

Name of Institution: University of Michigan

Name of Academic Unit: A. Alfred Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning

Interim Progress Report

M.Arch (non-pre-professional + 93 graduate credits)

M.Arch (pre-professional + 60 graduate credits)

Please provide contact information for the following individuals:

Program Administrator: [Sharon Haar](#)

Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., dean or department chair): Monica Ponce de Leon

Chief Academic Officer of the Institution:

President of the Institution: Mary Sue Coleman

Individual submitting the Interim Program Report: Architecture Program Chair [Sharon Haar](#)

Name of individual to whom questions should be directed: Architecture Program Chair [Sharon Haar](#)

Year of the Previous Visit: [e.g., 2012]

Current Term of Accreditation: 6 yrs

Submitted to: The National Architectural Accrediting Board

Date: September 14, 2010

NOTES:

1. All sections should be in Ariel 10 pt type. The template indicates what titles or section headings should be in **bold** and what sections should be in *italics*.
2. All reports should be formatted with 1" margins for all edges.
3. Reports should be single-spaced with appropriate spacing between paragraphs.
4. Please use the headers and footers as established in the template.
5. Reports must be submitted in PDF or Word.
6. Reports are limited to 3 MGs.
7. Instructions for submitting supplemental material are appended to that section of the report.

Table of Contents

1. Identify & Self Assessment
 - a. History Mission
 - b. Responses to the Five Perspectives
 - c. Long Range Planning
 - d. Program Self Assessment
2. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met
 - a. Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3
 - b. Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)
3. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
4. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
5. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)

1. Identity & Self Assessment

a. History Mission

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

I.1.1 History and Mission

Mission

The mission of the University of Michigan is to serve the people of Michigan and the world through preeminence in creating, communicating, and preserving the application of knowledge and artistic and academic values, and in developing leaders and citizens who will challenge the present and enrich the future.

Institutional Structure

The University of Michigan is governed by eight regents elected at large in the state. Each regent serves for eight years, without compensation, with two chosen at each biennial state election. The President of the University is a non-voting regent. In addition to the President, the executive officers of the University include the Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer; Vice President and Secretary of the University; Vice President and General Counsel; Vice Presidents for Government Relations, Development, Research, Communications, and Student Affairs; Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs; and Chancellors of the regional campuses at Flint and Dearborn.

On the Ann Arbor campus, each of the 19 schools and colleges is administered by a Dean, who is appointed by the Regents for a term of five years. The Deans report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who is directly responsible to the President of the University. In accordance with the Bylaws of the Board of Regents, all educational matters within each academic unit are the responsibility of the faculty of that unit. Considerable autonomy is granted to each unit in the organization and management of its affairs in fulfilling its educational mission. The University also operates 39 centers, 18 institutes, two bureaus, and nine hospital units in the University of Michigan Medical Center. The University's instructional staff is about 8,400 persons. Total student enrollment in the University is approximately 58,000 with approximately 41,600 on the Ann Arbor campus. Of the students on the Ann Arbor campus: 71% are undergraduates and 29% are graduate/professional; 61% are Michigan residents, 32% are out-of-state residents and 7% are international. Nearly 15,000 degrees are awarded annually. The University alumni body now exceeds 499,000 living persons.

Institutional Vision

As the University of Michigan prepares to embark on its third century, we fully embrace the legacy bestowed upon us by President James B. Angell in our first century. We are proud to offer "an uncommon education for the common man."

We are a community of learners. We serve our multiple constituents by providing access to and participation in scholarly and creative endeavors on a vast scale. Our academic research enterprise affects the world. The University is defined by a culture of interdisciplinary teaching and research, coupled with academic rigor. We encourage our students, faculty and staff to transcend disciplinary boundaries by tackling complex and vexing challenges facing modern societies at local, national and global levels.

We endorse and promote creativity in its many facets. We recognize the arts as a fundamental human need and a foundation that helps to define our future. We create new knowledge and

share the joy of discovery, and we see information technology as a powerful means for broadening access to knowledge and exchanging ideas.

We draw from study and experience to prepare our students for leadership in a wide range of social endeavors, including government, law, education, medicine and business, reflecting the University's many roles in contributing to good design and decision making within major domestic and international institutions.

We celebrate and promote diversity in all its forms, seeking the understanding and perspective that distinct life experiences bring. We proclaim ourselves a scholarly community in which ideas may be freely expressed and challenged, and all people are welcomed, respected and nurtured in their academic and social development.

We dedicate ourselves to ethical and responsible stewardship of financial, physical and environmental resources. We look for tools and strategies to create and enhance sustainable practices in all facets of operations and seek to lead in the global quest for a sustainable future.

(Excerpted from President Mary Sue Coleman's Vision Statement)

Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning

The Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning is one of 19 colleges on the Ann Arbor campus. As one of the university's smaller units, with approximately 699 total students (499 in architecture, 147 in urban planning, 14 in urban design, and 39 in the real estate certificate program), we are an intimate learning community within a large university. We benefit from collaborative opportunities with world-renowned programs (Engineering, Business, History of Art, and others) as well as funding initiatives, university-wide events, and the attraction our greater institution holds for potential students from around the world. From individual faculty collaborations to curricular initiatives that structure interdisciplinary experiences for students, the architecture program aims to benefit from the expansive virtues of the university at large while maintaining a student-centered program.

Located in Ann Arbor, a small yet culturally vibrant city, Taubman College has powerful connections to the Great Lakes region, East and West Coasts, and global partners. We also share a binding affiliation with Detroit, a raw and demanding physical environment that serves as an explicit example of America's rapidly changing cities. As a locus of diverse, vital, ethnic neighborhoods, technical innovation and artistic production, Detroit provides both inspiration and challenges to the work of our faculty and students.

The architecture program at the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning recognizes the diverse and ever-changing nature of the architect's role, with a program designed to prepare students to perceive the complex relationships between people and their environment and to translate that complexity into meaningful and relevant designs for the enrichment of human experience. Architecture's agency depends on the depth and breadth of its engagement with contemporary culture. Critical immersion provides the basis for meaningful production and is the foundation for the study of architecture at the University of Michigan.

2013-2104 Enrollment: 651 Total Students of which 518 are in the B.S. Arch., M.Arch., M.S. Arch., or Ph.D. Arch., 8 are in the Urban Design Program; and the remaining in the programs in Urban Planning

History of the College

Architecture classes were first taught at the University of Michigan in 1876, and had those courses continued uninterrupted, it would now be the third oldest architecture program in the nation, following MIT and Cornell. Because funding was not renewed, however, it was not until 1906 that architecture was permanently established as a course of study at Michigan, within the engineering school. In 1931, an independent college of architecture and design was established, offering programs in architecture, art, design, and landscape architecture, with the latter discipline migrating to the School of Natural Resources and Environment in 1965. A program in urban planning was added in 1968. The college moved from

Central Campus to a new building on North Campus in 1974, the same year that a separate School of Art & Design was established in the same building. The Master of Urban Design degree program was added in 2000. Since the mid-20th century, the college has been headed by Deans Philip N. Yountz (1957–1964), Reginald F. Malcolmson (1964–1974), Robert C. Metcalf (1974–1986), Robert M. Beckley (1987–1997), James C. Snyder (interim 1997–1998), Douglas S. Kelbaugh (1998–2008), and Monica Ponce de Leon (appointed in 2008).

