July 19, 2007

Gregory L. Geoffroy, President
Office of the President
Iowa State University
1750 Beardshear Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dear President Geoffroy:

At the July 2007 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the Iowa State University Department of Architecture.

The board noted the concern of the visiting team regarding problems with in several areas including curriculum and administration.

As a result, the professional architecture programs:

Bachelor of Architecture
Master of Architecture

were formally granted six-year terms of accreditation with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in two years to look only at Professional Degrees and Curriculum and the progress that has been made in this area. The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2007. The program is scheduled for its next full accreditation visit in 2013. The focused evaluation is scheduled for the calendar year 2009.

Accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are due by June 1 and must include a response to each condition identified as not met in the Visiting Team Report, a response to each of the causes of concern in the Visiting Team Report, a brief summary of changes that have been made or may be made in the accredited program, and the two-page statistical report. If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by the time of its fall board meeting, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program's next accreditation sequence. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found on pages 14–15 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2006 Edition.

NAAB encourages public dissemination of information about each school contained in both the school's Architecture Program Report and the Visiting Team Report. If the Visiting Team Report is made public, then it is to be published in its entirety.

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

Very truly yours,

R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA
President

Enc. Visiting Team Report

cc: Calvin F. Lewis, FAIA, Chair
    A. Spencer A. Leineweber, FAIA, Team Chair
    Visiting Team Members
Iowa State University
Department of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (164.5 undergraduate credit hours)
Master of Architecture (40 undergraduate credit hours plus 60 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
14 March 2007

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 department has worked extremely hard to redesign the graduate program since the last visit. The effort put forth by the faculty to integrate technical issues with design approaches is exemplary.

There is evidence that the faculty and administration of the school take the accreditation process very seriously. In both the undergraduate and graduate programs, the school has demonstrated ingenuity in addressing the concerns of the previous accreditation report.

The design-build classes treat the college environment as a laboratory and are effectively transforming the environment to be more hospitable and didactic.

The team recognizes the momentum toward interdisciplinary collaboration within the college and across campus and is encouraged by the prospect for greater involvement in the future.

Student attitude is extremely professional, positive, and optimistic about the future. The team was particularly impressed by the overwhelming interest of students to become licensed architects.

The higher administration is committed to the success of the department and the college. They are very well informed about the issues the school addresses and are knowledgeable of the vision set by the faculty and chair of the department.

The college and its department have demonstrated resourcefulness in responding to ongoing budgetary challenges since the last visit. This resourcefulness will bode well for the future changes in the proposed budgetary structure.

While there are a number of student performance criteria not met, these student performance criteria are met by existing electives within the department. The resources are currently available to meet many of the unmet student performance criteria. This is noted in the following SPC comments.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Condition 3, Public Information

The program must provide clear, complete and accurate information to the public by including in its catalog and promotional literature the exact language found in appendix A-2, which explains the parameters of an accredited professional degree program.

Previous Team Report: Outdated language about the accredited professional degree programs is printed in the current college catalogue and needs to be replaced by the current NAAB required language. Further, this text is not found in any of the Department's promotional materials, either in printed or digital media format.

The 1998 Guide to Student Performance Criteria is given to all incoming undergraduate students by including it in the Undergraduate Student Guide. Care should be taken to insure new faculty and graduate students also receive this information.
The proper NAAB language is on the web site and in the 2007 catalog. This condition is met. However, the students were not knowledgeable of the NAAB student performance criteria.

**Criterion 12.5, Fundamental Design Skills [pertains to Graduate Program]**

Ability to apply basic organizational, spatial, structural, and constructional principles to the conception and development of interior and exterior spaces, building elements, and components

**Previous Team Report:** Strong coordination of temporary faculty teaching at this level will lead to consistent delivery of this knowledge. There is little evidence of consideration for this criteria in the 3½ year graduate program.

Significant attention has been given to the development of a new graduate program curriculum. The team feels this criterion is now met.

**Criterion 12.9, Use of Precedents [pertains to Graduate Program]**

Ability to provide a coherent rationale for the programmatic and formal precedents employed in the conceptualization and development of architecture and urban design projects

**Previous Team Report:** Precedents are incorporated in the design projects in an ad hoc manner this criteria is not explicit in the pedagogy.

This criterion is now well met. There are numerous examples of precedents being integrated into the curriculum through courses such as Professional Practice (ARCH 582), design studios, and the SciTech sequence at the graduate level. The SciTech sequence is particularly effective in using precedent studies to investigate the integrative nature of building systems and as a spring board for design innovation and design studios.

**Criterion 12.14, Accessibility**

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

**Previous Team Report:** This criterion is introduced in the course work but an ability to apply this knowledge is not displayed in the studio projects.

This condition is now met.

**Criterion 12.15, Site Conditions [pertains to Graduate Program]**

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

**Previous Team Report:** The graduate program is focusing on urban sites at the expense of exploring a rich variety of site typologies.
The program has addressed this issue but there are still concerns in the design development of large sites including contour manipulation site drainage, parking layout, and site circulation.

**Criterion 12.22, Building Systems Integration [pertains to Graduate Program]**

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

**Previous Team Report:** The undergraduate sequence of 401, 448 and 458 adequately challenges the student to accomplish this criterion. Care should be taken to strengthen and reinforce this criterion in subsequent years. We see little evidence of similar integration skills at the graduate level.

This criterion is now well met.

**Criterion 12.28, Technical Documentation [pertains to Graduate Program]**

Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction

**Previous Team Report:** There was no convincing evidence of this criteria being met at the graduate level.

This criterion is not met. There is substantial reliance on an elective to provide the detailed knowledge development in technical documentation.

**Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design [pertains to Graduate Program]**

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:** The graduate sequence seems to lack the collaborative efforts displayed in the undergraduate sequence of 401, 448 and 458 between the design studio and technology coursework.

This criterion is now met.

**Criterion 12.30, Program Preparation**

Ability to assemble a comprehensive program for an architecture project, including an 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 an assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

**Previous Team Report:** This criteria is not covered in undergraduate or graduate level coursework.
This criterion remains not met for both the undergraduate and graduate programs. The full range of program issues are not addressed.

Causes of Concern (taken from VTR dated April 4, 2001):

A. **Faculty**: Recent faculty turnover at the senior level has left students and remaining faculty with a sense of insecurity. While the curriculum is being delivered, the Department of Architecture needs to hire its compliment of permanent faculty. A balance in faculty diversity must be maintained between the technical aspects of the program and a well-balanced theoretical base to the curriculum. The effort to hire senior faculty could be hampered by salaries that lag behind the national average.

B. **Graduate Program**: The graduate program is at an important crossroad. It needs to redefine its professional and intellectual focus with emphasis on the synthetic nature of the studio experience.

C. **Technology**: Continued support at the University level for technological advances is imperative. This support must include training of faculty to better deliver and take advantage of computer technology.

D. **Collaboration**: Previous teams have noted the potential for collaborative efforts within the College of Design and the greater University. These have failed to be realized. The commitment of Chairman Lewis to this potential will help make this a reality.

E. **Engagement**: Iowa State University, as a land grant University of Science and Technology, has an institutional mission to serve the community with engagement. The undergraduate program is beautifully positioned to fulfill that mission. This team urges Iowa State to align your goals with applied research within their own community. The Urban Center in Des Moines and the Design Build Studio are vehicles that could be built upon.

The team urges the upper administration of the University to take more advantage of the expertise of the Department on issues of campus planning, architect selection and design review. This would not only be a benefit to the campus, but would also recognize the quality of the faculty and its leadership.

3. **Conditions Met**

9 Information Resources  
13.11 Use of Precedents  
13.12 Human Behavior  
13.13 Human Diversity  
13.27 Client Role in Architecture

4. **Conditions Not Met**

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills (Undergraduate only)  
13.8 Western Traditions (Graduate only)  
13.9 Non-Western Traditions  
13.16 Program Preparation  
13.17 Site Conditions  
13.25 Construction Cost Control
5. Causes of Concern

A. With the increasing reliance on part time lecturers to teach many of the required courses, there is an increased need to have a well documented curriculum with explicit learning objectives and anticipated outcomes for each course. Without this structure, it is clear that consistent and anticipated student learning is not achieved. New faculty must be aware of the interrelationships between the courses in the curriculum and explicitly informed on expectations and evaluative norms.

B. The use of elective courses to satisfy NAAB student performance criteria conflicts with the Conditions for Accreditation. Care should be taken to insure that all faculty and students are aware of the student performance criteria and their relationship to the curriculum.

C. The undergraduate program has undergone considerable changes in recent years with the implementation of a college-wide core defined as "a common set of studio and lecture classes...intended to prepare (students) for application to any of the college's professional degree curricula." Careful assessment needs to be done concerning the impact this program has on upper level studio course content.
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 life of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several architectural faculty members serve in leadership roles at the university, including one who currently is the faculty senate president. Architecture faculty members contribute to the built environment of the university through various faculty-led research projects, e.g., a study of accessibility standards. Beyond the roles of individual faculty members, it is not evident that the department has a formalized role in the university’s decision-making processes regarding the campus environment.

The architecture department is the only academic unit in the college that lacks an assigned faculty member who is responsible for outreach. The president and dean both suggested that the architecture department can contribute more to the service-learning effort. The team sees there are important areas of the college mission where architecture can assume a more prominent leadership role.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students are a group of highly motivated young scholars who demonstrate an interest in their chosen profession and have embraced the corresponding responsibility to society. They acknowledge that the program requires hard work and dedication, yet feel
that coursework and workload are generally fair and appropriate to their educational development. Overall, the students have a positive outlook on the program, and are pleased with their education.

There is evidence of an informal process for students to communicate with the administration. There needs to be a formalized process for student feedback in order to provide more equitable representation and consistent input for decision making.

Student-led extracurricular organizations are evolving and, in some cases, thriving. There is AIAS activity and leadership, as well as socially-conscious groups such as Freedom by Design, Architecture for Humanity, Green Building, and the student publication. Some students felt there was not enough support for non-traditional projects or career paths.

Students were pleased by the college’s robust career days—approximately seventy firms from across the country visited the college to meet and interview students.

The recently implemented college-wide first year core program introduces students to a broad range of allied design disciplines in seminar, lecture, and studio settings. Students involved in this coursework value the opportunity to engage in inter-disciplinary study and reported continued relationships with students in other programs. Students are aware of the inter-disciplinary opportunities that the college offers and noted a desire for greater access to coursework in the other design programs.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[x ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[x ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department meets this condition through the professional practice course. Information received in coursework about the path to licensure is reinforced through formal and informal interaction with professionals from the Architectural Advisory Board and AIA Iowa.

The students strongly desire to become licensed architects. The department provides excellent resources for students to transition from the academy to practice.

The Career Services office tracks and maintains detailed information regarding placement of graduates, surveying their experiences and performance on the Architectural Registration Examination.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The undergraduate and graduate programs share a comprehensive, well-organized professional practice course. Students are exposed to a range of practice issues, through traditional lecture, but also involving guest appearances by professionals, for which students prepare questions ahead of time.

