July 21, 2009

Dr. Richard Herman, Chancellor
Swanlund Administration Building
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
601 E. John Street
Champaign, IL 61820

Dear Chancellor Herman:

At the July 2009 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the Directors reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, School of Architecture.

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, 2009. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2015.

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are submitted online through the NAAB’s Annual Report Submission system and are due by November 30 of each year. These reports have two parts:

Part I (Annual Statistical Report) captures statistical information on the institution in which a program is located and the degree program.

Part II (Narrative Report) is the narrative report in which a program responds to the most recent Visiting Team Report (VTR). The narrative must address Section 1.4 Conditions Not Met and Section 1.5 Causes of Concern of the VTR. Part II also includes a description of changes to the program that may be of interest to subsequent visiting teams or to the NAAB.

If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by January 15, 2010, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program’s next visit. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found in Section 10 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2009 Edition.

Finally, under the terms of the 2009 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 8 (page 18) for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Douglas L. Steidl, FAIA
President

cc: David M. Chasco, AIA, Director
    C. William Bevins, FAIA, Visiting Team Chair
    Visiting Team Members
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The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The Team wishes to thank the School of Architecture administration, faculty, staff, and students for their assistance and cooperation during the visit. The School provided a well developed APR, a clearly organized team room, and clear presentations about the program. The Team is especially appreciative of Dean Robert Graves and Program Director David Chasco for their open and candid discussions of the architecture program's history and legacy. Both were very helpful to the Team's understanding of how a "strong" legacy can be both a great strength and obstacle for future change.

As one of the two oldest architectural programs in the country, the Team found that the School of Architecture is well position within both the College of Fine and Applied Arts and the University of Illinois. The program derives great benefit from an entrepreneurial school administration, a supportive dean within the College of Fine and Applied Arts containing the creative and design disciplines, and being at one of the major research universities in the country. Importantly, the University of Illinois provides numerous and robust programs that support the creative and scholarly endeavors of its faculty.

From the outset it was apparent to the Team that both the CFAA and School of Architecture administration had taken the 2003 accreditation report very seriously. Without question the 2003 visit identified a program that was deeply entrenched in its legacy, but was struggling to find the balance of a strong past and a vision for the future. As a result, many changes have occurred within the school over the past six years; some anticipated, some planned, and others unexpected. Along with the 2003 visit, two other events have significantly impacted the timing and course of change that is currently taking place:

1. Existing faculty retirement/attrition (some anticipated, others unexpected) – A total of 20 new faculty have been added to the school as a result of past retirements and natural attrition (pre and post 2003 visit). While this number of faculty turnover would be considered disastrous to most programs, it has in fact provided the positive stimulus for change that the previous visiting team clearly identified was necessary. It was obvious to this Team that the school benefited immensely from the creative hiring opportunities within the University of Illinois system as evidenced by the expedient hiring of a full complement of new replacement faculty. The university and school's administration clearly understand the challenges of such a large influx of new faculty into an established program; however, through the diligent efforts of Program Director Chasco, the result is a highly productive faculty motivated by the collective challenges they face in moving the architecture program forward.

2. Curriculum changes (planned) – Concurrent with the new faculty hires, the school has revised both its undergraduate and graduate curriculums around a common core of studies/studies that is a requirement for all architecture students. Included in the change is moving the "Capstone" project, previously considered the comprehensive studio, to the 4th year within the common core curriculum. At the graduate level, students still have the ability to select specific "Options" that formed the previous curriculum; however all students now have the common core studies baseline that was absent from the previous curriculum format. While the "Option" opportunities remain a critical component and continue to provide richness to the program, some adjustments are still necessary to ensure that a smooth transition continues to achieve the full benefits of the new curriculum. The new curriculum affords an important opportunity for significant interdisciplinary teaching and scholarly activities between the faculty, and the potential to develop new interdisciplinary teaching pedagogies.

The Team recognized the myriad of changes and challenges the School of Architecture has undergone cannot be fully addressed within the six years since the previous visit. Consequently the Team feels that the program is still in a transition period, and many of the issues discussed in this report revolve around the transition not being completed at the time of our visit. While the
incomplete transition is important, the Team was very encouraged that there is now an emerging vision of where the School wants to be within the context of recognizing how its legacy can also frame its future. The Team encourages the program to aggressively refine and implement its vision and continue to move forward on all fronts.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Criterion 12.11, Non-Western Traditions (2003): Awareness of the parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2003): Following the review of diversity issues met in an exemplary fashion in Criterion 12.8 and a review of the series of well-constructed history courses focused on Western traditions, it is disappointing to conclude that no attempt is made to introduce non-Western traditions into required history/theory course materials. Even beyond these courses, little evidence was presented to indicate that non-Western traditions are given serious attention.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that Student Performance Criterion 12.11, Non-Western Traditions, is now MET.

Criterion 12.14, Accessibility (2003): Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Previous Team Report (2003): The team did not find credible evidence that this criterion is met in the body of student work presented in the Team Room. Moreover, the program would benefit from specific, formal instruction related to accessibility within the curriculum.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that Student Performance Criterion 12.14, Accessibility, is now MET with some concerns. See additional comments in "Causes of Concern" and SPC 13.15 of this report.

Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design (2003): Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria

Previous Team Report (2003): Placing the burden of comprehensiveness on Capstone Studios within specialized curricular options makes this criterion difficult to meet; some meet most of the expectations of Criterion 12.29, while others do not. The program has used the Capstone Project for student self-assessment, incorporating 10 expectations into Criterion 12.29. The team has found that some Capstone Projects did not meet these expectations.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that Student Performance Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design, is still considered NOT MET. As noted in the Team's comments on Criterion 13.29 of this report, the School has made great strides in addressing the comprehensive design deficiency noted in the previous visit report. However, the Team feels that resolution of the complex challenges of faculty transition and curriculum transformation are critical factors to resolving the comprehensive design deficiencies. Conceptually, comprehensive design represents the ability of a program to bring together the various elements of their curriculum into a single "comprehensive architectural project." Understandably, a program in transition would have difficulties in demonstrating the intent of this criterion. Consequently the Team feels the full, positive results of the faculty transition and curriculum transformation are yet to be realized within the context of the comprehensive design criterion.
Criterion 12.36, The Context of Architecture (2003): Understanding of the shifts which occur—and have occurred—in the social, political, technological, ecological, and economic factors that shape the practice of architecture.

Previous Team Report (2003): While the team finds that this criterion is met in an exemplary fashion for students in the Architectural Practice Studio, it is also observed that it is not met for students in other options. The concerns regarding the dramatic shifts within the profession were not exhibited to the team in other Capstone experiences.

While there is a general awareness of the profession of architecture, this awareness comes, perhaps, at the expense of an understanding, even appreciation, of the discipline of architecture: the issues, theoretical tools, and body of knowledge, that are and have been part of the historical and continuing evolution of the discipline of architecture.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: Criterion 12.36, The Context of Architecture, was combined other Student Performance Criteria in the development of the 2004 Conditions for Accreditation. While no longer a stand alone criterion, the Team found sufficient evidence in the student work presented to indicate this criterion now MET.

Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated April 2, 2003:

M. Arch. (3½ years)
A. The identity of Track 3 as a discrete professional track is not clear. It is difficult to discern the arc of the program across its 3½, or more, years. From available evidence, the curricular structure and the pedagogical approaches employed show a lack of recognition of the track as a graduate-level professional program with challenges and opportunities particular to it. In addition, there appears to be a lack of awareness, on the part of the students, faculty, and administration, of the nature of such a program and the diverse perspectives that Track 3 students contribute to the discipline and the profession.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that this cause of concern is now MET. This issue is further discussed in Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, in this report.

B. M. Arch. (4+2 years)
The curricular options at the graduate level are both opportunities for specialized design projects and a cause for concern. Design as a primary mode of research and inquiry is in danger of being sidelined by the curricular sequence in each of the specialized options that have determined particular Capstone course sequences. In contrast to these perhaps overly scripted sequences, the Design Options route seems particularly lacking in structure. Arch. 497, Design Thesis Prep, is a weak link. There is no specific content or focus to this course; neither research methods nor theoretical frameworks for thesis preparation are provided.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that this cause of concern is now MET. This issue is further discussed in Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, in this report.

This program suffers from the lack of a permanent school director. Interim Director Michael Andrejasic does a wonderful job, but he is limited by the impermanence of his position and his involvement with a number of different school programs. This has been an ongoing and damaging problem for several years; the university needs to give attention and priority to the appointment of a permanent director. Furthermore, the new director must be given the discretion and resources to move the program forward, including the appointment of new faculty members and the development of physical and information resources.
2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The visiting team found that this cause of concern is now MET with the hiring of Director David Chasco in 2004.

The team considers the five options of study in the M. Arch. degree to be both a great strength and a weakness of the program. The system of graduate options is a unique asset of the school, and all of the options are valuable, but they are not all providing the necessary common comprehensive design core. This inconsistency is allowing students to matriculate without the necessary tools. This could be remedied with better coordination and a concurrent core. The disparity is furthered by a disconnect between the options, with students and faculty lacking a solid understanding and appreciation of other curricula; this is partly a communication issue and is exacerbated by the divisional faculty structure.