A succinct timeline of historical events can be found on our website:
http://www.taubmancollege.umich.edu/about/the_college/history/

Mission of the College

At Taubman College we recognize that we are a public university with a public mission that changes in response to changing aspects of public life in the state and the nation. We are on the front lines of a shift from the manufacturing economy of the last century to a knowledge-based economy of the present and future. This geographic and economic reality encourages dynamic change, and has affected our educational mission in exciting ways. The architecture program and the Taubman College are taking this challenge head-on, investigating new methods of design and fabrication, and emphasizing the development of new educational products suited to our changing economy and the new roles our students will assume in the world beyond the academy. Because similar changes are occurring in all parts of the globe, with increasingly automated manufacturing driven by knowledge-based economies in varying locations, we feel that the vicissitudes of Michigan's history have equipped us particularly well to function as an international school of architecture. The combination of programs in architecture and urban and regional planning at the Taubman College provides a wider perspective on this change and facilitates a thoughtful, critical response to the transitions required for knowledge-based economies in all parts of the globe.

Addressing these shifting concerns for over 100 years, Taubman College offers students from the state, the country, and around the globe a complement of disciplinary and interdisciplinary degree programs that range from pre-professional to post-professional to Ph.D. Our committed and energetic faculty, staff, and students form a diverse, creative, and collaborative community within the University of Michigan, one of the world's largest and most distinguished research universities.

Taubman College seeks to improve the human condition through thoughtful design and planning for the built environment. Its academic programs prepare graduates for positions of responsibility within a wide spectrum of professions, organizations, and institutions that shape the built environment at scales ranging from local to global. Taubman College conducts innovative design and policy research and serves the community, the state, the nation, and the world through outreach and partnerships. Taubman College has a long educational tradition that combines design and technology. Today, it continues to foster a broad view of architecture and urban and regional planning in the context of a major research university where interdisciplinary initiatives are encouraged and supported.

The Architecture program pursues its mission through its curriculum (via requirements in history, theory, technology, representation, and design); research; public events (conferences, lectures, exhibitions, installations); and publications and awards. A cultivated sense of community is born of a series of regular events that continually change in their complexion and flavor: exhibitions, conferences, lectures, workshops, biannual public reviews, and an evolving web presence.

Goals of the College

Three intertwined goals provide the focus for our current direction in preparing future leaders of the profession and discipline: to link our legacy of design and technology in new ways to broaden the architect's role; to examine methods of architectural education by harnessing interdisciplinarity to reaffirm the discipline's strategic cultural and social roles; and to expand the role of architects in contemporary society; and increase their relevance to world challenges such as energy and economy. These goals underlie the research/creative work undertaken by our constituency (the diversity of faculty, students and

staff) and foster connections to a global culture, all of which coalesce to structure our curriculum and realize our mission.

Research:

Taubman College emphasizes research in all areas of its programs and curriculum. As a unit of the University, Taubman has access to a robust program of university research funding through the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR). OVPR offers a range of matching grants, and is coordinated with internal grant funding entities such as the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) and the Graduate Research Opportunities for Collaborative Spaces (GROCS). See <http://research.umich.edu/>

The College maintains a doctoral program that conducts original research in three areas: Design Studies, History and Theory, and Building Technology. In addition, design faculty can compete for internal research grants in the Research Through Making Program, inaugurated by our Dean in 2009 to advance research in design and fabrication, areas typically lacking in such funding, and to support the research efforts of architects.

Regional Outreach:

As we seek to broaden the core concerns of the architectural profession, our geographic proximity to Detroit offers valuable opportunities for engaging the contemporary world through issues ranging from the challenges of Detroit's problems with urban poverty and racial segregation, to the benefits of cultural diversity and the city's emerging successes of urban farming initiatives and small-scale fabrication innovations.

Working with urban and regional planning and urban design, the architecture program has reached out to the region of southeastern Michigan, particularly through the Detroit Community Design Center (DCDC), established in 2005, and through individual faculty efforts in Flint, Michigan. The DCDC program sponsors research in partnership with other funding agencies in the city of Detroit, teaches local high school students (NEA and donor-supported), collaborates on community design projects, and acts as a design resource for various organizations in the city.

[The work of the Detroit Community Design Center \(DCDC\) has been suspended. See Perspective E for current Regional Outreach.](#)

Global Outreach:

On the College level, international programs are in place in Beijing, China and Florence, Italy. Discussions are in the works for a relationship with the National University of Singapore and Delft University. Summer travel opportunities rotate, and have included studios in Taiwan, Argentina, Spain, Iceland, Japan, Germany, Ghana, France, and Italy. Taubman College is also a member of International Architecture and Engineering Student Training and Exchange (IAESTE), which places students in international internships and practice.

[Summer travel opportunities have expanded to include Rio de Janeiro and Mumbai.](#)

Dual Degrees:

In addition, our college has embraced the potentials of dual degrees by making it possible for Master of Architecture students to combine their architecture degree with:

- Master of Urban Planning
- Master of Urban Design
- Master of Business Administration
- Master of Engineering
- Master of Science in Design Research

[Master of Fine Arts \(hiatus 2014-2015\)](#)

Currently under development (in addition to the two-year-old Master of Science in Design Research) are new Master of Science programs in:

Historic Preservation/Conservation
Design + Health
Digital Fabrication

Material Systems

b. Responses to the Five Perspectives

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

Overview

The NAAB Five Perspectives [explained in detail below] are integrated and intertwined in our program's larger goals. As the Dean outlined in changes to the programs and letters to alumni, our student development, professional obligation and research agendas coalesce to form a place of focused debate. We must examine how architecture affects critical issues in the national agenda, the environment, housing, and infrastructure, and begin to chart a course for the future of the discipline. This will require new approaches to cultural engagement in which the disciplines of architecture and urban and regional planning will need to re-write their own rules. These changes need to begin "at home" with our own cultural institutions, namely in architecture and planning schools. At key points in the history of our fields, the academy has been a source of perspectives with which to measure and evaluate our impact upon the world. Because academia provides a lens independent of the demands of the professions, it has the potential to advance the fields in extraordinary ways.

Interdisciplinarity

Current environmental, economic, and societal crises have exposed the limits of conventional notions of specialization as a mode of research and scholarship in every field. Many disciplines are beginning to recognize this and are moving toward an interdisciplinary model of research and education. In no other area does this become more poignant than in the environmental arena. In this first decade of the 21st century, it has become clear that by looking at technological advances in isolation during the 20th century we missed their broader impact. Efficient production methods have led to the proliferation of goods, and it is now clear that our patterns of consumption have led to a disastrous impact on the globe. This is true for architecture as well as planning. In the last century, as we extolled the benefits of new materials and methods of construction in terms of their economic and material efficiency, we overlooked their impact on natural resources. For most of the 20th century we exalted the comfort and convenience of the suburbs while overlooking their impact on a larger network of natural ecosystems. Now we know that there is no easy answer to addressing environmental degradation and that the responsibility falls across many fields. Transgressing the boundaries of various disciplines may be the only way to address the complex challenges of our time.