Students have multiple opportunities to interact with professionals through the participation of the Architectural Advisory Committee, as well as professionals participating in studio reviews and desk crits for both graduate and undergraduate studios.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The architecture department demonstrates a strong emphasis on field trips, guest lecturers, and foreign study opportunities for both the B. Arch. and M. Arch. programs. Options studios provide an excellent opportunity for students to engage in civic involvement and service-learning opportunities. Care should be taken to provide a complete range of project types for all students to address contemporary societal needs.
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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department has a written assessment report that outlines goals, learning objectives and methods to be deployed to measure success. They also have an assessment matrix for both the undergraduate and graduate programs that describe various assessment tools and the impact assessment has had on changes to the curriculum. The last report was filed in 2003 and the last update is listed as 2005. In recent years these assessment processes appear to be more informal and anecdotal. There are clear advantages to the more formalized process. The written assessment process should be maintained in the future.

In addition, the team witnessed opportunities for the department to expand its sources for assessment data by including groups outside the faculty that would enrich the curricular deliberations.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The appropriate NAAB language is in the current 2007 university catalog and on the College of Design website.

More than 90% of the students who came to the student meeting (120+ students who were primarily in the lower three years of the program) were not aware of the NAAB student performance criteria. At the faculty meeting, several faculty members noted that they were not consulted concerning their course work and which NAAB student performance criteria it might exhibit.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty and administration are cognizant of their responsibility to continue to improve diversity and are willing to engage in self criticism to foster improvements. Formalizing the outcome of these deliberations could lead to policies that guide various recruiting activities for new students, as well as new faculty and staff.

The team observed divisiveness among the faculty. Some faculty members believe that there is ineffective communication between the faculty and the administration, gender insensitivity, practitioner preference over the traditional scholar, and confusion over proper governance processes.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although school representativees participated in the original drafting of the Studio Culture Task Force document, the visiting team did not find evidence that the studio culture proposal has been recently shared among faculty and students. In a student forum there was minimal recognition of the studio culture document, both among undergraduate and graduate students. The faculty commented that they did not participate in the development of, nor were they aware of, the studio culture policy document.

Nonetheless, students felt positive about their studio experience, although students identified encouragement by some faculty to perform "all nighters" as a part of an appropriate studio effort.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The core program has impacted the teaching resources of the architecture program; additional resources and long term commitment of dedicated faculty are required for the goals of the core program to be met.

The late scheduling of teaching assignments is having an impact on faculty preparedness, classroom effectiveness, and curricular consistency.

The increased reliance on part time faculty is a cause of concern, as it appears that the part time faculty are not as committed to following the agreed upon curricular goals.

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

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

The department has established procedures for the review of faculty for tenure, promotion, and performance. The documentation of mid-term reviews is inconsistent for tenure track faculty. The team was unable to find clear and definitive evidence that the written guidelines for the annual review of faculty are followed consistently.

The core program has impacted student acceptance patterns into the architecture department. There is concern that a significant numbers of students accepted into the College of Design with architecture as an intended major, participate in the core program, and then subsequently leave the program due to the extremely competitive nature for architecture enrollment spaces. More than a third of the intended architecture majors do not apply to the program after the core due to inadequate spaces. Fifty percent of those who apply are accepted into the program; there is a significant resource of students whose educational needs are not met.

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.*

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

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

The physical facilities of the college are recognized by the president, provost, dean and faculty as an asset for the department of architecture. The distinctive design of the building encourages communication and exchange between the disciplines. The department suffers in this interchange by having a bulk of its undergraduate studios in another building. This problem will soon be eliminated with the construction of a new building addition.

The shop is a small facility for such a large student population, with limited amounts of traditional power equipment. There are no metal working capabilities in the building. The new addition is scheduled to enlarge the shop.
The team noted that computer resources and access to the resources has continued to improve since the last visit, as has advanced digital fabrication resources.

Finally, the design-build classes treat the college environment as a laboratory and are effectively transforming the environment to be more hospitable and didactic.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted in the previous visiting team's report, the information resources continue to be exceptional. The in-college design reading room maintains publications and information for the past five years and has a good array of periodicals and journals. The design reading room is supplemented by the primary collection of NA books at Parks Library, the main campus library. The availability of information resources in both the Design Reading Room and the nearby Parks Library enhances the educational opportunities of the students in the architecture program. A good working relationship between the faculty in the architecture department and the humanities bibliographer has helped shape and maintain a current collection of architectural publications.

The visual resource collection is well maintained and a source of pride for faculty and staff. Faculty and graduate students have an excellent collection of nearly 200,000 35mm slides, documenting major works in the fields of architecture, landscape architecture, city planning, craft, and art from which to choose visual information for courses. An electronic catalog of the slide collection resides on a password protected web site called Plato's Cave, where over 144,000 slides have been scanned. This web site is used to support an average of 14 to 16 courses per semester.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been reductions in state funding to the university for the past five years; despite which the architecture department had an increase in its operating budget during the same period, demonstrating the resourcefulness of the department and a commitment from the administration. In spite of this growth, the department continues to rely on additional funding from the college to cover its budgetary shortfall.
In response to continued state funding reductions, the College of Design developed the core program where all students entering into the college are enrolled in a common first year curriculum with faculty provided by all departments. This is an example of the college and department developing a creative solution to address the trend of reduced funding by the state.

Faculty salaries still lag behind comparable salaries for peer institutions. Faculty members have received raises over the past five years, but work still needs to be done to close the gap between peer institutions and address salary compression issues.

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 (NWCCCU); 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>B. Arch.</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. Arch.</th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iowa State University is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The administrative structure of the upper administration is typical of a public university. The provost is the chief academic officer of the university; the deans report directly to the provost.

The architecture department is housed within the College of Design which is administered by a dean. The dean is supportive of the architecture department, and notes that it is usually perceived by others in the university as the “flagship” department of the college. The president made a very similar statement in his meeting with the team. The dean is supported by two associate deans, one of whom is an architecture faculty member.

The department executive officer is called the chairperson, and is appointed by and reports to the dean. The current chair has been in place since the previous accreditation review. The chairperson determines teaching assignments, makes merit raises, promotion and tenure recommendations (after receiving advice from the P&T committee), allocates the department budget, and advocates for the program to the upper administration.

The chair is advised by an Architectural Advisory Council of program graduates and other interested professionals. The council typically meets three times per year, often serving as jurors for student projects while they are visiting. The council believes their input is utilized, and that their participation is worth the time and expense they contribute.

The chair is also advised by a cabinet of faculty members with part-time administrative duties. The cabinet is large in proportion to the faculty. It is not clear if the faculty considers the cabinet to be representative of them as a group.

The faculty expressed a lack of understanding about various decision-making processes within the department, including hiring, promotion and tenure decisions, and curricular changes. Since the latter two areas are defined by the department governance document, which is the
responsibility of the faculty, clarity of specific responsibilities in the document requires discussion for appropriate implementation.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department has two professional degree programs: the 164.5-credit undergraduate degree program leading to the Bachelor of Architecture; and a 100-credit graduate degree (plus undergraduate degree) program leading to a Master of Architecture.

The program also uses the M. Arch. degree title for the one-year post professional non-NAAB-accredited degree program. This is contrary to the NAAB encouragement to use this title only for the first professional degree programs. Consideration should be given to change this non-accredited degree title.

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

The team was unable to find adequate traditional examples in the undergraduate program of academic writing using documented multiple source research, the analysis of facts, the development of a rhetorical argument, bibliographic information and the proper citation of sources in papers available for review.

The graduate program had numerous examples of academic writing including ARCH 595, 596, and 597.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
There is limited evidence in design work demonstrating that students embark on a process of critical reasoning that reviews diverse points of view, presents an argument based on facts and criteria, and eventually leads to a rationale for selection.

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]  [ ]

Students expressed apprehension about the sufficiency of visual communication skills (model making, electronic representation, and orthographic drawing) acquired in the undergraduate core curriculum and the introductory graduate courses. Increased attention should be given to this area at the beginning levels of both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

13.4 Research Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[X]  [ ]

Professional Practice (Arch 482/582) provides evidence of students applying interview and basic research skills. The graduate program provides evidence in ARCH 585, 586, and 597.

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]  [ ]

13.6 Fundamental Skills

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

Met  Not Met
[X]  [ ]

The core program provides the student with fundamental design skills and offers the potential for later collaboration between various design disciplines. Additional architectural skills need to be incorporated into this program or better implemented in the 200 level studio.
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

Met Not Met
\[ X \] [ ]

Project evidence suggests that productive collaborations exist within the architecture program. Team studio work seems to produce very strong and innovative architectural design. The College of Design offers greater opportunity for collaboration with other design disciplines as well in the university community.

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

Met Not Met
\[ X ] U [ x ] G

The graduate program needs a broader historical view of the western architectural canons and traditions in architecture that includes periods before the 19th century. While a summer reading list is provided to matriculating students, this activity is not considered to be performance at the level of understanding.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

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

Met Not Met
[ ] [ x ] U, G

Neither the undergraduate nor the graduate programs address the non-western traditions to the level of understanding. Several students selected non-western research topics for papers but this is not consistently accomplished by all students. There are several excellent electives in this area, however, electives cannot be used to satisfy the student performance criteria.

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

Met Not Met
\[ X \] [ ]

This criterion is met but the potential of this area should be more fully developed for all students, as most of the richness of regional traditions is covered by elective course work. Further integration of this material into required course work would provide deeper understanding for all students.
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>

There are numerous examples of precedent studies being integrated into a full range of course work in the undergraduate and graduate programs. A noteworthy example is the use of precedent studies in the graduate program’s Sci Tech series. In these courses, precedents are used to encourage integrative thinking about building systems as well and as a springboard for design innovation.

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>

This criterion is well met with course 271 Human Behavior and Environmental Theory.

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>

This criterion is well met with course 271 Human Behavior and Environmental Theory.

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>

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>

Responses to sustainable design principles are indicated in the work, however, students indicate a desire for more advanced understanding of ecology and sustainable design principles.
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>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is extensive and inventive evidence of program analysis, but no evidence of assessment of actual client and user needs, detailed inventory of space and equipment size requirements beyond gross square footage notations or consistent design assessment criteria implementation.

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

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

The program has addressed this issue through analysis but there is no evidence in the design of large site contexts, site drainage, parking layout, and site circulation for required course work. Site conditions are addressed in the options studios but not in required studios, so it is possible a student may not be exposed to these important criteria.

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

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

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

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

Both programs incorporate the teaching of environmental systems into their respective course work. The graduate program's "hands on approach" to teaching this subject in the Sci Tech courses is an innovative and effective way to present the material.
13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress
Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Life-safety principles are taught in seminar courses, but are not consistently reflected in
design studio projects. There is a need to place more emphasis on incorporating life-
safety concepts into studio projects.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of
building envelope materials and assemblies
Met [X] Not Met [ ]

The visual aspects of building envelope systems appear to be well studied, however, the
documentation of the envelope within required design studios and supporting courses,
particularly in the undergraduate program, is not strong.

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
Met [X] Not Met [ ]

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
Met [X] Not Met [ ]

The team found evidence of students having the ability to assess, select and
conceptualize many building systems. There were minimal and inconsistent examples of
student work for life-safety and building service systems. Nonetheless, both items are
introduced in Environmental Control Systems (ARCH 458) and have the opportunity to be
more systemically integrated into Materials and Assemblies II (ARCH 448), where the
other systems are investigated.
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

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

13.25 Construction Cost Control

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

Met [ ] Not Met [X]U,G

The team was unable to find evidence of construction cost estimating that includes life-cycle cost in student work.