Essentially, what is happening is the evolution of the subunits toward a form of departmentalization that continues to divide the faculty and prevent collaboration and coordination in the options of the graduate program.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The team observes a lack of shared objectives within this complex management structure that subverts leadership and shared course work.

The ratio of students to faculty members in the studio has risen significantly, sometimes going beyond 20:1. This could become the norm that would seriously affect the viability of the design studio. Efforts should be made to reduce the ratio to a maximum of 16:1.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: With the development of the new common core curriculum, the Team feels this cause of concern is now MET.

3. Conditions/Criteria Well Met
   1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context
   1.2 Architecture Education and Students
   9. Information Resources
   13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills
   13.8 Western Traditions
   13.18 Structural Systems
   13.19 Environmental Systems

4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met
   2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures
   13.28 Comprehensive Design

5. Causes of Concern

A. Vision: As noted throughout this report, the architecture program at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign is clearly still in a state of transition. There has been an ambitious and commendable effort focused on addressing the 2003 NAAB VTR deficiencies and causes of concern; however, the transition is not concluded and the results of the transition are not fully recognizable at this time. The change in vision for the future of the program is clearly in the mind of the Program Director, many of the faculty and a few of the students; however, the vision has not been articulated in a way that can yet be embraced by the broad constituency. The transition from a program with several strong and nearly independent "Options" to a core curriculum common with all students enriched by a broad and deep selection of specialties is occurring. With a large and diverse program deep in tradition the inertia to change is great, yet it is being accomplished without losing the tremendous strengths that come from having the history of producing the first graduating architect in the United States. The adeptness of the school's administration in progressing on this track is commendable. It is undoubtedly a decade long process that cannot be fully accomplished between NAAB accreditation visits.
While the vision is clear to the program’s administration, the plan or pathway for addressing this monumental change is at best foggy to the broader faculty and student constituency. Communication around the change has not been as frequent or as detailed as would seem vital for its success.

B. **Studio Culture:** The program has adopted a Studio Culture Policy that has been distributed to faculty and students, with both groups having input in the generation of the policy. That said the awareness of the policy was not high in either the faculty or students. The policy seemed more perfunctory than passionately demonstrated and has yet to be embraced as a living and evolving articulation of the culture. If the basis and development of the policy is remote or unknown, the real understanding of its value is diminished.

During discussion with the students it was evident that there is respect among students and faculty. However, the students noted that respect was not always demonstrated in faculty-to-faculty relationships.

C. **Structural / Environmental Systems:** SPC 13.18, Structural Systems and 13.19 Environmental Systems, were considered “Well Met”; however, the Team feels it is important to note that great success within a specific focus can, and often times does, undermine a comprehensive perspective to architectural education. The Team was very impressed with the emerging strategic direction for the program’s future and offers caution that as the program continues to evolve, specific focus areas should be support the broader comprehensive architectural education experience rather than be “stand alone” potentially competitive components of excellence.

D. **Accessibility / Site Conditions:** SPC 13.14, Accessibility and 13.17, Site Conditions, were “Met”; however, the Team found very little evidence in student design studio projects that involved sites with varying topography. The vast majority of the work reflected flat sites where the issues of building/site accessibility were easily resolved. While the School of Architecture is located on relatively flat terrain, the Team feels students should be exposed to a variety of site design issues, better insuring their understanding of complexities associated with site accessibility.

E. **Detail of Design Projects:** While technology has certainly offered the students unlimited opportunities in their abilities to graphically express their ideas, the Team found that many critical components of student work had become “absorbed” into the overall presentation of the project, resulting in comprehensive design projects that were well executed from a graphic presentation perspective but lacked sufficient detail for the Team to assess the student performance outcomes required of the Comprehensive Design criterion. This was especially evident in assessing the life safety and accessibility issues. Building floor plans specifically were presented as secondary elements to the overall project presentation, lacking clarity and the necessary information for the Team to make a fair assessment of the student’s abilities. The Team recognizes and respects the tremendous presentation opportunities now afforded students; however, the technology and presentation techniques should be used in a manner that clarifies a design solution, not renders it indefinable.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

Well Met    Not Met
[X]        [ ]

Condition 1.1, Architecture Education and the Academic Context, is considered “Well Met” based upon the following:

The institutional context of both the University and the College of Fine and Applied Arts offers the School of Architecture tremendous opportunities in support of research, teaching and learning, and service. The benefit of being a unit in a premiere research university is that it provides important resources for collaborative projects, mutually engaging endeavors, and cutting edge research. Importantly, in the context of the comment in the previous VTR, the School and its faculty are aggressively seeking out these opportunities and being successful in receiving them.

An important role that has emerged since the previous VTR is the role the Director of the program has assumed as the Chancellor’s advisor on building and planning. This is a significant contribution to the physical development and architectural quality of the campus, and includes architecture faculty on important committees concerning campus planning and design.

The faculty assumes their role as scholars and creative practitioners with a focused energy that results in significant productivity in both realms. The faculty exhibition bore witness to the important intellectual and design contributions the faculty is making to the discipline and profession of architecture.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program’s mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students’ diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.
1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program's relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students' understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

Condition 1.3, Architecture Education and Registration, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

During the school-wide meeting with the students, an overwhelming majority expressed a desire to be licensed, practicing architects and was aware of the steps necessary to achieve their goal. Those expressing the desire to become practicing architects also were aware of the IDP program as a component of the licensing process. The program has a long history of supporting the practice of architecture and many years ago was instrumental in securing positions on the State's licensing board for architecture educators. Currently the former director of the architecture program is the chair of the State of Illinois Board of Architects and the Practice and Technology Program Chair also is a member of the Board. Without question the students benefit from having this representation. The overall content of the curriculum clearly establishes practice as a program outcome with students becoming involved in practice related issues in the design studio as well as the professional practice class work. While most students typically become aware of registration/licensure issues later in their academic career in a professional practice class, at Illinois they are informed of the process in their first year in the program. Many of the students expressed their decision to attend the University of Illinois was its focus on a practice based curriculum.
1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program's particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects' obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

Met [X] Not Met []

Condition 1.4, Architecture Education and the Profession, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The Master of Architecture at the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign has a history and culture of connection to the issues of practice and the profession. A significant portion of the faculty is comprised of practice oriented architects. The depth and breadth of the program results in deep technical and professional resources which complement design education capabilities.

The East St. Louis Action Research Project embeds the student into the practicality of real projects involving real people. The Building Research Council and the Smart Energy Design Assistance Center provide real world opportunities to see the application of research into the execution of projects.

While centrally located between Chicago, St. Louis and Indianapolis, each is over two hours drive. Local architectural practice opportunities are somewhat limited. There was no evidence of a professional advisory council to the Director apparent during the team visit. A partially funded internship advisory council to the Director apparent during the team visit. A partially funded internship opportunity is provided for 15 students in summer programs with firms – a real and significant opportunity to UIUC students.

The school is directly engaged in professional associations in leadership positions including the AIA and NCARB. An active National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS) introduces issues of culture and diversity into the fabric of the institution.

The school has a robust visiting lecture program bringing in practitioners and scholars of note from around the world. Practitioners also participate in project reviews and as visiting faculty.

ARCH 101 as an introduction and ARCH 501 focusing on professional practice bracket the academic focus on professionalism that seems to be fundamental through the entire educational experience.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to
generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 1.5, Architecture Education and Society, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The student involvement in studio work and research associated with community outreach programs that the School has in Springfield, IL and their East St. Louis Action Research Project engage the students in societal issues. Additionally, students can participate in initiatives of the Building Research Council and the Smart Energy Design Assistance Center where they are exposed to, and involved with, the development of energy reduction strategies that look beyond the building code minimum requirements in both existing and new to building projects.

The program has significant foreign study opportunities for the students in Versailles, Munich, Tokyo, and China. This introduces students to the global context and provides the opportunity to engage in design in different cultures.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment, is considered "Not Met" based upon the following:

At the school level three committees direct administration, school and academic work. The Executive Committee, elected by the faculty, is the primary advisory body to the director. General faculty meetings throughout the year and seven other faculty committees also participate in various levels of direction and assessment. Student organizations are active and meet under the umbrella organization Architecture Student Advisory Council (ASAC). Student course evaluations and alumni and professionals also give feedback as to school progress and standing.

While the school has continued to progress and gained benefits from many recent improvements to the educational mission through self-assessment activities, clear strategic planning concurrent with on-going self-assessment activities is not evident. During the past five years, the school has welcomed a new school director, focused change in the curriculum, and moved a part of the program to a new facility for the second year course work to be integrated into one environment, sustained multiple faculty retirements and brought 20 new faculty to the program. Due to the amount of change the program is experiencing, the multi-method self-assessment programs need clarification and focus communicated to both faculty and students. The program should recognize that a focused self-assessment is critical to their long-term success.