Because of their history and their intrinsic natures, architecture and planning are best suited to develop an academic model that works across disciplines. After all, unlike most other fields, architecture is an intricate area of study that encompasses distinct fields in the sciences and the humanities, and urban planning is considered to be the first multi-disciplinary profession. It is not surprising that several schools of architecture and planning mention interdisciplinarity in their mission statements. For most institutions, however, this is limited to relationships among architecture, landscape architecture, interior design, and urban planning. Instead, the disciplines of architecture and urban planning need to re-examine their place within a larger body of knowledge that can lead to new pedagogical models. Only through new teaching

methods that work across disciplines can we enable future generations to look at design holistically, writing a new chapter in the public missions of architecture and urban planning.

Examples of how pedagogy is evolving at Taubman College:

Integrating expertise from other units on campus into core courses

The architecture program is currently revising its sequence on environmental technology. It will be taught in teams that include faculty from engineering and the School of Natural Resources (SNRE), as well as Taubman College. Other areas where we see similar opportunities are the history sequence, which could be co-taught with art history faculty, and site planning courses that could involve faculty from SNRE.

Revisiting the relationship between design instruction and the other areas of architectural expertise

This is essential in order to more closely represent contemporary professional practice. In this regard we have identified three strategies:

- Integrating studio work into other required courses. As an example, Construction II students are asked to advance their design studio project from a previous semester by developing it to a high level of technical resolution.
- Integrating various areas of expertise into studio. Studio may no longer be taught exclusively by a studio instructor but also by faculty in other areas of specialization. For instance, we are currently revising the format for the design thesis project so it will be co-taught by two instructors: a designer paired with faculty in another area such as history/theory, structures, environmental technology, or urban planning.
- Coupling design studios with courses in other areas of concentration. In the winter we are launching a pilot program that pairs a studio course with an upper level seminar in Structures. Students who enroll in the studio will be required to also enroll in the seminar. The content of the courses will be coordinated while each faculty will focus on his or her area of expertise.

Some of these initiatives have been revised as the result of information garnered from pilot programs. Nonetheless, the spirit of integration of disciplines has been maintained. Examples include:

- History/theory faculty serve as instructors in Thesis Prep classes.
- In 2014-2015 a member of the construction tech faculty will join the comprehensive studio as an unassigned, roaming studio instructor.

Taking advantage of the Cluster Hire Presidential Initiative

In 2008, President Mary Sue Coleman launched a call for interdisciplinary cluster hires, promising 100 such positions over a five-year period. Taubman College has competed and successfully secured three of these joint hires. Our first, the Sustainable Built Environment, includes a cluster of Taubman, the School of Natural Resources and the Environment, and Civil Engineering. Professor Lars Junghans will join the architecture program this fall. The other two positions will be searched for during the academic year 2011/12. Those appointments are 1) Mediterranean Perspectives on Global History (Taubman together with Romance Languages, Near Eastern Studies, History of Art, and Anthropology) and 2) Computational Media for Interactive Systems (Taubman together with Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, the School of Music, Theater and Dance, and the School of Art and Design).

The search for a Mediterranean Perspectives faculty member was unsuccessful after two years. Sean Ahlquist was hired for the position in Computational Media.

Focusing Faculty hires on Design, Environment and Urbanism

Beyond our cluster hires, there have been six tenure-track hires in Design in the last two years. These faculty hires indicate the areas in which the program desires greater depth: linking ecological and environmental issues to design prompted three recent hires of design faculty whose secondary areas of expertise embrace precisely these issues. Jen Maignet, Geoffrey Thun, and Kathy Velikov are engaged in research on topics ranging from water management to façade design to the post carbon highway). The Architecture Program's relationship to urbanity and access to current issues in the discourse, are now bolstered by the recent hiring of Mclain Clutter, Milton Curry and Sean Vance. Professor Clutter develops innovative urban modeling techniques using GIS software. Professor Curry researches the "urban subject," both philosophically and in terms of engagement with urban policy. Professor Vance specializes in Universal Design. Finally, a joint appointment of Maria Arquero with Urban and Regional Planning enables us to bring Architecture and Planning students together in studios.

New hires in these areas include: El Hadi Jazairy, Rania Ghosn, Matias del Campo, and Sharon Haar (see biographies in Supplemental Materials).

Perspective A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. *That faculty, staff and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.*

The Taubman faculty is a broadly respected and widely published group that regularly participates in worldwide events to share both knowledge and creative endeavors. In the last two years alone, our faculty have won two Progressive Architecture Awards, two National AIA Honor Awards, two Michigan AIA Honor Awards, two AIA Huron Valley Honor Awards, and seven other design awards (BSA, PRINT, OAA); published eight new books; secured three Graham Foundation grants; juried three international competitions (including Smithsonian's National Design Awards and US Artists), exhibited their own work in four international and seven national venues; delivered four keynote addresses at conferences; lectured on their own work at twenty five institutions, presented twenty four papers at disciplinary and interdisciplinary conferences; won five fellowships at institutes and centers here and abroad; and were published or cited in design magazines on numerous occasions. Additionally in the past two years, several of our faculty members have been invited to sit on editorial boards of academic journals. Scholarship is a wide and expanding field in which University of Michigan faculty continue to lead and contribute. A complete listing of faculty activities will be available in the Team room.

Whether directly in individual courses, indirectly through course presentations at the start of each semester, or in open house venues, brown bag lectures, local exhibitions, or through wider publication, our students have multiple venues for exposure to the research and design work of Taubman faculty.

Middle_Out, a volume cataloguing the work of our design faculty and edited by Professor Jason Young, was released in 2009. As a compilation, *Middle_Out* is simultaneously a testament to the strength of the faculty and an affirmation of the bond between Taubman College members present and past. Young describes the book and its goals in his preface to the book:

The Architecture Program at the University of Michigan is defined, in part, by the creative work done by design faculty through private practice. Inadequate on its own to fully account for the intensity of the school, these practices nevertheless pressurize the collective conversations within the curriculum. Much of the work speaks to recent contexts of economy and geography in southeastern Michigan through small-scale, design+build projects. Simultaneously, there is a

strong collection of projects that openly game with digital organization, fabrication, and assembly as it relates to projects of all scales. Pacing these two strands in the book is a third that exemplifies an intellectual preoccupation with representational methods and diverse conceptions of making. Together, these three strands offer a robust approximation of the [Michigan faculty].

The culture of having students work with, among, and alongside faculty is engrained in the Architecture program, including the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program sponsored by the University, and, within the College, increasing numbers of graduate research assistants (GSRAs) and graduate student instructors (GSIs), and new positions for doctoral students, the student publication *Dimensions*, design competitions, and ULI (the Urban Land Institute). These initiatives have expanded with our recent changes in leadership. In particular, Dean Ponce de Leon launched a new research initiative, "Research Through Making," which funds five to six competitively awarded proposals. In turn, faculty awarded these grants have used part of the funding to hire our students to carry out portions of the research and fabrication. This renewed and invigorating atmosphere of research funding is also spurring more grant proposals by our faculty

Research Through Making:

Historically, research and creative practice have been constructed as "opposites." This is not an unusual struggle in architecture schools, particularly in the context of a research university. Moreover, this perceived tension between design and research is indicative of an age-old struggle within the field of architecture to understand its own nature as an "applied art." The boundary between the "art" and its "application" has always been an existential crisis for the field. In some instances, design can be a purely creative activity not unlike creative practices in music and art. In other cases, design can be a purely problem solving activity, not unlike research in engineering and industrial production. The boundaries between these activities are never clear, since their methods and techniques in the context of design are ultimately very similar.

