March 14, 2014

Bernadette Gray-Little, Ph.D.
Chancellor
Office of the Chancellor
University of Kansas
Strong Hall
1450 Jayhawk Boulevard, Room 230
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dear Chancellor Gray-Little:

After reviewing the Focused Evaluation Program Report submitted by University of Kansas as part of the focused evaluation of its Master of Architecture program, in conjunction with the Focused Evaluation Team Report, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has found that the changes made or planned by the program to remove the identified deficiencies are satisfactory.

The term of accreditation stands. The next visit will be in 2016. The program is released from further reporting on the items that formed the scope of the focused evaluation.

The program report and the team report must be appended to the next Architecture Program Report, which is due in September 2015. The visit in 2016 will be conducted under the terms of the 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact the NAAB office.

Very truly yours,

Shannon B. Kraus, FAIA, NCARB, MBA, FACHA
President-elect

cc: Paola Sanguinetti, Chair
Nathaniel Belcher, AIA, Lead Reviewer
Linda Kiisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP Secondary Reviewer

Enc.
University of Kansas
School of Architecture and Urban Design

Focus Evaluation Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I: (142 undergraduate credit hours plus 38 graduate credit hours)
Track II: (Baccalaureate degree plus 118 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
January 2014

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

This focused evaluation primarily concentrated on three conditions that were identified as not met by the most recent VTR for the University of Kansas:

6 Human Resources
8 Physical Resources
10 Financial Resources

In addition, several causes of concern were identified involving leadership, faculty, teaching assignments and faculty development, as well as physical resource management as a hindrance to unit cohesion. These causes of concern were included in the program report and have been subsequently added to the scope of this focused evaluation.

The focused evaluation team met in January and February of 2014 via conference calls to discuss the program report and other documentation submitted for review. In addition, the team lead held a brief conference call with the current Chair of the Architecture Department, Dr. Paola Sanguinetti, and past interim Department Chair, Nils Gore to seek clarification given the scope outlined above as well as the recent leadership change. (Specifically that Interim Chair Gore wrote the report on the eve of the arrival of the current chair.) After reviewing the materials and the conversation outlined above the team determined that a site visit would not be necessary.

The program is to be commended for making significant progress in the conditions not met. The recent retirement of five faculty members and subsequent hiring of six additional faculty members has largely changed the human resource and faculty load picture. The current construction of a building addition as well as the merger with the design department and its additive physical resources has addressed much of the physical resource commentary. The financial obligation adjustments with the central administration, development successes and the impact/use flexibility of the roll out of a differential tuition program has alleviated some of the financial resource pressures.

That said, we feel the program needs to remain vigilant about issues raised from the 2010 VTR. We also feel compelled to comment that with six new hires it seems that the program might have found opportunities to address social equity among its faculty in ways that impact a demographic imbalance concerning gender and under-represented populations in its human resource portfolio. We also want to advise the program to keep on-going conversation with its upper administration to clarify whether the beneficial financial adjustments—such as the university’s assumption of financial responsibility for utilities and maintenance of remote facilities, are stop-gap as they appear or whether the financial responsibility is structured for the long term. If not, it will be important for the program to clarify and communicate broadly within the institution a need for significant financial structure adjustment in future.

We would like to thank Chair Sanguinetti and past interim Chair Gore for their prompt, diligent and open dialogue in this effort.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Program Response to the NAAB Focused Criteria

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.

6. Human Resources

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

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

This condition is now met. Since the 2009 visit, emergency faculty teaching reassignments have been rescinded, six new tenure-line faculty have been hired, curricular opportunities for students have increased, and a professor of practice has been added. In addition, there has been a recovery from past faculty attrition, the student to FT faculty ratio has improved and greater efficiencies in the Master of Architecture curriculum demonstrate that the program now provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture.

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

This condition is now met. Since the 2009 visit: KU’s School of Architecture Design and Planning (SADP) has invested resources to develop the East Hills Construction research Labs; improved infrastructure issues through its merger with the Department of Design; acquired a classroom space for the Center for Design Research (CDR); and, reorganized and co-located its physical resources so that there are now only four main architecture program facilities. Additionally, expansion of Marvin Hall is considered a top priority in the pending university major capitol campaign.
10. **Financial Resources**

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

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

   **This condition is now met.** Since the 2009 visit, the university has been working closely with the professional Architecture program to provide relief of financial responsibility of some remote locations by providing funds to cover the cost of utilities. In addition, the program is benefitting from a 6% increase in ‘Differential Tuition’ (only begun in 2003). This increase can now be applied to personnel needs. There is a near 10% aggregate annual budget increase since FY2010 which illustrates how the professional program currently has access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources. The program is also a priority in the pending university major capitol campaign.
III. Appendices

Appendix A: The Visiting Team

Lead Reviewer, Representing the Academy
Nathaniel Quincy Belcher, AIA
Director and Professor
The H. Campbell and Eleanor R. Stuckeman
School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture
The Pennsylvania State University
121 Stuckeman Family Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-6112
(814) 863-8137 fax
nqb3@psu.edu

Secondary Reviewer, Representing the Profession
Linda Kiisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP
624 Brown Street
Healdsburg, CA 95448
(307) 760-1625
lkiisk@hotmail.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Nathaniel Quincy Belcher, AIA
Lead Reviewer

Linda Klisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP
Secondary Reviewer

Representing the Academy

Representing the Profession