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I. Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan
Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item:

**Vision, Mission and Goals**
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  _x_ Needs Improvement

**Strategic Plan**
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  ___x Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement.
See accompanying narrative

II. Program Curriculum
Please evaluate the following: Master of Architecture

**Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes**
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  _x_ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

**Curriculum development coordination and delivery**
Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item:

Please evaluate the following: Master of Science in Architecture

Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
___ Excellent ___ Very Good __x__ Good ___ Needs Improvement

Curriculum development coordination and delivery
___ Excellent ___ Very Good __x__ Good ___ Needs Improvement

Program learning outcomes assessment
___ Excellent ___ Very Good __x__ Good ___ Needs Improvement

Program curriculum compared to peer programs
___ Excellent __x__ Very Good ___ Good ___ Needs Improvement

Please evaluate the following: Doctor of Philosophy in Land Use Management, Planning and Design

Alignment of program with stated program and institutional goals and purposes
___ Excellent ___ Very Good __x__ Good ___ Needs Improvement
offering the PhD is in alignment—the program needs improvement as suggested by the self-study

Curriculum development coordination and delivery
___ Excellent ___ Very Good ___ Good __x__ Needs Improvement

Program learning outcomes assessment
___ Excellent ___ Very Good __x__ Good ___ Needs Improvement

Program curriculum compared to peer programs
___ Excellent ___ Very Good ___ Good __x__ Needs Improvement
Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item:

III. Faculty Productivity

Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item:

Qualifications
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     _x_ Needs Improvement (if one is to grow the MS and PhD)

Publications
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     _x_ Needs Improvement (it was difficult to determine the range and quality based on the information contained in the report)

Teaching Load
___ Excellent     ____ Very Good     _x_ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

External Grants
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     _x_ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Teaching Evaluations
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     _x_ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Professional Service
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     _x_ Needs Improvement

Community Service
___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     _x_ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement.

See accompanying narrative

IV. Students and Graduates

Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item: Master of Architecture

Time to degree
___ Excellent     _x_ Very Good     ___ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Retention
___ Excellent     _x_ Very Good     ___ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Graduate rates
___ Excellent     _x_ Very Good     ___ Good     ___ Needs Improvement
Enrollment
___ Excellent  _x_ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Demographics
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Number of degrees conferred annually
___ Excellent  _x_ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Support Services
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Job Placement
__x_ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Student/ Faculty Ratio
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement

Master of Science in Architecture

Time to degree
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  _x_ Needs Improvement  (varies from 2.5-4.5 years)

Retention
___ Excellent  _x_ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Graduate rates
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  _x_ Needs Improvement

Enrollment
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  _x_ Needs Improvement

Demographics
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement

Number of degrees conferred annually
___ Excellent  ____ Very Good  ____ Good  _x_ Needs Improvement

Support Services
___ Excellent  _x_ Very Good  ____ Good  ____ Needs Improvement
Job Placement

___x_ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Student/ Faculty Ratio

__ Excellent     _x__ Very Good     ___ Good     ___ Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement

Doctor of Philosophy in Land Use Planning, Management and Design

Time to degree

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Retention

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement (cannot tell)

Graduate rates

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement (cannot tell)

Enrollment

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Demographics

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Number of degrees conferred annually

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Support Services

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Job Placement

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement (cannot tell)

Student/ Faculty Ratio

___ Excellent     ___ Very Good     ___ Good     ___x_ Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement
V. Facilities and Resources

Please evaluate the following by marking an X in one of the blanks for each item:

Facilities
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Facility Support Resources
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Financial Resources
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Staff Resources
___ Excellent  ___ Very Good  ___ Good  ___ Needs Improvement

Please comment on the positive components and suggested areas of improvement

VI. Overall Ranking

Please provide summative conclusions based on the overall review.

See accompanying narrative
Please provide summative recommendations based on the overall review.

See accompanying narrative
Academic Program Review of Graduate Programs in the College of Architecture
Texas Tech University

Summary Prepared by Lynn Ewanow, Associate Professor and Associate Dean, College of Architecture, Planning and Design

On March 24-26, 2015, the graduate programs in the College of Architecture were reviewed by a team of faculty from Texas Tech: Professor Debajyoti Pati, Department of Design, Professor Delong Zuo, Department of Civil Engineering and Professor Hyojung Cho, Department of Museum Science and Heritage Management. Dean Charles Graham, University of Oklahoma and Associate Dean, Lynn Ewanow, Kansas State University served as external reviewers. The team reviewed the Master of Architecture (MARCH), the Master of Science in Architecture (MSARCH) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Land Use Planning, Management and Design.

The review team was asked to examine the programs from the perspective of the description of the academic unit and strategic plan, program curriculum, faculty productivity, students and graduates and facilities and resources.

The College of Architecture provided a detailed self-study report along with supporting documents. The team met with the college administration, faculty and students on March 24th and 25th and toured the facilities.

Academic Unit Description and Strategic Plan

The College of Architecture’s mission and vision statements are very general and do not capitalize on the established strengths and unique qualities of the college. The college’s strategic plan, last updated in 2009, according to the copy of the document we reviewed, does not clearly align with the Texas Tech 2010-2020 Strategic Plan. While elements of the five priorities established in the university’s plan are present in the college plan, the college needs to consider creating a document that clearly identifies key strategies that can serve as benchmarks for assessing how well they are meeting their stated objectives.