The program is moving from one that has been described as a series of silos in the past to one of core integration supported by deep areas of knowledge in the future. It would be helpful to have an articulated plan for that transformation and then assessment of the progress toward achieving that plan. Buy-in by faculty is not universal and the inertia of former patterns is difficult to overcome. This context makes moving forward challenging, yet great strides have been made,
enthusiasm among many is high and the likelihood of success in this transformation is probable. A robust self-assessment program will identify where there are challenges to progress, how challenges are addressed and milestones that need to be accomplished along the way.

3. Public Information
To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Condition 3, Public Information, is considered "Met" based upon the following:
The visiting team reviewed the program's promotional documents, including the program's website information, and found the descriptive language to be in conformance with the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A.

4. Social Equity
The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

Condition 4, Social Equity, is considered "Met" based upon the following:
The program has sufficiently addressed the concerns outlined in the previous VTR. With the new School administration, more transparency of and access to information and decision making processes have developed at all levels of the program.
The School has aggressively taken advantage of recruiting and hiring opportunities afforded by the University to diversify its faculty both demographically and intellectually.

5. Studio Culture
The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

Condition 5, Studio Culture, is considered "Met" based upon the following:
The School of Architecture has adopted a Studio Culture Policy that has been developed with input from both the students and faculty. However, there are issues with regard to the Studio Culture policy that need addressing, see item B in the "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.

6. Human Resources

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 6, Human Resources, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The state, national and international student body and the faculty are clearly one of the notable strengths of the program. The new faculty is contributing to school vitality. Teaching loads are less of a problem as new positions are continuing to reduce teaching loads. Data provided indicates a 1:14 faculty ratio in the second year, and a 1:15 ratio at the 4th year level. This supports continued research, creative scholarship, and civic engagement for the faculty.

7. Human Resource Development

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 6, Human Resource Development, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The program has addressed the strong concerns mentioned in the previous VTR. The reappointment, promotion and tenure process has become more transparent, and a strong mentoring program for new faculty developed and monitored by the Executive Committee. The determination of curricular goals and structure, staffing plans, faculty search procedures, and the budget have become visible and consultative. Students participate on the major committees of the school and are able to present their views.

The school also has sufficient resources to support faculty, students and staff development in the areas of research and creative productivity, teaching and learning, foreign study and domestic programs, and service opportunities.

The university policy to “First we shall invest in people” as a clear guide is fully embraced by school programs with faculty and staff opportunities through distinguished professorships, fellowships, visiting critics and professors, and guest lectures and other school programs. The I-Space Gallery in Chicago and the broad offerings with the study abroad programs in Versailles, France, China, and Munich provide opportunities for faculty to participate at the global level in architecture. The well-established active program in East St. Louis for community design is unique in bringing faculty together from across the campus and within the college as participants in action research projects and community participation.
8. Physical Resources

The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.

Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

Condition 8, Physical Resources, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The School of Architecture at the University of Illinois is housed in three buildings. Since the previous accreditation visit the School has added the Architecture Annex building (2007). The Architecture Annex houses the first and second year design studios, technology and fabrication facilities, with some ancillary offices. The Architecture Building houses the third and fourth year design studios along with faculty offices. Also housed in the Architecture Building are the Dean's administrative offices for the College of Fine and Applied Arts as well as classroom areas for other programs within the College of Fine and Applied Arts, and the Ricker Library of Architecture and Art.

The Temple Buell Architecture Building is the newest of the three and houses the graduate level fifth and sixth year design studios, faculty offices, conference rooms and administrative offices. Like the Architecture Building, Temple Buell Hall also houses classroom and studio spaces for the Landscape and Urban Planning Departments within the CFAA. Although the School of Architecture shares spaces in its three buildings, the spaces allocated for the architecture program are of adequate size to meet the needs of the program and its students. The Temple Buell architecture gallery is the Architecture Building is a valuable asset, but is in need of mechanical and architectural renovations to be more useful.

9. Information Resources

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

Well Met [X]  Not Met [ ]

Condition 9, Information Resources, is considered "Well Met" based upon the following:

The Ricker Library of Architecture and Art is an exemplary resource for both teaching and advanced research and scholarship. The collection is both broad and deep, successfully fulfilling its role as a research resource supporting the scholarship of an accomplished faculty (particularly in art and architectural history). To understand the significance of the collection, the Ricker's sister institutions are the Avery Library at Columbia and the Loeb Library at Harvard.

Currently, approximately half the collection is housed in Ricker and half in the central library. It would be beneficial if such a preeminent collection was located in one facility. This would better support both the teaching and research mission of both the College of Fine and Applied Arts and
the School of Architecture if the library was located in one facility in or adjacent to those programs. In addition to the need for additional space to fully support the Ricker's mission, the current space has inadequate climate control and lacks wired access to be able to provide instruction on the collection and its uses.

As is to be expected, the increased cost of library materials has had impact on the acquisitions of the Ricker Library, especially foreign books and journals. Fortunately, the Library's endowments have been able to lessen that impact to date.

The Visual Resources Collection supports the College of Fine and Applied Arts and its schools and departments, and in particular architecture and art. Its impressive collection of slide and digital images will soon be reconfigured within a larger university collection located in the central library. This will provide more materials for faculty and student use. Recently, the collection had been licensed to access the Archivision image base, further enhancing its resources.

10. **Financial Resources**

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 10, Financial Resources, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The School of Architecture has sufficient financial support and resources to meet its mission. Importantly, over the past five years the school has used its resources in creative and entrepreneurial ways. This practice will continue to serve them well in an increasingly uncertain economic time.

The School is blessed with an unprecedented number of endowments which support students through scholarships, support for foreign study, and as design and academic awards.

11. **Administrative Structure**

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 11, Administrative Structure, is considered "Met" based upon the following:

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and School, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, (NCA). The School of Architecture is located in the College of Fine and Applied Arts and is one of three professional programs with the CFAA; the others being the School of Art + Design and the School of Music. All programs are equal and autonomous in their administrative structure within the College.
12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, is considered “Met” based upon the following:

The Master of Architecture degree is the only NAAB accredited degree offered and requires the undergraduate program, the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies or equivalent plus a minimum of 62 semester credits in the graduate program. The Master of Architecture curriculum requires all students complete 45 credit hours of general education.

In the past there was confusion due to multiple tracks suggesting differing degrees might be offered, but this confusion has been clarified through clearly differentiating between the M. Arch and the Master of Science in Architecture degrees. Candidates with an undergraduate in another discipline can enter the M. Arch with “limited standing” until they have completed prerequisites required prior to entering the two-year graduate program.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>[]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.1, Speaking and Writing Skills is considered "Well Met" based upon evidence as follows:

Speaking Skills: The visiting team was impressed with student's communication and interactive skills. In one-on-one discussions about their projects the students were able to communicate their ideas in a very understandable manner. Additionally, they were communicative and articulate in their responses to visiting team questions during the student group meetings.

Writing Skills: The visiting team found sufficient evidence of the student's writing abilities in reviewing various student papers from lecture class work as well as their project descriptive information included in their design studio presentations.

13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Criterion 13.2, Critical Thinking Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: ArchDesign and the Landscape, (ARCH 373), Arch History Electives (ARCH 41x – each student is required to take three of the eight total offerings), Arch Design & Development (ARCH 475) and Structural Planning (ARCH 502). Analysis of factual, experimental and theoretical materials read from many sources (sites, action projects and references) were merged through consideration and iteration with well-reasoned questions. Design project positions and project reports along with illustrated papers and essays demonstrated thoughtful results.

13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

Criterion 13.3, Graphic Skills is considered “Met” based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Anatomy of Buildings (ARCH 231), Graphics of Architects (ARCH 271) and Architectural Design Studio (ARCH 571). The students demonstrated ability to convey their design ideas in both freehand and digital media.

13.4 Research Skills

Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

Criterion 13.4, Research Skills is considered “Met” based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural History Electives, (ARCH 41x – each student is required to take three of the eight total offerings) all demonstrate the students ability in research and analysis in research papers and exams. Additionally Architectural Design Studios (ARCH 573 & 574), both demonstrate ability of applying research skills in the development of studio and thesis projects.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

Criterion 13.5, Formal Ordering Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Graphics for Architects (Arch 271). Students use hand drawn and digital graphic communication skills to study spatial and compositional issues. In addition, the Arch 41x History electives teach students ordering principles in various historical periods of architecture.
13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.6, Fundamental Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following: Student exhibits demonstrated a high level of design skills to communicate the realization of projects. Design work presented showed multiple views in scale and direction to more fully complete the design thought through presentation. This was largely shown through digital media.

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.7, Collaborative Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architecture Design Studio (ARCH 571). Additionally, students worked as teams in various other design studio projects.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.8, Western Traditions is considered "Well Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Introduction to Architecture (ARCH 101), Arch 201, Introduction to Architectural History, and the Arch History Electives (ARCH 41x – students are required to take three of the eight) provide a set of rich course offerings in the canons and traditions of Western environmental design.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Intro to the History of Architecture (ARCH 210), with additional content found in some courses comprising the Architecture 41X history series. Other offerings containing non-Western traditions are found in cross-listed history courses in Landscape Architecture and Art History to which architecture students have access.
13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.10, National and Regional Traditions is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Introduction to Architecture (ARCH 101) and Intro to the History of Architecture (ARCH 210), provide understanding of this criteria. Application of this understanding is seen throughout the undergraduate and graduate architectural design studio.

