May 28, 2012

Gregory L. Heileman
Associate Provost for Curriculum
Office of the Provost & Excellence
Vice President for Academic Affairs
The University of New Mexico
Scholes Hall 240
MSC05 3400
Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001

Dear Dr. Heileman,

The members of the Academic Program Review (APR) team for the Architecture
Program at the University of New Mexico respectfully submit the report on our
findings. As the APR was conducted concurrent with the NAAB Accreditation, we
chose to concentrate on the six specific questions identified in the APR Self-Study
document and reiterated in our charge letters. Our report is organized according to
those topics:

1. Departmentalization of the Architecture Program

Department Formation: According to the UNM Faculty Handbook and Constitution, a
department is formed by the faculty with the consent and advice of a dean and the
approval of the Faculty Senate. According to our conversation, at this particular time,
an Architecture Department would be approved by the current provost, Dr. Chaouki
Abdallah. Approval by the provost does not seem to be part of department formation
as stated in the UNM Constitution, but as the chain of command and flow of money
proceeds from provost to dean to program/department, it is an implicit requirement.

Autonomy: From the precedent of the UNM College of Fine Arts, where department
chairs are hiring officers, we understand that at the University of New Mexico, a
department in organizing itself, can create the procedure of having its department chair
as hiring officer. This organization would occur "with the advice and consent of the
Dean of the College" (or school). Such a policy might alleviate current perception of a
hierarchical hiring structure without redress expressed by architecture faculty. Such a
policy would be created with the consent of the Dean and is embedded in the current
bylaws of the architecture program. As a comparison, at the Universities of Arizona and
Houston, both architecture departments function with the Dean as hiring officer. The
flow of money would remain provost to dean to department at base plus, so
department status would not change monetary distribution. University wide policies
such as priorities for minority hires and spousal considerations would still pertain to a
department as to a program.

Identity: Creating a department might offer a catalyst for collaborative and cohesive decision making and thus an improvement in communication, vision, and honest appraisal of faculty capacities. A department process possibly creates unique identities and clarifies structure and hierarchies -- there are three degree granting accredited programs in the SA+P, which if they became departments, would be differentiated from certificate programs, centers, institutes etc in the SA+P. The process could include a policy for what initiates (and ends) a center, institute or program. This benefit would involve making departments out of all three degree granting accredited programs -- Planning, Landscape Architecture and Architecture -- and does not accrue if only Architecture pursues department status. The process might help coalesce an identity for architecture at UNM -- place, language, culture, ecosystem niche, technology, concentrations, etc -- could be articulated through a focused identity as part of creating a department.

Staff: There are concerns that staff status would change from their current level as admin III. According to the staff handbook and career ladder definitions, the position of administrative assistant III is the highest rank of administrative assistant, until specific assignments, like administrative assistant to the dean, are encountered. The handbook allows for in-range salary adjustments if duties are increased in time or specialization of between 3% and 7% and up to a maximum of 10%. If staff becomes assistants to a department chair, there would be a jump in recompense. Such costs would pertain to changing status from program to department, but the amount would require further study outside the scope of this report.

Summary: We currently perceive a talented and diverse architecture faculty with many specialties and capabilities. The rich resources of the faculty, dean and director are praised by students and student leaders who reiterated that they hoped we would advocate for more support for the dean and the director, for the new curriculum, and for the school as a whole. The provost also praised the community involvement and growth of the School. As the creation of a department would create support and provide a perceived status within the University community, as well as perhaps launching an internal process aimed towards cohesion, an honest assessment of capacities for the faculty, and open negotiation about the location of hiring responsibilities within the School of Architecture and Planning, it seems a very positive step forward. The faculty advocates for this step, the dean and directors receive it with positive interest, and the provost is open. This seems a good opportunity.