The Research Through Making Faculty Research Grant Program at the University of Michigan seeks to set aside these struggles by acknowledging MAKING as the common denominator that cuts across the imaginary boundaries between design and research.

Faculty from the Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning compete for a limited number of grants. Entries are evaluated by a distinguished jury from outside the College that has, in the past, included Sarah Herda Executive – Director of the Graham foundation, Reed Kroloff – Director of the Cranbrook Academy of Art and Art Museum, and Catherine Seavitt-Nordenson – Visiting Professor at Cooper Union.

The recipients of the 2009 Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning "Research Through Making Grants", totaling \$120,000 were:

Robert Adams, Assistant Professor. Project: "Spontaneous Mutations, Genetic Deletions, Adaptive Environments, and Assistive Technology in the Compression of Developmental Time."

Josh Bard, Lecturer; Steven Mankouche, Assistant Professor; and Tsz Yan Ng, Lecturer. Project: "Digital Steam Bending." The concept was used as a basis for a project that received a 2010 *Architect Magazine* Fourth Annual R+D Award.

Karl Daubmann, Associate Professor of Architecture and Art & Design. Project: "In Search of the (w)hole." Daubmann's project received a 2010 AIA Small Project Practitioners Design Award and a 2010 *Architect Magazine* 2010 R+D Award.

Nataly Gattegno and Jason Johnson, 2009-2010 Architecture Fellows. Project: "Aurora Project." Aurora was an extension of their work as Van Alen Institute 2008-09 New York

Prize Fellows.

Perry Kulper, Associate Professor. Project: " Spatial Blooms + Here Be Dragons"

Keith Mitnick, Associate Professor and Mireille Roddier, Assistant Professor. Project: "Heterogeneous Constructions."

"Research Through Making" was continued and \$100,000 was awarded to faculty for the following project concepts with a scheduled exhibit to occur in winter 2011:

Craig Borum, Associate Professor. Project: "Storm Glass"
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/rtm/2010_grant_storm_glass.pdf

Geoff Thun, Associate Professor, and Kathy Velikov, Assistant Professor. Project: "Stratus" http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/rtm/2010_grant_stratus.pdf

Maria Arquero, Assistant Architecture and Urban Planning Professor, and Jen Maigret, Assistant Professor. Project: "WATERSHED (or) Wrapping Sheds with Water"
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/rtm/2010_grant_watershed.pdf

Vivian Lee, Lecture. Project: " Hair, Spikes, Heather and Sedge: the research of thatch through Making" http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/rtm/2010_grant_hair_spikes.pdf

Maciej Kaczynski, Lecturer; Wes McGee, Lecturer; and Dave Pigram, Visiting Professor of Architecture. Project: " Re-vault: Extending from finding with computation, ecological and robotic fabrication" http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/rtm/2010_grant_revault.pdf

The "Research Through Making" grants have continued and are now augmented by "Research on the City " grants, which enables collaboration with faculty in urban design and urban planning:

"Research Through Making", 2011

Glass Cast, Catie Newell and Wes McGee
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/glass_cast/

Ruralopolitan Maneuvers / HOUSE 50, Mary-Ann Ray and Robert Mangurian
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/ruralopolitan_maneuvers/

Dirty Work, Neal Robinson
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/dirty_work/

Morphfaux... recovering plaster as architectural substrate, Steven Mankouche, Josh Bard, Matthew Schulte
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/morphfaux/

Resonant Chamber, Geoff Thün, Kathy Velikov and Wes McGee
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/resonant_chamber/

“Research Through Making”, 2012

Electroform(alism): Masters, substrates and the rules of attraction, Jean-Louis Farges and Anya Sirota
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/electroformalism_masters_substrates_and_rules_attractio/

Empty Pavilion, McLain Clutter and Kyle Reynolds (University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/empty_pavilion/

(DE)COMPOSING TERRITORY: Enclosure as a negotiation between bioplastics + environments, Meredith Miller
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/decomposing_territory_enclosure_negotiation_between_bio/

Crease, Fold, Pour: Advancing Flexible Formwork with Digital Fabrication and Origami Folding, Maciej Kaczynski
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_rough_making_grant/crease_fold_pour_advancing_flexible_formwork_origami_fo/

Platform for Architecture & Makin' It, A Situation Comedy, John McMorrough and Julia McMorrough
taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_through_making_grant/platform_architecture_makin_it_situation_comedy/

“Research on the City”, 2012

A Dozen Playgrounds, Jennifer Maignet, María Arquero de Alarcón, R. Charles Dersheimer (School of Education)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_city_grant/dozen_playgrounds/

Atlas of Love and Hate: Detroit Geographies, Steven Mankouche, Andrew Herscher, Andrew Thompson (School of Art & Design)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_city_grant/atlas_love_and_hate_detroit_geographies/

Geographies of Trash, El Hadi Jazairy, Rania Ghosn, Sangyun Lee (School of Natural Resources and Environment)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_city_grant/geographies_trash/

Imaging Detroit, Anya Sirota, Mireille Roddier, Jean Louis Farges, Lada Adamic (School of Information & Center for the Study of Complex Systems)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_city_grant/imaging_detroit/

Re: Tool-Kit for Detroit, Heidi Beebe, Julia McMorrough, Seth Ellis (School of Art & Design), John Marshall (School of Art & Design)
http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/resources/research_outreach_and_funding/research_city_grant/re_tool_kit_detroit/

“Research on the City”, 2013

Great Lakes Cities on the Shore, Maria Arquero, Jen Maigret, Richard Norton and Lorelle A. Meadows (College of Engineering).

Assessment of Community Development Corporations, Harley Etienne and Dale Thomson (College of Arts, Sciences and Letters, The University of Michigan-Dearborn)

Detroit Dis(s)census, McLain Clutter, Matt Kenyon (School of Art and Design) and Andrew Hupp (Institute for Social Research)

Finance, Risk and the Metropolitan Form: Theory and Evidence from Cities and Suburbs in Michigan, David Bieri, Robert Fishman, Michael Barr (Law School and School of Public Policy), Gerald Davis (School of Business), and Greta Krippner (College of Literature, Science & Arts)

Learning From Lollapalooza, Thom Moran and Bruce Conforth (College of Literature, Science & Arts)

In recent years the university has incentivized interdisciplinary research through several initiatives. The M-cubed program has supported projects between architecture faculty and faculty in: Humanities, Kinesiology, School of Information, College of Engineering, the Institute for Social Research, and the Medical School.

Perspective B. Architectural Education and Students. *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices; and to develop the habit of lifelong learning.*

Student experience is at the heart of our mission. Students are central to shaping their own educational experience and in turn affecting experiences for future generations through distributed participation in the life of the institution. Students are integrated into every facet of the program, from discussions of curricular reform to serving as committee members for the daily operation of program matters. Designated representatives attend faculty meetings, report to their constituencies, and air concerns.

Student groups are often allocated an annual budget that they must manage. They decide how to distribute resources (for example, offsetting travel costs for all AIAS members or fully funding one or two). The Architectural Representative Committee (ARC) meets with the Chair weekly. This is an elected student group with representatives from each studio section.

