f) the faculty as a whole respond to NAAB criteria and evaluations every 6 years (supplemented by annual reports).

Additionally, the University has both an ongoing student learning assessment process, and a program assessment on a 5 to 6 year cycle. The student learning assessment process is specific and detailed for Arch 121 because this course fulfills a University core requirement. For the body of the program the student learning assessment process requires a program-developed plan and quarterly reports, and offers training to faculty and administrators on course assessment procedures.

D. For statistical reports “comparative data is very important”*

The ongoing changes in the methods and subject matter for statistical data make the collection of comparative data difficult. We also believe that more precise definitions are required for many terms used. For example, expenditures per student can be calculated in a myriad of ways (e.g. does this include University services such as the library and gym, research budgets, scholarships etc.?)

E. Student achievement is now measured as either understanding or ability.

This change has helped clarify the goals and production of evidence.

F. The 32 SPCs are gathered into three realms.

Although the development of the realms has added conceptual clarity to the SPCs, we do not believe that they have or should shape our curriculum. We have organized our curriculum into the following categories: studio, communications, history and precedent, building, context, practice and research, and electives.

G. SPCs A.5 and C.9 were added

A.5. Investigative Skills: *Ability* to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.

We believe this clarifies previous SPCs and directly aligns with our new curriculum.

C.9. Community and Social Responsibility: *Understanding* of the architect’s responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

We believe this clarifies previous SPCs and directly aligns with our previous and new curriculum.

H. “The program must demonstrate that it has a clearly defined curriculum review process.”*

The standing curriculum committee has been and is charged with review of the curriculum. In 2010-11 the committee was tasked with developing a set of specific review processes.

I. “There is a new expectation that licensed individuals are engaged in discussions about curriculum.”*

The faculty currently includes and has previously included licensed architects. The current (Steve Dent, AIA) and previous chair (Mark C. Childs, AIA) of the curriculum committee are licensed.

J. There are new requirements for career information and ARE pass rates.

This material was added to the webpage shortly after the requirements were published.

K. Addition of a requirement on evaluation of preparatory and pre-professional education.

This is the most complex and significant change in the conditions.

Prior to the adoption of the 2009 conditions, the faculty decided that all SPCs, except fundamental design skills, would be addressed within both tracks of the M.Arch. program. Fundamental design skills are reviewed through the portfolio submissions of applicants for the 2 yr. track. Thus in terms of the NAAB SPCs the M. Arch. can be assessed without regard to the B.A.A.

However, our B.A.A. also contains many of the SPCs and serves to prepare students to undertake the accelerated 2 yr. track. We believe that the 2009 conditions and subsequent clarifications have substantially changed the relationship between NAAB accreditation and pre-professional degrees, and that nationally agreed upon methods to assess the difference between a pre-professional and a liberal arts degree in architecture need to be developed.

*Quotes from “2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation - Highlights of Changes”

Supplemental Material

Instruction: Include the following as a list of individual URLs or provide instructions for accessing a web-based portal for review of the following

Please do not attach files to the interim report, rather identify URLs to websites or servers, or other mainstream technology currently employed by your program to capture and host files.

1. Provide evidence that supports or demonstrates changes to the curriculum in response to not-met SPC (II.1).

Be sure to identify the changes/outcomes expected.

- a. New/revised syllabi
- b. Student work demonstrating the change

Regarding the cause of concern related to cost control, the document on this topic is found at this link:

<https://www.dropbox.com/s/jqnzhgn2l8ef18l/UNM%20Interim%20Report%20documentation.zip?dl=0>

2. Provide evidence or supporting documentation/narrative that demonstrates changes in other aspects of the program made in response to other not-met Conditions (I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4)

This is described on page four of this report.

3. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the desired contribution to the program. (i.e. narrative biography or one-page CV)

See pages five and six of this report. This is the link for Brian Goldstein's CV and website is here:

<http://saap.unm.edu/about/sap-people/faculty-profiles/brian-goldstein.html>

And the link to John Quale's bio and CV is here:

<http://saap.unm.edu/about/sap-people/faculty-profiles/john-quale.html>

4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the team at the next accreditation visit.

Additional information regarding the types of files that may be submitted in support of the program's responses in Sections 2-5:

As described above, we were not sufficient informed of the need to provide student documentation at the Interim Report stage in time for that work to be collected. The link to the cost control work for Fall 2014 is above.

1. *Syllabi or course descriptions. These shall be presented in Word or Adobe PDF*

2. *Student work*

- a. *Studio work shall be presented in digital form either 2D (PDF) or 3D (BIM) files. Reviewers must be able to review the files using zoom or pan techniques in order to review details. Further, the program is responsible for ensuring that the files can be reviewed in the same software used to create them. Instructors' comments and grades shall be visible or available. Students' identities may be removed in order to comply with FERPA.*
- b. *Classroom work shall be presented in digital form (PDF) after grading. Instructors' comments and grades shall be visible. Students' identities may be removed in order to comply with FERPA.*
- c. *Presentations or other oral projects shall be presented with both video clips of the presentation and copies of presentation materials (i.e. PowerPoint slides in PDF). Please limit video segments to 1 minute each.*