The college appears to employ a combination of mechanisms to determine progress toward the achievement of goals and objectives, many of which are informal and not systematically documented. Establishing an on-going systematic planning process will help the college to further demonstrate its centrality to the mission of the university.

The college’s faculty are encouraged to pay particular attention to the alignment of their mission and vision statements with the university. Establishing a systematic, on-going process for assessing these documents and making appropriate adjustments needs to take place particularly as the college hires new faculty who may not share the collective knowledge enjoyed by the current faculty.
Program Curriculum

The graduate programs in the College of Architecture include: Master of Architecture, which is accredited by the National Architecture Accrediting Board, the Master of Science in Architecture and the Doctor of Philosophy in Land Use Planning, Management and Design.

The programs in the College of Architecture have experienced a decline in enrollment that is consistent with what many other programs have experienced in the past several years. Recruitment strategies pertinent to the specific degree need to be clearly stated and communicated. Enhancing partnerships with the university, practitioners and alumni to increase the applicant pool as well as creating the appropriate “campaigns” to convert applicants to enrolled students should be strongly encouraged. The strategic allocation of resources of resources such as scholarships, fellowships and GTA/GRA positons needs to be considered in terms of both recruitment and retention.

The MARCH is a strong program. The opportunity to more fully integrate scholarly inquiry into the MARCH exists and would provide even greater distinction for the program’s graduates. Exploring avenues to effectively recruit a greater percentage of MARCH students in to the certificate programs would further strengthen the MARCH.

The MSARCH presents considerable opportunity for even greater collaboration across the university. It would be important to establish the critical mass of faculty and students necessary to sustain the number of programs and options within the MS program.

Student work in the MARCH and MSARCH demonstrates breadth and accomplishment. The faculty should consider the careful and systematic linking of projects to the location West Texas especially with regard to sustainability. Considering this type of an overlay would further advantage the students in these programs.

The planned revision of the PhD will help with the recruitment of students and should reduce the ambiguity as to the “ownership” of the program. It would be important to consider how this change will contribute to more fully integrating the PhD students into the life of the college. Again, the critical mass of faculty to support this program needs to be established.

The combined presence of the MARCH, MSARCH and PhD presents an opportunity for the college to creatively address specific content and skill areas within the areas of specialization and to address scholarship, research and creative endeavors as an imbedded skill for future practitioners.

The assessment of student achievement is described as an on-going process that takes place through faculty discussion, project reviews, and comprehensive end-of-semester reviews with a linkage to the annual faculty evaluation. Greater documentation of specific actions taken would help demonstrate these processes.
Faculty Productivity

There is considerable diversity in the faculty in terms of the range of academic preparation and professional practice they bring to the three programs. Balancing the strengths of the faculty with the demands of staffing three different programs is a challenge. This challenge appears most significant with supporting the MS and the PhD. It appears that a relatively small number of faculty are engaged in sustained scholarship and dissemination of that scholarship. Likewise the amount of funded research in the college is generated by a very small number of faculty. The supervision of MS students is also limited to a small number of faculty. The connection of the faculty and students to the practice community is strong but there seems to be a small number of faculty who are engaged in leadership positions in professional organizations. Increasing the number of faculty who are active and engaged in these endeavors will continue to be important as the college works toward meeting the TTU mission and strategic priorities.

The faculty survey and interview indicated there are a number of faculty who feel there are problems with communication and who do not feel included in decision making.

Students

The student work exhibited demonstrates competency to obtain entry level positions. Some work demonstrated advance levels of knowledge, skills and professional maturity beyond entry level positions. Employment rates suggest that students have achieved competency and demonstrate capacities that are desirable to firms.

The students we met seemed confident in their knowledge and skills and were capable of communicating their perspectives on the programs. Fostering even greater faculty and student collaboration on scholarship, research and creative endeavors, within each program and across the programs would further strengthen the college.

The student survey and interviews suggested there are some organizational and communication issues and they sense a division within the faculty. The students also expressed an interest in thinking about ways to increase student communication, between different years and programs, by how the studios and other activities are organized.
Facilities and Resources

The studios, student work spaces for those doing research, the library and shops are well suited to the range of endeavors in each program. Understandably, the design of the building creates limitations. However, to the extent possible, the students, faculty and administration should consider ways to increase informal collaboration and communication between the students that might include mixing the programs and levels on different floors.

Establishing scholarships, awards, teaching and research opportunities that will aid in the recruitment and retention of students will be of strategic importance to all of the programs but particularly to the MS and PhD programs.

Summary

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this review and to work with the review team. The College of Architecture at Texas Tech University has amazing students, passionate faculty and dedicated administrators. The programs are of high quality and are deeply layered. However, the capacity of the college to proactively engage the future and achieve even greater excellence will require the college administration and faculty to engage in systematic and reflective processes. Examining the college’s administrative structure and creation of an internal plan for communications would be worthy of consideration.