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Introduction

The University of Maine at Augusta’s Bachelor of Architecture program (B.Arch), slated for a fall 2013 opening, is a five-year professional degree program designed for qualified students from Maine, northern New England, and beyond. Growing out of a successful four-year Bachelor of Arts in Architecture degree, the new B.Arch will allow high school seniors, existing University of Maine at Augusta (UMA) architecture students, and regional transfer students the opportunity to successfully apply for and complete a professional degree in central Maine. The program is centered at UMA, part of the University of Maine System, within the College of Arts and Sciences.

Program Character
Having served the needs of northern New England as the only Bachelor of Arts in Architecture degree in Maine, we draw from our 25 years of experience to build this new professional degree. While we have learned and continue to learn from our experiences, we recognize the opportunities this new degree presents to develop and deliver new curricula. We relish this opportunity to craft a 21st century architectural education appropriate to our state and our region. We believe there are three meaningfully unique parts that make up our character and pedagogy: Community, Collaboration, and Fundamental Design Elements.

Community
UMA Architecture’s mission is We Engage Community. This is both our mission and our collective goal. As a smaller, regional institution, our pedagogy and experience is rooted in where we come from. We see ourselves as inexplicably linked to the communities that surround us. We want our students, whether through architecture or other avenues, to fully engage those communities.

If architecture is collaborative by definition, then we must, as educators and design professionals, embrace the idea that the communities we live in are part of that collaboration. At UMA Architecture we have put our collaboration with community groups and non-profits at the center of our pedagogy, developing numerous “real project” collaborations over the past few years. We aim to give our students the tools to create and foster relationships with their communities. The creation of a B.Arch will allow us to strengthen this mission, and help to educate a new wave of architectural professionals who see their “giving back” as central to their practice of architecture.

Collaborative Cluster Courses
With the B.Arch we are proposing a number of curricular and pedagogical innovations. These include the inclusion of Civic Engagement (CE) designated courses, both within the degree and across the UMA colleges. In creating this designation, and requiring a certain number of “CE” courses for the degree, we will best integrate community projects and people with our students and across our curriculum. This is an idea that is now being championed by UMA’s Coordinator of Civic Engagement with the hopes of having it in place by fall 2013.

We are also actively exploring the greater integration of “Cluster Courses” into our required course work. These are six to nine credit courses, combining different disciplines in order to bring about cross-discipline collaboration within the institution. This in turn creates an atmosphere of greater knowledge and discovery for our students. The UMA Department of Architecture was at the forefront of the development of the first of these courses taught at UMA, now being formalized by the University. Working with the Art and Philosophy departments, in conjunction with a local non-profit, we immersed our students in a collaborative experience resulting in design rooted in the collective environment. We see the creation of our new B.Arch degree as a prime opportunity to integrate Cluster Courses into our curriculum.
Space, Scale, Light, and Design with Intention
Our pedagogy is rooted in the fundamentals of architectural design, fundamentals that are all too often over-looked for current trends or flashy technology. The architecture curriculum at UMA stresses three major design areas: the awareness and facility of designing spatially, the knowledge for integration of scale into the design, and the power of light as the element that gives space its vitality and sensory content. When these elements are combined with an intention – the basic theme behind the design – a work of architecture may emerge. Much as the intention is at the core of a design solution, so the use and teaching of Design with Intention is at the very core of what we teach. We have created a curriculum that systematically breaks these essential elements into their basic components. By giving students these skills, piece by piece, we help to create designers that can fully utilize these tools, clearly understand how they are intrinsically intertwined, and use them to support thoughtful and socially meaningful design intentions.

These three emphases – Community, Collaborative Course work, and Essential Design Elements – form the core of our B.Arch degree, and align us with 21st century architectural practice while maintaining true to what we believe are core architectural fundamentals.

About this Document
Our submission attempts to answer two key questions: how is the existing program in compliance with NAAB Conditions; and if not, what is the plan to achieve compliance? In order to clearly demonstrate our plans forward we include here, in addition to our narrative, a number of “MAPS” showing project plans and specific milestones toward achieving our goals. These “MAPS” allow for the variety of plans to be overlaid in order to understand the full nature of our work to date, and to clearly see what remains to achieve our vision.

Thanks
The Department of Architecture would like to thank the UMA administration and staff for their tireless effort and support in helping to create this report. We would also like to recognize the Rochester Institute of Technology, and specifically Kit J. Mayberry, Ph.D. for sharing their experiences and work in their own process toward architectural accreditation.
Part One (I) – Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY & SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission

History, Mission, and Founding Principles
In 1965 the 102nd Maine Legislature established the University of Maine at Augusta (UMA) as a community-based institution offering associate degrees under the auspices of the University of Maine at Orono. In 1971, soon after moving to its present location in Augusta, UMA became an autonomous institution, the seventh campus of the University of Maine System.

In 1975, UMA offered its first baccalaureate degree program and began building an integrated faculty community, with appropriate terminal degrees, to teach both baccalaureate and associate degree courses. Due to its location and given responsibilities to the state, UMA developed a statewide interactive television system as well as a network of over 100 off-campus centers and regional sites, and coordinated the delivery of university programs, courses, and services at these centers and sites. Now called University College, this statewide alternative delivery teaching method is today still part of UMA.

Today as the third largest campus in the University of Maine System, the University of Maine at Augusta offers undergraduate degrees and professional certificates to prepare graduates for the 21st century. Located in Augusta, Maine’s capital, and in Bangor, the University leverages its relationships with state government and communities in central Maine to increase opportunities for students in all programs to be civically engaged, both on campus and in the worldwide “community.” As the institution with the most experience in distance education, UMA continues to be a leader using contemporary technology to provide innovative and quality learning environments for faculty and students.

UMA’s Mission: The University of Maine at Augusta, a regional state university, provides baccalaureate and select associate degrees to meet the educational, economic and cultural needs of Central Maine. Based on a common liberal arts core for all degree programs, UMA delivers professional programs to non-traditional, traditional and place-bound students.

Redirection of UMA’s educational mission has occurred during the past decade, illustrated through the offering of three baccalaureate degree programs prior to 1998 to a current total of eighteen. This increase in baccalaureate credit hours and degrees confirms UMA’s current designation as a Carnegie Classification Associate/Baccalaureate institution. This continued focused growth of UMA is paralleled by the architecture program’s growth.

History, Mission, and Founding Principles of the Program
Professor Roger Richmond envisioned the architecture program over 25 years ago as a two year-plus associate’s degree. At the time he saw a profound need to educate the Maine student in ways of meaningful humanistic design.

In UMA, Professor Richmond found a good match for the goals and aims of the architecture curriculum. With the help of Professor Robert Katz of the UMA Art department, the first program coursework was offered in 1987. The AA grew to a 4-year Bachelor of Arts degree in 2001. With
this growth came the opportunity to review and refocus our overall curriculum. While maintaining the core values of Space, Scale, and Light, and the necessity to Design with Intention, we recommitted ourselves to the more advanced tools and language of architecture. In this way we attempt to best prepare our graduates for further study, professional practice, or immediate employment, and to graduate them with an awareness of the importance of architecture in the development of society, and architecture’s power to affect the quality of individual lives.

Today those core ideals are carried forward in the formation of the B.Arch degree. As stated in the introduction, we see our overall program as having three essential elements. The first is the mission to engage community; this is where our work takes place. The second is the desire to work in collaboration, both within and without the university; this is what allows us to affect positive change. And third are our fundamental design elements; these are the tools we use to affect our collective built environment.

UMA Architecture’s Mission: We Engage Community. Our mission is consciously simple and desires to be universal. Our desire is to think beyond the classroom and even beyond architecture. We want to empower our students, some of which may not become practicing architects, to be good citizens and good stewards of the built environment. Combined with a strong liberal arts core, we aim to graduate students who utilize their education and energy to strengthen their respective communities.

Vision

The vision of the UMA B.Arch program is to instruct our students to view architecture as a humanistic and professional discipline, which synthesizes art, science, creativity, and math through challenging intellectual rigor. It is an academic search into how the designed environment affects psychological and social behavior while honoring keen aesthetic judgment, and technical understanding of how a building is built with all its many and varied systems.

The UMA B.Arch achieves this through teaching, scholarship, creative work, research, service to the greater community, and a fully rounded curriculum. The program is committed to the highest ideals of the profession and culture of architecture. In the end, our primary goal is to create lifelong learners, while preparing our graduates for employment or advanced study. In addition, they should be able to contribute effectively to each other while in school, the communities in which they live and work, and to the profession in the future.

Core Values

- UMA/ARC is committed to involvement with the greater social and professional community.
- UMA/ARC is committed to instill in students the importance and use of Space, Scale, and Light in the design process.
- UMA/ARC is committed to hand drawing and physical model making as a means to best understand design technology, and the use of advanced computer programs to present these ideas to others.
- UMA/ARC is committed to the investigation and implementation of sustainable ideals.
- UMA/ARC is committed to a liberal and fine arts base for architectural education in light of today’s complex society that demands a well-rounded practitioner with knowledge beyond architecture.
- UMA/ARC is committed to designing with intention reflecting the awareness that there is a connection between designed space and the quality of the user’s experience, and that designed environments affect behavior.
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- UMA/ARC is committed to its own academic growth and evolution in maintaining the high standards expected in professional degrees, and to a high standard of student work and faculty instruction toward that end.
- UMA/ARC is committed to the values of mutual respect, cooperation and communication, creativity and innovation, the pursuit of excellence, effective communication and diversity.

Benefit to the Institution

The B.Arch program benefits UMA in a number of ways including interdisciplinary opportunities, stronger ties to the community, growth of exhibition and lecture possibilities, and the retention of the type of committed student typically ready of architectural study at a professional level.

Community Connections. The continued focus on community work will strengthen UMA’s place as an engaged partner in the region. The mutually beneficial nature of community work is demonstrated in bringing community members to campus, and putting UMA students out in the communities in which they live and work.

Connections to Professionals. As the only professional architecture degree in Maine, public or private, the institution can put itself at the center of questions related to the built environment. Building upon existing connections to professional organizations, UMA can become a strong voice for an active, thoughtful design discussion and its effects on our common landscape.

Exhibitions, Symposia, and Visiting Lecturers. The creation of the street level Gannett Gallery, part of the recent renovation of the Gannett Building on Water Street, has been slated to predominately show architecture related exhibitions. These presentations will be a draw to a wide variety of guests, many coming to the university for the first time. Symposia will bring various constituencies from across Maine and New England to engage in conversation relating to the importance of the built environment, and its effects on everything from our economy to sustainable growth. In addition, this gallery space can be used as a small lecture hall seating 40-60 guests. Given architecture’s interdisciplinary qualities, we believe that students from other degree programs, as well as community members, will readily attend events held in this flexible space.

Interdisciplinary and Cluster Courses. The creation of cluster courses as an integrated part of the required architecture curriculum will be a first for UMA. This will ensure successful enrollments as well as maximize the potential for these interdisciplinary endeavors. The institution, and students in other disciplines, benefit as a result of this collaboration.

Rigorous, committed students. The typical undergraduate architecture student is a committed, engaged, and well-qualified individual. Throughout the degree, the students complete General Education requirements, as well as take a variety of art and art history courses, study math, physics, computer technology, and a host of architecture related electives. With the studio culture we create, these students will bring that same level of rigor to their general education courses that in turn raise the bar for all UMA students.

Professional Degree Program. The B.Arch builds on UMA’s successful 4-year pre-professional Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, and will give Maine and Northern New England its only public professional degree in Architecture. As a professional degree offered at UMA, the program strengthens UMA’s continued growth as a baccalaureate institution. The value and visibility of the program will carry over to other degrees, raising the bar as to what is possible in central Maine.
Benefit to the Program
Among the benefits the institution provides the program are high visibility as the first downtown university presence, the opportunity of a street level gallery space, and the experience that comes from 25 years of teaching architectural education.

Downtown Presence. Since spring 2011, the Department of Architecture has been housed in the Gannett Building located at 331 Water Street, downtown Augusta. UMA received the Gannett Building in January 2010 as a gift from Richard McGoldrick, a Portland developer who owns a handful of other downtown Augusta properties. Built in 1875, the building was renovated in 2010. Architecture is now housed on the second and fourth floors, with certain Art concentrations working on the third. This new space puts UMA Architecture and our community mission in the community where it can best thrive.

Street Level Gallery. As part of the renovations of the Gannett Building, a multi-purpose gallery space was constructed at street level. This new “face” to the Augusta community allows the architecture department its first departmental exhibition space. This flexible space also allows for lecture seating of 40 to 60 people, giving us the opportunity to bring guest speakers in, hold larger lecture classes on site, and create day-long symposia tackling larger issues facing Maine’s and the region’s built environment.

Facilities. The fifth floor of the Gannett Building is currently rented on a short-term lease. Assuming UMA is approved to offer the B.Arch, the fifth floor may be used to house the expansion, increasing the architecture program’s overall space by 50%. See Downtown Presence above for information on the Gannett Building; the possibilities for this expansion can be seen in Section I.2.3.

A Commuter School. Historically, UMA has been a commuter school, pulling students from wide geographic region, economic backgrounds, and age groups. This inherently connects UMA to a variety of communities. These community connections directly enhance our mission to engage community and support the focus in our pedagogy.

Experience in Architectural Education. As stated in Section I.1.1, the teaching of architecture at UMA started over 25 years ago. The experience and growth across that time, from a 2-year AA degree into a 4-year BA degree, forms an invaluable foundation for the B.Arch degree. With the B.Arch we are transforming a successful existing program into a more useful, meaningful, and refocused professional degree.

Liberal Arts and Practicum-based Learning
Core and General Education Requirements. As the UMA mission states in part, an education at UMA will be “based on a common liberal arts core for all degree programs.” It is the intention of the University of Maine at Augusta that every degree graduate will be prepared to function in our society as an effective and informed citizen. To this end, the faculty has designed a set of minimum expectations that students are expected to satisfy. These aspirations are defined by core skills, competencies, and abilities as well as knowledge based learning experiences that are the grounds for the General Education Requirements. These core skills include courses in written communication, oral communication, and quantitative skill. General education (liberal arts) requirements include instruction in scientific inquiry, social science, humanities, and the fine arts. Additionally, and per the UMA 2011-2012 course catalog, “All core and general education courses will address issues of diversity.” New core skills have been developed and will be published in the next UMA Course Catalog. Please see Appendix D for UMA Core and General Education Requirements.
Practicum-based Learning. The architecture program specifically targets work related experience in the Apprenticeship course, a requirement for graduation. Here the student spends a minimum number of hours under the tutelage of a licensed professional. Additionally, students are exposed to the collaborative nature of architecture through a number of group based studio projects, demonstrating through experience the necessity and benefit of collaborative endeavors.

In support, UMA Architecture actively employs a wonderful and diverse cadre of adjunct professors, most of whom are practicing architects. They bring their knowledge and experience to the classroom, using it as a lens through which our students design and learn. Finally, the community work we engage our students in is the best sort of practical experience, for it puts students and clients face-to-face, discussing needs and designing solutions to meet those needs.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

Learning Culture Policy
The program will review and update the existing Architecture Design Studio Policy currently in effect. Please see Appendix A for the existing policy and MAP: Student Development for our timeline to revise. Because of the importance of a positive learning environment the updated policy will look for input from all users including students, staff and faculty. This will be accomplished through open meetings attended by interested parties. The updated policy will advance existing ideas of studio etiquette, respect for others, professionalism, and sustainability while creating methods of assessment to ensure policies are in place and followed.

Policy Access
The current policy is handed out to all students at the beginning of studio courses. The B.Arch will continue to hand out and discuss the policy in class, as well as place the policy online for all current and potential students to view and download.

Assessment of Learning Culture
Assessment related to learning culture will be part of our open discussion to revise the Studio Policy. In this way those most affected by the policy will have input into its assessment, which in turn should lead to more success.

Harassment and Discrimination Policy
The UMA Student Handbook, specifically these sections, addresses harassment: http://www.uma.edu/studenthandbookpol-s.html#conduct, the Harassment Statement at http://www.uma.edu/studenthandbookpol-eh.html#harassment, and the UMS Sexual Harassment Policy (http://www.uma.edu/studenthandbookpol-s.html#harassment) that covers both students and employees.

Academic Integrity
The UMA Student Handbook 2011-2012 addresses Academic Integritiy. See the UMA Academic Integrity Code at http://www.uma.edu/studenthandbookpol-s.html#saic.

Diversity
UMA’s Diversity Statement, Accessibility Statement, and Non-Discrimination Notice can be found online at http://www.uma.maine.edu/studenthandbookstatements.html. Information on Disability Services is found at http://www.uma.edu/disabilityservices.html.
I.1.3 Response to the Five (5) Perspectives
We believe our program’s Core Values have a strong correlation to NAAB’s five perspectives. However, the specificity of the five perspectives offers us the opportunity to review and improve our core values, listed in Section I.1.1, as we introduce the B.Arch degree.

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community

Scholarship
Student Scholarship. For the architecture student, research is an integral part of his or her design education. Students understand and have the tools to investigate the contextual issues of any giving design problem, whether site, program, or conceptually related. At the heart of design is investigation: the tool necessary to gather information to create intentionally specific solutions to individual design problems. To ensure our students have the tools to proactively research and analyze we are introducing a new course, tentatively titled, ARC241, Architectural Research and Analysis. The course will focus on ideas and representation of research (information gathering) and analysis (information interpretation) as they relate to architecture.

Subsequently, these are in turn brought to a focus in the fifth-year thesis where students put tools of scholarly investigation to use on projects and research of their own choosing. Our thesis sequence (ARC 509/510) is built upon our current BA thesis semesters, which use an investigation of “Place” as the starting point for developing individual design projects. Each class works with a specific Maine city to develop an understanding and analysis of its workings or lack thereof. In response, students use this research to propose their own design projects located within the studied city.

Faculty Scholarship. Scholarship and research is a key focus at UMA as the transition to a baccalaureate institution flourishes. The following is taken from the Draft Faculty Handbook 2012-13 (currently under review). “Research is the activity of systematic investigation and examination designed to develop a new understanding or contribute to a body of knowledge.” Research activities can include:

- Conducting a search of and reporting the current literature pertaining to a subject of interest;
- Designing, conducting, analyzing and reporting results of an inquiry into an area of interest using either quantitative or qualitative methods;
- The production of scholarly or creative work for publication, performance or exhibition;
- The refinement of analyses;
- The development of critique or interpretations;
- The exploration of alternative perspectives and new ways of thinking;
- And the suggestion of and applications of novel modes of assessment.