2. Faculty Salaries

No Raises or C.O.L.A. in at Least 3 Years: The architecture faculty indicated that they have not received any raises or cost-of-living adjustments in at least three years. Unfortunately this is part of a national problem as universities are facing budget shortfalls because of a combination of the effects of the recession and diminished government support.

Similar Salary Structure to Comparable Schools: The external reviewers from the University of Arizona and the University of Houston commented that the salary structure and recent lack of raises at the UNM Architecture Program are similar to the situation in their own programs. (A summary of national salaries is attached at the end of this report.)

Issues of Fairness and Governance are Agitating Faculty: During a meeting of the APR team with members of the UNM Architecture Program, the lack of raises, and issues of fairness, salary compression, and governance dominated the conversation. Complaints included: the impression that the university leadership kept changing and obscuring the rules regarding hiring and raises; frustration that new hires are paid higher salaries that veteran faculty; and low compensation for adjuncts. Also, faculty were concerned that an administrative position had been added at twice the salary of long term faculty. It is possible that the current inequities provide an opportunity for the School to make a strong case to the University for help in addressing these issues.

Merit Raises/Equity Raises: While understanding that resources for raises may not be available, we recommend placing a priority on making funding pools available for merit raises and equity raises. It is essential to identify those cases where circumstances have relegated faculty to receiving unfairly low salaries, and just as important to create an environment where excellence in scholarship, teaching and service are rewarded.

Process & Communication: Fairness vs. Perception of Fairness: The perception of fairness is as important as fairness itself. Written guidelines on merit raises with a peer review component, and a clear and comprehensive Faculty Handbook covering these and other relevant matters would greatly increase the perception of fairness. Administrators at all levels should place a priority on ensuring fair processes for hiring and compensation, as well as making sure that these processes are effectively communicated to the faculty.

Adjunct Compensation Issues: Architecture programs throughout the world rely heavily on local professionals who teach as adjuncts to provide a unique type of one-to-one education. Adjuncts are often compensated at lower rates than tenure-track faculty. But a comment from UNM architecture faculty members that some "GA's (graduate assistants) earn more than adjuncts," caught the attention of the APR team because that suggests a remarkably low level of compensation. It also came to the attention of the APR team that some adjuncts that may be benefits-eligible under the present rules by virtue of their current workload, and yet are not receiving fringe benefits. We strongly advise an immediate review of adjunct workloads in order to make sure that everyone adjunct faculty member who qualifies for benefits receives them.

Outside Income: Grants, Consulting, Practice, etc.: Given the likelihood that widespread raises will not happen at UNM in the foreseeable future, outside sources of income should be facilitated for architecture faculty, even if it requires changing some current rules. During the APR team's meeting with the UNM Provost, the Medical School Model of Reduced Faculty Appointments in order to facilitate increased practice was introduced as a possibility for the Architecture Program. This seems like an interesting

idea worth exploring. We also suggest that the School of Architecture and Planning organize a series of workshops and/or seminars on obtaining grants, exterior consulting, and academic practice.

3. Post-Professional Degrees

Post-professional Meccas vs. The Rest of the Schools: UNM's Master of Science (M.S.) in Architecture program's difficulty attracting students is not unique. Most institutions that offer post-professional degrees in architecture face the hard reality of competing for post-professional students with the hand-full of schools that are recognized as the meccas of post-professional architectural education in the United States.

Program Elimination vs. Strategic Research Future: Before a decision is made to eliminate an under-performing post-professional degree program, a cost and benefit analysis must be performed to determine if such elimination would result in any savings. More often than not, post-professional programs in architecture incur little, if any, additional costs since the classes taught in these programs usually are already offered to the professional graduate students. There is great potential value in an architecture school having a post-professional degree program that allows for in-depth study and substantial research participation by students.

Graduate Study Concentrations: One recurrent strategy to attract highly-qualified students is to offer graduate study concentrations that capitalize on each school's strategic advantages. The UNM architecture faculty has already identified some areas that build upon the school's faculty strengths and geographic opportunities. We suggest offering concentrations that capitalize on the school's strategic advantages of people and place. An excellent model of a previously little-known architecture program gaining national prominence for a specialty is the Auburn University design/build program (Rural Studio) that now has been featured in several books of best practices.