As the social, political and environmental issues confronting us have changed considerably in recent times, our program has responded by increasing our efforts in the areas of sustainability and building technology, expanding our travel abroad offerings to sites in Africa and Asia as well as Europe and Scandinavia, and launching innovative courses with our permanent faculty as well as visiting professors, thereby providing experiences with other schools and countries that prepare students to successfully work and live in the world. Along with a robust set of course offerings, the school offers numerous opportunities for students to interact with faculty in different ways, including: Graduate Student Instructor positions, faculty advising, and student representatives on most faculty committees. In each of these settings, students are exposed to different facets of academic life in which they consider and debate the impact of architectural education upon the world. In addition to faculty-student committees, we have a strong culture of participation in numerous student organizations including: ARC, Alpha Rho Chi, NOMAS, and AIAS.

Financial support for students is an important means for helping students to achieve. In addition to student scholarships (funded in large measure by income from the Taubman Endowment), travel subsidies for courses, teaching opportunities and research collaborations with faculty, the school offers numerous yearly competitions in which students have the opportunity to distinguish themselves among their peers and receive monetary support for such things as future projects and travel. These include the Willike Portfolio Competition, the Booth Travelling Fellowship and, most recently, a new writing competition and a design competition for a magazine rack to be created for a new student reading area. Along with these competitions, students have opportunities to broadcast their work publicly through various exhibits and participation in the annual student-run architecture journal *Dimensions*, or the college-wide student-run newsletter &. Our school also offers a strong set of affiliations with alumni in the form of winter semester internships, competitions and annual events in which former graduates share their experiences of professional practice with current students.

Perspective C: Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located; and prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).*

The University of Michigan TCAUP exposes architecture students to the culture and structure of the profession's regulatory environment through a combination of courses, programs and student services. Studios within the school's sequence, such as our comprehensive design studio, seek to ensure that students are prepared to productively enter the professional environment upon graduation and begin the IDP process. Students are educated in the structure of the profession's regulatory environment – the role of the registration board and the IDP process – in the school's Professional Practice course, which is taught by Professor Eric Hill. Professor Hill is also the school's IDP Educator Coordinator, and is funded to attend the annual IDP Coordinator's Conference in order stay up to date as a trusted resource for the school about the IDP process. The school also offers a series of programs and services that expose students to the profession, organized by our Student Career Counselor, Beth Berenter. Each year the school sponsors a Spring Break Externship Program, which places students in a one-week unpaid externship in companies and organizations across the country. In 2010, this program placed 165 students in 150 different firms. This experience exposes students to the culture and environment of the profession, and those who participate each year of their education can graduate with exposure to a variety of offices. Throughout the year, the school also offers a series of workshops, alumni brown bag discussions, and career panels to assist students in developing job search skills, preparing for interviews, and exploring career options. Each year the school also hosts a Career and Networking Fair, which draws representatives from offices around the country to meet with and interview our students. Beyond these organized events that are meant to expose students to the profession, the school's Career Counselor is available to discuss with students the transition from school to the professional environment, and to help in that transition.

(See 1.2.1 for details on our career services and spring break externships)

The Spring Break Externship Program has expanded each year. In Spring 2013 179 architecture students were hosted by 164 firms. In Spring 2014 we hope to place 225 students.

Perspective D: Architectural Education and the Profession *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the positive impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities; and to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.*

Changes in the profession are clearly ongoing, but as a program we try to both anticipate and shape those directions from our positions as educators. The architecture program views education as a lifelong process, and likewise we offer several strategies for transitioning to the profession, securing employment, understanding the internship and licensing process, and maintaining an overall positive outlook in a dire economic time.

Studio topics and assignments are widely varied and involve students in focused investigations (of particular places where environmental issues weigh heavily; of phenomena such as the urban perimeter; of community involvement in places such as Detroit and Columbus, Indiana) which require them to work with others (consultants, one another, community institutions and members) in collaborative roles. Interdisciplinary studios, where two or more faculty join classes, are another mechanism for understanding the diverse roles of an architect. We have had planners, engineers, artists, historians, and fabricators, all working with architects in such courses.

Methods of exchange in the studio context – group critiques, desk crits, “cross-checks” (with a roaming critique by students of all work pinned up simultaneously), student led discussions – put students in various roles with respect to their work and the work of their peers.

Our study abroad opportunities continue to develop and expand. This past year two options for semester-long study were offered, our ongoing program in Florence, and a new one at B.A.S.E in Beijing. Spring travelling electives took students to Japan, Taiwan, Spain, Italy, China, France, and Iceland. Each year, interested faculty propose a new set of destinations. Open presentations are made to students early in the winter semester, after which they ballot for their top choices. The annual Urban Land Institute Gerald D. Hines Student Urban Design Competition has regularly drawn multiple entries from our college. Planning and Architecture students, together with Landscape Architecture and MBA students, form teams and receive supervision from College faculty members. This past year (winter 2010), our students led nine teams representing the University of Michigan in the challenge of “Transforming the East Village, San Diego, California.”

The University has closed its facility in Florence. We are currently looking for alternative venues for semester-long study abroad programs. Spring traveling electives continue to evolve. Spring 2014 opportunities include courses in Ghana and South Africa and a course that follows the work of Albert Kahn through Europe and the former Soviet Union.

In 2014 an MUD and March studio will represent the College in Vertical Cities Asia with student projects focused on Mumbai.

During our open house, we fly in every admitted student to the graduate program for a visit, and tours of local firms are conducted. In addition to exposing them to the culture of the place, it deepens their understanding of the context in which their education is operating.

Admitted students who attend open house are offered a \$300 stipend toward the cost of their travel.

The availability of our Real Estate Certificate Program also gives students a chance to deepen their awareness and understanding of the profession in a larger context. With required courses from law to business to design, this program combines skills to position graduates as effective leaders shaping the environment in ways beyond design.

Summary of ways students engage the profession:

Through Architecture Program curriculum:

Professional Practice course and regional firm analysis
Fab Lab
Design/Build summer studios
Curriculum (pro-practice, etc)
Interdisciplinary studios (with Environmental Technology, with Structures, and Regional Planning)
Real Estate Certificate

Through Architecture Program services:

Governing Board Student Show Jury
Career Services Office
Externships
Career Fair
Detroit Design Center
Local office visits (during recruitment)
Shadow program

Through faculty mentored extra-curricular activities:

Freedom by Design
Design/Build competition (class gift)
AIAS, NOMAS
ULI/Hines Competition
ARC

Perspective E. Architectural Education and the Public Good: *That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architects obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.*

Taubman College provides students with myriad opportunities to both understand the ethical implications of their professional decisions and nurture a climate of civic engagement. The Architecture Program's commitment to the public good is demonstrated at various levels throughout the college, both formally and informally. In particular, it can be seen in our commitment to engage the city and metropolitan region of Detroit as a real-world setting for experiential and service learning, research, and outreach corresponding to the mission of the University as a vital public institution; at the same time, similar engagements also extend outwards, to a series of sites across the globe where students are able to learn about and contribute to other communities, peoples and societies.