In fall 2011, the Department of Architecture, in collaboration with the Department of Art, defined departmental research and scholarship as the following (only items related to the architecture faculty are included here):

Research and scholarship in Architecture can include:
- Design work done for clients, for competition, or conceptually
- Construction of any of the above (for client, competition, or conceptual)
- Exhibition of one’s design work
- Curating an architecture exhibition
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- Presenting at a conference, workshop, school or museum
- Publishing one’s work in a journal or other publication
- Organizing and integrating architecture into social practice and community development
- Attending conferences and workshops
- Membership in arts or architectural organizations
- Continued education in the emerging technologies and forms in architecture

The start of the B.Arch allows us to reconsider the architecture department’s overall scholarship goals and focus. Now that we have defined the acceptable means of research and scholarship, the program needs to create goals, both as individuals and as a faculty group. To this end, we need to better understand how a variety of faculty scholarly activities might intersect and support one another, and better capitalize on that possible synergy. In addition, we need to look at how faculty scholarship might align and benefit from student promoted research. One possible way to accomplish these goals is to have annual or biennial themes around which scholarship might focus and find connection or create collaboration. We will be discussing and formalizing departmental scholarship Goals and Schedules for FT faculty in fall 2012. Please see MAP: Architecture Faculty.

Internal and External Community Engagement

Student Community Engagement. The department of Architecture has a growing history of work with the community. As previously stated, our mission is We Engage Community. We believe that the giving back of one’s time and talent, whether the vehicle is architecture or something else, is an essential part of the 21st century citizen. As we work to develop life-long learners, it is our responsibility to place students and faculty into positions and projects that directly connect them to communities, municipalities and non-profits. In the past five years UMA/ARC is proud that we have worked on 23 community-based projects with 19 different community partners. When a student truly engages with community members, he or she sees firsthand the power of design and its effect on people’s lives. This work is a continuing focus of our pedagogy, and brings faculty and students together through common causes. A full listing with brief descriptions of projects undertaken through the existing BA degree program can be found in Appendix B.

Where we have had some success documenting the work both in written format and in student produced video (Please see this link: [http://www.uma.edu/community](http://www.uma.edu/community)), our work here has not been consistent. To see the full benefits of this body of work we must integrate project documentation within course curriculum or find other means toward documentation.

Faculty Community Engagement. On the topic of public service, the Draft Faculty Handbook 2012-13 (currently under review) states:

- Expectation of faculty public service is required by the AFUM contract, Article 10.B.1.f. Public Service in Discipline. The committee of peers, Academic Deans and Provost decide what is considered valid public service, including but not limited to the following:
  - Membership and participation with professional organizations;
  - Outside application of discipline expertise;
  - Serving on boards of non-profits;
  - Discipline related community outreach; and
  - University representative to external organizations.

In fall 2011, UMA demonstrated its commitment to community engagement and secured a full-time Coordinator of Civic Engagement to aid all programs interested in integrating service learning and/or civic engagement into their curricula. Over the past year, the department of
architecture has met and worked closely with the new Coordinator, and will use her skills to further our mission.

Faculty University Service. Our emphasis on community at the center of the B.Arch pedagogy aligns with UMA’s overall expectations of all faculty members. As stated in the Draft Faculty Handbook 2012-13 (currently under review):

Faculty members are expected to participate in departmental, programmatic, College, University, and System activities as well as faculty, administration, and System committees to which they are elected or appointed and to act as representatives of the University to off-campus groups. Participation in these events is subject to peer review and is a factor in faculty evaluation.

As good academic citizens, faculty members are expected to be concerned with the problems not only of their discipline and College, but also with those of the University as a whole. Faculty should give a reasonable amount of their time to the University’s general growth and development. They should be concerned about public relations programs, adult education and community services, admission policies, and enrollment procedures.

Teaching

Faculty Teaching. Teaching is at the center of UMA’s mission. As stated in the Draft Faculty Handbook 2012-13 (currently under review):

The primary responsibility of full-time and part-time faculty members is to teach effectively. Other forms of scholarly activity, however, are normal functions expected of faculty members. They are, therefore, encouraged to engage in creative scholarly activity.

To be effective teachers, faculty members will be able to demonstrate the following behaviors:

a. Establish well-defined learning outcomes for the courses they teach, develop adequate teaching aids, including course outlines, syllabi, demonstrations and audio-visual devices, and/or organize laboratory activities and projects to aid student learning.

b. Organize the material to be taught in a way that will encourage students to achieve course-learning outcomes.

c. Have a command of those techniques of public communication and course organization that are considered essential to excellent teaching.

d. Be conscientious in meeting classes punctually and according to schedule.

e. Base their evaluations of students’ work on scholastic accomplishment.

Student Teaching. We strongly believe and support the idea that one learns through the act of teaching. The basis of any design studio, and the practice of architecture, is working together through design problems. In those group situations, students learn from and teach each other. In addition to collaborative group work done regularly in studio, students actively engage in design critiques, and will be required critique of lower-level design studios as an integrated part of the fifth-year thesis course. Please see ARC 510, Architectural Design IX, Thesis in Section 3.3.2 for course outcomes.

Holistic, Practical and Liberal arts-based education

As an undergraduate degree we take very seriously the need to simultaneously create potential architectural practitioners and yet well-rounded individuals. The liberal arts-based core of UMA’s general education requirements ensure this takes place. Currently, 55 out of 150 total
B.Arch degree credit hours are focused on general education and general elective courses. See Section II.2.2 for the proposed 5-year curriculum.

As our mission of engaging the community implies, we aim to create good citizens. Part of that work is exposing our students to a variety of influences and experiences. One of the central ideas to create well-rounded individuals is the creation of the B.Arch Foreign Travel Experience. In this required course degree candidates will spend time in another country focused on the culture and architecture found there. This not only makes for well-rounding students, but also will expose them to a wealth of experiences from which to pull when making design decisions. This exposure and breadth helps ensure that we graduate students prepared for the multi-faceted nature of the architectural profession. Please see more on this under Perspective B below.
MAP: Architecture Faculty

- Increase FT ARC faculty
  - New FT Faculty Search
    - Completed: spring 2012
- Improve & Coordinate ARC Faculty Research + Scholarship
  - New FT Faculty Start
    - Expected: fall 2012
    - Develop Guidelines & Timetable
      - Expected: fall 2012
- Systematize ARC Faculty Long-range planning input
  - Develop Departmental Goals & Schedule
    - Expected: fall 2012
- Integration & Activation of Plan
  - Expected: spring 2013
- Individual Research Foci
  - Expected: spring 2013
- End of Year Faculty Workshop + Review
  - Expected: spring 2013
- Funding Proposals
  - Expected: fall 2013
- Review enrollments
  - Expected: spring 2014
- New Search, enrollment depending
  - Expected: spring 2014
  - Complete Search
    - Expected: summer 2014
- New FT Faculty Start
  - Expected: fall 2015
B. Architectural Education and Students

Global World
Being located in central Maine, exposing our students to a global world can be a challenge, but one that we readily accept. Our initial focus is to create a diverse, accepting community within the program. By exposing students to each other and their varied backgrounds, they grow in appreciation of each other while gaining an understanding of our common connections. Our creation of a positive, supportive design environment builds in each student similar traits for dealing with colleagues, community, and clients. Through the studio students gain an appreciation and open-mindedness that allows for a free flow of ideas. As mentioned in Section I.1.2 we have a Studio Culture Policy, and are reviewing it in light of the B.Arch degree.

The B.Arch program is focused on two projects meant to increase our students’ connection globally. The first, mentioned previously, will place students in foreign countries to see and experience how others live and relate to their varied built environments first-hand; we are calling this the “Foreign Travel Experience.” While still in the early planning stages, the goal of this course, to be taken in the summer after a student’s third or fourth year, is to expose each student to other cultures and architectures; to make students more open, receptive and aware of the diversity of our global environment; and to bring that awareness back to their own communities. At this time we are in discussions with organizations that specialize in student foreign exchange to better understand how the reality of student travel aligns with our larger pedagogy. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development for timetable.

The second project is more immediate and is a course tentatively titled, ARC489 Topic course: Global Understanding. This course, to be introduced in spring 2014, offers a very unique opportunity for UMA students to learn about other cultures in a face-to-face environment without having to leave their classroom. This class is designed to make the most of interactive technologies to give UMA students the opportunity to communicate with students in different countries live. This way, students at each participating university can learn about a number of different cultures while simultaneously helping to teach about their own.

The cultural exchange is based both on written communications between pair of students (via ‘chatting’ and outside communication) as well as through “web-streamed” face-to-face dialogue. We are working to connect our UMA students with the architecture program at Slovak Technical University, Bratislava, Slovakia (http://www.fa.stuba.sk/generate_page.php?page_id=771). The planned elective course will connect our students with others facing similar challenges in different cultures. The draft Collaborative Agreement, yet unsigned, can be seen in Appendix F.

The development of this course is planned for fall 2013, with its first formal offering in spring 2014. However, we are investigating how to make these connections part of existing classwork and so capitalize on current technology sooner. Possibilities include shared project reviews, discussion of technology, and sharing of current professional work in each participating country.
MAP: Curriculum Development

### Project/Goals
- Development of New Courses
  - ARC 202, Electronic ARTs
  - ARC 241, Architectural R+A
  - ARC 341, Sustainability
  - ARC 362, Portfolio Devel.
  - ARC 421, Pro Practice
  - ARC 431, ARC Seminar
  - ARC 441, Foreign Travel
  - ARC 408, ARC Design VI
  - ARC 409, ARC Design, VII

### Action / Resources / Completion Deadline
- Review of Existing Courses
- Potential Collaborations Recognized
- Global Initiatives & Coursework
  - Review Complete
  - Expected: fall 2012
- Development of Collaborative Coursework
  - Find ways of integration
  - Expected: fall 2013
- Integration of Digital Media
  - Organize and Structure
  - Expected: spring 2013
- First B.Arch Cohort
  - Fall 2013
- New Courses Submitted for Approval
  - Expected: fall 2012
  - Continued Review
  - Expected: summer 2013
- Continued CAD + Studio Integration
  - Expected: fall 2013
  - Continued development
  - Expected: fall 2013
- ARC 202, Electronic Arts for Architects
  - Expected: fall 2014
  - Continued Review
  - Expected: summer 2014
- Global Coursework in Place
  - Expected: spring 2014
Leadership and Professional Opportunity
Leadership is also a key factor in the development of our B.Arch program. By placing students in community-based projects, and through a developing UMaine system-wide program in Innovation Engineering, we realize this program focus.

Our emphasis on community work puts our students directly in roles of leadership and responsibility. Currently, our students come in contact with and work with communities from across Maine at least three times in their educational careers, and often more. These first-hand experiences demonstrate to the students that they play a very real role in the future of their communities, whether from Maine or away. They understand they have power as young, invested designers to affect meaningful change. Many times we have seen young designers take on lead roles in community planning and design exercises. This type of hands-on experience, dealing not only with clients but more specifically clients in need, demonstrates to the student the power each has to effect change in our built environment. Through these experiences students see the possibility afforded by their chosen profession. Students accept and thrive under this responsibility.

Innovation Engineering (IE) is a groundbreaking program that provides a systematic approach to innovation. The fundamental concepts of the program include tools and methods for creating, communicating, and commercializing meaningfully unique ideas. Innovation Engineering is a proven system that provides students with the knowledge, tools, and confidence to become successful innovators and entrepreneurs.\(^1\) The UMaine System has recently committed to teaching IE on all seven of its campuses, with the potential of a minor being offered at each. UMA offered its first course in fall 2011. More information can be found at the UMaine web page [http://www2.umaine.edu/innovation/](http://www2.umaine.edu/innovation/)

The introductory IE course will be required and an integral element in our architecture degree program. Some architecture faculty members have attended training seminars in teaching the IE tools. In fall 2012, Associate Professor Eric Stark will co-teach the INV180 Innovation Engineering: Create course for the first time. He also received a grant to study integration methods of IE and architectural pedagogy to be completed in the fall 2012 semester. This research will form the basis for IE integration in the department. Our goal in exposing students to IE tools is to give them the confidence to lead in the creation, communication, and commercialization of meaningfully unique ideas in the field of architecture. This ability will help make innovative leaders out of our graduates.

Choices and Lifelong Learning
Lifelong learning is one part of our vision statement, as we strongly believe architecture is a consistently evolving, growing endeavor. Architecture is called a “practice” because one is continually growing and learning through the work. The study of architecture is a cognitive activity utilizing both sides of the brain equally. It is both creative and practical, and a mind trained in this unique way will often experience a stimulation of curiosity that may last throughout a lifetime. The brain, powerfully rewired through an architectural education, seeks creative solutions to any situation. As teachers we believe that the more future architects learn in any subject the more creative they become in that subject. When that proclivity is teamed with curiosity, lifelong learning becomes the nourishment of the architect’s mind.

Architecture is a complete education as well as a respected profession, whether or not a graduate

\(^1\) [http://foster.target.maine.edu/the-center/what-is-innovation-engineering](http://foster.target.maine.edu/the-center/what-is-innovation-engineering), August 24, 2012
chooses to get a license and practice. From the first design studio we teach the students that they are constantly making choices about the work undertaken, and need to accept that responsibility. Initially relatively simple choices of line weights and drawing layouts, these lead in time to more complex choices involving inhabitation, sustainability, and bettering the built environment. If the student understands the power and responsibility of making these choices, then we have set them up for a lifetime of growth regardless of their final career path.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment

Internship and Licensure
Since we have an existing Bachelor in Arts in Architecture degree, we fully understand and accept the responsibility of moving to a professionally accredited B.Arch. One of the B.Arch program’s goal is to graduate students who are well prepared for the rigors of an architectural profession, in its many different forms. To this end we currently discuss internship and licensure at our architectural new student orientation before a student has even begun classes, sharing verbal and visual representations of the path to licensure. The importance of clearly understanding the long road to licensure, its joys and trials, is something every entering student must be aware of, and all degree candidates kept abreast of.

To keep our students up to date we regularly have the Intern Development Program (IDP) coordinator for AIA Maine to our campus. She meets with students as well as keeps faculty up to date on current issues and changes regarding IDP. The department has yet to name an internal IDP representative, but that selection will be made in fall 2012. Please see MAP: Architecture Faculty.

As we develop our curriculum we are aware of licensure and how we might best support students’ successful completion of those exams. While we do not believe curriculum should look to the ARE exams for pedagogy as the exams will likely change before a current student reaches eligibility, we are looking at the inclusion of general topics and a keen awareness of the exam as a necessary step in helping our students toward licensure. In addition, our library maintains up-to-date study tools so that we can fully support our alumni, when IDP is complete, in successful completion of the ARE.

State Regulatory Environment
A number of existing and proposed courses relate to the important subject of regulation. These include Professional Practice, Intro to Sustainability, and Mechanical Systems specifically as it relates to energy code and consumption. We also keep abreast of these topics by partnering with statewide professional organizations that currently include: AIA Maine, the Maine Chapter of the Construction Specifications Institute, and the Portland Society of Architects. Other active groups we want to build partnerships with include GrowSmart Maine and the Maine Chapter of the United States Green Building Council. Through these professional groups we can help ensure that our students, both current and alumni, have strong connections to the world of professional practice and its regulatory environment.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession

Our focus here comes in three parts: the creation of globally focused coursework, continued growth of community-based projects, and the instigation of a UMA B.Arch Advisory Board.
Global Experience
We understand that in this ever shrinking world our students from Central Maine need to understand and be prepared to practice in a global economy. Toward that end, as stated under Perspective B above, the UMA B.Arch Foreign Travel Experience and the ARC course in Global Understanding are currently under development. The travel course is planned to be in place by fall 2013, while we are working to offer the Global Understanding course in spring 2014. We strongly feel that exposure to other cultures, different ways of thinking, alternative histories, and global architectures is key to creating well-rounded, thoughtful practitioners. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development.

Besides our three required courses in art and architectural history, exposure to global aspects of architecture are currently covered in ARC 123, The Theory and Philosophy of Architecture. This introductory course makes a clear case for the necessity of a global view of architecture, and for the specific understanding of the diversity each client brings to a project. In addition, the expansion of our degree program will allow for a number of culture specific elective courses that have been under discussion including course based in the cultures of Italy, Japan and Islamic-based societies. These courses not only expose students to other cultures and diverse ways of thinking, but also will allow them choices as to which cultures they are interested in exploring in depth. In this way our students are active participants in the responsibility of their own educations.

Local Engagement
We have already made, and continue to strengthen, our relationships with municipalities across the state and locally based non-profit groups. (Please see Appendix B for a list of 23 community-based projects). On multiple occasions our students experience working collaboratively with community clients. In interacting with a variety of community clients, the students see the diverse roles architects play, as well as better understand the responsibility they have to engender change. The experience of architect-to-client interaction helps them see the necessity of balancing design intention with client needs; that the architect is not only a practitioner but also an educator; and that the client is an essential part of the team that produces our built environment. These relationships, and their place in the profession, are currently intertwined within the upper-level studio curriculum and will be one focus in our proposed Professional Practice course.

By embracing these two opposite ends of the spectrum – the global and the local – the program will produce architectural designers with a broad-based education. Our students will be exposed to an expansion of ideas and yet remain rooted in the physical reality of local community.