Certificate Synergy: The UNM architecture faculty has already identified some areas that build upon the school's faculty strengths and geographic opportunities in its successful certificate programs. Topics such as Historic Preservation are a natural for a state like New Mexico that has remarkable riches in its historic built environments. Graduate study concentrations could parallel the certificate programs and "piggy-back" on their funding to provide electives for the graduate program.

Merging with M.Archs.: At the all-school student meeting with the visiting team, some students voiced the desire to have access to graduate study concentrations as part of the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) programs. Opening the possibility of graduate study to M.Arch. students (who desire a concentration) in addition to M.S. students would all the critical mass required to develop substantial areas of concentration. Of course, placement of the required comprehensive design studio in the curriculum sequence in a way that allows the M.Arch students to also take advantage of these graduate study concentrations is not easy. *

*Note: At the University of Houston graduate study concentrations in Urban/Suburban Design, Sustainable Design, History, Theory & Criticism, Digital Systems & Fabrication, and Extreme Environments are options available to all architecture graduate students in the various programs offered (M.S., M.A., M.Arch.). In order to complete a graduate study concentration as part of a Master's Degree program in Architecture, a student must complete at least twenty-one hours of credit in the desired concentration, distributed in the following manner: three 3-hour electives (total 9-hours credit) designated as qualifying for the desired concentration; and two 6-hour architectural studios (total 12-hours credit) designated as qualifying for each concentration offered. In order to be able to provide focused-topic studios in the final year, the required professional comprehensive design studio was relocated to the next-to-last year.

Possibility of On-line M.S.: One interesting possibility to consider increase enrollment in the M.S. program would be some form of on-line degree that targets students who work full-time, or are unable to reside in Albuquerque. The Architecture Program is already offering some on-line courses successfully, providing a foundation for exploring a potential on-line degree. Business schools in particular, have developed successful hybrid on-line programs that feature weekend and/or Summer in-person components.

Ph.D. is Essential for Future of Architectural Education: Another good reason for keeping the MS and for developing Graduate Study Concentrations is because these are the transitional steps towards a Ph.D. program. While it is never easy to start a Ph.D. program, it is essential to remain a research institution in the discipline in the long run. Architecture is one of the few remaining fields in universities where professors are not expected to hold a doctorate degree, but this is already changing. Sooner or later architecture faculty will be expected to hold Ph.D's, and architecture programs in research universities should start planning for the future by planning research-intensive degrees. This is particularly important for a university like UNM that houses the only architecture program in the state to avoid marginalization.

4. Additional Facilities

Our response to this question, as it was posed by our charge letter, is folded into a broader topic that arose out of several discussions with student groups.

Learing By Doing: From three encounters with students (all-student assembly, student leaders meeting, and all-college reception), recurring requests for increased hands-on learning were noted. At the student assembly, students expressed a keen appreciation for the service-learning requirement in their curricula and enumerated the positive outcomes of those experiences; from the technical knowledge gained to the sense of satisfaction derived from community engagement. They bemoaned the fact that these episodes of learning by doing were brief and infrequent. Many expressed the desire for more of such experiences, and some suggested iterations of hands-on experiences that could increase in complexity and skill level.

Students specifically called for more design- build opportunities during the course of their educations, and cited the need for expanded fabrication lab facilities. Both of these requests were reinforced by multiple student testimonials and a long discussion with the student leaders from all three degree programs. They asked for large-scale (house sized) design-build opportunities that would afford them the venue for learning about materials assemblies, detailing of construction connections, and weatherproofing problems. They felt strongly that these learning opportunities would contribute to their careers in the short and long terms. Couched within these discussions were opinions that more of the faculty should be licensed as professional practitioners and be active practitioners, as well as requests for more depth in the bench of faculty who teach technical courses. The comment was made that one faculty member is responsible for most of the technical courses. Undergraduate Architecture students expressed the desire to have instruction in Structures earlier in their course of study. Many felt that the knowledge of construction methods and actual experience in this arena is highly valued in professional practice.