The University of Michigan Taubman Architecture High School Program (TAHS) – administered by the A. Alfred Taubman College of Architecture and Urban Planning, U-M School of Education, and Detroit Public Schools - is an innovative college course for high school credit in mathematics and art focused on architecture, design thinking, and affiliated skills in mathematics, visual art and communication. The program provides integrated academic and career-focused learning, work-based learning and exposure to the world of work, and robust employer engagement. TAHS is a full-year college and high school credit program offered in the City of Detroit, 3 hours per day, 5 days per week, to 7 participating high schools. The College has operated an After School Program for High School Students in Detroit from 2007-2013, and will continue the program again in the upcoming academic year.

The establishment of the Detroit Community Design Center in 2005 initiated the Program's extension of professional design and planning services, as well as educational programs and

community outreach to organizations working in the city's most distressed communities. In undergraduate and graduate option and required studios, students focus on issues and settings crucial to Detroit's present and future well-being. Our design/build summer studios investigate and address specific public concerns through a hands-on, practical approach. Further afield from our region, the Program actively supports Habitat for Humanity and Architecture for Humanity as key venues for developing a reciprocal understanding among students, teachers and members of non-academic communities who do not ordinarily have access to the skills and resources of architects. In client-based service and experiential learning opportunities such as these, students are invited to learn to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the broader public and/or civic realms; these experiences also help establish a commitment to professional and public service and leadership early in the students' careers.

The Detroit Community Design Center has closed and we no longer offer the design/build summer studio. However, students continue to work on issues and in settings crucial to Detroit's contemporary circumstances. The "Research on the City" grants enable faculty to expand their research in Detroit and the Great Lakes Region.

To acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges, students and faculty must also engage the world at large. Knowledge and skills necessary to train effective global leaders are cultivated through a curriculum rich with international content, both in Ann Arbor and abroad; indeed, a large percentage of our students participate in Spring and Summer studios abroad and in our standing semester-long programs in Florence, Italy, and Beijing, China. In recent years, faculty-led studios have also been offered in China, Ghana, India, Japan, Spain, Argentina, Brazil, Iceland, Hong Kong and Italy, among other places. Due in part to the broadening of personal and institutional networks that grow out of our study abroad experiences, the college has seen a substantial increase in applications and enrollment from other countries, something that further enriches our efforts to engage the world around us and to learn and act responsibly in the broadest sense possible. In the end, to be effective globally one must also work where one resides, bringing knowledge about the world back home and apply its principles to the local situation. In courses like "Architects of Culture," which explores the ethical, social and political realms of practice, as well as those on colonial and post-colonial architecture, post-conflict reconstruction, architecture and violence, and many others, students are invited to become active, engaged citizens and to nurture a climate of professional leadership both here and abroad. In addition, a newly established studio track will focus on politics and culture throughout the series of studios that comprise the Master of Architecture curriculum, allowing students on this track to apply perspectives gained in lecture and seminar classes on social responsibility to design imagination and practice.

c. Long Range Planning

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

I.1.4. Long-Range Planning

New leadership at both the Dean and Chair levels (Dean Monica Ponce de Leon and Chair John McMorrough) since our last accreditation visit coincides with timely self-reflection and opportunities for mapping our future. Looking closely within the program itself (for example, through focused curricular discussion) and from the outside, through orchestration of public debate - including a series of "Futures" conferences that are bringing top thinkers to Michigan ("Future of Technology" this fall, which follows on the heels of "Future of Design" and "Future of Urbanism") - we are in the process of actively reevaluating our priorities.

Long-range planning is intimately connected to our institutional mission and goals discussed earlier (section I.1.1) and with our response to the Five Perspectives. The architecture program uses several means of identifying objectives and mechanisms for improvement, some with a regular predictable rhythm

(faculty meetings, task forces, committees) and others at larger intervals, such as internal and external university assessments. The five perspectives are integrated to varying degrees into our planning, such as the aspiration to weave social justice and sustainability into several courses, if not across the entire curriculum.

Architecture is at a critical point in its history. Environmental issues are bringing into question old modes of thinking and exposing the limits of how these fields were conceived. It is clear that our patterns of consumption have led to a disastrous impact on the globe. Buildings and their proliferation in the landscape have played a critical role in the creation of the problem. Architects must take responsibility and provide leadership if a true solution is to be achieved.

Technological advances are dramatically influencing architecture and urban planning; as a result the fields are poised to undergo dramatic changes over the next decade. Digitization continues to transform the way we imagine space, transfer information, and construct our material reality. Technology is transforming the building industry, and these changes impact the way buildings, sites and cities are conceptualized and developed. Just as the digital revolution of the '80s affected the way we represent buildings and sites, digital technology is rapidly changing the way building components are fabricated and assembled.

The diversity of the faculty, its breadth of knowledge and expertise, are fundamental to considering the cultural impact and relevance of our fields. In addition, the university as a whole has a long history of commitment to research and interdisciplinarity, two traditions that will be the key to addressing ongoing transformations in our fields.

During the last two years, faculty have participated in a series of brainstorming sessions to look at the history of academic components, how other schools are currently approaching them, and how each impacts its field. Together we are beginning to formulate answers to the question "can we do better?" Most of the topics for these brainstorming sessions have come out of one-on-one meetings with the faculty and out of conversations with the Chairs prior to the beginning of each term.

Distinct metrics guide our sense of direction and accomplishment. The quality of our faculty and students is our most important asset. Accomplishments of the faculty are submitted through annual faculty activity reports (FARs) that illuminate individual achievement, allowing the program to summarize its collective impact in external publications and media, such as our College website, *Portico*, *ACSA News*, and internal publications such as *Middle Out*, Michigan Fellowships, and the Michigan Architecture Papers (MAP) series.

Evaluating teaching performance each semester takes the primary form of course evaluations. This process has moved to an online response and collection system. Students have a well-publicized time frame to log in and evaluate their teachers, both numerically and qualitatively through prose. Faculty are able to view these evaluations after grades have been submitted for the term. Additionally, college administrators also have reading access and use the University Committee's data to inform one-on-one mentoring sessions with the Chair, as well as using the information to shape teaching assignments. The data are conveyed in various ways relative to both college-wide and university-wide averages, enabling faculty members to comprehend relative comparisons.

Two years ago when the Dean shared her response to the University assessment of our College, faculty discussed the strategies for addressing concerns and endorsed experimenting with new models of education.

The ratio of faculty to student is another factor that has warranted considerable attention this past year. Studios sizes, for example, have dropped from an average of fifteen or sixteen students to a maximum of twelve. Providing the physical atmosphere and space for optimizing instruction, research, and interaction among constituents and activities is also a priority. This topic was addressed with a thorough report from the space planning committee this year. (see Physical Resources for details)

Each year following the admissions season, the admissions staff compiles a report summarizing details of our applicants, including the standard metrics of test score averages, grade point averages, acceptance rates, and yield rates. More significantly, it includes information concerning those applicants who chose not to attend, why they did not choose Michigan, and in most cases, which institution they did choose. These details enable a more focused comparison of institutional image, curricula, financial aid packages, recruitment efforts, and admissions processes. The report is shared at faculty meetings or in smaller committees whose charge is recruitment.