B.Arch Advisory Board
Outside of the classroom we are currently in development of an UMA B.Arch Advisory Board. This board, slated to begin in the spring of 2013, pulls together architecture professionals and representatives of landscape architecture, historic preservation, interior design, structural engineering, construction, business, and the Maine state legislature. We believe that the collaborative nature of architecture demands we enlist multiple voices that play different roles in its creation, its construction, and the policies that influence it. Please see MAP: Program Development. This professional growth can also be seen in our strengthening connection to AIA Maine, and other professional groups mentioned in Section I.1.3.c.
MAP: Program Development

- **2011**
  - B.Arch Advisory Board
  - B.Arch Admissions Policy
  - Improvement in Internal Assessment Procedures

- **2012**
  - Requirements + Methods
    - Completed: spring 2012
  - Create Guidelines
    - Completed: spring 2012
  - Systems + Procedures
    - Completed: summer 2012
    - Admissions Goes Live
      - Expected: fall 2012
  - Policies Created: Studio, Technology, Gen Ed.
    - Expected: fall 2012
  - Name Board Members
    - Expected: fall 2012
  - Review Internal Assessment Procedure
    - Expected: fall 2012
    - Outcome Matrix
      - Expected: fall 2012
  - Admissions Due Date
    - Expected: 01/31/2012

- **2013**
  - Hold First Meeting
    - Expected: spring 2013
  - Policy & Procedure Implementation
    - Expected: spring 2013
  - First B.Arch Cohort
    - Fall 2013
  - Instigate Plan + Process
    - Expected: fall 2013

- **2014**
  - Capstone Exit Survey
    - Expected: spring 2014
E. Architectural Education and the Public Good

UMA Architecture’s strong ties to Maine communities can be seen in the work underway and completed. As stated in the introduction and again in Perspective D above, work in the Community is at the very core of what we teach and what believe in. Through a variety of community and non-profit partnerships our students are exposed to the great power and responsibility that design has to affect community.

From work with the non-profit Bread of Life Ministries on designing housing for Homeless Veterans, to working with city managers on a master plan of Lewiston’s riverfront, we expose our students to the multiple responsibilities facing today’s architectural designers. Our goal in undertaking this community work is nothing short of giving our students the tools to engage their own communities, and a deep-seated feeling of a responsibility to do so. Our students must also understand that they are stewards of the built environment. To this end we are increasing our commitment to issues of sustainability, Sustainable preservation, and Historic preservation through our curriculum offerings and integration. With our new curriculum, ARC341 Introduction to Sustainability will be a required course. Sustainable Preservation is an elective course that was approved in 2011 but has yet to be offered. And we are working with the University of Southern Maine’s Department of American and New England Studies to develop a graduate level certificate in Historic Preservation that will not only serve our students, but the wider Maine community.

Continuing this idea of collaboration across the UMaine system, we are exploring expanding our community initiatives on two fronts. UMA Architecture, in collaboration with the University of Southern Maine’s Muskie School of Public Policy, has held initial discussions to create a 3 + 2 degree (or some variation) that may allow architecture students to matriculate to the Muskie’s graduate program of public policy. This would give those students who see community work as core to who they are, an avenue to work at a larger urban scale. Secondly, we are actively searching for grant opportunities to create a Community Design Center (CDC), to be located within the UMA Architecture program in Augusta, the state capital. This would give us the focus, the staff and the tools to bring more meaningful, long-term community engagement to a wider population. Please see our plan for the CDC in Section 1.1.4. Long-Range Planning. While these projects are in their infancy, they demonstrate our commitment to putting UMA’s B.Arch on track to engage community partners on multiple scales.

UMA B.Arch Core Values and NAAB Five Perspectives
The chart below shows how our program’s existing Core Values presently align with the NAAB’s five perspectives. In this way we hope to demonstrate that in many ways our current degree lives up to the planned goals of our proposed B.Arch.
### Alignment of UMA B.Arch Core Values to 5 Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to involvement with the greater social and professional community</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to instill in students the importance and use of Space, Scale, and Light in the design process</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to work-by-hand as a means to best understand design technology, and the use of advanced computer programs to present these ideas to others</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to the investigation and implementation of sustainable ideals</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to a liberal and fine arts base for architectural education in light of today’s complex society that demands a well-rounded practitioner with knowledge beyond architecture</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to designing with intention reflecting the awareness that there is a connection between designed space and the life-quality of the user’s experience, and that designed environments affect behavior</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to its own academic growth and evolution in maintaining the highest standard expected in professional degrees, and to the highest standard of student work and faculty instruction toward that end</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to the values of mutual respect, cooperation and communication, creativity and innovation, the pursuit of excellence, effective communication and diversity.</th>
<th>A. Academic Community</th>
<th>B. Students</th>
<th>C. Regulatory Environment</th>
<th>D. Profession</th>
<th>E. Public Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.1.4 Long-Range Planning
As described in the introduction, there are three primary pillars to our B.Arch degree: Community, Collaboration, and Fundament Design Elements. By primarily focusing on improvement in these three areas we will improve the program overall. Some of the methods for assessing continuous improvement in these three areas are in place others need to be created. In addition, those methods that do exist could be put to better use in terms of the direct impact on our improvement.

The identification of needed improvement in the B.Arch will come through three sources: UMA’s existing assessment procedures, continued review of the program in light of UMA’s Strategic Plan, and from the UMA B.Arch Advisory Board. In these ways we feel we are getting assessment from a wide variety of sources: institutionally, internally and externally. As mentioned below in Section I.1.5, program review and improvement is conducted through an annual assessment process. In addition, we take the opportunity as we create this new degree to review our values and re-align them with the UMA Strategic Plan (2011 – 2016) entitled, Transforming Lives: Educating Our Students to be Global Citizen’s as well as consider them in light of the five perspectives. UMA’s full strategic plan can be accessed online at http://www.uma.edu/umastrategicplan.html. Finally, the B.Arch Advisory Board, scheduled to begin in spring 2013, will give us input from a wide variety of professionals in fields related to architecture.

Charted below are multi-year objectives as they relate to strengthening our three pillars and the NAAB’s five perspectives, and their proposed methods of assessment. Plans for achieving these objectives are found throughout this document with their location indicated under Notes. Where they are not found in other places they are described below. Other short-term objectives, related to improvement of the three pillars or implementation of the five perspectives, are not included here.

Multi-Year Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key to Areas Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community = COM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration = COL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Assessment Method/timetable or cycle</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, COM, COL, DES</td>
<td>Dedicated Studio Space</td>
<td>Comparison to other programs / complete Documentation of use of existing facilities / annually, starting in AY2012-13</td>
<td>See I.2.3 Physical Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Design Center. This vision for a Community Design Center (CDC) grows out of the work we have done in Maine communities over the last five years. A staffed entity dedicated to vetting, organizing and following through on projects will increase the effectiveness of the work from both the communities’ and students’ standpoints. The center will be located at UMA’s Gannett building in downtown Augusta, with a mission to deliver a wide variety of experiential learning opportunities for students in architecture and planning; and to serve as the nexus for collaborative research and outreach to Maine communities. Some forty such CDCs exist at universities across the nation, none now in northern New England. Goals of this project include:

---

2 We unsuccessfully applied for an UMaine System Strategic Initiative Fund Grant in 2010. We are currently working with a UMA grant writer to find other funds to get this off the ground.
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- Increase student enrollments, tuition revenues, and retention and graduation rates, and at least break-even financially within four years;
- Give UMA a distinctive and competitive advantage in attracting and retaining students who are interested in shaping the Maine and New England landscape and built environment in sustainable ways.
- Provide students with regular, challenging, and experiential opportunities beyond the classroom to engage them directly in the challenges facing Maine communities in planning and designing their future landscape and built environment;
- Work with the University of Southern Maine’s Muskie School of Planning to engage students across the separate academic disciplines of architecture and planning, and so enhance their professional credentials. This combination of architecture and planning at the undergraduate and graduate levels will be unique in New England among public institutions of higher education; and, so, will be NEBHE-eligible;
- Serve the pressing needs of Maine communities for assistance in shaping the future of their landscape and built environment, with possible focus in early implementation on a core value such as strengthening civic spaces, sustainability, or quality of place;
- Be an attractant to private and philanthropic sector donors with an interest in the built environment and a stake in Maine’s Quality of Place.

To date we have tried unsuccessfully to secure seed funding for this project. We continue to search for options, working with UMA’s grant writer. Our draft long-term plan:

Project Schedule:
- **Year 01:** Conduct a yearlong, for-credit Workshop for students and faculty from UMA to work with local officials and citizens on a challenging planning and design issue in Augusta.
- **Spring Year 01:** Competitively recruit a full-time research faculty member in architecture and community design on a four-year contract to direct the CDC in Augusta, with half-time teaching and half-time center-direction responsibilities.
- **Year 02:** Develop articulation agreement(s) between UMA and USM to accelerate student progress through the combined bachelor’s/master’s program in architecture and planning, and incorporate distance learning elements across the shared curriculum.
- **Year 02:** The CDC opens in the Gannett building in Augusta with teleconferencing facilities installed, a strategic plan developed, programming and marketing established, an Advisory Council recruited and appointed, outside funding sources identified, on-line application for services developed, a faculty/practitioner review panel established to evaluate applications, and the experiential course work of the CDC begun.
- **Years 02-04:** Faculty and new course development proceed in various areas. Possible topics include: sustainable architecture, urban and landscape design, historic preservation, and green building techniques.
- **Fall Year 04:** Mid-point progress report to the President and Chancellor, detailing achievements of the partnership, their costs and benefits.
- **Fall Year 06:** Final report to the President, the CDC is self-supporting.

Integration of Digital Media. In response to a recent peer review of our program, a reviewer stated that we needed to move our pedagogy beyond a CAD-centric view, and better integrate Digital Media at multiple levels. We have begun this process and are moving to a more integrated
approach to digital technology, weaving it directly into our studio curricula. Our goals are to develop practitioners that see digital technology as integral to their design processes and practice; graduates who can move easily between pencil and paper, and the computer and screen.

This integration includes a spring 2013 planned introduction to digital tools within our first year design curriculum in ARC 102, Architectural Design I. This will give students tools early on in their educations, and make digital technology part of their developing design processes. Discussion continues in regard to ARC 261, Intro to CAD and its better integration with studio so as to better support and grow both. Finally, we are proposing an architecture specific course ARC 202, Electronic Arts for Architects, to be developed with UMA’s ART department, as a required course in the B.Arch curriculum. This will focus on a deeper investigation into digital tools (other than drafting (CAD) tools) so that the digital is seen as a place to work and create. This course is planned to be on the books by fall 2013. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development.

Long-Range Planning
Primarily, the long-range planning of the degree program occurs at the level of our pedagogical objectives. Two groups, one internal and one external, have the primary responsibility of creating or helping guide the direction of the program. Internally, full-time and part-time architecture faculty engage in discussion about the program. At monthly departmental meetings as well as occasional outside discussions, we look for, discuss, and plan ways of making our teaching more effective.

Externally, the creation of the UMA B.Arch Advisory Board now underway, will give us invaluable input from practicing professionals connecting in a variety of ways to architectural practice. By keeping this Advisory Board varied in its constituency we ensure that views are vigorously discussed from a variety of viewpoints. As a professional degree, it is part of our responsibility to keep up with ever-changing aspects of the profession, and to use our collaborations outside the university to ensure the best course forward.

Data and Information Sources
Sources of data come from three essential constituencies: students, faculty, and outside professionals. Students submit course and teacher evaluations at the conclusion of every class. These are collected by the UMaine System office and returned after tabulation. We in turn review and use these to track successful (or unsuccessful) teaching strategies in the classroom, as well as the successful (or unsuccessful) achievement of stated course outcomes. In addition, students are at times asked to anonymously answer topic-specific surveys during the semester to help gauge their interest in topics ranging from outside lecturers to potential architecture electives.

Faculty input is less formal which we have noted as an issue needing to be addressed. We are currently planning to discuss best ways to engage faculty in a more systematic and consistent form of data gathering. Ideas put forth include in-class peer evaluations, formal presentations and discussion of course objectives, topic specific surveys relating to the teaching environment, and an annual faculty pin-up where each faculty member would present the best and worst work of his or her courses to gather input and consistency across the department. (Please see MAP: Architecture Faculty)

The B.Arch Advisory Board will bring outside input from working professionals and associated fields as it relates to the profession. What data and how it will be collected is something that the Board will discuss after officially starting its work. (Please see MAP: Program Development) We also assume that accreditation reports will help us refine and codify our information, and that NAAB feedback to those reports, as well as the accreditation process, will help us to best guide our program in the future.

In addition, in the summer of 2012 we undertook comparative research looking at all the Bachelor of Architecture programs in the United States, with a further focus on the publically funded degrees. We are using the information derived from that research to help plan for the continued growth and improvement of our program. As an example, we now can quantify the teacher to student ratios for full-time and part-time faculty across the US. This gives us not only a measure to judge our own status, but allows us to plan for future growth. A summary of that research can be seen in Appendix E.

Institutional Long-Range Planning
In November 2009, UMA’s Strategic Planning Process was presented to the entire UMA community. The statement of value and purpose was the following: “The top priority for UMA, for the next five years and beyond, is to develop a strong public identity that reflects who we really are: the third-largest campus in the system. We must anchor our investments and growth to this identity, incorporating expansion of academic programs, improved student engagement, and greater engagement with our local, national, and global communities.”

There were several phases to the process. Using a Scenario to Strategy Process (S2S), faculty and staff were encouraged to serve on one of four committees that would examine our approach to the future of this university. Those four approaches were: “Traditionalists,” local and onsite delivery; “International Traditionalists,” onsite and global delivery; “Techies,” local and online delivery; and “International Techies,” global and online delivery. More than 95 faculty and staff volunteered for the four quadrants to develop a plan that most suited each of the four approaches.

In April 2010, each quadrant presented a scenario for the UMA community. All employees were asked to vote on the quadrant that most aligned with their vision for UMA’s future. Two groups were close enough in popularity, quadrants one and three, Traditionalists and Techies, that they were combined and met again as a larger group and submitted a final report to the Provost and the President in June 2010. And so, the UMA Strategic Plan (2011-2016) was developed as a summation of campus wide consensus.

In addition, UMA uses the Baldrige continuous improvement process. This involves a survey of the campus community every other year. A university committee then evaluates the survey the following year to focus on issues that surface through the responses of faculty and staff. The committee then submits a report to the President’s Cabinet. The Cabinet is responsible for overseeing that the recommendations are addressed and are reported back as completed or are scheduled to be completed over a period of time. UMA is on its third cycle of continuous improvement. This year the focus is “UMA’s workforce.” This link can best explain what the focus categories are:


Role of Five Perspectives
As shown in the Alignment Matrix at the end of Section I.1.3, we see our many of our core values closely linked to the ideas represented in the five perspectives. As such, any discussion of long-
range planning takes place in light of the perspectives, and that they will play a significant role in future development.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures
In the UMA strategic plan (2011 – 2016) Key Goal 4 is to “Foster a ‘culture of assessment’ and data-driven decision-making to measure and improve institutional effectiveness.” In response to the strategic report, the position of Director of Assessment was created, and assessment methods have undergone a comprehensive review. This directive for data-driven decision-making demands the department of architecture collect required information for analysis. Currently, existing assessment guidelines and tools are used on an annual basis by the department.

Institutional Requirements for Assessment
According to UMaine System Guidelines, Section 305.3, Academic Program Review, Program review should focus on student outcomes and should support a systematic and broad-based approach to the assessment of student learning focused on educational improvement through understanding how and what students are learning in their academic program. Regular program assessment will improve the program review process. Specific identification of program goals and student learning objectives is a critical first step.  

Currently, the Architecture Program Coordinator submits an annual report to the college Dean and University Provost, with a full program review every five-years. The department of architecture submitted this five-year program review after the spring of 2010. This recent comprehensive review was a great help in focusing our goals and plans moving forward. Our next program review will be spring 2015 following our NAAB Initial Candidacy second visit.

Please see Appendix C for UMA’s most recent Assessment Plan.

Self-assessment Procedures
Above and beyond system and university requirements, we see the B.Arch as an opportunity to increase internal self-assessment procedures. To that end we see the UMA B.Arch Advisory Board and its input to assess and suggest ideas to best realize our mission, as central to continued improvement. The Advisory Board’s work will specifically discuss how our degree curriculum prepares students for professional practice among other topics.

In addition, in the spring of 2014 we plan to initiate an exit survey to be taken by all program graduates as part of the capstone Thesis course. This will give us feedback on the overall success of the curriculum in terms of student expectations and results, as well as perceived preparedness for the profession. And finally, a detailed tracking and survey mechanism to gauge the success of our alumni is in the discussion stage. This will prove important, as the true test of the success of our degree pedagogy will be our alumni’s success in the field. (Please see MAP: Program Development)

The largest gap we see in our self-assessment to date is specific review of successful achievement of a course’s stated outcomes. As stated in the system guidelines, assessment “should focus on

---

5 Due to its length, this report could not be included as an appendix here but can be made available for the planned site visit if desired
student outcomes.” Current methods of assessment do not specifically address how well students in specific courses are achieving these stated outcomes. We do feel that the SPC matrix, much like our own course outcome matrix, will be a great aid in being able to clearly state course objectives and subsequently show where courses are meeting those objectives. While the department has created outcome matrices for our current BA curriculum, this exercise has not been undertaken focused on the proposed B.Arch curriculum. An updated matrix cross-referencing Learning Outcomes to curriculum, assessment tools, and benchmarks for success will be completed over AY2012-13

**Progress Toward Program Mission**

Through our mission of engaging community we aim to educate and empower students to explore, investigate, and analyze the built environment, and propose valued creative design solutions based in the core value understanding of space, scale, and light in design with meaningful intention, for the enriched experience of human activity the betterment of human habitation.

To date our progress is solid. As stated, our work in and with the community continues to grow. We have placed our design studios in some form of community connection in each of the past five years, typically more than once. This in turn accomplishes our goal of putting students in client-based situations where design effectiveness can be actively seen, and our students are exposed to the power and responsibility they have as architectural designers. The testimonials and news articles coming as a result of this work demonstrate we following a good path. (Please see Appendix G) As we move forward we need to develop ways to better quantify our rates of success, and formalize methods of data capture as they relate directly to community service. This work will be combined with our discussion of departmental self-assessment. (Please see MAP: Program Development)

**Progress Toward Multi-year Objectives**

NA

**PART ONE (1): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES**

**I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development**

**Faculty Growth**

With the recent move to downtown Augusta and the growth that move has spurred, we feel confident that we can attract quality full-time faculty to our B.Arch program. As evidence, in the spring of 2012 we successfully completed a national search for a new full-time faculty member. This gives us three full-time tenure-track positions heading into fall 2012. We are extremely happy that Amy Hinkley will be joining the department on a full-time basis, beginning fall 2012.6 Professor Hinkley’s background in education and architectural practice, along with her pervious experience at UMA, directly supports the growth of the architecture program. By joining us ahead of the fall 2013 B.Arch start Professor Hinkley will have a full year to become more familiar with the university system, and to offer her input to the long-term planning of the B.Arch degree. This new full-time position, in conjunction with our strong part-time adjunct teachers pulled from the professional community, give us a robust department as the B.Arch gets underway.