More Space: Concomitant with this emphasis on more design-build experience was a forceful call for more space for the Fabrication Lab equipment and activity. This was brought up in all student discussions, citing the fact that the lab has already been expanded once and is full to capacity again. Students identified expanded hours of operation as a partial solution to the problem of lab crowding. They recognize the necessity for a compromise between the desire for continuous access and human safety.

A combined expansion with Art is viewed by some as a possible solution to the space needs in a campus-wide perspective. The Provost suggested this would be a possibility he would be interested in seeing happen. He was not receptive to a new building, but mentioned that expansion could happen in the context of an interdisciplinary facility with Art and/or Physics.

Internship: Finally, several students discussed the desire for a formal internship class or program, to aid in internship placements, initiation of IDP program credits, and codification of policies regarding payment for services. Some reported the local culture of unpaid internships (against AIA standards). This is another way they seek hands-on learning they view as valuable to their eventual career paths.

5. On-Line Learning

The review team has little to offer in terms of advice for teaching studios or labs on-line. We have seen on-line courses successfully taught for lecture - based courses or tutorial programs (for computer aided drafting and other graphics programs, for example). However, we do recommend the development of on-line courses as a new source of tuition revenue, especially if the University of New Mexico migrates to a Responsibility Centered Management system for accounting in the future. In this system, tuition and program fees go directly to the teaching units and the units are charged for the use of facilities. therefore, the on-line courses become a way to deliver instruction with less infrastructure costs.

Students and faculty in the College agree that one-on-one instruction is best for studios and hands-on labs. But students report that many other courses can be taught adequately on-line. Examples given were "World History" courses and other lecture-based courses such as "Site and Environment". "ARCH 311: Architectural Communications II" was another identified as a reasonable candidate for on-line instruction.

Students also reported that on-line courses can provide a solution to the scheduling problems that arise when students fail or drop a course and fall behind a year because they have to repeat it. It would be helpful to be able to catch up or get ahead by taking classes on-line. This could help non-traditional students who have scheduling problems due to child care issues or employment requirements. They also suggested that high quality software tutorials (Revit, especially) would be invaluable.

From the point of view of faculty members, there is a general willingness to convert existing courses into on-line courses, but there is a lack of available time. Release time would help with course development. Some financial incentives are already offered by the university, but these are not sufficient for a course buy-out in order to gain time. The College may benefit from a cost analysis to determine whether the expense involved in course releases given to faculty in order to facilitate the development of on-line curricula would eventually be repaid by on-line course revenues from courses that could be run during the summer and managed by teaching assistants.

<u>6. Funded Research</u>

Definition: The first step in building a culture of funded research seems to be a meaningful definition of what is research for the architecture faculty. Given the diversity of the faculty, definitions would vary with discipline, but a definition process would provide leadership for the students and for the faculty as a whole. Such a process might also create a closer identification with other faculty's work and might ignite some collaborative opportunities.

Support: Both part and full time faculty expressed a desire for grant writing tutorials, and general assistance. The provost indicated an interest in generating such opportunities. Support could come in the form of help writing grants – either institutional help, like having a grant person who works with faculty, or in terms of creating competitive opportunities for faculty to win monies to buy out a course, for instance, in order to write large grants. The CFA has a "grant to write a grant" program that enables a faculty member to propose a grant s/he will write and win monies to buy out a course or pay a graduate assistant. A faculty handbook for grant writing including grant lists would be a useful resource. The CFA has created one for faculty, including help navigating the online submission process required by the University (Cayuse). A regularly updated and available spreadsheet that calculates the fringe benefits, F&A and other complexities would help all applicants. Support could also come in the form of compensation time for grant writing activities. Release time should

be a regular part of faculty contracts, to support research and scholarship before third year and tenure reviews.