While building economics is indicated as a learning outcome for Professional Practice (ARCH 482-582) the visiting team could not find any evidence of student work to indicate that this criterion is met by the required curricula.

There is evidence that this criterion is addressed in design-build elective studios but electives cannot be used to satisfy NAAB student performance criteria.

13.26 Technical Documentation

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

Met [X]U Not Met [X]G

Evidence of this criterion is found in the course work for Materials and Methods I (ARCH 240). The course effectively teaches students technical documentation through a combination of generating verbal and graphic documents and "red lining" each other's work. This process mirrors practice and effectively demonstrates a student's knowledge and ability. The team expresses a concern that the exclusive use of light wood frame structures inhibits the full potential of this course.

The graduate program does not exhibit the thoroughness of various building systems, the full range of scales or all the forms of representation that are typical of technical documents.

There is significant reliance on an elective course to inform the technical documentation knowledge, this course is not taken by all students.

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
Case studies in the professional practice course demonstrate a good understanding of the client role in the project definition, design and construction process.

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

Architectural Design V (ARCH 401) does not meet the requirements for comprehensive design. However, there was ample evidence that Architectural Design V when taken in concert with the elective Integrated Design Workshop (ARCH 529f) met the expectations for comprehensive design. However, electives may not be used to fulfill NAAB student performance criteria.

The team found Advanced Architectural Design III (ARCH 603) in the graduate program meets expectations even though there were inconsistencies among projects. The team found no explicit rubric for evaluation that is shared with students and describes all the variables that need to be considered when comprehensive design is combined in one studio course.

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

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
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

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

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

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

There is evidence of student leadership opportunities in the program. There is a desire by some students and faculty for a broader range of experiences to be available for all 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>

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>

While both the undergraduate and graduate programs meet this criterion, there is a reliance on the professional practice course to satisfy it. The department should identify other opportunities to incorporate ethics and professional judgment into other required courses.
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Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2007 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report.

Iowa State University is a broad-based university of international stature. The majority of its students are from Iowa, but every state and more than a hundred foreign countries are represented in the student body.

The University is composed of the Colleges of Agriculture, Business Administration, Design, Engineering, Human Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College. In Fall 2006 the University had an enrollment of 25,462 students and a faculty of 1,734. Typically, the university awards more than 5,900 baccalaureate, advanced, and professional degrees each year.

Iowa State University was one of the earliest institutions established in the movement to create an educational system uniquely suited to an American democratic philosophy, providing access for a broader population. It was chartered by the Iowa General Assembly in 1858.

Iowa was the first state to accept the terms of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862. In March 1864, the General Assembly awarded Iowa’s grant to the chartered institution at Ames. In 1903 the university set the pattern of county cooperative extension that is now conducted throughout the United States. As Iowa State adapted the land-grant philosophy to the changing needs of the twentieth century, its program became that of a university with special teaching responsibility in science and technology, an extension education program throughout the state, and focused research interests to advance the frontiers of learning. Since 1959, it has been known as Iowa State University of Science and Technology. ISU is a Carnegie doctoral comprehensive research university with very high research activity, one of 96 in the nation. We are also one of only 38 public universities that are members of the American Association of Universities.

The College of Design is a comprehensive design school embracing a wide range of the visual and environmental design disciplines in the Departments of Architecture, Art and Design, Community & Regional Planning and Landscape Architecture. Formed in 1978, the college united the four departments which had long-standing reputations in other colleges in the university.

The College of Design at Iowa State University is the product of the interest and persistence of many faculty members. Long before the establishment of the college, the sense of shared interests and identity among faculty in the various departments of art, design, and planning on campus resulted in the establishment of a formal structure designed to promote cooperative associations among these disciplines. In 1967, the State Board of Regents authorized the formation of the Iowa State University Design Center for the purpose of coordinating common functions and responsibilities between the Departments of Applied Art, Architecture, and the Department of Landscape Architecture and Community Planning which were in the Colleges of Family and Consumer Sciences, Engineering, and Agriculture. The Design Center was administered by a council composed of the chairpersons of the three departments. Design Center activities centered on the development of a basic interdisciplinary education program, support for faculty research, and an exhibits and lectures program.
On May 17, 1973, the faculty of the above departments unanimously recommended to the university administration the formation of a College of Design. Faculty believed that a college structure was essential for the future growth and development of design education at Iowa State University.

The college's programs encompass growing research initiatives and creative explorations; visiting lectures and symposia; workshops and exhibits; practice and internships; field trips and foreign study programs; opportunities for individualized studies and international studies; and extension and continuing education programs. The reputation of the college's programs also devolves from its 24,429 alumni distributed nationally as well as throughout the world. In the Fall 2006, the college enrolled 1,773 undergraduate and 148 graduate students in its departments. At the Spring 2006 commencement, 211 (57 in architecture) undergraduate and 18 (5 in architecture) graduate degrees were conferred by the college's disciplines. The college has maintained about 234 FTE faculty including full- and part-time appointments.

The college's support facilities include: the Design Reading Room, Visual Resources Collection, computer-aided design laboratories, Career Services Office, Student Programs and Services Office, model shops, exhibition Gallery, Institute for Design Research and Outreach, Architecture Technology Lab, and Extension offices. The dean of the college is assisted by an Associate Dean for Academic programs, an Academic Fiscal Officer, an Information Technology Manager, an Associate Dean for Research and Outreach and Associate Director for the Institution of Design Research and Outreach, as well as the chairpersons of the four departments. The support and administrative areas have additional staff to coordinate and implement the respective programs.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2007 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report.

Iowa State University of Science and Technology is a public land-grant institution serving the people of Iowa, the nation, and the world through its interrelated programs in instruction, research, extension, and professional service. With an institutional emphasis upon areas related to science and technology, the university carries out its traditional mission of discovering, developing, disseminating, and preserving knowledge.

Mission

Create, share, and apply knowledge to make Iowa and the world a better place.

In carrying out its mission, Iowa State will increase and support diversity in the university community. Diversity enlivens the exchange of ideas, broadens scholarship, and prepares students for lifelong, productive participation in society.

Create knowledge through world-class scholarship in teaching, research, and creative endeavors.

Share knowledge through outstanding undergraduate, graduate, profession, and outreach programs.
Apply knowledge to improve the quality of life for current and future generations.

Culture

We accomplish our mission:

- through innovation, collaboration, and continuous improvement,
- with honesty, integrity, and professional ethics, and
- with sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of our state, nation, and the world.

Core Values

We value:
- land-grant ideals,
  - a diversity of ideas, peoples, and cultures,
  - intellectual freedom,
  - leadership, and
  - excellence in all we do.

Iowa State University provides high quality undergraduate programs across a broad range of disciplines, as befits the institution's stature as a university. In its dedication to excellence in teaching, the university strives to instill in its students the discernment, intellectual curiosity, knowledge, and skills essential for their individual development and their useful contribution to society. A common goal of undergraduate education is to assure that all students, regardless of disciplinary major, acquire literacy in science and technology, an understanding of humane and ethical values, an awareness of the intellectual, historical, and artistic foundations of our culture, and a sensitivity to other cultures and to international concerns. Consonant with its role as a teaching and research institution, Iowa State University has a strong commitment to graduate education that, at both the masters and doctoral levels, emphasizes the development of professional, research, and scholarship skills.

As an integral part of the learning process, Iowa State University fosters the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge by supporting research, scholarship, and creative activity. The university also uses existing knowledge to address problems and issues of concern to the state of Iowa in particular, as well as to the national and global community. The university's research and scholarly endeavors are supported by public and private resources and are conducted in an environment of open scientific inquiry and academic freedom.

Extension, professional service, and continuing education activities are conducted through innovative and effective outreach programs that provide the people of Iowa, and beyond, with practical knowledge and information derived from leading instructional and research efforts at Iowa State University and elsewhere. Through its outreach programs, the university stimulates and encourages progressive change.

Iowa State University enrolls academically qualified students who represent diverse age groups, socio-economic levels, racial ancestries, ethnic heritages, and international cultures, and who provide a gender balance. Through the use of a variety of educational opportunities, advanced instructional technologies, and student services, the university supports the development of both traditional and non-traditional students, preparing them for citizenship and life-long learning in a rapidly changing world.
Finally, Iowa State University participates in international efforts to alleviate world hunger and poverty, to prepare students and faculty to be productive and responsible citizens of the world, and to contribute to increased cultural, educational, economic, scientific, and socio-political interchange and understanding between and among Iowans and other members of the world community.

**College of Design**

The mission of the College of Design was approved by the State Board of Regents upon the college’s establishment in October, 1977. It was derived from the historic evolution of the design disciplines and the visual arts at Iowa State University and their consolidation into one college. The mission statement approved by the State Board of Regents in 1977 remains applicable today:

1. to provide an organization for direct interaction among students, faculty, and professionals involved in all aspects of the visual arts, design, and planning of structures, communities, and environments;
2. to improve educational opportunities for the increasing number of people entering programs in the design professions;
3. to provide opportunities for all students in the university to undertake studies in art, design, and the built environment;
4. to foster creative thought, scholarship, and research on an interdisciplinary basis as well as on an individual basis; and
5. to serve as a design resource for the university, the community, and the state.

The college has, since 1977, expanded the scope of its basic mission by acknowledging the importance of its leadership, the distinction of its programs and pedagogy, and by serving as a design resource at national and international levels.

3. **Program History**

The following text is taken from the 2007 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report.

The Bachelor of Architecture program traces its roots to 1914 when it began as a program in "Structure Design". The major thrust of the program changed to architectural engineering (1917) and then to architecture (1940). A Bachelor of Architecture (5 year) professional degree program was offered until 1969 when a Bachelor of Arts (4 year) followed by a new Master of Architecture (2 year) degree program was introduced as the first professional degree. The Bachelor of Architecture degree was re-introduced in 1979 in a modified form as a continuation of the Bachelor of Arts degree. The undergraduate program was reorganized into a continuous five year program leading to the Bachelor of Architecture in 1985.

The 1985 five year program was established with a 1+4 structure. Today, the first year is an open enrollment program with approximately 275 pre-architecture students, nearly half of the college's 600 first year students. The students focus primarily on general education courses and three required design studies courses that all College of Design freshmen must take. After completing the first year coursework approximately 200 students, who meet architecture's special pre-requisites of math and physics, apply for admission to the 85 places in the professional program. This respects ISU's land-grant history of wide access to the university, enables students to become acclimated to university studies, and positions architectural aptitude and academic performance as the
key criteria for admission into the professional program.

As the only architecture school in the State, ISU has experienced large undergraduate enrollments throughout most of its history and has continued to grow despite its limit to enrollment within the professional program. The program has attracted substantial numbers of out-of-state and international students, a trend that continues to prevail (43% over the last two years).

The history of the Master of Architecture program dates to 1917 when a Master of Science degree was offered in architectural engineering. The program drew its strengths from the engineering disciplines and was recognized as a professional graduate degree. In 1985, the two-year Master of Architecture was introduced as a first professional degree, accredited by the NAAB, and which, with the four-year Bachelor of Arts in architecture degree, replaced the five-year Bachelor of Architecture program.

The history of the current professional Master of Architecture degree program can be traced to 1979 when a degree program was introduced permitting the enrollment of students with non-architecture baccalaureates and providing an accelerated program such that they could earn the Master of Architecture degree in three to four years. In 1995, with the naming of a Coordinator of Graduate Programs in the Department, the Master of Architecture programs were reorganized into one three-part program into which students with a variety of backgrounds could be admitted and which would operate in parallel with the reinstated five-year undergraduate program. This structure of two intentionally and largely autonomous professional programs is the basis for the current operation of the departmental curricula.