As we look forward to growing our FT faculty, we felt it important to understand how the UMA

---

6 Professor Hinkley’s Resume can be found in Section 4.3 of this document
The B.Arch program compares to others across the United States. To this end in the summer of 2012 we researched all the Bachelor of Architecture programs nationally, with a focus on public institutions. That research can be seen in Appendix E, part of which looks at faculty-to-student ratios. When considering faculty-to-student ratios for UMA, we include both full-time (FT) and part-time (PT) faculties, as both are integral to our teaching model. UMA’s current ratio of FT+PT7 faculty to FT+PT students is 1:15. The current average of FT+PT faculty to FT+PT student ratio of all public US B.Arch degrees is 1:17.8 This means that UMA Architecture is 12% better than the national average indicated small class sizes. This capability to offer students personalized instruction gives us a strong foundation as we start the professional degree.

However, when narrowing the research to consider FT faculty only, UMA Architecture does have some improvement ahead. Based upon our research, the average FT faculty to FT+PT student ratio of US public B.Arch degrees is 1:22.9 UMA’s current ratio is 1:25, which is 12% below the national average. We strongly believe, and have administrative support, that as the program grows we need to get our FT faculty numbers closer to national averages. This will better support our students, and will help grow our departmental scholarship, which in turn supports UMA’s baccalaureate mission.

Due to financial constraints being felt across the UMaine system, the previous plan to hire a fourth full-time faculty member in preparation of the fall 2013 start of the B.Arch program has been placed on hold. However, the administration is fully committed to supporting our students and program, and has agreed that should enrollment projections bear out, additional full-time faculty will be hired.

Using the research we have generated as a guide, UMA Architecture plans to grow its FT faculty to a level necessary to meet our expected growth in student body. To this end we have laid out the following plan to get our FT faculty-to-student ratio within 8% of national averages. The plan depends on fall 2013 enrollments, and subsequent retention, as a trigger for additional hiring in the year following that enrollment. In this way our faculty grows in direct relationship to the need of our B.Arch program and student numbers.

Based on a 2013 entering class of 30 (see Enrollment Projections under I.2.4 Financial Resources), combined with an estimated number of BA students currently in and staying in the program, we plan the following:

---

7 PT students and PT faculty are integrated at 1.3 FTE per Greg Lapointe, UMA’s Director of Institutional Research.
8 See Appendix E for Comparative Research to Public B.Arch programs in the United States, done by the University of Maine at Augusta Department of Architecture, Summer 2012
9 See Appendix E for Comparative Research to Public B.Arch programs in the United States, done by the University of Maine at Augusta Department of Architecture, Summer 2012
Full-Time Faculty Hiring Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th># of FT+PT Students (estimated)</th>
<th>FT Faculty to FT+PT Student Ratio</th>
<th>FT Faculty Search Trigger (for following fall start)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3 FT/90 Students = 1:30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4 FT/93 Students = 1:23</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4 FT/94 Students = 1:24</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4 FT/94 Students = 1:24</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4 FT/113 Students = 1:28</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5 FT/113 Students = 1:23</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This plan lays out clear milestones on which to base new FT faculty hires. Because the new hires are based on direct need, we can confidently say that we will reduce our faculty-to-student ratio if growth continues as projected.

Faculty: Course Matrix
The following matrices cover the two academic years prior and identifies each faculty member, the courses he/she was assigned during that time, and the specific credentials, experience, and research that supports these assignments. In the case of adjuncts or visiting professors, only those individuals who taught in the two academic years prior to the visit are identified. Additional information and a faculty resume can be found in Section 4.3.

---

10 Student numbers are a combination of FT and PT students, including both projected B.Arch and remaining BA in Architecture students averaged over AY2009-2011.
### Bartlett, Larry - Licensed architect and licensed engineer with over thirty-five years of professional experience in the design of architectural lighting and daylighting systems.

### Elizabeth, Daelynn - Owner, Architectural consulting firm focused on space-behavior impact, founder/former chair AIA Maine Outreach, connecting the architect to public, highlighting benefits of good design.

### Hancock, Morris - Practicing architect with 35+ years experience, specializing in construction methods and professional practice. Past president of AIA Maine. Author/Editor of Architect’s Handbook.

### Hinkley, Amy - 15 years of experience designing structures that support simple forms and sustainable construction methods. Designs grounded in environmental sensitivity, importance of place and community.

### Lemieux, Denis - Architect with 35+ years experience, still drawing all documents by hand. Involved in multiple professional organizations in leadership roles.

### Moreno, Daniel - Research focus on computer related design and implementation. Multiple years with firms as CAD manager-trainer, concurrently leading/teaching at CMCC in CAD. RA in Maine.

### Needham-Curtis, Rosie - Research centered on the connection between light and health in architecture. Individual design practice concentrating on housing that is both low cost and energy efficient.

### Richmond, Roger - Only NASA architect, Louis Kahn student, 3-D photographer doing lifelong study/teaching of the influence of space, scale, and light on human behavior.

### Sherman, Robert - A licensed EIT and RA. Sustainability is a focus serving on UMA’s Council for Environmental Sustainability, Green Campus Consortium, and Maine USGBC. Research of tensile structures.

### Stark, Eric - Focus on community-education partnerships with 20 projects in the past 5 years. Current research focuses on the use of the diagram in making visual argument.
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Faculty Resumes
See Part IV, Section 3 for faculty resumes.

EEO/AA Policies
These policies can be found online at http://www.main.edu/system/hr/nondiscrimination.php.

Diversity
Please see Section I.1.2. for information on this topic.

Development Opportunities
Faculty is encouraged to pursue professional development opportunities. Funds are available in the College Dean’s budget for all faculty members. The average award for professional development is $850 per person. During AY 11-12 an additional $10,000 was added to support faculty development. Requests for Professional Development funds are submitted to the Dean for approval and awarded on a first-come-first-served basis.

Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure
This information can be downloaded at http://www.main.edu/system/hr/labor_relations.php by clicking the link labeled AFUM Contract 2009-2011.

Visiting Lecturers and Critics
While we have not had a previous site visit, we have had numerous lecturers and guest critics come to UMA Architecture and share their knowledge and insight with our students. This list is inclusive for the past 5 years:

Jon Boyd, AIA, Harriman Associates
Paul Fowler, AIA, Lassel Architects
Morris C. Hancock, AIA, Architect
Harry Hepburn, AIA, Scott Simons Architects
Phil Kaplan, AIA, LEED, Phil Kaplan Architects
Robert Klinedinst, AIA, Principal Harriman Assoc.
Mark Lee, Harriman Associates
Kevin Moquin, AIA, Whitten + Winkelman Architects
Daelynn Morton, AIA, Daelynn Morton Design
John Priestley, AIA, Bernard & Priestley Architecture
James Schildroth, AIA, James Schildroth Associates, Architects
Jesse Thompson, LEED, Phil Kaplan Architects
Chris Delano, Art of Space
Paul Lewandowski, AIA, LEEDAP, SMRT Inc.
Scott Teas, AIA, principal TFH Architects
Carol Wilson, Carol Wilson Architects
Michael Boucher, Boucher Landscape Architects
Peter Biegle, Sytdesign, Landscape architects
Carol De Tine, President, Maine Chapter AIA
Lance Fletcher, Lance Fletcher Architect
Will Gatchell, Scott Simons Architects
Sarah J. Holland, Holland and Foley Architects
Caleb Johnson, Johnson and Bell Architects
Lincoln Jeffers, Asst. to the Administrator, Lewiston, ME
Wiebka Theodore, Principal, Theodore + Theodore Architects
Pamela Hawkes, Principal, Ann Beha Architects
M. Curt Sachs, Adjunct Professor of ARC
Jane Precourt, Adjunct Professor of ARC, UMA
Dick Barringer, USM Muskie School of Public Service
Kris Kowal, AIA, NCARB, WBRC Architects
Jill Simpson, WBRC Architects
Brewster Buttrfield, Prospect Design
Daniel R. Ellingson, Harriman Architects + Engineers
Sarah Hentges, Asst. Professor of American Studies, UMA
Ellen Belknap, SMRT
Michael Belleau, Michael Belleau Architect
Jeremiah Bartlett, Gorrill-Palmer Consulting Engineers, Inc.
Daniel R. Ellingson, Harriman Architects + Engineers
Chief Paul LeClair, Lewiston Fire Department
Greg Day, DayMatero Studio
Public Exhibitions
Even though to date we lack specific funding, we have made the opportunity to have architecture related public exhibitions and lectures over the past three academic years. These events expose our students to architects and those in related fields, while simultaneously promoting the UMA Department of Architecture to the larger Maine community. These include:

Architecture Lecture Series & Gallery Exhibit /Fall 2011

New Ideas/New Firms – An exhibition and lection series looking at the impetus for starting a new firm given the current economic climate. What are the goals and aspirations of these bold designers? What separates these new firms from others?

• Evan + Sasha Carroll, Bild Architecture, Portland, ME
• Soren Deniord, Soren Deniord Design Studio, Portland, ME
• Rick Jones, Jones Architecture, Salem, MA

Architecture Lecture Series & Gallery Exhibit /Fall 2010

CONCEPT: from Idea to Built Form – An exhibition and lecture series focused on how conceptual ideas relate to and become built works of architecture. Scheduled speakers and exhibitors included:

• Carol Wilson, Carol A. Wilson Architect, Falmouth, ME
• Nancy Barba, Barba + Wheelock Architects, Portland, ME
• Amy Shakespeare + Virginia Kindred, Redtop Architects, New York City, NY

Architecture Lecture Series & Gallery Exhibition /2009-2010
Sustainable Practices: Architects Working in Maine – An exhibition and lecture series focused on how sustainable ideas relate to multiple facets of architecture. Scheduled speakers and exhibitors included:

- Steven + Wiebke Theodore / Theodore+Theodore Architects, Bath
- Kevin Moquin + Claire Betze / Taggart Construction, Freeport
- Scott Simons / Scott Simons Architects, Portland

Please see Appendix H for marketing materials for these public exhibitions and lectures.

Since a primary goal of the program is to engage community, we are working on finding long-term funding for our lecture and exhibition series. Our initial plan is to support six lectures and four to six exhibitions per academic year. To date we have received an annual commitment of support from AIA Maine in the amount of $1000, which will go specifically toward a fall and spring lecture. We have developed an annual budget goal, and are currently working on a plan to secure additional support, primarily from architecturally related organizations.

In addition to lectures or exhibitions highlighting professionals we hold an annual Juried Architecture Student Show. This is an opportunity for all our students to submit work that is reviewed by a panel of architects in a closed session. The selection of awards and winners is left to the jury. Unlike our professional events, this event is specifically held in the Danforth Gallery on UMA’s main campus. This exposes the university community to what our students are accomplishing, and keeps us in touch given our move off-campus. These annual events began in 2005, and continue each spring.

Students: Evaluation for Admissions
Starting with our first B.Arch cohort in fall 2013, the architecture program will transition from our current open admissions policy to the stringent one outlined below. A committee of architecture faculty, comprised of both full-time and part-time faculty, will make admissions decisions. We are looking for students with the drive, talent, and potential to achieve success at UMA. As an undergraduate degree we understand that many of our students will not have taken architecture specific courses prior to entering the program, and factor that into our procedures and policies. We have set up our admissions policy to specifically allow for students who may be strong in one area but weaker in another the opportunity to demonstrate their respective talents. Admissions policies and procedures are available online as of September 2012, and will be updated annually. Documents can be found in Appendix I and seen at http://www.uma.edu/barchapply.html.

Admissions requirements to the B.Arch will be as follows:

First-time college applicants
- High School Diploma or General Equivalency Diploma (GED)
- SAT scores (Mathematics, Critical Reading, and Writing)
  - Minimum scores will place students for reading and mathematics levels
- TOEFL scores for International Students
  - Minimum scores will place students for reading and mathematics levels
- Architecture Review Challenge (ARC)
  - This is a four-question challenge testing a variety of skills including drawing, conceptual creativity, and writing ability. As an undergraduate institution we have made a conscious choice to offer this option in lieu of portfolio submissions. The ARC allows all students the opportunity to apply to the program, and not only those in typical high school tracks. This in turn allows for a wider variety of student to apply and be accepted to our program. (This idea is taken from the
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admissions procedures of the City College of New York Spitzer’s School of Architecture) or
  o  Portfolio + Essay
•  A personal interview between a UMA B.Arch faculty member and the candidate, either face-to-face or via Skype
•  Two letters of recommendation, one minimum from a former instructor

Transfer Student or UMA BA in Architecture student (current or alumni) applicants
•  Official College Transcripts
•  College cumulative GPA of B or better
•  Architecture Review Challenge (ARC), see above for description or
•  Portfolio of work
  o  Transfer student – necessary if student desires transfer credit for previously completed design studio coursework
  o  UMA Student (current or alumni) – portfolio should demonstrate word done at UMA and any other professionally applicable design work
•  A personal interview between UMA B.Arch faculty member and the candidate, either face-to-face or via Skype
•  Two letters of recommendation, one minimum from a former instructor

An overview of UMA admissions is located on the web at: http://www.uma.edu/overview.html. First-year students can find information at: http://www.uma.edu/firstyear.html. Transfer students can find information at: http://www.uma.edu/transferstudents.html. While Adult students can find specific information at: http://www.uma.edu/adultstudents.html. For students who are ready to apply, UMA has created an Architecture program specific tab with our specific requirements that can be seen at: http://www.uma.edu/readytoapply.html.

Timeline for Admissions Procedures. Admissions are due by 11:59 PM January 31st proceeding the fall start date. Personal interviews, for students with complete applications, will be completed by February 21st. Acceptance decisions and letters will be sent by March 1st to meet Early Financial Aid Awarding.

Recruitment of Underrepresented Students
While there is no specific policy on recruiting “underrepresented students,” UMA’s entire mission is access, and the “Responsible Admission Policy,” which can be found in the catalog and at http://www.uma.edu/overview.html, guides us.

In essence, with nearly open admissions at the institutional level, we admit and enroll many underrepresented or economically disadvantaged students. Nearly 80% of UMA students receive Federal Pell grants, with an average Pell award of more than $3,400 ($5,500 maximum). The vast majority of our students are first-generation college bound students.

Typically, underrepresented means ethnic and racially diverse students. UMA does enroll the second largest percentage of Native American students of any campus in the UMaine system (106 Native students), and our student body is 6.9% minority representation, far above Maine’s statewide level of ethnic diversity. (Please see Section 1.3.1 for additional information)

Student Support Services
Degree candidates in architecture are supported both by department-specific advisors, as well as existing academic and career services available to all UMA students.
Advising. Upon entry to the architecture program each student is assigned a faculty advisor from the architecture department that aids that student throughout his or her academic career. This faculty member addresses the short and long-term goals of the student, aligns coursework with those goals, and helps to layout milestones across the student’s planned academic career. The assigned faculty member typically meets with each advisee twice per academic year to schedule classes, and typically more often to discuss other related matters.

In addition to guidance from within the institution, planning is underway to create a mentorship and apprenticeship program with the Portland Society of Architects (PSA) (www.PortlandArchitects.org). Their mission is “Advocating for design excellence in the Greater Portland built environment while promoting fellowship within the local design community.” As part of that design community we see it as mutually beneficial to connect with this professional group. The goal of this endeavor is to have each desirous degree candidate be supported by a personal relationship with a practicing professional outside the institution. We believe this professional mentor will be a boon as we move to the professional degree, and that this relationship will act as a bridge between the classroom and the workplace. Our goal is to have the program tested and ready for implementation in conjunction with the first B.Arch cohort in fall 2013. (Please see MAP: Student Development)

Academic Support. The Office of Academic and Career Advising offers professional staff members who help students plan college schedules, and assist with course registration. Part of their work is to aid in the process of combining a student’s career goals with their academic plans. By taking career goals into consideration, they provide students with the tools to make appropriate academic choices. This combination of academics and career planning is key to the continued success of our students and graduates. Of course as a professional degree career advising and aid falls in part to the program itself. At this time we do not offer specific career aid, but do have a course requirement, ARC406 Architectural Apprenticeship, that puts our students in an office environment. In addition with the new B.Arch degree will be introducing a course tentatively entitled, ARC361, Portfolio Development that will prepare our students for job searches post-graduation. Please see Section 4.2 Course Descriptions for course outlines and outcomes of these courses.
MAP: Student Development

- **UMA AIAS Chapter**
  - Project/Goals: UMA AIAS Chapter
  - Action/Resources/Completion Deadline: Chapter Formed, Completed: fall 2008

- **Studio Culture Policy Review and Revision**
  - Completed: fall 2012

- **Portland Society of Architects Mentor/Apprentice Program**
  - Committee Assigned, Completed: spring 2012

- **AIAS to Join ARC faculty Meetings**
  - Expected: fall 2012

- **Develop Guidelines + Procedures**
  - Expected: fall 2012

- **Open Meetings: Policy + Assessment**
  - Expected: fall 2012

- **AIAS Events**
  - Expected: ongoing

- **Test Run Program**
  - Expected: spring 2013

- **Revised Policy Reviewed at Open Meeting**
  - Expected: spring 2013

- **Roll-out Full Program**
  - Expected: fall 2013

- **Revised Policy goes LIVE**
  - Expected: fall 2013

**First B.Arch Cohort**
- Fall 2013
Student Activities. Providing our students with access to field trips and other off-campus activities is essential to getting students out beyond mid-coast Maine. Internal to the program, primarily through our AIAS chapter, we arrange a minimum of two trips to Boston each academic year. These are often in conjunction with either architecture conventions being held at the time, or with the UMA Art department. Photos of AIAS events and trips can be seen on their Facebook site: https://www.facebook.com/groups/132902296286/photos/

We also partner with the Portland Society of Architects, connecting our students not only with built work of interest but also with the practitioners that created that work. These events have included trips to Boston, as well as local events touring architects’ offices and new projects of interest. In addition, the university takes a group to New York City on an annual basis, and architecture students are a large part of that cadre. Finally, trips to construction sites or buildings of interest are often used specifically in our structures and construction techniques courses so that students can see first hand the materials and methods of architecture.