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.11, Use of Precedents is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Use of Precedents is demonstrated throughout the curriculum, but specifically in Arch Design & Development (ARCH 475) and Architectural Design Studio (ARCH 573)

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.12, Human Behavior is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Design Studios (ARCH 573 & 574) demonstrate understanding of human behavior issues in design in the development of design studio and thesis projects

13.13 Human Diversity

Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.13, Human Diversity is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: The team found evidence of the understanding of human diversity in several areas across the program. Intro to the History of Architecture (ARCH 201) and Architectural History Electives (ARCH 41x) give clear evidence of an
understanding of human diversity. Arch 572 Architecture Design Studio showed this criterion to be understood in the broader context of design projects.

### 13.14 Accessibility

Ability to **design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.14, Accessibility is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Anatomy of Buildings (Arch 231), Construction of Buildings (Arch 232), and Architectural Practice (Arch 501) provide students the opportunity to analyze accessibility concerns within the context of existing buildings. Arch Design and Development (Arch 475) is considered the "Capstone" project for the program and students apply accessible principles to their design studio work. The team is concerned that the principles of universal design could be explored more thoroughly in Arch 475. Additionally, most sites used in the design projects were flat and provided no opportunity to address complex issues of accessibility. See item D in the "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.

### 13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the **principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.15, Sustainable is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Environment Tech HVAC (ARCH 341) and Environment Tech Lighting & Acoustics (ARCH 342), both demonstrate in quizzes, exams, homework assignments, problems, papers on subjects such as the impact of architectural systems on global warming, and short projects, the understanding of sustainability and indoor air quality.

Architectural Design Studios (ARCH 573 & 574) both demonstrate understanding of ecology and sustainable design in the development of design studio and thesis projects.

Architectural Design and Development (ARCH 475 – Capstone Project), demonstrate through inclusion of sustainable features, and the understanding of sustainable design in the development of a comprehensive design project.

### 13.16 Program Preparation

Ability to **prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 13.16, Program Preparation is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Design Studio (ARCH 573). All high passes demonstrate great ability in thorough analysis of all elements needed for program preparation, while the low pass indicates a less comprehensive ability.

13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Criterion 13.17, Site Conditions is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Arch Design and the Landscape (ARCH 373). The student work in this course showed design concepts and projects elevated through the engagement of land forms, views beyond given sites, landscape and global ecological concepts, and other precedents. A majority of examples were of sites that were flat . . . more complex topological situations were not included. See "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.

13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

Well Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Criterion 13.18, Structural Systems is considered "Well Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Statics & Dynamics (ARCH 351), a course taught both in Illinois and in Versailles, demonstrated understanding of structural forces in architecture and was demonstrated in lab problems, exams, in-class assignments and models.

Structural Planning (ARCH 502), demonstrated understanding of structural system selection and design, and was demonstrated in exams and a group building project including digital and physical modeling.

Clarity in structural understanding was also demonstrated in many of the studio courses and projects.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

Well Met [X] Not Met [ ]
Criterion 13.19, Environmental Systems is considered "Well Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Environmental Systems (Arch 331 – Lecture).

Environmental Tech HVAC (ARCH 341) and Environmental Tech Lighting & Acoustics (ARCH 342), both demonstrate in quizzes, exams, homework assignments, problems, papers on subjects such as the impact of architectural systems on global warming, and short projects, the understanding of the principles of environmental systems in the development of projects. Issues of sustainability and indoor air quality were also addressed demonstrating an understanding of the importance of these current issues.

Architectural Design & Development (ARCH 475) also demonstrates evidence of understanding in student projects.

Clarity in environmental systems understanding was also demonstrated in many of the studio courses and projects.

13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.20, Life Safety is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Construction of Buildings (ARCH 232) and Construction of Buildings (ARCH 432). The team found evidence of life safety issues being addressed in the lecture courses noted, however there was very little evidence of the student's ability to transfer their understanding of life safety issues into their studio design projects. See item E in the "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.21, Building Envelope Systems is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Anatomy of Buildings (Arch 231) and Construction of Buildings (Arch 232). Students analyze existing campus buildings through sketching, technical drawings and physical mockup models to understand light and heavy construction systems.

13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Criterion 13.22, Building Service Systems is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Environment Tech HVAC (ARCH 34) and Environment Tech Lighting & Acoustics (ARCH 342), both demonstrate in quizzes, exams, homework papers and problems, the understanding of the principles of building service systems.

Architectural Design & Development (ARCH 475), as demonstrated in presentation drawings, also provides evidence of the students understanding of Building Service Systems.

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.23, Building Systems Integration is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Arch Design & Development (ARCH 475).

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Anatomy of Buildings (ARCH 231) and Construction of Buildings (ARCH 232) both demonstrated student understanding of how materials and building components are part of a network of systems and relationships in buildings.

Construction of Buildings (ARCH 432), as demonstrated in student exams.

Structural Planning (ARCH 502) also provided evidence of understanding of materials and their characteristics.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and case studies prepared by students. While conceptual understanding of cost control was demonstrated, application of detailed understanding of the processes of setting budgets,
quantity take-offs, estimating, economic trade-offs, life cycle cost analysis, and related skill sets were only marginally demonstrated.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Construction of Buildings (ARCH 232, previously ARCH 432), as demonstrated in floor plans, sections, details, wall assembly drawings, and elevations prepared by students. The rigor of the documents decreased somewhat when the course was changed from a 400 series to a 200 series but the content was still good with full size construction assemblies being built by students to supplement and better understand the relationship between drawings and reality.

Architectural Design & Development (ARCH 475), as demonstrated in detailed presentation drawings which included wall and building cross sections, details, floor and framing plans, elevations, axonometric drawings, and equipment installation drawings supplemented by scale models of building and wall assemblies. These were more at a design development level rather than the construction document level of ARCH 232.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.27, Client Role in Architecture is considered Met based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers, and case studies prepared by students.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design is considered "Not Met" based upon the following: While great strides in addressing comprehensive design have been made, the Team found the student projects presented did not demonstrate an ability to effectively resolve the myriad of design issues associated with this criterion. For additional comments see "Causes of Concern" at the beginning of this report.
13.29 Architect's Administrative Roles

Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

Criterion 13.29, Architect's Administrative Roles is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers, tests, writing assignments and case studies prepared by students.

13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

Criterion 13.30, Architectural Practice is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following course: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers, tests, writing assignments and case studies prepared by students.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

Criterion 13.31, Professional Development is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following course: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers and tests taken by students.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

Met | Not Met
---|---
[X] | [ ]

Criterion 13.32, Leadership considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following course: Architectural Practice (Arch 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers, and case studies prepared by students.
13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.33, Legal Responsibilities is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in following studios and/or courses: Architectural Practice (Arch 501 – Lecture), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers and experts, tests, and case studies prepared by students.

13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criterion 13.34, Ethics and Professional Judgement is considered “Met” based upon evidence found in following course: Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), as demonstrated in power point printouts of presentations by faculty and visiting lecturers, tests, and case studies prepared by students.
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Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Architecture Program Report.

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) is the flagship institution for higher education and research in the State of Illinois. UIUC is located in east central Illinois with Chicago, Indianapolis, and St. Louis within a 180-mile radius of the campus. The University forms a part of the Urbana-Champaign community that has a population of approximately 100,000 not including the student population.

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign began in 1867. Chartered as the Illinois Industrial University, the University opened for business in 1868. Renamed the University of Illinois in 1885, it is one of the original 37 public land-grant institutions created after President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act in 1862.

The 2006-2007 operating budget for UIUC was approximately $3.68 billion, of which approximately 21.7% came from funding provided by the State of Illinois.

The Urbana-Champaign campus extends over some 1,466 acres with over 272 major buildings consisting of lecture theaters, classrooms, studios, laboratories, libraries, residence halls, recreational and cultural facilities. Nearby are the University's 1,650-acre Willard Airport and Robert Allerton Park, the campus's 1,500-acre nature reserve and conference center, plus 3,600 acres of agriculture land.

Eight Academic Units (College Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences; College of Applied Health Studies; Institute of Aviation; College of Business; College of Media; College of Education; College of Engineering; College of Fine and Applied Arts; College of Liberal Arts and Sciences) offer programs of study leading to a baccalaureate degree. Post-baccalaureate students study in the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, College of Law, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, College of Medicine, School of Social Work, School of Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College.

The School of Architecture is one of seven teaching units in the College of Fine and Applied Arts, which includes the School of Art and Design, Department of Dance, Department of Landscape Architecture, the School of Music, Department of Theater, and Department of Urban and Regional Planning. In addition to its teaching units, the College also includes the Krannert Art Museum, the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts, Japan House, the East St. Louis Action Research Project, and the I Space Gallery in Chicago.