In 1992 the graduate program was reorganized to develop a curriculum that was responsive to the intended autonomy of the program and, second, to establish standards for admission and for performance that would insure a level of quality commensurate with the goal of international distinction. The Program took an explicitly theoretical approach in this iteration, and gained significant national recognition. However, the departure of key graduate faculty and leadership in 2000-2001 left the program without direction. Enrollment declined, and coursework reverted to a default reliance on undergraduate offerings. The 2001 NAAB report pointed out significant shortcomings in the graduate program, which we have actively sought to address.

In 2002, a reconstituted Graduate Committee was charged with revitalizing the Graduate Program. The Arch. curriculum was completely overhauled, with a holistic emphasis on socio-cultural, environmental, and technical integration. A completely new first year offers three equally weighted courses in Design and Media, Architecture and Culture, and Science and Technology. A summer intersession includes a five credit studio that integrates regional architectural history and practice with technology. The final two years offer core coursework in Design, Theory and Practice, and Science and Technology while providing elective credits and two option studios that allow students to pursue individual interests.

Fifty students are currently enrolled in the Graduate Program, primarily in the M.Arch. I degree curriculum. The program draws heavily from the state of Iowa (50%) and from the region, but also regularly draws applicants and enrollees from throughout the U.S. and internationally. As enrollment has risen, the program has had an increasingly important presence in the College and Department. It now "hosts" one studio option in the spring that is open to graduating fifth year B.Arch., Landscape Architecture, and Interior Design students. Students in the M.Arch. I program regularly participate in the Department's Rome program, and the Graduate Program has been the sponsor for seminars and guest lectures that have drawn attendance from throughout the College.
The revamped curriculum has gained peer recognition through papers involving faculty research, and—significantly—through reportage on our program’s structure, including papers presented at ACSA’s Annual Meeting and the recent Building Technology Educator’s Symposium. Further recognition has come in the form of a major new technology textbook authored by SCI-TECH faculty, books edited and written by graduate faculty aligned with their teaching, and faculty invitations as lecturers and guest reviewers.

A Graduate Committee oversees development of the program. The curriculum has been expanded as a self-contained unit, and dependence on undergraduate offerings has been minimized.

Graduate enrollment was 50 at the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year, providing an increasingly visible and important presence in the college and department. Enrollment has been from undergraduate schools across the country, alongside a significant international presence. Conscientious recruitment, assessment, and retention efforts have led to a female/male gender ratio of nearly 44:56.

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2007 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report.

The Department of Architecture advances the study of architecture as a cultural discipline. Architecture is a cultural phenomenon arising from the aspirations that individuals and groups have for their quality of life and the environment that supports it, and from the social enterprise of designing and building for the future. The practice of architecture is a demanding discipline, requiring a broad range of continually growing knowledge and skills. We view architecture through the lens of culture and recognize that the future of architecture depends upon the advancement of practice.

The academic programs are grounded in the requisites of the discipline and profession. The educational philosophy is inclusive, seeking to instill individual motivation, critical ability, social responsibility, and the formation of personal values and convictions, as students learn to design, to communicate ideas, and to undertake the complexity of architecture. The curricula are centered on making buildings, and reach outward into the landscape and inward to interior space and installations. Knowledge of architectural technology and theory are brought together through design, encompassing diverse peoples, places, values, and needs for the world we inhabit. The programs of the department weave these activities together through conventional and unconventional means, using digital and non-digital media, in order to prepare our graduates for professional practice broadly conceived. Graduates are prepared for creative leadership both inside and outside of private practice as principals, designers, managers, technical writers, information technologists, educators, and public servants.

The Department of Architecture, an intentionally pluralistic community, is committed to strengthening its position as a comprehensive center for the scholarship of learning, research, and public service in architecture. We strive to provide a supportive and integrative environment for faculty research and for academic and service learning for our students. Together with the Departments of Community and Regional Planning, Landscape Architecture, and Art and Design, we constitute a College of Design, a valued interdisciplinary educational environment.
5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2007 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report.

We can take pride in the many strengths of our program. We have a positive national reputation. We are one of only eight schools to be ranked (top 15) by the prestigious professional publication, Design Intelligence, in at least four out of the last five years, and we have been as high as seventh in their rankings. Our graduate program now ranked in the top five programs within our twelve state region and climbing. Our undergraduate program is ranked second in the region as judged by both national and regional professionals. All the rankings are based on a program's preparation of their graduates for a career in architectural practice, a criterion we value highly. We are a known and respected entity among architecture programs, largely due to our highly productive faculty who maintain a strong national presence. Our students are wonderfully creative, dedicated, spirited, engaged, savvy, and growing in diversity and recognition. The programs of the department continue to evolve, with critical reflection and direction from faculty. Graduates are highly successful, both inside and outside of traditional practice. The local professional community is knowledgeable about our programs and extremely supportive.

Graduate Program

Vision Our Graduate Program provides both professional and post-professional studies in architecture for a wide range of students; our Professional Degree (M.Arch.) caters to students with undergraduate degrees in other areas. We focus on the integration of design, technology, and sociocultural factors. While studio is a primary element, other coursework (particularly in the first year) is designed to reinforce the broadest possible scope of the discipline. Students with four-year undergraduate degrees in architecture and students with international professional degrees are typically given advanced placement in the Professional Degree program. The post-professional M.Arch. program emphasizes more theoretical research and design experimentation, while the M.S. program enables students from all backgrounds to complete individualized research programs with architectural topics.

Our vision is thus one of critical practice. We believe in preparing professionals who will be actively engaged with their clients, their societies, their environment, and their cultures. Therefore, the primary pedagogical strategy of our curriculum is an active integration of three primary curricular areas: design studio, science and technology (sci-tech) and the study of the built environment (seminar). Coursework for each of these three classes is planned to overlap, reinforce and resonate. In addition to the planned intersection and overlap of class topics and tasks, students and faculty also gather several times a semester to discuss special cross-curricular and interdisciplinary topics drawn from contemporary local and/or global events. In our first-year core curriculum we depart radically from the typical studio-heavy pattern and teach design, sci-tech and seminar as three five-credit courses. We believe that the equal weight of these courses ensures that students understand them as equal in value. This rethinking of the relationship of design studio to other components of design education comes from our recognition that one of the primary failures of contemporary architectural education is the protected and privileged status of design studio. The Sci-Tech course sequence itself departs significantly from the traditional approach to teaching building technologies, which tends to isolate concepts about building structure from environmental forces and materials and methods of construction. Our comprehensive approach considers the building as an integrated
whole. This is necessary as we work to mainstream ideas about sustainable technology and responsible design. Throughout, we also stress collaboration amongst ourselves, and with clients, consultants, and communities.

Issues
- Visibility within the College and University
- Limited financial resources
- Uncertain assistantship funding from the University
- Limited space
- Permanent leadership of program at DOGE level
- Attaining and maintaining diversity in faculty and student body
- Attracting top-level prospective students
- Future drain on faculty resources through retirement of undergraduate faculty (especially technology)

Proposals
- Partnership with Landscape Architecture Department and potentially other college disciplines to share introductory coursework and to provide collaboration opportunities for faculty and students
- Grassroots initiatives to boost assistantship funding through research grants
- Participation in Solar Decathlon
- Rotating leadership to emphasize committee-based decision making and strategic planning
- Outreach to regional colleges and universities with architectural studies programs
- Increased visibility through faculty publications
- Overhaul of publicity mechanisms (website and mailing material)

Undergraduate Program

Vision The undergraduate curriculum is both an intense professional course of study and a broadly conceived experience in general education. The design studio is the core of the program, where students learn the synthesizing practice of design. From the beginning, students are involved in the construction, representation, and simulation of architecture. The curriculum follows a sequence of increasingly advanced involvement in the elements of the field of architecture: design; technologies; history, theory, and criticism; social and environmental issues; professional practice; and design communication. Each level is composed of a set of interactive courses, each of which draws on the other in the student’s learning experiences.

In an effort to take full advantage of our unique interdisciplinary collegiate setting, we played a leadership role in developing a common first year core curriculum for all of the programs in the college. This common curriculum introduces interdisciplinary dialogue among both faculty and students right from the beginning of their educational experience and helps establish relationships that continue to reinforce the valuable interdisciplinary lessons. An added benefit of this process was the addition of a first year drawing course to our curriculum which had been eliminated over the years due to budget constraints and the addition of faculty positions to teach the expanded number of core studios to all collegiate disciplines. The common first year curriculum now allows students to apply to any or all of the enrollment managed programs in the college through a coordinated process, an invaluable benefit to students who gain unique exposure to all collegiate disciplines before committing to a program.

In the spring of 2006 our department and college had the honor to host the 22nd Annual International Conference on the Beginning Design Student. The conference improved
our awareness of issues applicable to our new Core curriculum and strengthened our position as leaders in the effort to maximize opportunities for interdisciplinarity and collaboration in design education. As a benefactor experience to that interdisciplinary philosophy, we have also led the expansion of collegiate Option Studio opportunities offered to the upper level students from all disciplines. This practice was begun by generating joint studios between Architecture and Landscape Architecture faculty and students and now includes approximately 10 varied offerings each spring semester with faculty and student participants from every discipline in the college.

A minor modification in our technology sequence has balanced the workload for our students and appropriately moved exposure to environmental issues ahead in the curriculum. Arch 357 Environmental Forces in Architecture was moved forward one semester into the spring of the second year. This created an opening to move Arch 458 Environmental Control Systems into the fall semester of the third year instead of being doubled up with Arch 443 Materials and Assemblies I during spring semester of that year. This results in an effective three semester sequence for these courses and allows for an earlier and more balanced opportunity to integrate these courses into the parallel studio pedagogy.

**Issues**

- The required math and physics courses in the first year are not as effective as we think they ought to be in supporting architectural development and, because they are a unique requirement to our program, they compromise the collegiate Core concept of any first year student being eligible to enter any of the collegiate disciplines.
- Although 50% of the first year students have a pre-Architecture designation, our faculty is devoting time to teaching many more non-architecture majors than in the past.
- The technology sequence still does not effectively integrate into the studio pedagogy as well as we would expect it to.
- The first year drawing course has evolved from an art-based still-life rendering methodology and does not provide sufficient sketch based skills and exercises.
- The Option Studios provide interdisciplinary opportunities among our students, but there are still only a few sections that offer interdisciplinary faculty teams delivering the coursework.

**Proposals**

- Develop a new 4 credit course that takes the place of the marginal Math and Physics courses required in the first year and offer the course in an opening in the technology sequence during the first semester of the professional program. This would improve the course content and support the concept of a universal core curriculum.
- Use the development of this new course and the success of the integrated technology sequence in the graduate program to evolve the technology course sequence into coursework that is more embedded within the studio pedagogy.
- Host a seminar with national expertise to discuss the options and potential for the new technology sequence.
- Continue to promote the importance of interdisciplinary and collaborative values through encouragement, opportunity and incentive.
- Continue to play a leadership role in the ongoing evolution of the Core curriculum and Option Studio opportunities. Expand the positive influence and rigor of our program across the college while gaining insight from the rich and varied perspectives of our collegiate colleagues.
Computers

Vision Information technology has tremendously impacted the architectural design profession in various aspects ranging from design to construction, and from education to practice. Along with the changes in design culture toward digitally represented architecture, digital skills are a new aspect of design formulation that has become a necessary supplement to the traditional skills of sketching and making. Thus, digital representation and design methods are respected as a significant component in the curriculum structure, and includes topics such as 2D drawing, 3D modeling, lighting, image processing, video processing, realistic rendering, animation, fabrication, geographic information systems, scripting, Internet communication, and virtual reality. It is expected that a good understanding of digitally represented architecture could develop new visions on using information technology as generative and simulation tools beyond the standard conventions for design assistance and presentation.