Studio schedules have been rearranged to decrease pressure on studio review spaces and other facilities. The master plan for an addition to the building is also complete; fund-raising to build the addition is in its final stages. The addition will, among other things, add office space and enable the expansion of studio spaces and other facilities in our current building.

d. Program Self Assessment

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

I.1.5. Self-Assessment Procedures

At the start of each academic year, a faculty meeting provides a context for outlining and reminding faculty of our larger goals, both specific for the year (such as planning two international conferences, fulfilling additional space requirements, or considering the directions of curricular reform by establishing focused topics, such as how drawing integrates across levels of instruction) and with longer term implications (initiating discussions of new programs such as the expanded Master of Science postprofessional degrees or ideas about the role of thesis in the graduate program, etc).

In her first year, the Dean established several faculty committees charged with self-assessment, followed by suggestions for improvement. These committees include the Technology Committee, Space Planning Committee, Interdisciplinary Committee and the Detroit Group. These committees included faculty, staff and students. These committees, some of which are ongoing, report to the Dean and Chairs. The technology committee, in particular, generates concrete goals that are being addressed with equipment and software purchases for student and faculty use.

Results of faculty, student and graduate assessment of both our curriculum and the broader context in which we operate are gathered in several ways: 1) Through meetings with external groups, such as the regular board of governors – the alumni board – who convene twice a year. (These dedicated volunteers, who subsidize their own visit, spend a full day hearing program reports, reviewing and judging student work, and interviewing and meeting with students); and 2) Internally with student groups who meet weekly with the architecture Chair to report concerns with class offerings and suggest specific curricular ideas. We recently launched a series of spring (most institutions call them summer) courses at the repeated request of graduates who wanted the opportunity to bear lighter course loads at thesis time for better concentration and performance.

A comprehensive survey issued to recent graduates (2008 - present) illuminates strengths (and weaknesses) of program preparation in relation to the Five Perspectives. Based upon a fairly high response rate (more than one third of each class responding), we find strengths in preparing students to continue asking questions and examining themselves in relation to their contexts. The responding cohort averages 4.79 out of 5.00 (for 2010 graduates) and 4.66 (2008-2009 graduates) when asked whether they were “well prepared” (5.0), “somewhat prepared” (3.0) or unprepared (1.0) to continue a habit of lifelong learning. (See Appendix 1: Comprehensive Student Survey). Additionally the second and third highest rankings for preparedness in the same survey are “responding to the needs of a diverse and changing world” and “contributing to the growth and development of the profession.” Taken together they

suggest that instilling a love for learning yields increased contributions to and involvement in the profession at large.

Another recent structural mechanism for self-assessment is an end of term internal review of studio work by level, involving the studio faculty and the Chair, with no students present. For example, the third-semester undergraduate studio professors gather and pin up examples of high pass and minimum pass student work. The point is not only to compare head-to-head studio results from across the various sections, but also to revisit objectives, successes, how work is leading to the goals for the next term, and what skills and concepts are missing or need to be reinforced. This review also insures that grades are equitably distributed across the various studios. This is proving to be a charged, energetic session with curricular and personal implications. Teachers seeing themselves directly through the student work and in relation to their peers is immensely revealing, initiating discussion of such issues as proper times to shift scales, how many models should be required, and specific types of drawing and media to be utilized.

This past year we instituted an annual accreditation review retreat, where NAAB criteria are pinned to the wall, faculty indicate where they feel their classes make contributions, and then we discuss each criterion through the lens of all course offerings. This provides faculty members with a valuable overview of their individual roles within the broader curricular structure.

Institutional Assessment

The University of Michigan requires an internal assessment of each of its colleges at least once every ten years. This is a rigorous undertaking staffed and initiated by the Office of the Provost. Our College underwent such an assessment in 2007-08. Two teams (one internal to the University and one external) reviewed our college by reading a comprehensive strategic assessment, conducting a series of interviews with faculty, students, and staff, and by observing design reviews. Each of the final reports offers critical and constructive views of the architecture program with several key comments highlighting their conclusions.

Quoting from the external report dated June 12, 2008 signed by external assessment committee chair, Gary Hack:

The Taubman College of Architecture/Urban Planning at the University of Michigan has made extraordinary progress over the last ten years. It has risen from a capable but undistinguished set of programs in the late 1990s to one of the very top programs of its sort in the country in 2008. By any quantifiable measure the transformation is extremely impressive. Three dozen outstanding tenured and tenure-track personnel have been hired reflecting a 75% turnover in faculty. Faculty are extremely prolific, producing more books and design recognitions in the last decade than in the previous nine decades of the college. Students come into the college with much higher test scores than before and garner more prizes, honors and awards while in their programs than their predecessors. They also receive two and a half times more financial aid than ten years ago.

Following these reviews, we undertook an in-depth self study comparing our curriculum to numerous peer institutions, including graduate architecture programs at Harvard, University of Cincinnati, Columbia, MIT, Yale, Cornell, Washington University in St. Louis, Virginia Tech, and UT Austin. We also gathered information on undergraduate architecture programs at Rice, Cooper Union, UT Austin, University of Arkansas, University of Cincinnati, Penn State, Cornell, USC, RISD, and Syracuse.

[This study will be renewed in Spring 2014.](#)

Color coding areas such as environmental technology (ET), drawing/representation, design, and history/theory, and marking their places in various curricula, allows a quick scan across both time and institution. In other words, one could quickly surmise that ET enters the graduate radar sooner at institution x, or is scattered throughout three years of study at institution y. In this review, drawing seems to be less emphasized at most institutions, for example.

Embedded in the Space Planning Committee and the Technology Task Force reports are detailed comparisons to our peer institutions. These reports will be available in the team room.

In June 2010 the University of Michigan received renewal of accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools for another 10 years. The HLC report is available on line at:
<http://www.accreditation.umich.edu/portrait/HLCreport.php>

A set of methods for assessing curricular achievement and development remains in place: an annual exhibition of student design work; end of semester reviews by coordinators in consultation with the Chair; course evaluations providing feedback to faculty as well as to Chair, Associate Dean and the Dean; and weekly meetings with ARC (Architecture Representative Council). Through formal and informal discussions, these moments when we look at ourselves through student work bear directly on decisions about coordination of studio topics, methods of carrying out a thesis project, or how both the pre-thesis seminar and the culminating thesis studio are staffed.

Student evaluations indicate a very positive reaction to the inclusion of a civil engineering faculty member on the instruction team for the introductory environmental sequences (Sustainable Systems I and II).

The annual juried student exhibit cuts a swath throughout the entire studio curriculum, enabling crossreferencing and a series of feedback sessions. Faculty meet around the work in teaching teams, the alumni board visits during the exhibition and judges the work publicly, and faculty tour current classes through the exhibit as a set of examples of what to do or not do, as the case may be.

Particular courses offer a fine grain assessment. Conceptual logics that structure design solutions in studio are tested as they are developed in construction courses. Construction II (Arch 427) requires comprehensive development of an earlier studio project. Such simple structural arrangement provokes reflection and interaction among different teaching constituencies and illuminates issues of pacing, for example, how quickly to jump into massing models at the urban scale, or when to address building interiors for consideration of the experiences they might foster.

Results from early experiments:

As mentioned in the overview in I.1.3, last year we tested a new model for teaching a thesis development seminar. A group of four faculty (one history/theory and one technology faculty member paired with two designers) was assigned to teach a group of 24 students, who balloted to participate in the group based on themes and interests presented by the faculty. This model proved too expensive, but a version of this idea, in which two pairs of designers with related interests are paired, remains. Other results from pairing seminar courses with studios were successful according to student course evaluation numbers, and faculty concluded that student work reached greater levels of development in these instances.