Incentives: Incentives could include getting to teach option or elective studios if faculty have a research topic that is funded, or getting release time for research. Could the outreach center be developed to put out grant applications for projects that would involve faculty and pay students? Could these provide supplemental compensation for faculty as well as practice and creative opportunities? This could be place for interdisciplinary work to occur. Competitive funding through the architecture program to travel to the Architectural Research Centers Consortium/Association for Architectural Education conferences would help as well. The Architecture Program can create incentives by requiring professors to have funding to teach an option or elective studio – thus linking their teaching work and research. There could be a threshold for funding – a RAC grant might work, ($10,000) but a smaller grant not.   Or, require preparation of studio results for publication in Architectural Research Quarterly (US), International Journal of Architectural Research, (Europe) Architectural Design Research (Australasia) or other publication – a publication studio. Other incentives could include compensation -- non-University funding can provide additional salary. Inside the University there are often restrictions – for instance on RAC grants – requiring that monies go only to projects and not for compensation.

Emergent Materials Research: Students stressed their interest in emergent materials and fabrication in general. Placing a higher priority on funding CRAF+T – The creation of a center for architectural research at the SA+P and using it for product development/ think tank for emerging materials seems crucial to creating an atmosphere of funded research. This is done at many schools – MIT, University of Minnnesota, CITA http://cita.karch.dk/ (Copenhagen School of Architecture) are just a few examples. Finding a donor who would fund such a center would help, but even using the center to generate patents or other sources of manufacturing income would be an option.

Academic program development and research: An interdisciplinary PhD program in the SA+P as a whole might additionally spark a climate of research. This could provide focus towards an existing interest area rather than expanding. A possible road might be connecting the community through CRAF+T and hiring a PhD director based in action/architectural/materials research – CITA program has a 3 year PhD in overlaps of technology and architecture. The PhD could be based in CRAF+T, rather than a particular discipline, or it could borrow from the Edinburgh College of Art's models of interdisciplinary design courses.

It was our honor and pleasure to meet with students, staff, faculty, administrators and the Provost's office during our visit. We wish the best of times for this promising program and all of its participants.

Sincerely,

Mary Hardin
Associate Dean and Professor of Architecture
The University of Arizona

Rafael Longoria
Professor of Architecture
University of Houston

Catherine Harris
Assistant Professor of Art and Ecology
University of New Mexico

Appendix

Average Faculty Salaries by Rank and Gender
Total University (All Faculty)
FY 2012

Average Salaries by Rank	Low Salary	High Salary	Average Salaries					
			Total		Men		Women	
			Salary	N	Salary	N	Salary	N
Professor	$59,254	$189,699	$104,011	397	$105,085	337	$97,977	60
Associate Professor	$45,326	$127,139	$73,545	336	$75,349	215	$70,340	121
Assistant Professor	$35,968	$128,125	$62,694	336	$63,155	194	$62,063	142
Instructor	$20,910	$79,618	$44,945	206	$48,225	82	$42,776	124
Average Salary/Total N	$20,910	$189,699	$75,551	1,275	$81,909	828	$63,774	447

Historical Average Faculty Salaries
Total University

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2011	FY 2012
Low Salary	$ 22,792	$ 18,293	$ 20,400	$ 20,400	$20,910
High Salary	$162,084	$174,000	$208,880	$174,000	$189,699
Avg. Salary	$70,235	$ 72,812	$ 73,107	$ 73,231	$75,551
Total Number	1,264	1,305	1,293	1,251	1,275
Avg. Men	$75,727	$79,008	$79,957	$80,133	$81,909
Men	865	871	852	815	828
Avg. Women	$58,329	$60,377	$59,874	$60,330	$63,774
Women	399	434	441	436	447