To implement basic digital aspirations into the curricular structure, the department and college assumed the need for adequate software, hardware, and course facilities. However, since 2000 several new initiatives on upgrading software and hardware have been accomplished and new proposals for interdisciplinary cooperation are in progress to integrate the digital representations and equipment component with other research institutions and professional practice.

Issues

- Through the college computer lease program, every student owns a personal laptop to be used in their design studios beginning in the second year. Complicated and advanced computation work can be done on desktop computers located in labs. The college provides a rich set of software, digital cameras, video cameras, plotters, color printers, and projectors for course use.
- The change of course fees to the university computer fees yielded funding opportunities. Since 2003, four Computer Advisory Committee (CAC) Grant proposals were awarded for purchasing advanced and costly hardware facilities, including 20 sets of high resolution digital video cameras, a laser cutter, a 3D printer, and a CNC router. These facilities provided a robust foundation for the video animation and fabrication courses.
- To enhance software access, the department received a number of free license grants to use systems of Revit (free download), Inventor (free download), VIZ (free download), ArchVision (20 licenses), and ArchiCAD (20 licenses) installed in Labs for faculty and student use.
- A Digital Media Minor Program was initiated by the architecture department computer committee in fall 2003. They solicited representation from all college disciplines to expand options and opportunities for development. The minor was approved by the Faculty Senate and Provost's Office in February 2006. This minor covers the knowledge and techniques for applying digital representations to generate design and art. This body of knowledge specializes in the fields of art, design, and planning, and includes studies of various media for 2D drawing, 3D modeling, rendering, animation, video processing, prototyping, photography, computer gaming, Web design, geographic information systems, human-computer interaction, stereoscopic image creation, and virtual environments. Because of the diversity of its offerings, this minor is a multidisciplinary program across the departments within the College of Design. The architecture department has carefully guided the development of this coursework benefits in many ways: (1) the CAD/digital courses that were originally offered by and for each department are now visible and selectable across departments; (2) it provides a venue to systematically organize these resources to help support our department, (3) it provides students with clear guidance to learn.
critical information technology methods, and (4) it benefits students' transcripts and portfolios. Currently, 8 courses out of 24 are offered by the architecture department. This minor program has enriched the intellectual resources for the department and has opened opportunities for future growth and enrichment.

- The Virtual Reality Applications Center has provided C4 and C6 immersive virtual reality facilities for architectural course teaching and faculty research. The joint efforts between Human Computer Interaction (HCI) Graduate Program and architecture generated significant results; several research grants from the NSF and AIA were awarded. Undergraduate and graduate students have been participating in the research since 2001. Several demos in C4 and C6 had provided practitioners from Des Moines and AIA in Washington DC, with unique opportunities to experience design in virtual worlds. Connections between teaching, research, and extension have been built up.

- Joint research has been developing since spring 2006 with the Universal Design Lab and Computer Science Department regarding smart home design. The purposes are to find methods on helping senior and disabled citizens living in an information technology assisted environment.

**Proposals**

- Develop a CAC proposal for installing a 3D scanner. Laser scanners would provide students with the ability to digitize built organic objects, sculptures, artistic artifacts, or buildings. Students in the design disciplines could further explore design-related issues using the scanned digital model. This technology is widely used in commercial applications and is well-accepted in academia as a training tool. The input and output facilities in the College of Design have various equipment installed allowing students to go from digital to physical. Laser scanners will give students the ability to go from the physical to the digital realm and explore more design opportunities. Thus, this proposal intends to train students not only in the use but also in the practical benefits of the new laser scan technology.

- Strengthen courses in fabrication and rapid prototyping. The long term goal is to further extend the area, in order to address in more detail the direction of product design and to evolve the Digital Media Minor into a Digital Media Major at the College of Design. It is believed that this new niche would attract more students from neighboring states and attract attention and cooperation from fields of industrial design and engineering.

- Provide scripting and programming skills to promote creativity through computer graphics and to implement the concept of cognitive science in design.

- Work with the AIA Iowa Chapter providing public seminars in Des Moines on introducing new concept of Building Information Modeling.

- Establish international cooperation in applying techniques of human computer interaction (HCI) to smart house design.

**Research and Outreach**

**Vision** The research and outreach work in the department is diverse, rich and individually driven. The opportunity we face as architectural thinkers is to shape the discipline of architecture through our scholarship, teaching and practice. The challenge is to connect this work to the communities we serve and in which we are engaged. Our department and its faculty should be a leader and a resource at the university, in the community and among our peer colleagues and institutions based upon the excellence, value and vitality of our work.

The content of our scholarly work is aligned with the Department of Architecture's cultural discipline mission, however, mining the overlaps of our individual scholarly endeavors
and outreach efforts will provide a basis for focusing, supporting and developing the Department's mission and identity. Aggressively pursuing the opportunities for funded scholarship endeavors, thus increasing the resources and value of our faculty and department, is at the core of our research and outreach mission.

Over the last few years the department has been experiencing unprecedented success in this area. We received the college's first NSF grant in thirty years (the only other one was ours as well), and we have received multiple grants from national AIA programs including a Practice Academy Grant which was distributed this summer to only three academic programs. Other significant efforts like the Solar Decathlon are being pursued by a broadening range of faculty participants. Our representative to the new Center for Excellence in Arts and Humanities expanded on a departmental presentation program developed by one of our faculty members. Throughout the year collegiate faculty now give noon-time presentations on their research agenda throughout the year. The department has supported this effort for three years by providing a modest lunch for the audience, even after it became a collegiate activity. Starting this year, all departments will share in that support.

Issues
- Create a culture of shared information/knowledge
- Structure a supportive environment for scholarship development
- Increase opportunities and provide a support structure for funded scholarship endeavors
- Extend scholarship to outreach initiatives
- Extend scholarship and outreach initiatives to pedagogy and students

Proposals
Exhibit student and faculty work publicly on campus or in the community
- Set goal of at least one proposal for funded research submitted by each faculty member per year
- Distribute information to all faculty regarding ongoing/current research: eventually on a semester by semester basis
- Develop a departmental strategy for practice/experience opportunities for students
- Reinstate extension faculty position in the department
- Support graduate programs, including a college-wide Ph.D.
- Regularly publish faculty work in the college publications, a departmental publication, and departmental web site
- Develop research associations using common thematic grounds as a basis for resource development
- Develop a departmental policy regarding outreach and community-based projects
- Maintain an associate chair for research and outreach

Space and Facilities

Vision Architecture design studios, the core of the professional degree programs, house the unique educational opportunity of synthetic learning. This learning is supported by all kinds of media, (clean drawing, messy construction, meticulous computer work), and all kinds of instruction, (public presentation and critique, tutorial, seminar/discussion), happening in the studios or in close proximity to the studios. The studio environment supports student use of multiple media, including information technology, when designing. The studio environment supports independent learning, peer learning, tutored learning, and collaborative learning. The studio environment supports the integration of what students are learning in other classes into design.
Each year our Design Build studio has been making incremental improvements to our collegiate facilities, including the upgrade of review spaces and the reconfiguration of advising offices to a common location at the second floor lobby. However, two major efforts to improve facilities are currently in process. The departmental offices are being remodeled for the first time since the building was constructed in 1978. Walls have been removed to create an open environment with shared daylight and effective zoning that serves the staff while providing access and support to faculty and students. New furnishings will improve efficiency and ergonomic conditions.

A long awaited addition to the College of Design building has been funded and is in process (some fundraising still remains). The addition will recreate the open and interactive nature of the old Armory while overcoming the existing challenges of proximity, security, acoustics, and lighting. Our department will be impacted the most by this addition since we are the primary occupants of the Armory which houses half of our studio spaces.

**Issues**

- Inadequate facilities and furnishings: quality and quantity
- Reallocation of collegiate space
- Infusion of collegiate computer technology and output implication
- Improvements to existing common spaces including the site
- A lecture room to house 80 students (one class level)
- Problems of co-tenancy between College of Design, Campus Security, and ROTC in the Armory
- Evolving pedagogy that demands construction and computers, in addition to drawing, modeling, talking, and thinking, to happen in the studios or nearby the studios
- Encroachment on space caused by increased enrollment and converted uses
- Effect of student laptop computers

**Objectives** Throughout all the professional program studio spaces, we need our students to be able to:

- Talk across studios horizontally
- See the work and workings of their peers and elders
- Use a variety of materials—paper, wood, metal, plastics, and glass
- Have enough room to work on a drawing and a model at the same time, and a place to store them while working on something else
- Have immediate access to computers and output devices
- Hold an in-class, (or very close to class), seminar discussion around a table, (large horizontal surface), full of reference materials and/or studio products
- Hold an in-class, (or very close to class), presentation with pin-up space for drawings, room-darkening capacity for slides, and connections for computers
- Hold an in-class, (or very close to class), lecture that could also include an entire level (80 students) when necessary,
- Have the option of building small models, big models, and the occasional full-scale construction
- Use power tools in an appropriate setting
- Keep work produced during earlier phases of a project close at hand for reference

**Proposals**

- As part of the programming for the addition, study space use and allocation
within the existing COD building, and design a proposal for space reallocation and improvement based on pedagogic objectives - the college Facilities and Services Council could provide the venue

- Stay fully engaged in the programming and design process associated with the new addition.

Financial Resources

Ultimately, most issues are significantly impacted by this ubiquitous presence. Since the last accreditation visit, there have been a series of cuts and reversions to the budget that have required creative and proactive efforts to generally maintain the expected standards while looking to selectively improve critical conditions through effective leveraging of the limited resources. One of the most controlling issues in the budgeting process is the temporary teaching funds that are required to maintain the teaching standards of the department. Since the last visit, those temporary special funds have been transferred from the university to the college and a portion of them have been harden to the departments, but our department remains one of the two collegiate departments that must still receive these significant additional resources to operate (approximately $100,000 annually). The timing, amount, and distribution of these resources is impacted and exacerbated by an annual state funding system that is usually not finalized until the close of the fiscal year. As a result, the late notification of net annual resources to the department adds an overwhelming burden to the hiring process, compromising our ability to make timely commitments in a professional manner.

The minimal raises that have occurred over this same period could begin to have an impact on faculty retention if improvements are not made. Considering all the financial challenges faced by the College, it has been the proactive effort, strategic thinking, and cooperative attitude of both the administrative leadership and the collegiate collective that have turned some of the budgetary lemons into the lemonade of new collegiate priorities like the development of the Core Program and internally funded support for faculty leaves.