At UIUC the educational community is composed of 10,924 faculty and staff members and 42,728 students, of whom 31,427 are undergraduates representing every state in the nation. Seventy-seven percent of the undergraduate student body is Illinois residents. About 5,200 students are from foreign countries. Thirteen percent of all students are minorities and forty-seven percent are women. Many of the faculty has distinguished records of achievement. These include members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Sciences, and National Academy of Engineering, and as recipients of the National Medal of Science and recognition by the National Endowment for the Humanities, Guggenheim Foundation, and Sloan Foundation. UIUC alumni include
ten Nobel laureates and sixteen Pulitzer Prize winners. Many academic units are ranked within the top ten nationally.

UIUC holds one of the preeminent research collections in the nation and the world. With more than 10 million volumes and 24 million items it ranks first among public university libraries in the nation. The Library is committed to maintaining the strongest collections and services possible to support the University's mission of teaching, research, and public service. It consists of 38 departmental libraries including the Ricker Library of Art & Architecture that are located throughout campus and administratively organized into eight divisions. The University's cultural facilities attract artists and performers of national and international stature to the Krannert Center for the Performing Arts. The Krannert Art Museum is second only to The Art Institute of Chicago in size and value of art collections in Illinois.

At UIUC more than 4,000 courses incorporated in 150 programs of study are offered each academic year. The campus calendar includes two 16-week semesters, one 4-week Summer Term 1 and one 8-week Summer Term 2 each academic year.

There are over 1,000 registered student organizations including one of the largest fraternity and sorority system in the United States. Three branches of the Armed Services have ROTC units on campus. Choral groups, orchestras, bands, the Marching Illini, theater, dance, and opera provide students with the opportunity to perform.

The senior institutional administrative officers of the University, Campus, College of Fine and Applied Arts, and the School of Architecture are:

B. Joseph White, President
Richard Herman, Chancellor
Linda Katehi, Provost and Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Robert B. Graves, Dean, College of Fine and Applied Arts
David M. Chasco, AIA, Director, School of Architecture
Robert I. Selby, FAIA, Associate Director, School of Architecture
Arthur L. Kaha, Interim Associate Director, School of Architecture

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Architecture Program Report.

The University of Illinois is among the preeminent public universities of the nation and strives constantly to sustain and enhance its quality in teaching, research and public service.

Mission
The University of Illinois will transform lives and serve society by educating, creating knowledge and putting knowledge to work on a large scale and with excellence.

Vision
To create a brilliant future for the University of Illinois in which the students, faculty and staff thrive and the citizens of Illinois, the nation and the world benefit, a future in which the University of Illinois is the recognized leader among public research universities in:

• Teaching, scholarship and service
Engagement and public service  
Economic development  
Arts and culture  
Global reach  
Athletics

Guiding Values
In all that the University does, we will:
  • Aim high
  • Strive to control our destiny
  • Be accountable for our actions and exercise responsible stewardship
  • Be inclusive, treat each other with dignity and respect and promote citizenship
  • Value excellence, quality and service
  • Foster innovation and creativity

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Architecture Program Report.

Beginnings
The University of Illinois was among the first American institutions of higher learning to offer a curriculum in architecture. Until 1868 there were no architectural schools in the United States, although Thomas Jefferson has proposed one at the University of Virginia in 1814. American architects were either trained as apprentices or pursued studies abroad. The profession's growing awareness of the need for a professional architecture school in the United States was evidenced by the report of the Committee on Education at the first annual convention of the American Institute of Architects in 1867.

Even prior to this report, the recently appointed president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, William Barton Rogers, had recognized the need for formal professional training in architecture, and in 1865 appointed William R. Ware to his faculty for the specific purpose of establishing the first such curriculum. Ware spent a year in Europe preparing the program and in October 1868 the MIT architecture department opened with four students in the four-year course.

Almost a thousand miles to the west, another newly appointed leader, Regent John Milton Gregory, in another newly established center of learning, the Illinois Industrial University, also realized the need for formal professional training in architecture. Architecture was included in the Polytechnic Department of the proposed administrative structure Gregory presented to the trustees in May of 1867. The first student in this curriculum, Nathan Clifford Ricker arrived in Urbana at midnight on January 2, 1870; the proud tradition of architecture at Illinois began.

Nathan Clifford Ricker
While a student, Ricker studied under James W. Bellangee, a graduate of the University of Michigan with a degree in biology, and Harold M. Hansen, a Swedish architect who had studied for two additional years at the Preussische Bauakademie in Berlin. A formative experience in Ricker's education was the brief period he spent in Chicago during the autumn of 1871 as part of the Illinois National Guard, called upon to prevent looting in the fire-devastated city. Ricker later observed "It was indeed a great practical training, perhaps not equaled since the burning of Rome."
As a result of Regent Gregory's efforts, Ricker became the first graduate of an architecture program in the United States in 1873. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Cornell University celebrated their first graduations in June of that year also.

Ricker's capabilities were recognized early in his career as a student at Illinois. Regent Gregory saw him as a potential candidate for a teaching assignment in the newly established program and offered him a position upon graduation. As a condition of his appointment, Regent Gregory insisted that Ricker spend six months in Europe. There he attended the Vienna Exposition of 1873 and was visited a Russian carpentry shop. His most impressive experience, however, must have been his tour as a special student at the Bauakademie in Berlin. Ricker chose the Bauakademie over the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris because he considered the quality of its program and pedagogy superior to the individualistic and competitive French system. The influences of Ricker's travel abroad reverberated throughout his career.

He returned to the Urbana and took up his new duties as head of the Department of Architecture in September of 1873. There were five students in the program, and Ricker's duties included supervising the university shop, making drawings for all new buildings, remodeling old ones, running levels for drains and installing sewer systems when needed, all in addition to teaching. For a dozen years Ricker continued to teach all courses in architecture, producing his own texts when those available proved unsuitable. Ricker's Elementary Graphical Statics and Construction of Trussed Roofs (1885) was the first book published by any member of the Illinois faculty.

Ricker's progress up the academic ladder was rapid. In 1874 he was advanced to Assistant Professor and in 1875 to Full Professor. In 1878 he became Dean of Engineering while continuing to serve as Head of the Department of Architecture. Amazingly, Ricker also served as University Architect, completing four major buildings and numerous smaller projects.

In 1890 Ricker introduced a four-year curriculum in architectural engineering, the first such curriculum in the country. The idea arose from Ricker's close involvement with Dankmar Adler, William LeBaron Jenney, and other Chicago architects and engineers responsible for the first high rise steel skeleton buildings. Ricker also believed that students fell into two major classes—those with design ability and those with ability for structural analysis and synthesis. After the introduction of the new curriculum, student enrollment was evenly divided between the two programs which Ricker felt gave support to his theory.

Ricker firmly believed that research was essential to the education of an architect. In 1903, Ricker helped establish the first engineering experiment station associated with an educational institution to further the research efforts of the faculty in engineering and architecture. Establishing an adequate library was also a pursuit of Ricker throughout his academic career. At Illinois, architecture was the first unit to have a departmental library. The impressive collection, which grew steadily with Ricker's stewardship, was formally named in his honor in recognition of his forty-third year of service to the university in 1917.

Ricker's devotion to the profession extended beyond the university setting. In 1897 he and Dankmar Adler, worked to move the architectural registration act of Illinois through the state legislature. The act was modeled after the state's existing regulatory systems in medicine and law. The origins of architectural licensing in the United States can be traced to the passage of this legislation. The first Illinois Architect's Registration Board exam was given in 1898, and by 1902 Ricker was able to convince the board to adopt a rule
which provided that any graduate of an approved four-year curriculum in architecture was qualified to take the registration exam. Ricker retired from his illustrious career at the age of 74.

In 1922, a convocation was held in honor of Dr. Ricker marking his fiftieth year of service to the university and the Department of Architecture. He had seen the program enrollment increase from an average of eight students during his first decade to two-hundred-and-fifty at the time of the convocation. At the turn of the century, approximately one quarter of all students regularly attending American architectural schools were enrolled at the University of Illinois.

Frederick Mann, Loring Provine and Rexford Newcomb
Dr. Ricker's successor as head of the Department of Architecture was Frederick M. Mann, a graduate of the University of Minnesota in civil engineering and of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in architecture, who had served as Professor of Architecture at Washington University in St. Louis from 1902 to 1910. Professor Mann remained at Urbana for three years, then resigned to accept the headship of the department at the University of Minnesota.

Upon Mann's departure, Loring H. Provine, who had been a student of Ricker, was brought back into academic life to head the department after completing a decade of work in the design and erection of power-generating plants. Professor Provine continued as head for thirty-five years until 1948. Thus Ricker and Provine together provided administrative direction for nearly three-quarters of a century. The eminence of the Department during these years is attested by the numerous awards it and its students received and by the enthusiastic reception given to its graduates by architectural firms throughout the world.

In 1931 the College of Fine and Applied Arts was formed by Dean Rexford Newcomb, the pioneering scholar of the history of Spanish colonial architecture and the father of regional architectural history. Newcomb was well known for his careful and authoritative class outlines of monuments and his books on the architecture of Kentucky and the Old Northwest. Like Ricker, he was especially active in state and national professional organizations. At that time, the Department of Architecture came over to the College of Fine and Applied Arts from Engineering.