External to the program, the UMA Office of Student Life maintains a full calendar of events and trips that all UMA students are able to attend. This not only further exposes architecture students to quality activities outside the institution, but also connects them with undergraduates in other disciplines. More can be found online at: http://www.uma.edu/studentlife.html.

Professional Organizations. We want to make UMA Architecture a central hub for architecture in Maine. In line with our desire for greater collaboration, we want to bring students, professionals, and communities together to learn and discuss issues facing our region and state. As mentioned in response to Perspective C in Section I.1.3, we maintain ties with a wide variety of professional organizations, all of which are aware of and support the B.Arch degree. Maine is a small state, and as such one’s network is doubly important, especially for our students. To this end, a number of our students, current and alumni, serve on the boards of AIA Maine, the Maine Chapter of the US Green Building Council, and the Portland Society of Architects. We also currently host an annual Construction Specification Institute (CSI) meeting on campus, as well as monthly AIA Maine Board meetings.

The Honors Program. UMA has a campus-wide honors program, and architecture students regularly achieve this special distinction at graduation. More information can be found at: http://www.uma.edu/Honors.html.

Student Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities since last site visit
NA

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance

Administrative Structures
UMA Administrative Structure. UMA’s deans, one for each of its two colleges, report directly to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Provost in turn reports to the President.

Program Structure. The major academic unit at UMA is the college. The Department of Architecture resides in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). Each degree program within the college has an appointed Program Coordinator (similar to a departmental chair). The Program Coordinator is the representative upon whom the Dean of the College relies for information and advice regarding the general conduct of the department and from whom the Dean receives
program requests and recommendations concerning instruction, instructional support, personnel, budget, accreditation and/or internal program reviews where appropriate.

The architecture program will continue to be led by a Program Coordinator. Additional coordinator responsibilities under the B.Arch will be chairing B.Arch Advisory Board meetings and NAAB accreditation oversight. The following chart shows the CAS structure; the Architecture program and its administration are shown highlighted.

**College of Arts and Sciences Structure**

**Governance Opportunities**
Curriculum development starts at the departmental level. Changes or augmentation to the curriculum is typically championed by a faculty member and brought before the full architecture faculty (full-time and part-time) for consideration and comment at monthly departmental meetings. Upon agreement by the department, potential curriculum changes are shared with the College. The department responds as necessary to College comment and then, depending on the level of amendment or addition required, the curriculum is sent to the college dean, and finally to the provost for signature. The UMA curriculum committee that represents all colleges, addresses larger questions as required.

Under the B.Arch, curriculum discussions when appropriate will be brought before the B.Arch Advisory Board for their input to help ensure consistency and consideration in terms of the profession.

**Student Representation.** At the University level, architecture students are represented in student government through the UMA Student Government General Assembly. This body is constituted of students elected from the entire UMA student body. For additional information: http://www.uma.edu/generalassembly.html.

At the program level the UMA chapter of the American Institute of Architect Students (AIAS) forms the major voice of the architecture student body. They are very active in creating community among
students including an annual Swan Island Camping Trip. One program of note is their AIAS Design Clinic, an annual event where community members are invited to the architecture building to receive free design advice on any project from students and participating practicing professionals. The group boasts 94 members through their Facebook page (https://www.facebook.com/groups/132902296286/).

In addition, and along with our desire to get our students more involved, we have cleared with the UMA administration adding an AIAS representative to our monthly departmental meetings starting in AY2012-13. This will allow for direct input from a student representative on student thoughts and concerns. (See MAP: Student Development)

Faculty Representation. At the University level, architecture Faculty is represented in the UMA Faculty Senate by members elected from the College of Arts and Sciences. At the departmental level, monthly meetings are held for all full-time and part-time architecture faculty. These meetings are presided over by the Program Coordinator who develops the agenda with input from all. Meeting minutes are shared with the CAS Dean.

Other Degree Programs in the College of Arts and Sciences
Bachelor of Arts in Art
Bachelor of Arts in Biology
Bachelor of Arts in English
Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies
Bachelor of Music in Jazz and Contemporary Music
Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies
Bachelor of Arts in Social Science
Associate of Arts in Liberal Studies
Associate of Arts in Photography
Associate of Science in Jazz and Contemporary Music

Degree information, as well as minors and certificates offered, can be found online: http://www.uma.edu/artssciencesdegrees.html.

I.2.3 Physical Resources
In the fall of 2011 the existing Architecture Program moved to the Gannett Building, downtown Augusta. With the move, the program went from one and one-half classrooms on campus to two floors – the 2nd and 4th floors of Gannett – totaling 7842 gross square feet. This was a monumental accomplishment for the program and the university. Indeed it was the acquisition of the Gannett Building that gave rise to the idea of applying for NAAB accreditation.

All architecture courses, except those requiring a computer lab, are currently run out of Gannett. General Education courses and those offered by other departments are delivered on UMA’s Main campus, located 2.2 miles to the northwest. Please see a map here: http://goo.gl/maps/FsMto. The Gannett building plans in this section represent spaces used by architecture majors and do not show all classroom space available at UMA. For plans of spaces, other than Gannett, available to our students please see Appendix J.

Gannett Building – Today
The Gannett Building supplies the existing architecture program its first dedicated studio space, its first dedicated critique spaces, its first adjunct faculty office space, its first gallery space, and provides two additional architecture drafting/studio classrooms that are hard-wired with internet, streaming and recording technology. Faculty offices, lobby display areas for student work, meeting space, printing specific areas, computer stations, and a model construction area complete
the existing facilities. Please see following 1st, 2nd, and 4th Gannett floor plans showing layout and location of the existing facilities.

**Studio-Based Learning.** We believe the UMA B.Arch program must foster and support a cacophony of ideas. The energy upon entering the studio should be palpable, chaotic, a mix of action and thinking. We believe that “making is knowing.” We support and encourage an exploration by our students and faculty that uses the act of creation as a means to investigate and test ideas. The program, its faculty and its facilities, must support, to the highest extent possible, this exploration.

On the fourth floor of Gannett, we currently have the capability to offer Dedicated Studio Space to a maximum of 30 students. This equals 65 square feet per student space (including circulation & work space; excluding support spaces like restrooms or elevator lobbies). UMA currently offers Dedicated Studio Space to our upper level (3rd and 4th year) BA in Architecture design students. In fall 2011 this was 35% of our design student body (22 of 62 students). This existing space means we can offer dedicated studio space to our upper level students through the first three years of the B.Arch, through AY2015-16, possibly longer depending on enrollments and retention numbers.

**Interactive Learning.** Currently, the Gannett Building’s second floor houses two shared studios. These serve as the studio space for 1st and 2nd year design students, as well as classroom space for associated technology, elective, and some art classes. These rooms are fully wired and allow for a variety of teaching styles including: lecture, discussion, creation, and small group discussion, among others.

In addition, the building offers two dedicated critique spaces, on the 2nd and 4th floors. These spaces are used for project critique, class discussion, student presentation, guest lectures and more. Students will also commandeer these spaces for group project meetings, as well as AIAS meetings.

Finally, the Gannett Gallery – earmarked for exhibitions and lectures related to architecture – offers additional flex-space that can be used for larger critiques (we currently hold thesis reviews here), large and small group discussions, lectures seating up to 60, and is available for community use. We are currently 25% toward our goal of funding the purchase of new flex-furniture that will allow the full realization of this space’s potential. Please see MAP: Physical Resources.

**Faculty Spaces.** Each faculty member is currently given a private office with the appropriate furniture and supplies, allowing for university related work, faculty research, and interaction with students, both in small groups and one-on-one, to occur. In addition, the Gannett Building offers our first Adjunct Faculty office; compete with desk and storage space. This space allows our adjunct faculty a place to prepare for classes as well as council students in privacy.

With our very recent growth and its requisite expenditure, immediate additional growth is not feasible. In addition, the University is “space challenged,” with no unused space open to reconfiguration or renovation for our use. At this time we feel we have sufficient space to strongly support the B.Arch degree, while we phase out the BA in Architecture. However, we are aware there will likely be need for additional space growth. The administration has voiced clear commitment to supporting proven need for additional space as we move the program forward. The following is our proposed plan, along with retention goals and triggers for action, as it regards additional space for the architecture program.
Gannett Building – Tomorrow
Given our recent increase in space, and the current budget issues facing the UMaine System, any additional increase in space for the architecture program will need to be a result of demonstrated need. To this end we will be tracking current and future use of our current dedicated studio space so that we can move quickly and efficiently as need arises.

Studio Space. A mix of action and thinking is what leads to success in the studio. We affirm the importance of creation as essential to the studio’s success, and since much of what is created occupies physical space, we need to work toward giving each student a physical space to call his or her own within the program.

Currently 96% of all public B.Arch degrees offer Dedicated Studio Space for all design students as part of their program’s facilities. These numbers increase to 100% after the first year of study. This data, and our committed belief in the benefit of Dedicated Studio Space to student success, make this a priority for the UMA Architecture program.

Any increase in space will need to meet specific triggers as described below. One option is the top (fifth) floor of the Gannett Building, currently leased on a short term basis, and would offer the architecture program the ability to increase its teaching and studio space by 3420 gross square feet or 50%. Please see following Gannett Building’s 5th floor plan showing its potential. Another option would be the reconfiguration of the 4th floor of Gannett to offer dedicated studio space to a greater number of students. Please see the MAP: Physical Resources for the schedule in determining and planning for space requirements.

The following growth plan is based on a B.Arch entering class of 30 students in fall 2013, and will need to satisfy triggers discovered through our planned study of current use.

In order to seat our projected number of students we plan the following:

**Phase 1:** This first phase was completed with the current renovation of the Gannett Building. Beginning in AY2011-2012, we offered our upper level BA in Architecture students (3rd and 4th year) dedicated studio space for the first time in our 25-year history. Seating capacity is currently for 30 students. The 1st and 2nd year students’ studios are shared but do constitute a doubling in square footage compared to our space before the move to Gannett.

**Phase 2:** Dedicated Studio Space for all upper level students, 3rd through 5th year. This would continue our current model of supplying Dedicated Studio Space for our upper level students. We see this as a focus as we believe these are the students who have fully committed to the learning and practice of architecture. According to projections this would be 42 students in AY2016-17, and 60 students in AY2017-18. Another mitigating factor for growth will be the interest from transfer students and UMA alumni, of which to date there has been a fair amount.

---

11 See UMA B.Arch Comparison Research in Appendix E
12 See 1.2.4 Financial Resources for enrollment projections
13 See UMA Architecture Enrollment and Retention Projections, Section 1.2.4. Financial Resources
Currently at Gannett
2nd floor Gannett – 1330sf /continue using this for the 1st and 2nd year studios as non-dedicated studio space, and for other ARC classes
4th floor Gannett – 1900sf /would seat all of 3rd & part 4th year, currently 30 students
Gannett Gallery – 1220 SF /Seats up to 60 lecture style, coordination with other gallery uses is require

Additional space possible
5th floor Gannett – 1900sf /would seat part of 4th year & all of 5th year
Dedicated Critique Space – similar to 2nd and 4th floors
(2) Additional faculty offices

Conclusion
Per our current enrollment projections the addition of Gannett’s 5th floor could house all the upper level (3rd – 5th years) design students on floors 4 and 5 of Gannett. For this Phase to be achieved a renovation of 5th floor would be required.

Actions/Triggers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A three-year study of current dedicated studio space use covering AYs2012-13, 2013-14, and 2014-15</td>
<td>36 hours per week per student</td>
<td>The migration from the current BA in Architecture to the B.Arch will need to be factored into this study as we are moving to a differently minded student body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of projected enrollments and retentions14</td>
<td>Projections to be confirmed</td>
<td>Will adjust need as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 3: Dedicated Studio Space for beginning level, 1st & 2nd year students. This would bring us inline with other public B.Arch programs across the nation offering all design students dedicated space. Timing of this phase is dependant on enrollments to the B.Arch program and successful completion of Phase 2.

Current at Gannett (based on a completed Phase 2, above)
2nd floor Gannett – 1330sf /being used for the 1st and 2nd year studios as non-dedicated studio space, and for other ARC classes
4th floor Gannett – 1900sf /seating all of 3rd & part of 4th year, 30 students
Gannett Gallery – can seat up to 50 lecture style, coordination with gallery use is required

Additional required
2nd floor – 1330sf /re-purpose shared studios as dedicated studio space for 2nd year students, 23 students projected
5th floor – 1900sf /part of 4th year & 5th year
Option FLR 05a: would seat 48 students (see plan FLR 05a below)

---

14 See UMA Architecture Enrollment and Retention Projections, Section 1.2.4. Financial Resources
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Option FLR 05b: would seat 32 students + hold 2 faculty offices, and dedicated critique space (see plan FLR 05b below)

Other studio space – 1950sf /30 projected 1st year students at 65sf/student
Other classroom space – 600sf /one classroom/seminar/meeting space with seating capacity of 20-25 - could be found on campus

Conclusion
A complete review of the Gannett building would be required to accomplish Phase 3. This Phase requires an additional 2550sf + support spaces. This may be possible through a larger rearrangement within the building’s existing space, or may require finding additional space within Gannett or elsewhere.

Actions/Triggers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Trigger</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Phase 2</td>
<td>See above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of projected enrollments and retentions</td>
<td>Projections to be confirmed</td>
<td>Will adjust need as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study need of additional classroom space</td>
<td>Specific Need</td>
<td>Demonstrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library Resources
The majority of the library resources will continue to be housed in the Bennett D. Katz Library on the main campus. We recognize that the distance between our new downtown location and the existing library needs to be addressed. To that end three projects have emerged, a web-based Architecture Research Guide, an Onsite Architecture Resource Center to be located in the Gannett Building and an online Art + Architecture Digital Database. Please see Section I.2.5. for a full description of the existing and planned growth of these architectural holdings.

Computer Resources
The majority of the computer facilities, including both PC and Mac-based computer labs and classrooms, are currently located on the main campus. Please see http://uma.edu/cs.html for a full description of UMA’s computer resources. A computer lab at the Gannett building is not seen as a primary need at this time, as B.Arch students will be required to have their own computers. We do have four computer workstations on site. Two are located in classroom studios and are used by students and teachers in class. Two others are located along with plotting and printing equipment on the fourth floor. These are networked. Software includes: AutoCAD latest version, REVIT, Adobe Creative Suite, Microsoft Office Suite, Google SketchUp, and software associated with available scanning devices. We do plan to augment computer use with equipment not typically within a student’s reach including a flatbed image scanner (fall 2012), a large format sheet scanner (fall 2011), graphic workstations, and multi-media workstations. This spring we received a grant to purchase equipment to set up a digital photo lab/studio so students can document their work. That equipment has been purchased and we are working on finalizing the training and procedures for use. We plan to have this up and running by spring 2013. Plotting, printing, and copying are currently provided at the Gannett Building. (Please see MAP: Resource Development)
Other University Space
The general education courses that are part of the B.Arch curriculum are primarily taught on the main UMA campus, located 2.2 miles from the Gannett Building. There is a shuttle bus running between locations, as well as ample parking in both locations. On campus classrooms are equipped with up-to-date technologies allowing for the recording and web casting of course materials. These classrooms and support spaces are available for architecture courses as needed. Please see Appendix J for plans and notes of other University spaces that directly support the B.Arch degree.
MAP: Physical Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Goals</th>
<th>Action / Resources / Completion Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated Studio Space</td>
<td>Phase 1: upper levels (3rd, 4th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed: fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gannett Gallery Furniture Fit-out</td>
<td>Large Format Sheet Scanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Completed: fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Resources at Gannett</td>
<td>Flatbed Image Scanner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AIA Maine Donation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review need for Additional Workstations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: fall 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continued Funding Exploration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digital Photo Shooting Studio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First B.Arch Cohort</td>
<td>Furniture In Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>Expected: Spring 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: upper levels (3rd, 4th, 5th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3: increase (All design students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected: TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gannett 5th Floor Potential Desk Layout Comparison
I.2.4 Financial Resources

Conservative and sound financial practices are the hallmark of UMA’s management of financial resources. UMA continues its historical and concerted effort to strengthen academic programs, to create new baccalaureate offerings, to enhance and expand student services, to maintain and enhance the physical plant and continue to invest in technological resources. These investments have been made despite a faltering economy and stagnant state appropriation levels. At the same time, UMA has strived to keep tuition increases at levels deemed to be within reach for our students.

Current Fiscal Year Report & Forecast Expenses

Our current fiscal year is FY2013, which runs from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. At this point in time, we have only budget figures for the current year; it is too early to show any actual expenses for the year. Therefore, the following chart includes actual expenditures for FY12, as well as actual budgeted expenses for FY13 and projected budget for FY14.

It is important to note that UMA does not budget at the department level for expenses related to adjunct faculty salaries and benefits, or for faculty additional compensation or overload expenses. These costs are budgeted in a central budget administered by the Provost; resources are allocated to departments as needed and approved, through a transfer of dollars from “E&G”. This transfer line is also ordinarily not budgeted for at the department level. The following chart shows FY12 actual expenses in these cost categories and includes a projection of anticipated transfers and expenses for the current fiscal year and FY14. However, these lines are not part of an approved budget for the Architecture Department.

Projected income from the B.Arch degree is shown below under Five-year Program Income Projection. The Net Revenue and Expenses of $142,294.36 represents in the following chart represents the amount required to fund the architecture department’s actual net expenses – primarily from tuition, fees and state appropriation revenues. Actual revenues during FY12 (Subtotal Revenues) came in just over $118K and annual actual expenses (Subtotal Expenses) were $260,521.47 – for a net of $142,294.36.

The University of Maine system publishes its annual audited financial statements online: [http://www.maine.edu/ufms/annualfinancialreports.php](http://www.maine.edu/ufms/annualfinancialreports.php) and the Board normally approves a system-wide balanced budget. The bulk of UMA revenues – tuition, fees, and state appropriations – are budgeted and recorded in a single department. From this ‘money pot’, all other cost centers (including Architecture), in essence, are funded. We include this link in the spirit of financial transparency.

