

Program Review Panel Report Outline & Summary
Andrews University
Graduate Council & Undergraduate Council
Graduate & Undergraduate Program Review and Development Committees

Programs Reviewed: Master of Architecture, Bachelor of Science in Architecture, Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies

Review Time: Summer 2010

Panel Members: Duane Covrig, Rubén Muñoz-Larrondo, Wayne Perry, Carmelita Troy, Tiffany Summerscales (Chair)

Review Protocol Revision: January 2010

Document Revision: October 5, 2010

1. Evaluation of the strengths & weaknesses of the program.

a. Mission-centeredness

A major strength of the architecture programs is a strong focus on a well-articulated mission that is closely aligned with that of the University. This mission involves a holistic approach that fully integrates faith and learning. Service is also emphasized with both faculty and students engaging in a number of significant service projects. The school of Architecture was even commended in their focus on their mission by their NAAB accreditors.

b. Program Inputs

All faculty appear to be well-qualified to fulfill their teaching assignments and the school has excellent support staff that meet the programs' curricular needs. In addition the Architecture Resource Center has received recognition from international design groups and is the official repository of the Environmental Design Research Association's worldwide publications in the field of environmental behavior and design. Student interest the architecture programs has been strong with a steady increase in enrollment over the past decade. Enrollment in the last year has decreased due to the current economic downturn but is expected to increase again once the economy improves.

One major limiting factor for the curriculum is space needs for the studio courses. Recent building additions only replaced existing space in other buildings. The program provides 61 gross square feet of studio space per student when they should have 80-100 square feet per student, according to benchmarking. A second weakness of the program is in faculty recruitment, due to the fact that faculty salaries fall far behind salaries of licensed architects.

c. Program Outputs

The hands on, project oriented, spiritually infused, and mission driven programs challenge students to develop intellectually, physically, socially and spiritually. The artistic emphasis also brings together a deep respect for cultural well-being. The program's belief, articulated very clearly, is that "architecture is by its nature social" and a civic art and is a vocation that brings human nature and the natural world together to make dwelling places. The architecture program is an exemplar of the holistic learning possible from an Adventist philosophy of education.

The School of Architecture currently does not assess program outputs in a systematic way but needs to develop a systematic assessment program, which annually monitors its student/program outputs. This would help the school document its strengths and target areas for improvement.

d. Finances

Over the 10 years for which data were provided, the program has trended towards increases in operating income which has been at 20% of revenues or greater since 2006. The income to expense ratio has been in recent years between 1.4 and 1.6, indicating that for each dollar of expense incurred by the program, there is approximately \$1.50 of revenue. Overall, in recent years the program has operated profitably and made a contribution to the financial well-being of the University taken as a whole.

e. Program Future

Once the current economic downturn is over, enrollment in the architecture programs will likely continue to grow. This growth will be limited primarily by studio space restrictions that already pose a problem even with current enrollment numbers. If more space were to be made available to the school of architecture, it would be able to take advantage of the opportunities presented by increasing student interest.

Another future challenge is the problem of faculty recruitment and retention. The School of Architecture has historically had difficulty with recruiting faculty. According to benchmarking conducted by the school, its faculty are currently the lowest paid in the nation. This problem of low salary is compounded by the fact that most of the faculty do not have doctorates. The Masters in Architecture is considered a terminal degree in architecture but it may keep faculty on a lower payscale. Furthermore, most are not at the higher earning levels of associate and full professor. This may be because of difficulty in advancement because of the type of creative scholarship they engage in. More needs to be done by the provost office to clarify potential inequities.

2. Recommendations

- a. Space. Enrollment growth may have to be capped in the near future due to lack of studio space. An increase in space is necessary to ensure continued growth and the quality of the current programs.
- b. Program Assessment. More assessment needs to be done so that the school has evidence of the positive outcomes that are likely taking place. The school has already taken the first steps in putting together a plan for systematic assessment. This plan, once implemented, should help Architecture to better tell its story.
- c. Faculty Salaries. As stated earlier, recruitment and retention of quality faculty is hampered by salaries that are low compared with those in the profession and faculty at other schools. One remedy may be to make licensure equivalent to a Ph.D. when determining payscale. Since licensure represents the highest level of achievement and expertise in the field of architecture it could be viewed as the terminal professional degree. Becoming a licensed architect involves three years of internship prior to taking a series of 9 exams within a 5-year period. In addition, the School of Architecture could work with the University administration to develop a White Paper or clear policy that delineates the activities that constitute scholarly achievement in architecture that should be considered for promotion and tenure. Finally, the University administration should take a close look at the financial productivity of the School of Architecture to see if salary augmentation is feasible.
- d. The CERENID Bolivia mission project has been a vital component in achieving the mission objectives of the architecture programs and in fulfilling the service goals that the school has for its students for the past 15 years. This essential program should be reinstated in future summers. In addition, the University administration should design a systematic set of criteria for determining which tours and trips receive funding and give priority to those that are vital components of their hosting programs and/or have a strong mission or service emphasis.

School of Architecture Response to the Recommendations

- a. Space. The School administration continues to monitor the space needs as it relates to the changing enrollment. There continues to be positive dialog with donors who have expressed the desire to fund the construction of a new architecture building. Because of the nature of this dialog it is difficult for the School administration to press for another temporary solution. It is in the best interest of the University that a permanent solution be found, either through the donors mentioned, or through the conventional services of University Advancement.
- b. Program Assessment. The School administration is working with the office of university assessment to put in place a sound assessment policy and procedures, and is working with the architecture faculty to improve their assessment procedures.
- c. Faculty Salaries. The School of Architecture administration has reached an agreement with the University administration to grant PhD pay scale to those who hold a terminal degree (MArch) in architecture. This will be implemented at a date yet to be determined, and when this is put in place faculty salaries will improve but will still be on the low end for all architecture schools, if not still the very bottom. The School administration will continue to encourage faculty to advance in rank as a means to increasing salary.
- d. The School of Architecture administration continues to hold this mission project in high regard, and will do everything possible to ensure that it or a similar project will be part of the program in the future. It has presently submitted a budget for this tour for the summer of 2011.

In response to criterion 4.6 c. concerning developing a White Paper, the School of Architecture has had a White Paper for more than ten years. We will continue to push for its consistent use by the Rank and Continuous Appointment Committee.

The School of Architecture administration thanks the Program Review Committee for their thoughtful attention to this self-study report, the expressions of support for the program as a whole, and the helpful critique that can be used to improve the program.

Carey C Carscallen, Dean
Paula Dronen, Assistant Dean

Undergraduate Council Comment on the Recommendations

The Undergraduate council strongly supports the recommendation to reinstate the CERENID Bolivia mission project in future summers.

Graduate Council Comment on the Recommendations

The Graduate council also strongly supports the recommendation to reinstate the CERENID Bolivia mission project in future summers.