Issues

- A new university budget model that is based on a business production philosophy which emphasizes funded research and increased enrollment.
- Impact of temporary teaching funds
- Development of new resources

Proposals

- Consider enlarging the undergraduate program to meet the university strategic plan objective to increase enrollment to take advantage of the new budget model, and to provide educational opportunities for an additional number of qualified candidates to our program (annually, we admit 10 to 15 students who are applying to the program for a second time; that additional section of students could have just as easily been admitted on their first try if there had been room)
- Continue exploring a proposal to expand our program through a formal association with one or more of several Chinese universities who have solicited our interest.
- Evaluate the implications of a change in program length and nomenclature (other programs in the region have gone to continuous 5.5 year Master of Architecture programs, and the new university budget model under consideration would favor graduate students)
- Work aggressively toward the hardening of temporary teaching funds
- Support multi-year funding from the state
- Encourage the development of research opportunities as a supplement to resources
- Develop a Minor in Architecture that would expand the outreach and influence of our program while potentially increasing resources.

Note: These proposals have significant pedagogical influences that would require a thorough and holistic analysis to determine their propriety. This needs to be done with the understanding that we are part of an educational context that appears posed to undertake significant change both internally and externally, whether or not we think it is appropriate.
This page is left blank intentionally.
Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
A. Spencer A. Leineweber, FAIA
Spencer Architects, Inc.
2366 Liloa Rise
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
(808) 955-9595
(808) 944-9115 fax
aspencer@hawaii.edu; spencer.leineweber@gmail.com

Representing the ACSA
Dan Willis
Pennsylvania State University
Department of Architecture
206 Engineering, Unit C
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-9535
(814) 865-3269 fax
dew2@psu.edu

Representing the AIAS
Andrea G. Lazor
29155 Pointe O'Woods
Apt. #206
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 408-4805
al000085227@littu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA
O'Brien Atkins Associates, PA
204 Hardwick Drive
Durham, NC 27713
(919) 361-1492
kmontgomery@obrienatkins.com

Representing the ACSA
David Cronrath, AIA, Dean
College of Art and Design
102 Design Building
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
(225) 578 5400
(225) 578 5040 fax
dc1@lsu.edu

Observer
Michael Broshar, FAIA
IN VISION
531 Commercial Street, #900
Waterloo, IA 50701
(319) 233-8419
(319) 233-9772 fax
(319) 240-0620 mobile
invisionarch.com

Observer
Erin Olson-Douglas, AIA
3819 Lincoln Place Drive
Des Moines, IA 50312
(515) 779-9988
eodouglas@post.harvard.edu
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

ISU Department of Architecture NAAB Accreditation Visit
March 3 – March 7, 2007

Saturday
March 3

Team arrives at the Des Moines airport by approximately 2:00 PM

Noon
A. Spencer Leineweber, FAIA
University of Hawaii
Chair and AIA representative

Afternoon
Kevin G. Montgomery, AIA
O'Brien/Atkins Associates
AIA representative

Afternoon
Daniel Willis
Penn State University
ACSA representative

Afternoon
David Cronrath
Louisiana State University
ACSA representative

Afternoon
Andrea Lazor
Lawrence Technical University
AIAS representative

Afternoon
Erin Olson-Douglas, AIA
Observer

Afternoon
Mike Broshar, FAIA
Observer

Driving tour of Des Moines and Iowa State campus
(as time allows)

4:00 PM
Check in at Gateway Hotel and Conference Center
2100 Green Hills Drive, Ames, Iowa

5:00 PM
Team meeting at Carver Board Room in Gateway Center
(this room is available for use during entire visit)

7:00 PM
Team dinner at Audubon's in the Gateway Center
Sunday
March 4

8:00 – 9:00 AM  Team breakfast with Cal Lewis at Audubon's in the Gateway Center

9:00 – 9:15 AM  Travel to the College of Design

9:15 – 10:15 AM  Introduction to Team - Room (411) and the Primary Exhibit - Room (407)
    Cal Lewis, Tom Leslie, Cameron Campbell, Bruce Bassler,
    Kate Schwennsen, William Stockdale

10:15 – 12:05 PM  Tour of the Design Center
    Cal Lewis, Tom Leslie, Cameron Campbell, Bruce Bassler,
    Kate Schwennsen, William Stockdale

Graduate Studios – Tom Leslie
Undergraduate Studios – Gregory Palermo
Research Lab – Dr. Arvid Osterberg
Design/Build – Bruce Bassler
Computer Labs, Laptop Lease Program – Mike Miller
Rapid Prototyping – Mike Miller, Alex Gino
Wood Shop – Paula Streeter, Jason Griffiths
Visual Resource Center/ Plato's Cave – Susan Pcague, John Maves
Design Reading Room – Carlota Gutierrez
Rome Display – Ulrike Passe
Student Organizations – William Stockdale

12:00 – 1:00 PM  Team lunch with Architecture Cabinet in Gallery 181
    Cal Lewis, Jason Alread, Bruce Bassler, Karen Bermann,
    Marwan Ghandour, Tom Leslie, Gregory Palermo, Kate Schwennsen

1:00 – 1:45 PM  Introduction to Secondary Exhibit Room (Gallery 181)
    Cal Lewis, Tom Leslie, Gregory Palermo, Kate Schwennsen

1:45 – 3:45 PM  Campus walking tour of other facilities
    Cal Lewis, Tom Leslie, Gregory Palermo

    C6 – Dr. Chiu-Shui Chan
    Library – Ed Goedeken
    Armory Studios – Jason Alread, Karen Bermann

3:45 – 4:30 PM  Core program presentation – Karen Bermann

4:30 – 4:45 PM  Break

4:45 – 5:45 PM  Meeting with Architecture faculty in Room 130 (no cabinet members)

5:45 – 6:45 PM  Reception in the Lightfoot Forum
    Faculty, Students, Administrators, Practitioners, Advisory Council

6:45 – 7:00 PM  Travel to Gregory Palermo residence at 2048 Pine Hurst Drive

7:00 – 9:00 PM  Team dinner with Architecture Advisory Council and guests
Monday
March 5

7:30 – 8:15 AM  Team breakfast with Cal Lewis at Audubon's
8:15 – 8:30 AM  Travel to College of Design
8:30 – 9:30 AM  Meet with College Administration in Room 134
                Dean Mark Engelbrecht, FAIA
                Associate Dean Kate Schwennesen, FAIA
                Associate Dean Dr. Tim Borich

9:30 – 10:30 AM Meeting with Undergraduate Committee in Room 411

10:30 – 11:30 AM Meeting with Graduate Committee in Room 411

11:30 – 11:45 AM Break

11:45 – 12:45 PM Team lunch with selected faculty in Gallery 181
                Nadia Anderson
                Dr. Chiu Shui Chan
                Cameron Campbell
                Jason Griffiths
                John Maves
                Dr. Mikesch Muecke
                Ulrike Passe
                Dr. Lynn Paxson
                Dr. Paul Shao
                Ann Sobiech-Munson
                Dr. Jamie Horwitz
                Alex Gino

12:45 – 1:00 PM Walk to Beardshear Hall – Ann Sobiech-Munson, Paul Shao

1:00 – 2:00 PM Meeting with University Administration, 1750 Beardshear
                Dr. Gregory Geoffrey, President
                Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, Executive Vice President and Provost
                Dr. David Holger, Associate Provost
                Dr. Jack Payne, Vice President for Extension & Research

2:00 – 2:15 PM Walk to Design Center – Dr. Arvid Osterberg, Nadia Anderson

2:15 – 4:00 PM Review exhibits and records

3:45 – 4:00 PM Break

4:00 – 5:00 PM Meeting with Architecture students in Kocimski Auditorium

5:00 – 8:15 PM Review exhibits and records

8:15 – 8:30 PM Travel to downtown Ames
8:30 PM  
Dinner at Spice restaurant, 402 Main Street  
Travel to Gateway Center following dinner  

Tuesday  
March 6  

7:30 – 8:15 AM  
Team breakfast with Cal Lewis at Audubon's  

8:15 – 8:30 AM  
Travel to College of Design  

8:30 – 9:00 AM  
Meeting with Department Chairs, in Room 411  
Roger Baer, Art & Design  
Michael Martin, Associate Chair, Landscape Architecture  

9:00 – 12:00 PM  
Review exhibits and records  
(Optional visits to classes)  

12:00 – 1:00 PM  
Team lunch with selected students in Gallery 181  

1:00 – 4:00 PM  
Accreditation deliberations in Room 411  

4:00 – 5:00 PM  
Optional meeting with Architecture faculty in Room 130  
(please notify the Department office by 12:00 PM if this meeting is desired.)  

5:00 – 9:45 PM  
Draft Visiting Team Report (VTR) in Room 411  
(dinner catered @ 7:00 PM)  

9:45 – 10:00 PM  
Travel to Gateway Center  

Wednesday  
March 7  

7:00 – 7:30 AM  
Check out of Gateway Center. Transfer luggage to van  

7:30 – 8:15 AM  
Team breakfast with Cal Lewis at Audubon's  

8:15 – 8:30 AM  
Travel to College of Design  

8:30 – 9:15 AM  
Meet with College Administration in 134 College of Design  
Dean Mark Engelbrecht, FAIA  
Associate Dean Kate Schwennsen, FAIA  
Associate Dean Dr. Tim Borich  

9:15 – 9:30 AM  
Walk to Beardshear, Cal Lewis  

9:30 – 10:30 AM  
Meeting with University Administration, 302 Catt Hall  
Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, Executive Vice President and Provost  
Dr. David Holger, Associate Provost  
Dr. Jack Payne, Vice President for Extension & Research
10:30 – 10:45 AM  Walk to College of Design - Cal Lewis

11:00 – 12:00 PM  Team presents evaluation to administration, faculty, and students
                  Kocimski Auditorium

12:00 – 1:00 PM   Travel to Des Moines airport

               Departures

               Afternoon  Kevin G. Montgomery, AIA
               O’Brien/Atkins Associates
               AIA representative

               Afternoon  Daniel Willis
               Penn State University
               ACSA Representative

               Afternoon  David Cronrath
               Louisiana State University
               ACSA Representative

               Afternoon  Andrea Lazor
               Lawrence Technical University
               AIAS representative

               Thursday Morning  A. Spencer Leineweber, FAIA
               University of Hawaii
               Chair and AIA representative
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

A. Spencer A. Loineweber, FAIA
Team Chair
Representing the AIA

Dan Willis, AIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Andrea G. Lazor
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA
Team member
Representing the NCARB

David Cronrath, AIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Michael Broshar, FAIA
Observer

Erin Olson-Douglas, AIA
Observer
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Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report
Cassandra Paar  
Accreditation Manager  
National Architectural Accrediting Board  
1735 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Cassandra,

We received an email message containing the draft of our 2007 Iowa State University Team Report on 19 April 2007. We graciously accept the evaluation of our visiting NAAB team, but we would like to clarify several factual points.

The most significant issue is the "Not Met" evaluation of our undergraduate program for Student Performance Criteria 13.28 – Comprehensive Design. My colleagues and I are concerned that this assessment may have been made based on a misunderstanding of the material on display, and we would respectfully request that the evaluation be reconsidered. We believe the exhibited student work displayed a clear achievement of the stated performance criteria, and we are concerned that there may have been uncertainty or confusion on the part of the Visiting Team about what portion of the work on display was representative of required coursework. This may have been caused by our regrettable decision to include selected elective coursework in conjunction with the required coursework on display.

The applicable performance criteria requires students to demonstrate the:

"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."