There will be an increase in FT faculty line (AFUM Faculty Salaries Base) for the Fall 2013 given our recent new hire. Once that paperwork is approved and processed, a budget transfer via the Position Management System will be made to fund the addition. An amount for such payroll changes is budgeted and creates a ‘reserve’, awaiting certainty before transfer to the department.
Fiscal Year Reports

University of Maine at Augusta
Architecture E&G Fund 00
FY 12 Actuals, FY 13 & 14 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2012 Actual</th>
<th>FY 13 FUTBUD</th>
<th>FY 14 FUTBUD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42119</td>
<td>Course Fees</td>
<td>(15,127.80)</td>
<td>(16,100.00)</td>
<td>(17,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80000</td>
<td>Transfers From E&amp;G</td>
<td>(92,599.31)</td>
<td>(93,000.00)</td>
<td>(95,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81500</td>
<td>Transfers From E&amp;G Reserve</td>
<td>(10,500.00)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Revenues</strong></td>
<td>(118,227.11)</td>
<td>(109,100.00)</td>
<td>(112,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50003</td>
<td>Fac Sal Cancellation Fees</td>
<td>214.10</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>215.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50004</td>
<td>Fac Sal Async/ITV Fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50009</td>
<td>Fac Sal Additional Comp</td>
<td>9,464.19</td>
<td>9,500.00</td>
<td>9,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50016</td>
<td>Fac Sal Overload Fall</td>
<td>9,592.00</td>
<td>9,600.00</td>
<td>9,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50017</td>
<td>Fac Sal Overload Spring</td>
<td>6,370.00</td>
<td>6,400.00</td>
<td>6,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50100</td>
<td>AFUM Faculty Salaries Base</td>
<td>97,676.02</td>
<td>98,394.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50401</td>
<td>PATFA Faculty Salaries Fall</td>
<td>30,845.00</td>
<td>31,080.00</td>
<td>31,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50402</td>
<td>PATFA Faculty Salaries Spring</td>
<td>30,466.00</td>
<td>30,700.00</td>
<td>31,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52012</td>
<td>Classified Temporary</td>
<td>544.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54010</td>
<td>Retirement Incentive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54800</td>
<td>Employee Benefits Distribution</td>
<td>48,349.63</td>
<td>50,575.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54810</td>
<td>Employee Ben Dist - Temp Employee</td>
<td>7,174.66</td>
<td>7,230.00</td>
<td>7,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60103</td>
<td>Catering Services</td>
<td>1,383.78</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60300</td>
<td>Memberships Dues &amp; Fees</td>
<td>312.00</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>7,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60400</td>
<td>Postage &amp; Delivery Svc</td>
<td>372.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60401</td>
<td>Bulk Mail US Post Office</td>
<td>93.13</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60402</td>
<td>Delivery Svc (e.g. FedEx UPS)</td>
<td>118.95</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60403</td>
<td>First Class US Mail</td>
<td>309.81</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60500</td>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>6,451.19</td>
<td>265.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60600</td>
<td>Printing &amp; Copying Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60603</td>
<td>Copying</td>
<td>1,270.25</td>
<td>1,450.00</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60604</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>482.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61000</td>
<td>Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>3,948.55</td>
<td>1,850.00</td>
<td>1,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61005</td>
<td>Computer Supplies</td>
<td>338.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61007</td>
<td>Food and Provisions</td>
<td>635.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Non-Travel</th>
<th>Out-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61009</td>
<td>Laboratory Supplies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61022</td>
<td>Toner</td>
<td>523.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61026</td>
<td>Meals Non-Travel</td>
<td>88.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61402</td>
<td>In-State Motor Pool Charge</td>
<td>149.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61407</td>
<td>In St Travel - Vehicle Rental</td>
<td>88.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61500</td>
<td>Out of State Travel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62000</td>
<td>Equipment Unit Cost &lt; $5000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,580.00</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62016</td>
<td>Computer Software &lt; $5000</td>
<td>1,370.00</td>
<td>5,132.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62516</td>
<td>Computer Software &gt;= $5000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64000</td>
<td>Telephone &amp; Telecommunications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64008</td>
<td>Toll Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64700</td>
<td>Maintenance of Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64750</td>
<td>Maintenance Computer Software</td>
<td>1,890.00</td>
<td>1,890.00</td>
<td>1,890.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70000</td>
<td>Transfers To E&amp;G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Expenses 260,521.47 263,071.00 348,090.00

Net Revenue & Expenses 142,294.36 153,971.00 236,090.00

Five-year Program Income Projection
The following tuition income projections are based on an entering class of 30 in fall 2013, and subsequent retention. Due to uncertainty, it does not include students remaining in the BA degree program, transfer student enrollments to the B.Arch, or current UMA Architecture matriculating to the B.Arch. Retention and associated income numbers will be adjusted as we move through the program. Please see Section 1.2.4 Financial Resources for our enrollment and retention projections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total cr hrs</th>
<th>ARC cr hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year 2013-14</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of FT students</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$138,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Tuition</td>
<td>$18,560</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Fee</td>
<td>$93,600</td>
<td>$161,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Fees</td>
<td>$8,352</td>
<td>$103,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
<td>$17,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$161,040</td>
<td>$103,572</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 New England Board of Higher Education - Students are eligible for the Regional Student Program (RSP) Tuition Break when they enroll in an approved major that is not offered by the public colleges and universities in their home-state

16 The percentage of non-resident students is a best estimate based upon consultation with Mr. Arnaldo Melendez, Undergraduate Admissions Coordinator at Spitzer-CCNY (May, 2011);
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals, 1st yr</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>$249,280</th>
<th>$27,840</th>
<th>$5,400</th>
<th>$0.00</th>
<th>$282,520</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total of 1st year revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$282,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Courses only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,740</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBHE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$32,175</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,775</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,690</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals, 1st yr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st yr revenues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals, 1st yr**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-state</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st yr</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$249,280</td>
<td>$27,840</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$282,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Year 2014-15</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of FT students</td>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>All Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBHE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$193,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Year 2014-15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total revenues of 2nd year revenues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total revenues of 2nd year revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-state</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of FT students</td>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>All Tuition</td>
<td>Unified Fee</td>
<td>ARC Fees</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$97,216</td>
<td>$12,180</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
<td>$282,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBHE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$62,400</td>
<td>$5,220</td>
<td>$2,760</td>
<td>$184,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$870</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$35,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$176,416</td>
<td>$182,799</td>
<td>$9,660</td>
<td>$502,109</td>
<td>$706,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Year 2015-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grand Total of 3rd year revenues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total of 3rd year revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-state</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of FT students</td>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>All Tuition</td>
<td>Unified Fee</td>
<td>ARC Fees</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$69,874</td>
<td>$69,874</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
<td>$706,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBHE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$44,850</td>
<td>$44,850</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,760</td>
<td>$334,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$12,075</td>
<td>$12,075</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$198,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$126,799</td>
<td>$126,799</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,660</td>
<td>$334,969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fourth Year 2016-17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth Year 2016-17</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of FT students</td>
<td>Annual Tuition</td>
<td>All Tuition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geographically, the closet public professional B.Arch degree.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-state</th>
<th>NEBHE</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>$6,944</td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$159,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>90,272</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$15,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10,933</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,205</td>
<td>$841</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4,160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$706,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>397,881</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$254,613</td>
<td>$53,961</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>503,246</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,418</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY</strong></td>
<td>$887,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total of 4th year revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-state</th>
<th>NEBHE</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>$73,346</td>
<td>$42,250</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>$129,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$4,160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$503,246</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$254,613</td>
<td>$53,961</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$606,037</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,418</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEBHE</strong></td>
<td>$10,400</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$159,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,205</td>
<td>$841</td>
<td>$15,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$3,915</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$369,233</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,418</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-state</strong></td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$16,800</td>
<td>$783</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16,800</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$841</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$89,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$13,650</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$783</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$89,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$129,246</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
<td>$334,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$470,295</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,080</td>
<td>$470,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total of 5th year revenues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In-state</th>
<th>NEBHE</th>
<th>Out-of-state</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>$50,778</td>
<td>$29,250</td>
<td>$9,450</td>
<td>$89,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$2,340</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARC Courses only</strong></td>
<td>$503,246</td>
<td>$312,418</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$606,037</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$312,418</td>
<td>$71,922</td>
<td>$887,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEBHE</strong></td>
<td>$29,250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$29,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$900</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-state</strong></td>
<td>$9,450</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$9,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$2,340</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$3,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>$89,478</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,420</td>
<td>$470,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$563,193</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,420</td>
<td>$563,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparative Reports**

NA

**Core expenses per FTE enrollment, by function - SY2010**

**Source:** IPEDS Data Feedback Report, University of Maine at Augusta, November 2011
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Annual Expenditures and Investments per Student
As noted in the letter prepared by Mr. Rodriguez following his February 2012 visit to Maine, UMA – like the six other universities in the University of Maine System – budgets and tracks expenses on a functional basis. Similarly, tuition revenue is not credited to particular departments or programs. Instead, these revenues along with revenue derived from the levying of mandatory fees on each enrolled credit hour, are credited to University financial resources – the University’s “bottom line.” In contrast, course fees and major fees charged by individual departments are credited directly to that department. We do not intend to alter this approach to budgeting.

However, we have been working to develop analytics that allow us to fairly compare academic programs in terms of capacity, student retention, tuition generation and cost; this effort was discussed with Mr. Rodriguez at the time of his visit. The development of these analytics remains a work in progress. It is challenging not only in terms of ensuring we have identified the proper variables for analysis, have pulled data from the proper sources and have correctly constructed algorithms, but these exercises raise a range of “political” challenges at the campus level. While the exercise remains open to refinement, this report presents data for these metrics; the intent of including these data is to address the concerns raised in Mr. Rodriguez’ February 8th letter.

The table below shows the number of FTEs\(^\text{18}\) by college, by selected academic program and for the University as a whole, for AY12.\(^\text{19}\) It also includes the direct cost or expenditures per FTE for credit hours generated in the same Academic Year. The fourth column shows the cost per FTE adjusted to include a gross estimate of indirect expenses. The factor used to adjust direct expenses is UMA’s federally approved indirect rate for instruction, as authorized by USDHHS. Importantly, the federal indirect rate is designed to set out a guideline for an allowance the federal government will make for overhead expenses when funding grant activities on a University of Maine System campus. The methodology used caps administrative costs at 26%. As a result, the 49.6% factor understates UMA’s true overhead expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per FTE</th>
<th>FTEs</th>
<th>Direct Cost/FTE</th>
<th>Adj. Cost/FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>$5,029</td>
<td>$7,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene/Assisting</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$20,233</td>
<td>$30,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$14,076</td>
<td>$21,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Lab Tech</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,092</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Tech</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$10,646</td>
<td>$15,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>$5,393</td>
<td>$8,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$8,331</td>
<td>$12,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMA</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>$5,211</td>
<td>$7,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare the cost or expenditure per FTE student in these professional degree programs to the tuition and fee revenue each generated in AY12.

\(^{18}\) FTEs are calculated by dividing the total credit hours generated by a given department over the course of the year by 30.

\(^{19}\) AY12 includes the 2011 summer sessions, fall 2011 semester and spring 2012.
Professional Degree Program Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Adj. Cost/FTE</th>
<th>Revenue/FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental Hygiene/Assisting</td>
<td>$30,268</td>
<td>$11,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>$21,057</td>
<td>$7,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Lab Tech</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
<td>$7,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Tech</td>
<td>$15,927</td>
<td>$7,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>$12,464</td>
<td>$8,364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from this table that many of the professional programs are subsidized, with costs outpacing revenues. While the direct costs of the Architecture program are exceeded by tuition/fee revenue, the application of indirect expenses alters that picture. The Lab Tech program is heavily subsidized by the local medical center. Other programs are subsidized by larger, lower cost programs in the University’s portfolio. All operations are, to some extent, subsidized by state appropriations that, in FY12, totaled more than $13 million.

Subsidizing programs is not done without consideration and conscious decision-making. Some subsidized programs (and it should be noted that the list above does not represent the universe of UMA subsidized programs – there are others) such as Nursing and Dental – are designed to meet certain of Maine’s particular workforce needs. Others – like Architecture – are signature programs that help distinguish UMA from other alternatives available to students.

Financial Health of the University

Since the last report to NAAB, UMA’s financial indicators have been updated and show continued good “health.” The University’s Primary Reserve Ratio at the close of FY11, while still below benchmark, showed continued improvement, rising to its highest level in more than five years. Net operating revenues far exceeded benchmark and were more than twice that observed for the previous fiscal year. UMA’s Return on Net Assets Ratio was three times the benchmark in FY11; performance on both this measure and net operating revenues are related to strong enrollment and revenue growth. Similarly, UMA’s Viability Ratio exceeded the benchmark by almost 100%, as the institution carries very little debt on its books. Overall health, as measured by the Composite Financial Index of 6.1, remains strong.

Despite the stubbornness of the recession in Maine, UMA finished the most recent fiscal year on June 30th, 2012 with a $1.3 million surplus. This is a testament to the management approach employed by the University, which is careful and conservative. Particular care was taken in preparing the budget for FY13. State appropriations to the University System declined again with the last legislative session. Family incomes in Maine are at best, stagnant. Here, as across the nation, the public is very concerned about access to higher education and rising tuition rates. As a result, the UMS Board of Trustees placed a moratorium on increases on in state tuition and mandatory fees for FY13. This moratorium is expected to hold for at least several years into the future.

UMA’s operating revenue is derived primarily from state appropriation dollars, and tuition and fees. The moratorium on tuition increases, then, presents an additional challenge for the University, as operating costs continue to rise. In order to bring the FY13 budget into balance, UMA has made approximately $800 thousand in cost reductions. These savings span the depth and breadth of the campus and include (but are not limited to) initiatives involving reductions in the number of part time faculty teaching lower level courses, hiring freezes, decreases in travel budgets and so on. Additional reductions will have to be made in FY14.
At the same time, it is notable that efforts have been made to continue support of key programs that help distinguish UMA from other campuses. Among such programs is Architecture, which is seeing an increased investment this fiscal year as a new, full time faculty member has been hired for the program – as planned – effective September 2012.

In the 2011, the Office of University Advancement re-established the UMA Foundation to accept unrestricted gifts. In fall 2011, University Advancement will host an event designed to cultivate membership among new and returning friends of UMA, to build momentum for growing the Foundation. During FY2012, the Office launched its first-time senior (pre-alum) appeal, which is intended to strengthen graduates’ relationships with UMA and increase their philanthropic mindset before departing campus. Kick-off of the third annual giving campaign was in November 2011. The Director of University Advancement is a member of the President’s senior leadership team, Executive Committee and Cabinet, and is closely integrated into planning and operational discussions at the campus level. This ensures the Office is aware of and considered in all-important decisions made at the executive level.

**Anticipated Changes in Funding Models.** At present, UMA has no plans to alter the way in which it funds faculty, instruction, overhead or facilities operations.

**Other financial issues.** Any significant fiscal issues have been described above.

**University Enrollments**

UMA’s enrollment projections continued to prove to be conservative in AY12, exceeding budget by 6%. Much of this growth has been fueled by increases in online enrollments. In AY13, a slight decline is projected for budgeted credit hour enrollments. This downward adjustment is primarily driven by a change in policy related to the waiting list for UMA’s nursing program. This shift has resulted in students who might have enrolled at UMA to work on core general education requirements while awaiting admission to the nursing program to pursue that baseline work elsewhere, resulting in a loss of credit hour enrollments. However, it is anticipated that over the course of the next several academic years, UMA will continue to otherwise see modest growth rates in summer session enrollments, with stable fall and spring enrollments and a growth in the average credit hour load per student, offsetting the loss arising from the change in nursing program admissions policy. In other words, credit hour enrollment from AY14 through AY16 is expected to remain relatively flat.

In Mr. Rodriguez’s February 2012 letter, he cited the fact that UMA officials had noted that, as the University continues its evolution to a full-fledged baccalaureate institution, the number of full time equivalent students was rising, even as headcount was declining. Mr. Rodriguez stated in his letter that the data supporting this observation were not clear.

The following chart exhibits the observed change in student headcount (the top, blue line), as well as the change in the number of student FTEs over the years. FTE counts are increasing, as headcount declines.
Student Headcount to Student FTEs

[Graph showing the headcount and FTEs from 1991 to 2011]

Architecture Department Enrollment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Year&lt;sup&gt;21&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Year&lt;sup&gt;22&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected B.Arch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current BA Students&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All ARC</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>20</sup> This table does not account for the likelihood of transfer students, current UMA architecture students or UMA architecture alumni enrollments entering the program at upper levels.

<sup>21</sup> Assumes 25-percent attrition between first and second year in the B.Arch program

<sup>22</sup> Assumes a minimal 5-percent attrition rate for all following years

<sup>23</sup> This is based the average FTE students of AYF09, F10 and F11. F12 numbers are not available at this time. It assumes a 25% reduction year-over-year as the BA in Architecture degree is phased out.
I.2.5 Information Resources

Current library/research resources available to Architecture Students at UMA

The UMA Libraries include the Bennett D Katz Library on the Augusta campus, and the Nottage Library on the Bangor campus. Architecture resources, including research assistance for in-person and distance students in the Architecture program, are located solely at the Katz library, thus the enumeration of services will be restricted to those available at and through the Katz library.

The Libraries reside in the Academic division, reporting to the Provost. The Dean of Libraries and Distance Learning heads the staff of 2 librarians and five para-professional staff members all with at least Bachelor’s degrees. The Head of Collection Development and Copyright Services joined the Association of Architecture School Librarians and serves as the liaison to the architecture program for collections, reference and instruction matters.

Library collections

The current collection includes

- Monographs: over 6000 print titles directly related to the program; hundreds of full-text e-books via consortial access
  - Major subject areas included in this total:
    - Architecture (2278), Visual Arts (1258), Decorative Arts (327), Drawing/Design/Illustration (208), Building Construction and Structural Engineering (240)
- Periodicals: 46 subscriptions to individual journals
  - Access to 20 of the 44 English-language core journals identified by the AASL on their “Core list of titles for a first-degree program in architecture.”
- Electronic databases: subscriptions/consortial access to hundreds of databases, including:
  - Art Fulltext
  - Art Index Retrospective
  - ArtStor
  - Avery Index to Architecture Periodicals
  - Building Materials
  - Building Green
  - DOE Green Energy
  - JSTOR
  - ScienceDirect
  - SpringerLink
  - TechStreet: Technical Information Superstore
- Multimedia: over 100 DVD/VHS recordings

While the holdings are robust considering they serve a pre-professional degree, more assessment is necessary to determine the currency, range and quantity within specific subject areas to bring the holdings, physical and virtual, in line with the proposed professional degree. This assessment, in conjunction with other work planned, will be completed in fall 2012. Please see MAP: Library Resources.