Turpin C. Bannister, Alan K. Laing and Granville S. Keith
Newcomb chose as head of architecture from 1948 to 1954 Turpin C. Bannister, a graduate of Dennison, Harvard, and Columbia Universities. He was famous for his knowledge and research on concrete and iron. He was also one of the earliest innovators of the preservation movement, including the field of industrial archaeology. Bannister organized and wrote much of the remarkable Architect at Mid-Century for the Centennial of the American Institute of Architects. It was a thorough study of the profession and its education up to the mid 1950s. He was the first editor and a founder of the Society of Architectural Historians, and was its president, as was Newcomb. Under Bannister the architecture curriculum was revised, modernized, and expanded from four to five years.

In 1954, Professor Alan K. Laing, a graduate of the University of Denver, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University, was appointed chairman of the department. He continued with the implementation of the five year curriculum, initiated studies for further curriculum revision, and worked diligently to strengthen ties with the profession and alumni. In 1961 he relinquished administrative work to return to teaching and research.

Professor Granville S. Keith, who received both bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Illinois and studied at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris in 1928-29 as a
Plym Fellow, succeeded Professor Laing and served until 1966. Under his administration alumni support for fellowships and scholarships was expanded and work begun toward the establishment of a program of resident study in Europe for students in the department.

Jack H. Swing and G. Day Ding
In 1966, Professor Jack H. Swing, who received his degrees in architecture and landscape architecture from the University of Illinois returned from the planning of a new agricultural college in India to assume administrative direction of the Department. Under his leadership the program of European study, which has developed into the Study Abroad Program at Versailles, was established—the first program for foreign study in the university. In 1969 the curriculum was revised to lead to the professional Master of Architecture degree at the end of six years of study. This change allowed for more concentrated areas of professional studies in the final phase of the graduate program. Through a choice of options in the final year, specific areas of concentration are offered by each of the teaching divisions affording the graduate student an opportunity to select an area for study in depth.

R. Alan Forrester
Shortly after R. Alan Forrester was appointed as Executive Officer of the program in 1981, the designation of the unit as the Department of Architecture was changed to the School of Architecture recognizing its equivalence to other major academic units in the College and elsewhere on campus. The title of the chief administrative position also changed from a Head to a Director.

During his tenure Professor Forrester strengthened the long-standing undergraduate Study Abroad Program in Versailles, France, and our exchange arrangement with the Ecole d'Architecture de Versailles. In 1987 a summer program jointly operated within the Departments of Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning was inaugurated with the School of Architecture at Tongji University in Shanghai, China. In 1988 an exchange program in the names of Walter Burley and Marion Griffin was formed between our School and the Department of Architecture and Building at the University of Melbourne in Australia.

Director Forrester developed joint master's degree programs with Business, Civil Engineering, Computer Science, Landscape Architecture, and Urban and Regional Planning. He worked with the Department of Landscape Architecture to launch the jointly administered PhD program. He was successful in developing the gift from Temple Hoyne Buell for the construction of a new multiple disciplinary building. Director Forrester and Associate Director Hub White worked with architect, and alumnus, Ralph Johnson, FAIA of Perkins & Will, to program, design, and construct Temple Hoyne Buell Hall, the academic home of Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Urban and Regional Planning. Buell Hall opened in 1995, facilitating interdisciplinary collaboration among faculty and students.

Michael Andrejasich
From 1999 to 2004 Michael Andrejasich was Acting Director then Interim Director. During his tenure the School's tradition of civic engagement was strengthened through faculty and student participation in the East St. Louis Action Research Project. In 1999 the School renamed the "Versailles" Committee the International Programs Committee and expanded its mission to include the planning and oversight of all international programs. An international programs coordinator was appointed from the faculty. The first graduate student exchange with the Technical Institute in Munich occurred in the summer of 2000 and the first faculty exchange with the Mackintosh School of Architecture in Glasgow began in the fall 2000.
Director Andrejasich was also successful creating greater bridges between the School and professional firms. Chief among these programs is Career Expo, or "XPO," a major event where 70 — 90 firms from around the United States come to campus to recruit students about to graduate or who are looking for summer internships.

In 2001 the first PhD candidate was admitted to the new program; the School conferred its first PhD in May 2007 on Nicholas Watkins, PhD.

David M. Chasco
The current Director, David M. Chasco, was appointed in 2004. He has been working with Robert I. Selby, Associate Director for Graduate Studies, to improve the graduate program at Illinois. In May of 2006 the School received approval by the Senate to implement its new Core Curriculum. Beginning in Fall 2006 all M. Arch students, regardless of Option specialization, are required to take four design studios (ARCH 571-574), Architectural Practice (ARCH 501), Structural Planning (ARCH 502), and one course from a menu of Professional Issues and one from Architectural Thought. Requiring all M Arch students to take the same core assures that all of our graduates experience the same high-level academic rigor appropriate for the professional degree program.

The new common core allows the M. Arch program to be a "curriculum without boundaries." There are no longer "required electives." Beyond the core, students are free to design a graduate program that suits their individual needs. This means that graduate students may choose to follow a course of option recommended professional electives, or they may elect to take elective courses in any of the School's sub-disciplines.

Our Master of Architecture degree is the professional degree accredited by the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB). Students holding a four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (or similar degree in architecture) may be admitted to the M. Arch program which typically takes two years to complete. Alternatively, if students hold a bachelor's degree (or higher) in any field other than architecture, they may be admitted to the Master of Architecture program with Limited Standing. Students in M. Arch (Limited Standing) typically take two years to complete undergraduate prerequisite courses to attain full standing in the M. Arch program.

In March 2007, The School of Architecture received approval from the Senate and the Board of Trustees to offer one graduate program leading the Master of Science in Architectural Studies (Post-professional Degree) program for students holding a five-year Bachelor of Architecture professional degree. The MS in AS degree is not accredited by NAAB. Before 2007, this degree was called M. Arch, creating confusion as to whether it was a professional degree. Changing the degree nomenclature to MS in AS makes it clear to all applicants, esp. international students, and architectural registration boards, that the one-year degree is not a NAAB accredited degree.

Director Chasco is working with faculty to improve the undergraduate program and its relationship to the graduate program. Beginning in the fall semester of 2007, the "capstone" studio was moved from the sixth year to the fourth year. Moving the capstone studio allowed the sixth year to be a more intellectual, theoretical and creative opportunity for design thesis projects.

Though the years, and under several administrations, considerable effort has been made to create private funding and independent support for the School. In 1987, an Office for Alumni Affairs was established with Leanne Courson heading development
activities from 1994 to 2006 and Erin Hart taking over from 2006-2007. Having a person devoted solely to alumni affairs and development for so many years has created a mature program at this time. The School of Architecture's annual fund campaign raises between $82,000 and $105,000 from over 500 alumni and friends. Specific year amounts are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Annual Fund money raised</th>
<th>Number of contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>$90,809</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>$105,472</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>$82,650</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td>$104,512.71</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08 through 11/26/07</td>
<td>$41,570</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Director Chasco and the Alumni Relations and Development Office have built upon years of successful alumni development, and this momentum was highlighted in September 2006 with the first investiture of Professor Botond Boglar as the Edgar A. Tafel Chair in Architecture. Since this investiture, the School has secured three other endowed professorships, the Thomas D. Hubbard Distinguished Professorship in Architecture, the Robert D. Kleinschmidt Professorship in Interior Architecture, and the Ernest L. and Reba E. Stouffer Professorship in Architecture. One of these is a deferred gift, one is a deferred gift with current use support, and the other is a deferred gift that has been realized.

There have been thirteen chief administrators of the architecture program at UIUC:

- 1873-1910  Dr. Nathan Clifford Ricker, Head
- 1910-1913  Professor Fredrick M. Mann, Head
- 1913-1948  Professor Loring H. Provine, Head
- 1948-1954  Dr. Turpin C. Bannister, Head
- 1954-1961  Professor Alan K. Laing, Chairman
- 1961-1966  Professor Granville S. Keith, Chairman
- 1966-1969  Professor Jack H. Swing, Chairman
- 1969-1973  Professor Jack H. Swing, Head
- 1973       Professor Richard L. Tavis, Acting Head
- 1973-1980  Professor G. Day Ding, Head
- 1980-1981  Professor Richard L. Tavis, Acting Head
- 1981       Professor R. Alan Forrester, Head
- 1981-1995  Professor R. Alan Forrester, Director
- 1995-1996  Professor Hub White, Acting Director
- 1996-1998  Professor R. Alan Forrester, Director
- 1999-2000  Professor Michael Andrejasich, Acting Director
- 2000-2004  Professor Michael Andrejasich, Interim Director
- 2004-      Professor David M. Chasco, Director

During 1995-96, Professor Forrester served as Interim Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts.
4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Architecture Program Report.

The mission of the School is to pursue architecture as a humanistic and professional discipline, which synthesizes art and science through intellectual rigor, aesthetic judgment, and technical understanding. The School achieves its mission through teaching, scholarship, creative work, research, and service, and commits itself to the highest ideals of the profession and culture of architecture.