Arch 401 – Comprehensive Design Studio has taken this statement to the letter within its curricular structure. Students receive an eight-page architectural program, complete with environmental, daylighting, spatial, and circulatory requirements. They must place this design on a complex, real site in downtown Montreal.

Throughout, they are assessed on precisely the issues given in the Comprehensive Design criteria. We have attached a sample grade sheet that demonstrates how formal assessment is delivered; this includes numerical and written comments for program, site, circulatory (including life safety), structural, urban, architectural, envelope, and environmental aspects. Also attached is a standard list of requirements for all reviews. Note here that the requirements are geared precisely to the criteria’s emphasis on planning, structure, environment, and material assemblies.
Displays in both the team room and throughout the building provided clear examples of students’ engagement with the seven listed requirements for comprehensive design. Students are required to demonstrate a working structure, a workable environmental strategy, a code-compliant life-safety system, and developed details and cladding systems. The program itself is geared toward sustainability, requiring students to assess their designs against daylighting, solar gain, and energy consumption criteria while offering opportunities to consider embodied energy and socio-cultural sustainability issues.

Our intention was to treat these in the most rigorous possible way, while having students understand the connections between these technical criteria and broader urban and architectural issues. Our approach has been peer reviewed in several conference paper presentations, and has been modeled by other institutions seeking to meet this requirement while not ignoring the potential for such a large-scale project to inform students about these broader issues.

We fear there was a misconception on the part of the Visiting Team regarding the relationship of this required course to Arch 528f — Integrated Design Workshop. This elective course is offered in parallel to Arch 401, giving students an opportunity to present socio-cultural, technical, and architectural issues raised by the studio in graphic format. Lectures in this course are shared at intervals with the entire Arch 401 class and become an integral part of the required course structure. The major assignment in the workshop course, a set of “client binders,” allow students to document their work in studio to a greater extent—these binders invariably show up as portfolio pieces—but the course does not ask for additional technical resolution of studio projects, it merely reinforces the pedagogical “scaffold” already provided by the studio.

Two minor points may be worth mentioning regarding the Visiting Team’s review of this material. In their request for supplemental information, they asked for further student work from the Workshop class, and we provided them with additional presentation binders. Had they asked, instead, for further studio work that had not been done in parallel with the elective course, the focus of the studio, and its ability to meet the Comprehensive Design requirements on its own, would have been clear. Second, it is worth noting that the Graduate Program’s Comprehensive Design studio, which in the Team’s report did meet the criteria as a stand-alone course, uses the same course structure. Program, syllabus, presentation requirements, and schedule are shared between the graduate and undergraduate versions of the course. Both courses have even been taught by the same faculty members in different years. The Graduate version of the coursework, Arch 603 — Comprehensive Design Studio, was presented without accompanying binders (only two graduate students took the elective course last year, due to scheduling conflicts), and apparently offered a clearer view of the studio’s ability to meet the expected performance criteria all by itself.

We would be very grateful to receive reconsideration of the “Not Met” evaluation of Student Performance Criteria 13.28 — Comprehensive Design for our undergraduate program. We base this request on the quality of the work shown for Arch 401 — Comprehensive Design Studio, and the likely misunderstanding by the Visiting Team that much of the work presented for that required course was instead the result of an elective course, Arch 528f — Integrated Design Workshop. In fact, it is the required course that provides the substantive background for all of the comprehensive work. We have attached a typical example of the program, instructor
policies, final review assessment, minimum review requirements and sample assessment for the required Arch 401 – Comprehensive Design Studio.

The remaining clarification is not a challenge to the evaluation, but merely a factual correction. This is regarding Student Performance Criteria 13.7 – Human Resource Development. The report states that, “The CORE program has impacted the student acceptance patterns into the Department of Architecture.” The CORE Program has not actually impacted student acceptance patterns into the Department of Architecture. The Department of Architecture has had an enrollment management system in place for many years, including the last several accreditation visits. In the last three years with the CORE program in place, we still have approximately the same number of first year students identify Pre-Arch as their classification (250-300). We still have approximately half of those students apply to our program, and we still accept approximately half of the applicants, 68, into our program.

The CORE program has had two primary impacts on the enrollment management of our program. The first impact is that we have a few more students, who did not declare Pre-Arch as their classification, apply to our program anyway. The second is that we have a significant number of our Pre-Arch students, who were not admitted into our program, accepted into one of the other programs in the college.

In the past the students who were not admitted into our program were expected to fend for themselves. The CORE program has made it possible for seamless acceptance into our other design programs. This is because all of the departments in the college now use the common CORE coursework as criteria for admittance into their individual programs. The CORE program has actually increased the college’s ability to effectively meet the educational needs of even more students.

Our entire Department of Architecture appreciates the time and care provided by the Visiting Team in their deliberations. As we did following the last visit, we will take their comments to heart and work diligently to overcome our perceived deficiencies, no matter how limited they might be. We will also re-evaluate how we are delivering and representing the criteria that we believe we already do well, like 13.28 – Comprehensive Design and 13.17 – Site Conditions. We want to be sure to leave no doubt about the effective performance of our students.

Sincerely,

Calvin F. Lewis FAIA
Professor and Chair
Department of Architecture

Attachments
MEDIATHEQUE DU QUEBEC
Montreal, Canada

In order to recognize the unique Anglo-French society of Quebec and to support the role of Montreal in the literary, cinematic and visual culture of the region, the Provincial Government has commissioned a new Mediatheque for the center of the city. The building is to house a variety of performance and exhibition venues, as well as offices for administration and staff, a large set of library stacks and associated reading areas, digital archives and storage, a restaurant and café, and a Youth Center. Because of the importance of the program to the city, the government has included extensive public areas, both interior and exterior, as well as required transit connections, parking and a high quality loading facility. The client has specifically asked that the building’s architecture negotiate between the 400 year heritage of French and English culture on the site, the likely future of Montreal as a digital city, and the complex network of functional relationships represented by the program.

**PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>3810 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Circulation Stacks</td>
<td>2000 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 250,000 volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All shelving must be accessible to 90% of population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have diffused daylighting and artificial illumination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be accessible from freight circulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare/Archival Stacks</td>
<td>200 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be located in secure area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strict environmental controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No daylight—artificial illumination only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Areas</td>
<td>800 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Convenient to General Circulation Stacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include table seating for 250 persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include carrel seating for 30 persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include lounge seating for 50 persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be distributed evenly throughout stacks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All reading areas must have diffused daylighting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Rooms</td>
<td>260 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10 small study rooms @ 10 sq. m. ea. (3-4 occupants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8 large study rooms @ 20 sq. m. ea. (6-8 occupants)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be convenient to book stacks and reading areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Department</td>
<td>300 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space for two reference librarian positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be convenient to and visible from Library Entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Shelving for 30 000 reference books, meeting all shelving criteria of main stacks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>150 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Display shelving for current periodicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Inside Circulation Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Entry</th>
<th>100 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Desk for 4 no. checkout positions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Security Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 10 no. computer workstations for searching holdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be convenient to ALL Library facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cinema</th>
<th>525 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Cinema</td>
<td>250 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Theater for 300 patrons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fixed Seating (Continental only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be sloped to allow full sight lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be convertible for lectures (no fly tower)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 sq. m. Projection Booth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 no. Small Cinemas</th>
<th>150 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Theaters for 50 patrons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fixed Seating (Continental only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be sloped to allow full sight lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have stage for light performance (no fly tower)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 5 sq. m. Projection Booth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lobby</th>
<th>125 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Must be convenient to both Cinema theaters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have direct public access from street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 position ticket booth with secure entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concession stand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibition/Cultural center</th>
<th>200 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Gallery</th>
<th>160 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For rotating cultural exhibitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be convenient to street entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have high security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have controllable daylight, i.e., blackout capability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storefront Gallery</th>
<th>30 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For local artist’s display</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have autonomous street entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must have controllable daylight, no blackout required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storefront Office</th>
<th>10 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Work space for Storefront Gallery manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be immediately adjacent to Storefront Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New-Media Center</th>
<th>350 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circulation Desk</th>
<th>50 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- One staff position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visible from Main Building Lobby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Browsing/Reading Area</th>
<th>250 sq. m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Table seating for 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 60 PC/MAC workstations with half-height privacy screens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Must be visible from Circulation Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Artificial illumination and/or controlled, diffused daylight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack for New Media Storage (DVD, CD-ROM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All shelving must be accessible to 90% of population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diffuse daylighting and artificial illumination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be convenient to freight circulation, Browsing/Reading Area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inside Circulation Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 200 linear feet of book shelving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be accessible to 90% of children under 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Children's tables and lounge furniture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be convenient to main building entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have dedicated restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have natural daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be secure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Support/Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director’s Suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offices for Director (20 sq. m.) Asst. Directors (3 @ 15 sq. m.) and Department Heads (4 @ 10 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clerical Work Area for 4 Assistants (35 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting Room (30 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All above spaces must have natural daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reception Area (15 sq. m. with Receptionist’s Desk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supply Closet (5 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kitchenette</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian’s Suite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Offices for Head Librarian (20 sq. m.), Associate Librarians (2 @ 15 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clerical Work Area for 3 Assistants (25 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meeting Room (25 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All above spaces must have natural daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supply Closet (5 sq. m.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Laboratory (100 sq. m.) with no daylight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offices for Conservator (15 sq. m.) and Assistant (10 sq. m.) with daylight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Locker Rooms and rest rooms for 60 staff, split evenly M &amp; F (20 sq. m. ea.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Break Room (40 sq. m.) with kitchenette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be adjacent to loading dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must not be visible from public areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Lobby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must be directly accessible to and visible from major street entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Must have immediate access to main vertical circulation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Café/Restaurant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seating for 60 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kitchen must be out of public view but accessible to dining area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 sq. m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loading Dock</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza/Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical/Telecom Closets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

arch 401
Fall 05
MEDIATHEQUE DU QUEBEC

Studio instructor’s Policies

This studio’s exploration is intended to exercise your ability to integrate diverse objective and technical requirements into coherent designs. Therefore, the studio will demand well-disciplined work and stringent standards for attendance, presentation, and process. We intend for you to develop your design work along physical and conceptual lines this semester; I take a “both/and” approach to this requirement. Your work should be conceptually rigorous and technically fluent, a difficult goal involving integration and iteration in addition to inspiration and rhetoric. You will be constantly nudged toward solutions of clarity and depth rather than ones of flash and effect.

Because of the program’s complexity, and the considerable requirements for drawings, models, etc., you are encouraged (though not required) to work in pairs for the semester. Past experience has shown that, aside from the advantage of doubling the number of hands working on each project, the collaborative effort has led to better rounded, more focused work. You are encouraged to review this document periodically with the instructor with respect to your work and progress.

GRADING

Grades and written evaluations will be issued after every review, during the next scheduled studio session. You will receive a score of 1 to 5 (5 being highest) along with explanatory comments for each category (see attached example). These figures will be averaged to give you a numeric ‘grade’ for the review as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.75-5.00</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50-4.75</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25-4.50</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75-4.25</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-3.75</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25-3.50</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75-3.25</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50-2.75</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25-2.50</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75-2.25</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50-1.75</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00-1.50</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, values will be assigned based on the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Requirement is met or exceeded, efficiently achieved, and fluently integrated into the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Requirement is met or exceeded, efficiently achieved, and integrated into the overall project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Requirement is met, either inefficiently or awkwardly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Requirement is met, both inefficiently and awkwardly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Requirement is not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Grave deficiency or lack of consideration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final grades will be figured by weighting each review’s grade by the percentage listed in the Studio Schedule. These may be modified by up to 0.50 points based on attendance (see below) and/or a poll taken of each member in a pair or group.