Library facility and services

The physical building is open an average of 60 hours/week; has 10 networked desktop computers, 10 laptops, building-wide Wi-Fi, printing, scanning (including a large format scanner) and photocopying technology, as well as group and quiet study areas.
A web-based Architecture Research Guide (LibGuide) has been developed and is maintained by the librarians. This guide (http://lumalibguides.uma.edu/architecture) is reviewed, expanded and updated on an ongoing basis. Any associated costs for these updates are assumed as part of staff’s ongoing responsibilities. Librarians are available for reference questions via chat, phone, email or in-person consultations any time during library hours. We continue to improve and increase the robustness of this portal as an essential tool for student research and investigation. One initiative is to occasionally include librarians in departmental meetings to best assess and coordinate efforts. A more systematic effort to evaluate institution-wide availability and effectiveness of library resources and services is just beginning.

One area of special focus is to address the challenges related to the location of the primary architecture classrooms and design studios, located 2.2 miles from the Katz library on the main UMA campus. To support the new degree to its fullest, two projects are currently underway.

The first project, the Gannett Onsite Resource Center, will be housed on the 4th floor of Gannett in an area already set aside for reading and discussion. The library is currently pulling together an “essential” list of volumes that ARC students need for reference and inspiration. These volumes will be open for use within Gannett, and will augment some volumes already secured through donation. In addition, the library staff, in conjunction with architecture faculty, is exploring increasing eBook holdings to provide access 24 hours per day to essential reference materials. This collection will help inspire and support the new program during open studio hours while the online resources are available 24 hours per day. All costs of this project will come from existing library funds.

The second project, the web-based UMA/ARC Digital Library, will create a resource based on the 1000’s of slides from the collections of Professor of Architecture Roger Richmond and Professor of Art History Brooks Stoddard. Of special interest to the architecture program are Professor Richmond’s 3D slides that when projected create life-like three-dimensional images ideal for the discussion and learning of architecture and space. Professor Richmond has given 100’s lectures across Maine and internationally using these slides. Putting these collections online will not only support Architecture but also the Art and Art History programs, and make the work available on and off campus to all. We are looking at the resource of the University of Arkansas Architecture program for inspiration. (http://architecture.uark.edu/185.php) We have secured the equipment and volunteer staffing necessary to scan all slides, and are in the process of creating the infrastructure to allow our students to access and learn from the images. Any additional financial support will come from existing architecture funds.

Funding support
At this time the library is confident that current levels of funding support the planned new degree. However, further study is underway to more deeply analyze the current collection and compare ours to peer institutions’ in order to determine gaps and, therefore, develop an estimate for any additional funding. This assessment is planned to complete in spring 2013. Please see MAP: Library Resources.
MAP: Library Resources

- **2009**
  - **Project/Goals**: Architecture Research Portal
  - **Action / Resources / Completion Deadline**: Create web-based portal, Completed: fall 2009

- **2011**
  - **Project/Goals**: University-wide Library Assessment
  - **Action / Resources / Completion Deadline**: Purchase scanning equipment, Completed: fall 2011
  - **Project/Goals**: Gannett On-Site Resource Collection
  - **Action / Resources / Completion Deadline**: Annual review + update, Completed: spring 2011

- **2012**
  - **Project/Goals**: Art + Architecture Online Digital Database
  - **Action / Resources / Completion Deadline**: Annual review + update, Completed: spring 2012
  - **Project/Goals**: Secure funding, Completed: summer 2012
  - **Project/Goals**: Server space, User Interface App, Holdings Assessment
    - **Expected**: fall 2012
    - **Expected**: Expected: fall 2012
    - **Expected**: Collection & shelving, Expected: fall 2012

- **2013**
  - **Project/Goals**: Complete slide scanning, Financial Assessment
    - **Expected**: spring 2013
    - **Expected**: Expected: spring 2013
  - **Project/Goals**: Annual review + update, Installation of resources
    - **Expected**: spring 2013
    - **Expected**: Expected: spring 2013
  - **Project/Goals**: Online access
    - **Expected**: summer 2013

- **First B.Arch Cohort**
  - **Fall 2013**
PART ONE (1): SECTION 3 – INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports
In this section of the APR-IC, we attempt to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in our program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development. Since spring 2013 will be our first Candidacy visit we have made some base assumptions, outlined below, in order to create a picture of our program. The statistics based on our assumptions and currently available data follow below.

**Program Student Characteristics**
In regards to “demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit,” for the lack of a previous visit, we have defined previous visit as Fall 2010.

In regards to “qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit,” at this time no qualifications are required. We are moving from an open admission policy to one with stringent requirements. Please see Students: Evaluation for Admissions under Section 1.2.1 and Appendix I for those requirements and related documents.

In regards to “Time to graduation” and “Normal time to completion,” that number is currently less than or equal to 4 years (<=4 years). In regards to “150% of Normal time to completion,” that number is less than or equal to 6 years (<=6 years). These numbers will of course change going to the 5-year B.Arch curriculum.

Please note: Although not required, included is an additional section showing terms to completion.

**Program Faculty Characteristics**
It is important to note that the following statistics represent full-time faculty only. As stated Section 1.2.1, we typically include part-time faculty at 1/3 FTE when considering faculty data.

In regards to “Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit,” for the lack of a previous visit, we have defined previous visit as Academic Year 2010-11. Please note that are most recent hire, Assistant Professor Amy Hinkley, begins work with us full-time in AY2012-13 so is not reflected in the information below.

**Architecture Accreditation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Bachelor of Arts in Architecture</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>UMA All Degree Seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3296</td>
<td>3286</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4466</td>
<td>4501</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and ethnicity unknown</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3729</td>
<td>3794</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4466</td>
<td>4501</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Arts in Architecture</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\leq 4) years (Fall 05 cohort), n=26</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\leq 6) years (Fall 05 cohort), n=26</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\leq 4) years (Fall 07 cohort), n=25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Arts in Architecture</th>
<th>AY11 Graduates</th>
<th>AY12 Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Terms to Completion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Full-time</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 10-11 (^{24})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{24}\) Source: Associate Professor of Architecture Eric Stark  
\(^{25}\) Source: Associate Professor of Architecture Eric Stark
### Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta

**ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Full-time</th>
<th>UMA All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 10-11</td>
<td>Academic Year 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59 60%</td>
<td>61 57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39 40%</td>
<td>46 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98 100%</td>
<td>107 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>98 100%</td>
<td>106 99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98 100%</td>
<td>107 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Full-time</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Given</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Full-time</th>
<th>UMA All</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>3 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Given</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Full-time</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Year 11-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses Maintained</td>
<td>2 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

26 Source UMS Faculty and Tenure Statistics Report 2010-2011 and Sheri Stevens Executive Director of Administrative Services
27 Source UMS Faculty and Tenure Statistics Report 2011-2012, Sheri Stevens Executive Director of Administrative Services, and Rachel Rosa UMS Human Resources Information Specialist
28 Source: Associate Professor of Architecture Eric Stark
29 Source: Sheri Stevens Executive Director of Administrative Services
30 Source: Associate Professor of Architecture Eric Stark
I.3.2 Annual Reports
NA

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials
Current full-time and part-time faculty credentials can be found in Part Four of this document. As stated in Section I.2.1, the full-time department faculty will grow depending on need. As the faculty grows, credentials will be added to future reports.

PART ONE (1): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
Except those listed below, policies that are currently available have been included previously within the document, either are URL’s, inserts, or part of an appendix. Some policies, indicated below, are in progress.

Student-Faculty Ratios. Please see Section I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development for our current and planned Student-to-Faculty Ratios. The architecture program’s current caps on enrollments depending on course type are:
  Studio 1:15
  Classroom/semiarn 1:20
  Lecture 1:40

Square Footage per Student. Currently our dedicated studio workspaces, limited to the upper level design studios, measure approximately 65 square feet per student, excluding support space. Please see Section I.2.3 Physical Resources for our plan for student space moving forward. In addition to dedicated studio space we utilize two classroom studios for our first and second year design courses. These are specifically equipped for studio teaching with drafting/work tables, but are used by typically 2 students throughout a day. This space offers 40 square feet per student when in use.

Square Footage per Faculty Member. Each faculty member is given a private office equipped with computer, phone, desk, desk and office chairs, file drawers and other storage. We also have a dedicated Adjunct Faculty Office for use by all part-time faculties to meet with students or to prepare for classes.

Advising Policies. In order to deal with potential transfer students, we have set up our SPC matrix so that all SPCs are met in multiple classes, at least one of which is at the upper level or course unique to UMA Architecture. In this way we believe students transferring into our degree with previous credit are assured of covering each SPC while enrolled in UMA Architecture. (Please see Student Performance Criteria Matrix under Section II.1.1)

We have current policies and procedures for transfer students, especially regarding first year studio credit, however not yet developed in regard to confirming SPCs are being met. Please see Appendix M for this document. We review transfer work under the tenet, “by example and not by grade,” when making placement decisions. This means that all transfer students who wish credit for previous studio coursework must meet with a faculty member and present a portfolio that clearly demonstrates the meeting of required course outcomes. At this time we do not have specific policies and procedures in place for other coursework, and, as stated, not specifically in regards to assessing successful completion of SPC guidelines. Updated policies specific to transfer credit and our SPC Matrix will be reviewed fall 2012 so that they will be in place by late spring 2013 in time for transfer student evaluations leading to the fall 2013 B.Arch start. Please see MAP: Program Development.
Information Literacy. “Information literate people are those who have learned how to learn. They know how to learn because they know how knowledge is organized, how to find information and how to use information in such a way that others can learn from them. They are people prepared for lifelong learning, because they can always find the information needed for any task or decision at hand.”

The following will appear in the next edition of the UMA Course Catalog:

Information Literacy: The UMA graduate will be able to find, evaluate, and use information from traditional and new technology sources and be able to:

- Determine the extent of information needed;
- Access the needed information effectively and efficiently;
- Evaluate information and its sources critically and constructively;
- Retain and integrate selected information into his or her knowledge base;
- Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose;
- Demonstrate the ethical use of information.

The Department of Architecture meets UMA’s Information Literacy area of the General Education requirements through the research and analysis inherent in the design process. Any design project has specific elements such as site, client and/or program. A student must understand these varied elements in order to successfully design any project. In order to understand, a student must be able to research (gather information) and analyze (synthesize information) – these are topics taught throughout studios, and will be addressed in-depth in the proposed course ARC 241, Architectural Analysis. As architecture is a visual endeavor, the demonstration of these outcomes is typically done visually through drawings and images. The ability to “find information” is aided through specific orientation to university resources mentioned in Section I.2.5 Information Resources. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development for the course development timeline.

Part Two (II) – Educational Outcomes and Curriculum

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria
The Mission, vision, goals and objectives of the program have been outlined earlier in this document. Please see Section I.1.1 History and Mission.

The following matrix shows which of our courses cover which NAAB student performance criteria (SPC). The B.Arch curriculum has been formally discussed since 2010, and informally for years before that. Over summer 2012 it has been finalized. We are now in the process of developing individual syllabi for submission and approval to the College over the fall 2012 semester. Our plan is to have the majority of the B.Arch courses, existing and proposed, on the books by fall 2013 so that an interested student can see the long-range view of his or her chosen degree path. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development.

---

As we create and revise coursework we are reviewing with the SPC in mind. Many of the NAAB criteria align with our existing program outcomes but review and emphasis will make the courses more focused, and better prepare the program of future accreditation. (Please see Alignment of UMA B.Arch Core Values to 5 Perspectives)

In the matrix an SPC we believe is satisfied by our currently curriculum (or should be) is indicated by an “X.” The “O” designation indicates those SPCs that will be satisfied by new proposed coursework, not yet on the books. The * next to courses in the Matrix indicates courses currently in development. Others exist in the current BA curriculum and are undergoing a full and extensive review in conjunction with the creation of new coursework. Due to its essential nature to the degree and profession, art history courses are included at the bottom of the matrix. Though not part of the architecture department, we will be reviewing and creating new course material with the art history faculty that best serves the needs of the architecture pedagogy.
Student Performance Criteria Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 121</td>
<td>Architectural Design I</td>
<td>Critical thinking and problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 222</td>
<td>Architectural Design II</td>
<td>Communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 323</td>
<td>Architectural Design III</td>
<td>Creativity and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 424</td>
<td>Architectural Design IV</td>
<td>Environmental design and sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Courses are grouped by similar content.
II.2.1 Regional Accreditation
Current accreditation documentation can be found preceding this report.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum
Curriculum
The Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch) program consists of 150 semester credit hours; 95 credits are
under the major, and 55 are general education credits. Planned completion for the degree is five
years.

General Studies
As stated, the program supports and follows university guidelines for quantity and breadth of
general education studies. See Section I.1.1 and Appendix D.

Electives
All students are required to take seven elective courses (21 credits) in the program; three
architecture electives with a minimum of two at an upper level; two humanities electives; and two
general electives outside the program. The program supports, and the students have, a wealth of
minors available to them. See http://www.uma.maine.edu/degrees.html for a complete listing.

The following semester-by-semester chart indicates a course schedule planned for successful
completion of the B.Arch degree in a 5-year time span. Individual course outlines, showing
existing and proposed courses can be found in Part Three of this document. The curriculum is
color coded to represent five areas of pedagogical focus we have used in creating the overall
curriculum outline. As Studio & Design is one of our focus areas, we have created a Studio Arc
indicating major studio milestones and potential places in the studio curriculum for collaboration.
Please see Appendix K for this visual representation of our studio sequence.

Curricular Collaboration
In addition to a review of our existing and newly planned program, we see the creation of the new
B.Arch degree as the perfect opportunity to integrate collaboration across the overall curriculum.
Through cross-curriculum integration we see potential for expanding as well as deepening the
learning for our students. Collaboration represents a fundamental aspect of being an architect: the
necessary synthesis of many areas related to the design and building professions.

We see three fundamental areas of collaboration: 1) Between Specific ARC courses and our ARC
Studio sequence (i.e. within the ARC Department – ARC-to-ARC); 2) Between the program’s ART
requirements and our ARC Studio sequence (ARC-to-ART); and 3) Between ARC electives and
required humanities courses (ART-to-HUM).

ARC-to-ARC. To collaborate across specific ARC Courses would be relatively easy to structure for
the simple reason that the department controls its own curriculum and we have the support and
agreement of our own faculty. These collaborations would be required so that all students benefit
from their integration. As an example, we may require all Second Year students take Materials &
Methods in the spring, concurrently with second year studio. The result would be the integration
of material exploration into the design sequence as a clearly defined step in the design process.
Other possible ARC-to-ARC collaborations could include: Construction Techniques and Second Year Studio (spring semester); Structures and third year studio (spring semester); and Sustainability and fourth year studio (spring semester).

ARC-to-ART. Collaboration between ART courses and our ARC Studio sequence would likely be loose collaborations – basically getting ART and ARC instructors to meet with each other and reinforce lessons in their respective courses. For this to work, we would need to make sure that students are co-enrolled in collaborating courses.

As an example collaboration between Drawing 101 and Arc 101 would lead to a strengthening of the many overlaps including line, tone, contrast, and figure/ground. This collaboration might not occur in an overtly scripted way as in ARC-to-ARC, but a productive collaboration is clearly possible. Another possibility would be the proposed Electronic Arts for Architects and Studio. This would be a fruitful collaboration helping our students to do a better job of organizing and presenting their research, investigations and designs digitally.

ARC-to-HUM. In order for collaboration between ARC courses and required humanities courses to take place, additional consideration and organization will be required. One, because we will interfacing with a faculty that does not typically coordinate with architecture, and two because students may be taking varying sections of these core courses. However, it’s certainly worth exploring because one can imagine some really amazing outcomes and learning opportunities. These collaborations might be more project-based. For example, we could pair ARC History and Formal Analysis and have students write an “Historical” Analysis along side a Formal, Visual Analysis on the development of Louis Kahn’s use of served and servants spaces. Simultaneously, they would do a parallel visual analysis of that idea in three of his buildings.

Other courses might benefiting from a more structured approach, and might be taught in a true inter-disciplinary way – for example Architectural Ethics could be taught as a six-credit “cluster course” between Philosophy and Professional Practice. In this way, a deeper investigation into how we develop our “Architectural Ethics” and how does it relate to how we structure our firms, how we practice, what we design, and who we serve. Please see MAP: Curriculum Development.