The School's mission is based upon the conviction that architecture is first, reflective of the diverse, changing goals, values, and resources of society; and second, that architects have various and vital roles in interpreting and determining the status, values, conditions, and direction of society, its culture and quality of life.

Architectural education at Illinois is based upon the premise that to be an architect in today's complex and fast-changing, global society the architect must have knowledge in a variety of areas beyond the profession. Recognizing the diversity of roles that are now emerging in the profession, graduates should also have a well-developed focus in which they can initiate their career.

Based upon these premises, the School of Architecture believes that the professional degree must be attained in concert with advanced studies; thus, the professional degree is the graduate degree. As mentioned earlier, the requirements for attainment of the NAAB accredited professional degree are met by the successful attainment of the four-year undergraduate degree and the two-year graduate degree. The Master of Architecture is our professional degree but it must be considered as a continuation of the professional and liberal studies begun in our undergraduate degree, the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies, or an approved equivalent degree from another school.

Understanding that our program is a continuum of studies which meets the NAAB requirements for the professional degree and additional advanced studies in architecture, the 4+2 degree program is designed:

To provide students with a solid base of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences.

This is largely accomplished by the required and elective General Education courses of the undergraduate program. Additional studies in these areas are often elected by students in the graduate program.

To provide students with a professional education in architecture.

This is accomplished by the required and elective professional courses in the undergraduate and graduate programs.

To provide students with advanced professional education beyond the NAAB.

These additional studies enable students to focus upon a specific area in the field of architecture or a related discipline. This is accomplished by the choice of study options or dual degrees containing required courses and supportive elective courses which are begun in the first graduate year but mostly completed in the last year of their academic
education. The intent is to have students conduct advanced research and/or creative work in their specific area of interest.

Architectural education at Illinois addresses our mission and objectives by focusing upon the development and expansion of students' intellectual and judgmental capabilities, the nature of problems and their cultural and environmental context, the methodologies of problem solving, and the fostering of creative skills.

5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Architecture Program Report.

This section will briefly outline the program's strengths and challenges and a plan to address those challenges.

Program's Strengths

As described in Section 1.3 Program History, the University of Illinois is one of the earliest American institutions of higher learning to offer a curriculum in architecture. The first graduate from a collegiate program in the United States was Nathan Clifford Ricker here at the University of Illinois. Over the years the School has earned an outstanding reputation worldwide. Illinois alumni have been in leadership positions in architectural firms throughout the world. Illinois alumni have earned the AIA Gold Medal, they have been elevated to the AIA College of Fellows, their practices have been awarded National AIA Firm Awards as well as state and local design awards throughout the United States, and in addition, Illinois alumni and faculty have received significant local, state, national, and international awards as educators.

The School's reputation attracts excellent faculty from all over the world who are experts in one or more sub-disciplines in the study of architecture. Over the years the School has been able to offer opportunities for students to specialize their studies in a sub-discipline, such as design, history/preservation, and structures. These sub-disciplines have become attractive "Options" that students with a keen interest in these areas may choose. As a result of the School's and faculty member's excellent reputations, the School attracts brilliant, high-achieving, highly motivated undergraduate and graduate students. These students excite each other to excel in what might be described as friendly competitions to be the "best of the best." Upon graduation, these new alumni continue to build on Illinois' proud tradition as a premier program in architectural education.

Program's Challenges

As admirable as Illinois' reputation is, students today are not studying under Nathan Clifford Ricker. Nor is their world now the same world that Dr. Ricker inhabited. However, as a life-long pioneer in architectural education, Dr. Ricker would probably be a leading advocate of the new design tools and technologies employed in academic and professional studios. Accordingly, even programs with excellent pasts need to continually evolve to meet future architectural and environmental challenges to the profession and the public.

Undergraduate Challenges
One challenge in architectural education at Illinois is as critical today as it most assuredly was in Dr. Ricker's era (as demonstrated in his writings): How to integrate all of the disparate knowledge architecture students need to learn to equip them to design excellent
buildings to fit their time in history, using the best materials and methods of construction available to them. "Design Integration" has been difficult because students sit in separate environments learning pedagogical "parts" of the whole. Traditionally, it has been expected that "integration" occurred in design studios where students apply knowledge about all of the sub-disciplines. The School is demonstrating that it is doing a better job of integrating architectural knowledge in the traditional way while we rapidly transitioning into 21st Century techniques of design integration as outlined in the following pages.

Undergraduate courses did not fall into an ideal sequence to interrelate course content at each year. In the past, there was not designated integration course incorporating a "test" of integration at the undergraduate level. Therefore, there has been an unmet need to determine if undergraduate students are able to demonstrate their ability to engage in a comprehensive design.

Graduate Challenges
There are several challenges at the graduate level the School is addressing. The last visiting team noted a lack of equivalent rigor across graduate options including different numbers of design studios required by options. The options also have had different menus of "required electives." Some elective lists were so long and rigid that students in some options really did not have time in their schedules for selecting electives outside their options. Options with only one faculty member to teach all the "required electives" were creating academic bottlenecks that threatened students' abilities to complete their degree program on time.

The sixth year design thesis studios have been the studios that demonstrate the student's ability to complete a comprehensive design. The challenge to the thesis studios was contained in the NAAB Visiting Team Report in 2003 which informed the School that "comprehensive design" was a condition/criteria not met. It is difficult to evaluate this condition/criteria at the sixth year because each thesis project is unique. Focusing on comprehensive design in the thesis year has distracted faculty and students from concentrating on the intellectual and theoretical issues that that should be central to a thesis investigation and design.

Since the last visit, it has become evident that the School's degree offerings lacked clarity among student prospects, licensing boards, and the last visiting team. The 2003 VTR noted that "The identity of Track 3 as a discrete program is not clear...." The School offered three "tracks" toward a Master of Architecture degree, specifically Tracks 1, 2, or 3. Most students entered the two year Track 2 program. Those students with a professional B. Arch degree entered the one year Track 1 (post-professional) program, but they earned a degree with the same name as Track 2 students earned. This created considerable confusion for international applicants who expected to earn a professional, accredited M. Arch in only one year.

Finally, the program called Track 3 created the impression that students with a degree in another field could earn their M. Arch in three years when it typically took four years to do so. Track 3 students typically studied two years completing undergraduate course prerequisites to enter the M. Arch program with full standing for two more years of study. In the 2002 APR the School created the impression that Track 3 was a discrete M. Arch program, when it was not.

Program's Plan to Address Challenges
Undergraduate Program Improvements

The School is redesigning undergraduate course content and sequencing to allow for a greater interrelationship among the subjects taught each semester. For example,
sophomore students have studios in the Architecture Annex where they have access to hand tools, and laser cutters. In this studio context students are scheduled to work Monday, Wednesday, and Friday on ARCH 271 (design) and Tuesday and Thursday on ARCH 231 (technology) in the fall semester. The design project programs are being written to coordinate with the course content of the technology class. For example, students are able to design a wood frame project and then build a full scale stud wall. The same concept of design integration continues into the spring semester in the ARCH 272 (design) and 232 (technology) sequences.

As the School is able to acquire the appropriate technology there is the potential to teach disparate course content in a more integrated method using building information modeling (BIM).

Beginning in the fall semester of 2007, the capstone project was moved from the sixth year to the fourth year (ARCH 475). All students worked on the same project building type, site location, and program. Lectures or "course modules" were given on such topics as precedent case studies, site analysis, schematic design response to site and program, energy analysis, structural systems, environmental systems, lighting, and building envelopes. Based on observations of student outcomes in this first experience of conducting comprehensive design at the fourth year, it proved to be a good way to integrate knowledge and test student abilities. Lessons learned in this studio will be applied to subsequent studios for continued improvements.

Currently, the fourth year spring studio, ARCH 476, is an elective for all but the M. Arch (Limited Standing) students. The School plans to require all undergraduate students to take ARCH 476 in the near future. This spring studio will then become the location of the comprehensive design project.

Graduate Program Improvements
The School faculty agreed to create an M. Arch program where all students experienced equivalent rigor. To do this, the faculty created a common "core curriculum" all M. Arch students would take, specifically four design studios, structural planning, architectural practice, a course in "architectural thought" and another course in "professional issues." All other courses were to literally be "electives." The university Senate approved the new core curriculum in May of 2006 and it was implemented the following fall.

The School will continue to offer graduate "options," currently Design, Structures, Practice and Technology, and History/Preservation Options. Students may elect to take option recommended professional electives if they chose. Since only the core curriculum contains specifically "required" courses students, may chose to migrate across the sub-disciplines for their elective courses. Director Chasco refers to this as a "curriculum without boundaries."

While the School has a common core curriculum, various options' sixth year design studios are presently offered with differing course credit for essentially identical content. The School is presently moving towards all sixth year design studios providing identical course credit. This change will complete the task of assuring that all M. Arch students complete the program with content of equivalent rigor.