Another proposal endorsed by faculty was to increase the college-wide course offerings in order to expand our undergraduate program and make our areas of expertise more accessible to other units. We are accomplishing this with two new offerings: one entirely new course, called Architecture and the City (to be taught on central campus in the winter of 2011) and a second time slot for an already existing course called Understanding Architecture (now taught in both fall and winter semesters instead of only winter).

2. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met from the Most Recent Visiting Team Report

- a. **Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3**
A.4 Technical Documentation
- b. **Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)**
None

3. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern from the Most Recent Visiting Team Report

There were no official causes of concern in the 2007 VTR however we have addressed some of our own.

Lingering Causes for Concern:

In the 2005 VTR there were a number of overarching causes of concern that linked previous concerns in 1999 to similar concerns in 2005. We continue to monitor these concerns, although not specifically raised again by NAAB in the interim review in 2007.

Assessment Process

Please see the section on self-assessment, as this represents one of our more important concentrations this past year. Many structural changes are underway or already in place for addressing this key dimension of our program.

Breadth versus Depth in the Curriculum

“Too much breadth can come at the expense of depth.” Current revisions to the graduate curriculum address this concern at the scale of individual courses. The array of required courses (theory, site operations, professional practice, building systems, representation, etc.) is not only broad, but also deep in terms of skill acquisition and content within each topic.

Student Advising

Several new mechanisms are in place to insure that each student feels he/she is being adequately advised. Advising takes multiple forms, ranging from tracking student progress through the curricular requirements, to scheduling those courses, counseling students on elective options, and guiding career and life decisions.

The majority of faculty are now advisors. This includes virtually all design faculty, most of the building technology faculty, and a number of history/theory faculty. The College Registrar creates an advisee/advisor list in Wolverine Access (our University-wide program for all academic business, including student registration) that pairs each student with an advisor prior to the start of classes each fall. Likewise, each faculty member receives a list of advisees prior to the start of school.

A mandatory meeting of all advisors with the Chair during the first week of classes orients them toward their obligations, which include posting regular office hours for student visits during the term, announcing a group meeting at the start of each term, scheduling individual meetings with advisees, and explaining updates/changes to the program planning forms that advisors must sign for each student at the end of every term to insure satisfactory progress toward graduation.

Additionally, the college is adding a new staff position titled Academic Advisor/Counselor, for which there is a search currently underway. This represents a major shift to embrace a more holistic view of “advising,” including overall well-being, time management issues, career options and opportunities to discuss any other struggles. The intention is to create a consistent, visible presence so students know there is always a trained professional with whom to talk. This is a permanent position and represents a serious move to address prior concerns regarding student advising. Specifically, the duties of this individual will include:

As a member of the Student Services Team, Faculty and Student Advising:

- Counsel students with academic and/or personal issues;
- Advise enrolled students and faculty and disseminate information regarding academic requirements and procedures;

- Review and counsel students on possible changes in status, such as leaves of absence, withdrawals or a reduction to part-time status;
- Facilitate communication when necessary with academic departments and other University resources such as University Health Services, CAPS, etc.;
- Serve as initial contact for the grade appeal process;
- Work with the Registrar to track students making unsatisfactory progress, report to academic program chairs and develop plans for mitigation;
- Serve as the Taubman College local student disability coordinator and work with students with disabilities, including receiving documentation, advising students about UM resources and functioning as a liaison for those resources, liaison with Taubman instructors to develop appropriate accommodations, work with University Disability Office, and track students' progress.

The college has added this member of the advising team as well as a director of student services.

4. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

Such as

- Faculty retirement/succession planning
- Administration changes (dean, department chair, provost)
- Changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures)
- New opportunities for collaboration
- Changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures)
- Significant changes in educational approach or philosophy (e.g., new provost = new approach)
- Changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building, cancelled new building)

5. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if *Conditions* have changed since the previous visit)

The new requirement taking pre-professional work off the table has radically shuffled our earlier matrix wherein many SPC were met through a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses. This change inspired some of our most productive conversations of the past year and in turn prompted a restructuring of our graduate studio sequence. For many this shift is a welcome revision, where a skeletal structure is more explicit, and objectives from year to year are more evident and consistent, thus enabling cumulative development for students. The most major adjustment in responding to these changes is how we are addressing the comprehensive design requirement. Where previously this took shape in our undergraduate curriculum, now the new comprehensive design studio is becoming a gateway into thesis for all graduate students.

New levels of achievement, shifting from awareness to understanding, are also prompting change: all professors of the required courses are revising their syllabi to insure a greater depth (particularly with respect to evidence) of material coverage. In some cases this might simply mean that, rather than only exposing students to the topic through a PowerPoint lecture, now a response paper or test is required. In other words, "understanding" requires more hands-on student involvement with the learning objectives.

New criteria are being distributed into course work through our year-end retreat.

A5 Investigative Skills

This new criteria is clearly linked with A6 (Fundamental Design Skills) and in fact, those are already addressed in the prevailing studio culture that emphasizes thoughtful, reasoned action at every scale and level of study. The program envisions analyzing, assessing and applying relevant information as most related to studio instruction; however, it will also be covered in the required Theory course (arch 572) and Thesis Seminar (arch 660) which is also required.

C9 Community and Social Responsibility

Thresholds design studio (ARCH 552), the first studio for all entering 2G students (and returning secondyear 3G students) will be the primary home for this new criteria. Partial responsibility will be distributed to the Professional Practice course (ARCH 583).

Consolidation of student performance criteria into realms encourages a holistic conceptualization of "coverage." This change facilitates building relationships between various courses.

Not required for 2013

Supplemental Material

Instruction: Include the following as a list of individual URLs or instructions for accessing a web-based portal for review of the following

Please do not attach files to the interim report, rather identify URLs to websites or servers, or other mainstream technology currently employed by your program to capture and host files.

1. Provide evidence that supports or demonstrates changes to the curriculum in response to not-met SPC (II.1).

Be sure to identify the changes/outcomes expected.

- a. New/revised syllabi
- b. Student work demonstrating the change

[Provided via Box Folder](#)

2. Provide evidence or supporting documentation/narrative that demonstrates changes in other aspects of the program made in response to other not-met Conditions (I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4)

[All other Conditions met. Responses to Causes of Concern provided via Box Folder.](#)

3. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the desired contribution to the program. (i.e. narrative bio, one-page CV)

[Provided via Box Folder](#)

4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the team at the next accreditation visit.

Additional information regarding the types of files that may be submitted in support of the program's responses in Sections 2-5:

1. *Syllabi or course descriptions. These should be presented in Word or Adobe PDF*
2. *Student work*
 - a. *Studio work should be presented in digital form either 2D (PDF) or 3D (BIM) files. Reviewers should be able to review the files using zoom or pan techniques in order to review details. Further, the program is responsible for ensuring that the files can be reviewed in the same software used to create them.*
 - b. *Classroom work should be presented in digital form (PDF) after grading. Instructors' comments and grades should be visible. Students' identities may be removed in order to comply with FERPA.*
 - c. *Presentations or other oral projects should be presented with both video clips of the presentation and copies of presentation materials (i.e. PowerPoint slides in PDF). Please limit video segments to 1 minute each.*