Grades and evaluations are given based solely on individual projects, not relative to the studio as a whole. I do not have ‘curves’ or quotas.

Grades are strictly confidential. Any sharing or comparing of written grades is a violation of your right and mine to academic privacy and will be brought to the University’s attention for possible disciplinary action.
ATTENDANCE

Full participation in studio is a major element of your education, as discussion and engagement between students is vital to the development of your design process from a social and cultural point of view. You will be expected to be present for all studio sessions, and to be prepared to discuss your work on a daily basis. The studio problem selected is intentionally difficult and complex, and constant attention to your design on your part and that of the instructor will be critical to its successful completion.

Studio sessions should be regarded as “sacred time” for your design efforts, and should be spent working amongst your colleagues. Attendance will be noted throughout the entire studio period, not simply “showing up” for a desk crit.

Your fellow students deserve your attention and comments during reviews. Full attendance at and for the duration of each internal and outside review is mandatory and non-negotiable. In no case will review time be allowed for completing work “en charrette”.

Grades will be lowered by 0.50 points for any three unexcused absences or for persistent partial attendance. An “unexcused absence” is any failure to attend a studio session that is not agreed with the instructor beforehand. An adequately explained emergency situation will not constitute an “unexcused absence” (i.e. illness, death in the family, etc.), however the instructor reserves the right to require documentation for such occurrences.

Invariably, due to conferences and travel, I will miss one or two studio sessions. In those cases, I will schedule additional time outside of studio for desk crits at your convenience.

Late or incomplete work

Deadlines and requirements for presentations, reviews, etc., are issued at the beginning of the term and are absolute. It is your responsibility to pace yourself to meet each deadline. Late work will not be accepted except in emergency cases and by prior arrangement with the instructor, and late or incomplete work will be penalized by a full grade point. I do not issue “F” grades at the end of the term and I will not accept work turned in beyond the final review for grading except in extreme circumstances.

STUDIO ENVIRONMENT

The studio should be a place in which learning, creativity, and inquiry are supported and encouraged by all possible means. Any activity or conduct that interferes with other students’ abilities to learn, create, or work is contrary to university and departmental policy and will not be permitted/tolerated.

Specifically, noxious or toxic materials must not be used or stored in studio. As architects, we are supposedly concerned with ecological issues on both large and small scales. How we conduct our daily business, and the materials and equipment we use to do this, reflects on our commitment to larger issues. The use of resin, volatile paints or adhesives, plastics, etc., is therefore expressly discouraged in favor of environmentally clean, sustainable materials such as wood, cardboard, and water based glues, paints, etc.

You are encouraged to maintain a neat studio space, and you will be required to work in ways that do not interfere with other students’ space or efforts. This pertains to not only your physical environment, but to items such as CD players, televisions, and power tools.

Harassment of other students in any form (racial, ethnic, sexual) is strictly prohibited by the University. If brought to the instructor’s attention, the instructor has a legal and contractual duty to initiate appropriate disciplinary procedures with the Dean of Students.

ACCOMODATION FOR DISABLED STUDENTS

Per University policy, students with a documented disability are entitled to, and will receive, reasonable academic accommodations to ensure their ability to successfully participate in and complete this course. Such students must make an appointment during office hours to discuss any such disability with the instructor, and are responsible for bringing to the instructor’s attention any accommodation needs prior to or early in the term.

recommendations and idp mentoring

I will be happy to write professional or academic recommendations, or serve as IDP mentor, for any student achieving a “B+” or above in this studio.

Office hours and instructor contacts
My office hours are generally 1200 to 1300 on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Appointments are encouraged, however I maintain an open door policy throughout the working week.

Office: 589 Design
Phone: 4-8460
e-mail: tleslie@iastate.edu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group:</th>
<th>Ashley &amp; Rachael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comments:</td>
<td>The drawings and model worked very well together—for the first time, I think the jury understood completely both how the scheme worked and what its spatial implications were. The curtain wall made big strides, but I think it could still have been pushed further—particularly in the corner, where the jury rightly pointed out some details that contradicted your stated intentions. Still, a tremendous effort to bring what had been a very diagrammatic project at scheme design to a level of resolution and believability that the reviewers seemed utterly sold on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Program: | 5 | Excellent job of polishing off the few bits from DD that hadn’t quite worked. The first floor in particular sailed through the review. |
| Site: | 4.5 | I think this may have slipped a bit as you got into detail. The elevations didn’t really show enough site context to be convincing, and I’m not sure the stone wall helped you much on this score. Overall, the diagram remained a convincing site strategy, but didn’t seem to trickle down into the elevations. |
| Circulation: | 5 | Remained strong throughout the last half of the term. |
| Structure: | 4.5 | Some smart decisions in the final weeks, and good development on the roof. The roof plane itself, however, remained sketchy, and there were some issues with the structure of the curtain walls and louvers that weren’t fully resolved. But, overall, some good exploration and some obvious figuring out. |
| Urban: | 4 | This (correctly) wasn’t where the energy went in the final weeks. Again, the overall gesture seemed to link with the urban grid in important ways, but the garden and front surfaces didn’t really get developed. |
| Interior: | 5 | Got even better as the project moved into detail. |
| Cladding: | 4.5 | Generally some very good development, I think the louver structure was still a bit undefined and there were some awkward moments at the corner. Again, though, some impressive figuring out. |
| Environmental: | 4.5 | The louver depth never really compensated for the changing spacing. |
| Graphic/Model: | 4.5 | Very strong—my only complaint is the lack of site information on the sections and elevations, which I think would have helped your case. The models were particularly well done, and the sections and plans read (finally!) very clearly. |
| Verbal: | 5 | You guys are pros. Detailed explanation that brought the jury along and convinced them of the soundness of your scheme. |
| Total: | 4.65 | A-. Thorough development in most areas, I think with another week the cladding would have been at an even more developed level. |
| Semester Grade: | 4.56 | A-. A strong semester. You took a scheme that was exciting but lacking an order, and managed to tease out what the ordering principles should be. It got “brought down to earth” without losing its energy or richness—hopefully a very good lesson!
# Mediathèque du Québec

**Minimum Review Requirements**

| Conceptual Study | Friday, 27 Aug  
(1 Week) | - Finished, exquisite full scale mockups  
- Sketches showing process  

5% of final grade, based on Conception and Execution |
|---|---|
| Schematic Design Review, 
Wednesday, 6 Oct  
(3-1/2 Weeks) | - Massing model to fit site model, showing outdoor spaces, architectural elements, major fenestration and relationships to surrounding buildings/spaces  
- Site plan showing all parking, pedestrian routes, connections to urban fabric and surrounding buildings. 1:500 min. scale  
- Plans of all major levels showing individual spaces, circulation elements, service areas. 1:200 min. scale.  
- Minimum of two sections through key spaces and elements showing floor-to-floor height, vertical circulation strategy, fenestration and materials. 1:200 min. scale.  
- Major elevations showing relationships to surrounding buildings, fenestration, and materials.  
- Perspectives and/or axonometrics demonstrating three-dimensional disposition of program or experience of major spaces.  
- BINDER of diagrams explaining Program and Site analysis  

20% of final grade, based on Program Solution, Site Solution, Circulation, Structural Concept, Technical, Interior and Exterior Spaces, Presentation, and Binders. |
| Design Development Review, 
Friday, 5 Nov  
(4-1/2 Weeks) | - Massing model to fit site model showing above requirements plus interior spaces.  
- Site plan showing above requirements, landscape or urbanscape strategy and materials. *Must demonstrate daylight requirements for outdoor spaces.* 1:400 scale  
- Plans of all major levels showing individual spaces with access, circulation elements, service areas. 1:200 min. scale  
- Minimum of two detailed sections showing key spaces and construction of floors and exterior walls. *Must be animated to show relationship of key spaces (stacks, reading rooms) to human dimensions.* 1:100 scale  
- All major building elevations. 1:100 minimum scale. *Should be animated to show relationship to street scale.*  
- At least one detail section model showing materiality and connections of building cladding. 1:10 min. scale.  
- BINDER of diagrams explaining Circulation and Structural strategies  

25% of final grade, based on Program and Site Solutions, Circulation, Structure, Urban and Interior Spaces, Cladding, Environmental, Graphic and Verbal Presentation, and Binders. |
| FINAL REVIEW  
Fri., 12 Dec.  
(5 Weeks) | - Same requirements for Design Development review PLUS:  
- Plans must show typical furniture layouts  
- Detailed section model 1:50 showing major spatial sequence within the project and related tectonic development  
- At least two detail sections showing materiality and connections. One must be of exterior cladding. 1:10 min. scale.  
- Diagrams of structural and environmental systems demonstrating their integration with program, circulation, and overall architectural concept.  
- Full areas schedule |
• BINDER of diagrams explaining Servicing, Cladding strategies.
• Both previous BINDERS.

50% of final grade, based on Program and Site Solutions, Circulation, Structure, Urban and Interior Spaces, Cladding, Environmental, Graphic and Verbal Presentation and Binders.

In extreme circumstance, these requirements may be modified by prior agreement with the instructor. In general, however, this schedule is a ‘tried and true’ roadmap to legible, fully developed presentations.

Up through the final review sketchy models and drawings are fine. The final models and drawings must FLUENTLY demonstrate the formal, technical, and spatial qualities of the project, i.e. we must not be distracted by poor craftsmanship or incomplete work. In all cases, drawings should be workmanlike—well crafted, legible, clear but not necessarily “pretty” or “fancy”.
APARTMENT BLOCK, CHICAGO IL
Arch 401
Leslie Studio

Second Intermediate Review Evaluation
22 Nov, 1950

Group: Ludwig Mies van der Rohe

General Comments: Good development since schematic, though I still think the site plan is overly simplistic—surely you can come up with something more exciting than just the two rectangular blocks! The idea about combining structure and cladding systems is interesting, but sounds confusing—are you suggesting that these are two different systems, or that they are somehow combined? Your drawings are good—less isn’t necessarily more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>score</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site/Program Solution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The massing doesn’t seem to address Lake Shore Drive in any meaningful way, and the floors are clumsily organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Excellent parking layout. I worry a bit about where the ‘front door’ to the blocks might be—you may need to call this out somehow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Simple, efficient, and well integrated with the apartments. How can you best express this on the elevations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hard to tell how this relates to its neighbors, especially that wonderful stone block to the south.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Your perspectives are too simplistic, they need to show more people, plants, etc. And the collage of 'Guernica' seems overdone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cladding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I don’t get it—what do you mean that the cladding and structure modules are ‘aiming at the unity of construction, structure and form?’ This doesn’t come through in the elevations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Surely you can’t be proposing single glazing on a north façade, and no shading whatsoever on the south—these will be unbearable!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Presentation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Model needs work, drawings are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Way too brief—and what on earth did you mean by “beauty is the radiance of truth”? Focus on the project!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>C. You have been too locked in to the idea of the ‘slow unfolding of form’ for too long—this project has to progress on a material and structural level. One strategy might be to start at the corners and to think about whether the volume is a cage with infill windows, or a glass volume with its structure displayed graphically. A “B” might be in the details...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>