The School clarified its master's degree offerings with the following revisions to its Program of Study:

"The School of Architecture offers two graduate programs leading to a Masters degree: 1) a two-year Master of Architecture (Professional Degree) and 2) a one-year Master of Science in Architectural Studies (Post-professional Degree)."
The Master of Architecture program is for students holding a four-year Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (or similar degree in architecture). One may be admitted to the Master of Architecture program with Limited Standing if the student holds a bachelor's degree (or higher) in any field other than architecture. Student in M. Arch (Limited Standing) typically take two years to complete undergraduate prerequisite courses to attain full standing in the M. Arch program. The Master of Architecture degree is a professional degree accredited by the National Architectural Accreditation Board (NAAB).

"The Master of Science in Architectural Studies (Post-professional Degree) program is for students holding a five-year Bachelor of Architecture professional degree. The MS in AS degree is not accredited by NAAB."

More about the School's self assessments and plans for improvement is in Section 2.1 Summary of Responses to Team Findings.
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
C. William Bevins, FAIA
FreemanWhite, Inc.
8845 Red Oak Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28217-5593
(704) 523-2230
(704) 523-8958 fax
wbevins@freemanwhite.com

Observer
Ralph Johnson, Principal
Perkins and Will
330 North Wabash Avenue
Suite 3600
Chicago, IL 60611
(312) 755-4550
(312) 755-0775
ralph.johnson@perkinswill.com

Representing the ACSA
Donna Dunay, AIA
G.T. Ward Professor of Architecture
Chair, Board of Advisors, International Archive of Women in Architecture
School of Architecture & Design
College of Architecture and Urban Studies Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24060
(540) 231-5512
ddunay@vt.edu

Representing the AIAS
Ms. Erike De Veyra
4201 Henry Avenue
Apt. 751
Philadelphia, PA 19144
(832) 527-5078
deveyra2@philaau.edu

Representing the AIA
Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
NAC/Architecture
1203 West Riverside Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201-1107
(509) 838-8240
(509) 838-8261 fax
bblackmer@nacarchitecture.com

Observer
William Miller, FAIA
ACSA Distinguished Professor
College of Architecture & Planning
375 South 1530 East, Room 235
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-0370
(801) 581-7116 direct phone
(801) 581-8254 CA+P office
(801) 581-8217 fax
miller@arch.utah.edu
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

NAAB Accreditation Visit AGENDA
March 28, 2009 – April 1, 2009
Master of Architecture (M. Arch.)

Team Members:
C. William Bevins, FAIA – team chair, representing NCARB
Donna Dunay, FAIA – representing ACSA
Erike De Veyra – representing AIAS
Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA – representing AIA
Ralph E. Johnson, FAIA – observer
William C. Miller, FAIA - observer

General Visit Information:
Hotel: I_Hotel
1900 S. First Street
Champaign, IL 61820
217-819-5000

Team Room: Rm. 105 Architecture – Distinguished Plym Professor Office

Saturday – March 28
Afternoon
3:30pm
Team arrival and check-in at the hotel

Bevins review of Team Room with Director

5:00pm – 6:15pm
Team meeting
Hotel – Bevins Rm
Member introductions, orientation, and APR review/comments

6:15pm – 6:30pm
Travel to dinner

6:45pm – 8:00pm
Team only dinner

Jim Gould's
1 Main Street
Champaign
217-531-1177

Sunday – March 29
7:30am – 8:45am
Team Breakfast
Houlihan’s (at Hotel)
Dean Robert Graves
Director David M. Chasco

8:45am – 9:00am
Travel to Architecture Building

9:00am – 10:00am
Initial review of Team Room (Team only)
Team Rm 105 Architecture
Complete APR review, Team member work assignments, assembly of issues and questions

10:00am – 11:00am
Presentation of Architecture Program
Team Rm 105 Architecture
Undergraduate/Graduate
Director David M. Chasco,
Arthur L. Kaha, Associate Director for Undergraduate Studies
Robert Selby, Associate Director for Graduate Studies
Prof. Paul Armstrong, Design Program Faculty Chair

11:00am – 12:15pm **Overview of Team Room**
Presentation of Student Work, Room Layout, etc.
Director David M. Chasco,
Program Faculty Chairs:
  - Structures – Prof. Mir Ali
  - Design – Prof. Paul Armstrong
  - Practice and Technology – Prof. Michael McCulley
  - History and Preservation – Prof. Paul Kruty

12:15pm – 12:30pm **Travel to Lunch**

12:30pm – 1:45pm **Lunch**
Director David M. Chasco
Associate Director Robert I. Selby

1:45pm – 2:00pm **Travel to Architecture Building**

2:00pm – 3:15pm **Tour of facilities**
Architecture Annex
Temple Buell and Architecture Building
  Director David M. Chasco
  Associate Director Robert I. Selby

3:15pm – 4:30pm **Team Work Session**
Review of student work, exhibits and records

4:30pm – 5:30pm **Entrance Meeting with Faculty**

5:30pm – 6:30pm **Team Work Session**
Review day’s activities, discuss Monday’s agenda

6:00pm – 6:15pm **Travel to dinner**

6:15pm – 7:30pm **Team-only Dinner**

---

**Monday – March 30**

7:30am – 8:45am **Team Breakfast**
Director Chasco
Assoc. Director Selby

8:45am – 9:00am **Travel to Architecture Building**

9:00am – 10:15am **Team Work Session**
Continue review of student work, exhibits and records
Prepare for entrance meeting with Provost

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:15am – 10:30am</td>
<td>Travel to Provost’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30am – 11:30am</td>
<td>Entrance meeting with the Provost</td>
<td>200 Swanlund Building 601 E. John Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice-Provost Barb Wilson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am – 11:45am</td>
<td>Travel back to Architecture Building</td>
<td>Team Rm 105 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with program administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director Chasco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Director Selby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(if not required Team will continue to work in Team Room)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm – 1:15pm</td>
<td>Lunch (catered by Jim Goulds)</td>
<td>Conference Room 115 Temple Buell Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Committee:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Kathryn H. Anthony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Botond Bognar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Kevin J. Hinders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Michael T. McCulley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Gaines Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15pm – 3:30pm</td>
<td>Team Work Session</td>
<td>Team Rm 105 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue review of student work, exhibits and records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit studios, lecture classes, library, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30pm – 5:00pm</td>
<td>Presentation of Special Programs</td>
<td>Team Rm 105 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Botond Bognar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Alex Lapunzina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East St. Louis Action Research Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynne Dearborn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Selby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laura Lawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois Cooperative Work Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Andrejasich or Carl Lewis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00pm – 6:00pm</td>
<td>School-wide meeting with Students</td>
<td>Plym Auditorium, Room 134 Temple Buell Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm – 7:00pm</td>
<td>Reception with administrators, faculty, students, alumni</td>
<td>Temple Buell Hall Atrium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00pm – 7:15pm</td>
<td>Travel to dinner</td>
<td>Kennedy's 2560 South Stone Creek Urbana 217-384-8111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15pm – 8:30pm</td>
<td>Team-only Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday – March 31**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:30am – 8:45am</td>
<td>Team only Breakfast</td>
<td>Houlihan's (at Hotel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45am – 9:00am</td>
<td>Travel to Architecture Building</td>
<td>Team Rm 105 Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am – 12:00pm</td>
<td>Team work session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continue review of student work, exhibits and records
Visit studios, lecture classes, library (Librarian-Jane Block), etc.

12:00pm – 1:15pm  Lunch with student representatives  Room 115, Temple Buell Hall
(catered by Jim Goulds)

1:15pm – 6:00pm  Team work session  Team Rm 105 Architecture
Complete review of student work, exhibits and records
Visit studios, lecture classes, library, etc.
Meet with Director, Assoc. Director, Option Chairs or selected faculty as necessary
Draft VTR, determine accreditation recommendation

6:00pm – 6:15pm  Travel to dinner

6:15pm – 7:30 pm  Team only Dinner  Biaggi’s
2235 South Neil
Champaign
217-356-4300

Wednesday – April 1

7:00am – 7:45am  Team Breakfast  Houlihan’s (at Hotel)
Director David Chasco

8:00am – 8:45am  Exit meeting with the school administrators  Houlihan’s (at Hotel)
Dean Robert Graves
Director David Chasco

8:45am – 9:00am  Travel to Provost’s office

9:00am – 10:00am  Exit meeting with the Provost  200 Swanlund Building
Vice-Provost Barb Wilson
601 E. John
Champaign

10:00am – 10:15am  Travel to Architecture Building

10:00am – 10:30am  Team preparation for exit meeting with faculty,  Team Rm 105 Architecture
administrators, and students

10:30am – 10:45am  Travel to Lincoln Hall Theater

10:45am – 11:30pm  School-wide exit meeting with faculty,  Lincoln Hall Theater
administrators and students

11:30pm – 12:00pm  Team visit concluded  115 Temple Buell Hall
(catered Team only lunch as travel plans allow - TBD)

12:15pm  Team members depart for Chicago and/or airport
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

C. William Bevins, FAIA  
Team Chair  
Representing the NCARB

Donna Dunay, FAIA  
Team member  
Representing the ACSA

Erik Lee Veyra  
Team member  
Representing the AIAS

Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA  
Team member  
Representing the AIA

William Miller, FAIA  
Observer

Ralph Johnson, FAIA  
Observer
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