In support of our plan for collaborative teaching, the University has recently been working to establish guidelines and procedures for offering Interdisciplinary Coursework across all degree programs. This work is partially in response to our previous successful cross-collaboration between architecture, art and philosophy programs. The draft version of the Interdisciplinary definitions and procedures can be found in Appendix O.
## UMA B.Arch Curriculum by Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studio &amp; Design</th>
<th>Communication Skills</th>
<th>Building Science and Technology</th>
<th>Professional Practice</th>
<th>History and Theory</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FALL</strong></th>
<th><strong>SPRING</strong></th>
<th><strong>SUMMER</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 101</td>
<td>ARC 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION TO ARCHITECTURAL GRAPHICS</td>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101</td>
<td>ARC 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE WRITING</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY OF ARC &amp; DESIGN THEORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 112</td>
<td>ENG 102W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE ALGEBRA</td>
<td>INTRO TO LITERATURE or ENG 317W - PROFESSIONAL WRITING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 115</td>
<td>ARH 106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAWING I</td>
<td>HISTORY OF ART &amp; ARC II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 111/ARH 105</td>
<td>ART 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY OF ART &amp; ARC 1</td>
<td>2D DESIGN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CREDITS</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Professional Content and General Education Courses

The following is a list identifying the courses and their credit hours required for professional content and the courses and their credit hours required for general education for the UMA B.Arch degree. Please see Appendix L for the UMA B.Arch Course Check Sheet that includes student options for General Education electives and Architecture portfolio review requirements for successful completion of the degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – Professional Content</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 101 Introduction to Architectural Graphics &amp; Design Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 102 Architectural Design I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 123 Philosophy of Architecture and Design Theory</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 203 Architectural Design II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – General Education Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHY 115 General Physics + Lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Topics in Architectural Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Topics in Architectural Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM XXX Humanities Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 407 Architectural Design VI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 408 Architectural Design VII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 430 Architectural Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 406 Architectural Apprenticeship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 421 Professional Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 441 – Foreign Travel Experience</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC XXX Social Science Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Topics in Architectural Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Topics in Architectural Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 509 Architectural Design VIII</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 510 Architectural Design – Thesis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM XXX Humanities Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 351 Portfolio Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN ELEC General Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Topics in Architectural Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN ELEC General Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN ELEC General Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN ELEC General Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDITS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – Professional Content</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 204 Architectural Design III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 221 Concepts of Structure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 231 Architectural Materials and Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 241 Architectural Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 261 Introduction to CAD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 305 Architectural Design IV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 306 Architectural Design V</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 322 Concepts of Structure II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 332 Construction Techniques</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 341 Introduction to Sustainable Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 350 Mechanical Systems in Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 361 Portfolio Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 406 Architectural Apprenticeship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 407 Architectural Design VI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 408 Architectural Design VII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 421 Professional Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 431 Architectural Seminar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 441 Foreign Travel Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489 Architecture Electives (9 credit hours total, 6 min. at 300 or 400 level)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 509 Architectural Design VIII - Pre Thesis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 510 Architectural Design IX - Architectural Design Senior Thesis</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits – Professional Content 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – General Education</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARH 105 History of Art and Architecture I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARH 106 History of Art and Architecture II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARH/ARC 312 History of Modern Architecture</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 112 2-D Design</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 115 Drawing I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 202 Electronic Arts for Architects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 101 College Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 102W Introduction to Literature or ENG 317W Professional Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Elective (6 credit hours)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV 180/380 Create: Innovation Engineering I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT 112 College Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHY 115 General Physics I + lab</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 100 Introduction to Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Elective</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electives (6 credit hours)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Credits – General Education Content 55

Total Credits B.Arch Degree 150
Off-Campus Programs
NA

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
See “Long-Range Planning,” Section I.1.4 and “Self-Assessment Procedures,” Section I.1.5.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION of PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

The UMA/ARC Application Process
Applicants to UMA’s B.Arch program will be evaluated on the basis of submitted materials along with a personal interview. The Admissions office collects the materials through existing channels. We have worked closely with admissions to tailor procedures to our program and student type where necessary. All materials, except for portfolio submissions, are scanned and filed electronically. Portfolios are submitted directly to the Architecture program for review.

Upon receipt of all necessary materials, the student is alerted that their application is complete and an interview is set up between the student and a member of the Architecture Review Committee. This committee is made up of FT and PT members of the architecture faculty. Each faculty member will make recommendations on their respective interviewees for acceptance or non-acceptance to the program to the full committee. At that time discussions and agreement will be reached. Decisions will be by committee vote and will be by majority; ties will be avoided by having the committee’s membership be an odd number. Should a tie result for some reason (e.g. a member recuses themselves from a vote) then the Program Coordinator will make the final decision.

The process for evaluating previous credit is divided between general education credit and professional (architecture major) credit. Bethany Vigue, UMA’s Academic Transcript Evaluator, evaluates the general education credits using historical data where appropriate. When no historical data exists, she uses course descriptions as a guide to transfer credit. As stated earlier in Section I.1.4 – Policy Review, Architecture faculty will review all applications for the transfer of professional credits and procedures and policies are under development. All student acceptance and transfer actions are documented in their permanent files.

Students Applying for Admission
The UMA B.Arch student body falls into three categories: newly admitted, first-time college bound students; transfer students from other institutions; and current or alumni students of UMA’s BA in Architecture degree.

Newly admitted. Since these students will be true freshmen, their meeting of the SPC will fall completely within the proposed B.Arch curriculum. The chart in Section II.1.1 indicates our current and planned coverage of the SPC. As stated, we are conducted a thorough review of all coursework and its relationship the NAAB criteria to ensure that students will meet the SPC through the proposed curricula.

Transfer Student. These students pose the biggest challenge as they bring with them the most unknowns. We do have experience in these cases, and have established means in our existing degree to deal with the most common transfer issues and requests. This experience allows us to craft comprehensive guidelines to ensure that all entering students are both prepared for rigorous
study, and to ensure our graduates meet all SPC requirements. To this end we will be creating three specific transfer policies: Students requesting Studio advanced standing; students requesting Technology advanced standing; and students requesting general education advanced standing. As we continue our review of the curriculum we will remain cognizant of these students and create unique review policies where necessary. These policies will be reviewed or created as required in fall 2012 so that they are in place by late spring 2013, in time for the review of the first transfer students to the B.Arch program. Please see MAP: Student Development.

Current and Alumni. These students are ones with whom we are personally familiar. Of course this does not eliminate a thorough review of their standing against the SPC as we understand our previous course work may fall short in certain areas. To that end, and because we strongly feel it necessary, every current student or alumni of our existing BA in Architecture degree accepted to the B.Arch will undergo a one-on-one review of their entire course work against the SPC. We consciously will not create a one-size-fits-all re-admittance policy but rather will handle these students as individually unique cases. We feel this is the best way to ensure that nothing is assumed from their previous education, and that they graduate with the full benefit of the B.Arch degree’s goals and pedagogy. Specific admissions requirements for all student types can be seen in Section I.2.1.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The program will reformat and update our current website to reflect degree changes, philosophy, curriculum, as well as share the required documents listed below. See http://www.uma.maine.edu/archcourse.html for our current website.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All catalog and promotional materials, online and in print, will include the required text as it is worded in Appendix 5 of the NAAB 2009 Conditions for Accreditation starting with the 2013-14 catalog where time to print allows.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

These documents are linked directly to the UMA Architecture program website: 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, and the 2010 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect). Updates to the most current additions will be made as necessary. See http://www.uma.edu/naab-required-information.html.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information


II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program will make the following documents available to the public once Initial Candidacy is granted:

All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
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The final edition of the most recent *Visiting Team Report*, including attachments and addenda

PDF versions will be available for download from the UMA Architecture program website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates
ARE Pass Rates can be information useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. We have linked our website at [http://www.uma.edu/naab-required-information.html](http://www.uma.edu/naab-required-information.html) to this information at [http://www.ncarb.org/are/are-pass-rates.aspx](http://www.ncarb.org/are/are-pass-rates.aspx).

Part Three (III) – Progress Since the Last Site Visit
Spring 2013 will be our first site visit so this section is not applicable at this time.

PART THREE (III): SECTION 1 – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO TEAM FINDINGS
NA

PART THREE (III): SECTION 2 – SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CHANGES IN NAAB CONDITIONS
NA

Part Four (IV) – Supplemental Information

PART FOUR (IV): SECTION 1 – DESCRIPTIONS and POLICIES for EVALUATING STUDENT WORK
The process and breakdown of each course’s methods of evaluation are required parts of all UMA syllabi. This ensures that students are aware of evaluation policies and procedures from day one. Varying types of courses are evaluated differently. We have limited the following information specifically to architecture courses.

Architecture student coursework is typically evaluated in one of the following ways: presentation and critique (P); discussion (D); written paper (W); examination (E)(various forms including essay, short answer, problem solving and multiple choice); and sketchbook or journal (S).

As can be seen, courses often use a variety of methods to evaluate student work and successful attainment of stated course outcomes. These methods described below are meant to show typical uses. Each course’s instructor will adjust those methods, as he or she feels is appropriate to the class work and desired learning outcomes, clearly informing students of the methods in use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course No. &amp; Title – Professional Content</th>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 101 Intro to Architectural Graphics &amp; Design Communication</td>
<td>P, W, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 102 Architectural Design I</td>
<td>P, W, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 123 Philosophy of Architecture and Design Theory</td>
<td>E, S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 203 Architectural Design II</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 204 Architectural Design III</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As mentioned earlier in this report, the specific assessment of outcomes in individual courses will be a focus of the architecture program over the next year. The discussion and review of evaluation methods will be part of this work.

One example of design presentation/critique evaluation that we have used successfully can be viewed in Appendix N.

**PART FOUR (IV): SECTION 2 – COURSE DESCRIPTIONS**

Following are Course Descriptions for Architecture courses, existing and in development, for the UMA B.Arch degree. The majority of courses to be developed will be submitted for college approval in fall 2012, and subsequent provost approval in spring 2013. Please also see MAP: Curriculum Development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARC 221</td>
<td>Concepts of Structure</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 231</td>
<td>Architectural Materials and Methods</td>
<td>P, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 241</td>
<td>Architectural Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>P, W, E, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 261</td>
<td>Introduction to CAD</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 305</td>
<td>Architectural Design IV</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 306</td>
<td>Architectural Design V</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 322</td>
<td>Concepts of Structure II</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 332</td>
<td>Construction Techniques</td>
<td>P, E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 341</td>
<td>Introduction to Sustainable Design</td>
<td>P, E, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 350</td>
<td>Mechanical Systems in Architecture</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 361</td>
<td>Portfolio Development</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 406</td>
<td>Architectural Apprenticeship</td>
<td>W, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 407</td>
<td>Architectural Design VI</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 408</td>
<td>Architectural Design VII</td>
<td>P, W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 421</td>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>W, E, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 431</td>
<td>Architectural Seminar</td>
<td>W, E, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 441</td>
<td>Foreign Travel Experience</td>
<td>W, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 489</td>
<td>Architecture Electives</td>
<td>P, W, E, S, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 509</td>
<td>Architectural Design VIII - Pre Thesis</td>
<td>P, W, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC 510</td>
<td>Architectural Design IX - Architectural Design Senior Thesis</td>
<td>P, W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 101, Introduction to Architectural Graphics and Design Communication (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course introduces the fundamentals of architectural drawing and model making. Assignments enhance student’s ability to observe, analyze, understand and represent architectural forms and spaces.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Understand how to think and draw analytically
- Understand how to communicate with architectural line and tone
- Understand the tools and processes of architectural drawing and model making
- Understand how to observe and measure architectural forms and spaces
- Understand how to communicate with freehand architectural sketches

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A1. Communication Skills
A3. Visual Communication Skills
A8. Ordering Systems Skills

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
10% Graphic Composition
10% Freehand Architectural Sketching
10% Architectural Survey Work
20% Basic Orthographic Drawing
15% Axonometric
15% Shadow Constructions 15%
20% Construction of one and two-point perspectives

Prerequisites
ENG 005, REA 008, MAT 009, Co-requisite: ART 115

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Architectural Graphics, Ching
Instructor developed Praxis

Offered (semester and year)
Fall Semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Amy Hinkley, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Denis Lemieux, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Michael Belleau, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 102, Architectural Design I (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
In ARC 102 students are asked to understand project limitations and issues, create design solutions in response, and visually represent those solutions.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Understand the concept of limitations and issues
- Understand the idea of reciprocity between space and form
- Use the tools and processes of architectural drawing and model making to represent architectural ideas
- Understand how to transform a conceptual idea into an architectural space

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
25% Limitations and Issues
25% Reciprocity in Space and Form
25% Conceptual Design Response
25% Transformation of a Conceptual Response into Architectural Space

Prerequisites
ARC 101, Introduction to Architectural Graphics and Design Communication

Textbooks/Learning Resources
*Form, Space, and Order*, Ching
Instructor Developed Praxis

Offered (semester and year)
Spring Semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Amy Hinkley, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Denis Lemieux, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Michael Belleau, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 123, The Principles and Philosophy of Architecture (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course introduces students to space, scale, light, intention, creativity, and behavioral and health experiences in architectural expression.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Awareness, facility and vocabulary in designing space for habitation
- Awareness and facility in developing environmental relatedness with human scale in design
- Awareness and facility in designing light in space and its impact on experience
- Developing a creative approach to architectural problem solving
- Develop an understanding and how to manifest the desired human experience in architectural design

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
- A2. Design Thinking
- A9. Historical Traditions & Global Culture
- C2. Human Behavior

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
40% Space and Reciprocity
10% Scale
20% Light
30% Intention and design
10% Sustainability

Prerequisites
None

Textbooks/Learning Resources
*Manipulating Spaces*, Roger Richmond (unpublished)

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Roger Richmond, Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 203, Architectural Design II (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Students will focus on developing an understanding of the basic design “palette” Space, Scale, and Light and their integration in the development of architectural expression.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Introduce some of the concepts of the Space/Behavior response and connection
- Introduce spatial awareness through an understanding of figure/ground, solid/void expressions and reciprocities
- To become aware of spatial sequencing, types of spaces, and ways of defining space
- To become familiar with the concept of scale as it relates to architectural design
- Learn the basic elements and types of light, and to design with light, and to begin to understand the impact of light on emotional user response, and light’s relationship to scale, and to see how light can drive and direct architectural expression
- Continue to expand cognitive skills with ever increasing amounts of data integrated into expression
- Continue to develop an individual work ethic in a creative group environment.
- Commitment to excellence, and professionalism in presentation

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A2. Design Thinking Skills
A6. Fundamental Design Skills
C2. Human Behavior

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
50% Spatial Awareness, Manipulating Space and Space Behavior
25% Scale Studies
25% Light Studies

Prerequisites
ARC 101, Introduction to Architecture
ARC 102, Architectural Design I

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Manipulating Spaces, Roger R. Richmond
Form, Space, and Order, Francis Ching

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned
Daelynn A. Elizabeth, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Rosie Curtis, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 204, Architectural Design III (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Students will continue developing an understanding of the design elements Space, Scale, and Light with an additional focus on intention in design process.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Expand upon the concepts of the Space/Behavior response and connection
- Increase awareness of spatial sequencing, and some of the types and kinds of spaces in the designer’s vocabulary, and the infinite ways of defining space
- Introduce design programming, site analysis, design organization analysis, and resolution of limitations and issues
- Understanding intention seeking and translation into form
- Continue to expand cognitive skills with ever increasing amounts of data integrated into expression.
- Commit to develop an individual work ethic in a creative group environment.
- Commitment to excellence, and professionalism in presentation

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A6. Fundamental Design Skills
B1. Pre-Design
B4. Site Design
C2. Human Behavior

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
50% Light study/Design Process within residential context
50% Designing with Intention

Prerequisites
ARC 103, Theory and Philosophy of Architecture

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Manipulating Spaces, Roger R. Richmond
Form, Space, and Order, Francis Ching

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Daelynn A. Elizabeth, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Rosie Curtis, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 221, Concepts of Structures I (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Structures I offers an introduction to the study, analysis, and mathematical solutions to architectural structures and the forces of compression and tension acting upon them.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Understand compression, tension, shear, flexure and torsion, along with typical structural materials including timber, masonry, steel and reinforced concrete.
- Understand concurrent and coplanar forces
- Understand non-concurrent forces
- Understand concept of center of gravity and relationship of centroid of areas
- Understand structural framing for floors and roofs with regards to wood, steel, and reinforced concrete construction.
- Understand nomenclature of trussed structures and typical types
- Understand elastic theory
- Understand and demonstrate solutions for shear and bending moment
- Understand and demonstrate ability to perform structural analysis for frames, cables, and arches

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
B9. Structural Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
- 15% Non-Concurrent Forces
- 10% Structural Framing
- 15% Trussed Structures
- 10% Introduction to Frames, Cables, and Arches
- 15% Center of Gravity
- 15% Introduction to Elastic Theory
- 10% Shear and Bending Moment
- 15% Precedent Structures, Concurrent and Coplanar Forces

Prerequisites
MAT 112, College Algebra, PHY 115, General Physics I and Lab

Textbooks/Learning Resources
- Structural Principles, I. Engel

Offered (semester and year)
Spring Semesters, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 231, Architectural Materials and Methods (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
A survey course of common building materials and how they are used, with an emphasis on a material’s contribution to design

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
Acquaint the student with the importance of material selection in architecture. Includes performance related to:
- Codes
- Economy
- Sustainability
- Strength
- Design

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A4. Technical Documentation
B7. Financial Considerations
B10. Building Envelope Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
7.5% Site work and Foundations
7.5% Wood light frame
7.5% Heavy timber
7.5% Interior and Exterior Finishes for wood construction
7.5% Steel
7.5% Masonry
7.5% Roofing
7.5% Site cast Concrete
7.5% Precast Concrete
7.5% Glass
7.5% Complete construction of a large urban building
7.5% Commercial Interiors
7.5% Unusual applications of materials

Prerequisites
1 semester of second-year design studio

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Morris C. Hancock AIA, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 241, Architectural Research & Analysis (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course will focus on methods of research (information gathering) and analysis (information interpretation) as they relate to the study, process and practice of architecture.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- To give students tools for investigative research
- To give students tools to present analysis
- To give students tools to create understanding in clients/critics as it relates to their design intentions

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
20% Research
20% Analysis
15% Diagram
15% Library and Information Resources
15% Digital tools of presentation

Prerequisites
Prerequisite: ARC 102

Textbooks/Learning Resources
To be determined

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 261, Computer Aided Design (CAD) (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This Course is an introduction to AutoCAD software to produce Architectural and Architecturally related drawings.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Introduction to CAD – industry Formats and procedures
• Introduction to Google Sketch-Up, its command structure and use
• To create and present projects created in the virtual world - expressing sketches, drawings, iterations, concepts and ultimately conceptual models similar to projects developed in ARC 203

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A3. Visual Communication Skills
A4. Technical Documentation

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
20% Document title sheet
20% Site Design
20% Building Design
13% Wall Sections
13% Site design - Introduction to Google Sketch Up
13% Building design – introduction to Google Sketch Up

Prerequisites
Prerequisite: ARC 102

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Illustrated AutoCAD® 2011, Quick Reference, 1st Edition, Ralph Grabowski
Harnessing AutoCAD 2011, 1st Edition, G.V. Krishnan Thomas Stellman
Required Software:
AutoCAD 2011 or 2012
Google Sketch-up 8

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Daniel C Moreno, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 305, Architectural Design IV (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
The course expands on the design issues Space, Scale, and Light. Additional, there is a greater emphasis on “Design with Intention,” and the use of diagram.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Develop skills in creative conceptual design and graphic/model presentation
• Understand and produce design analysis, awareness, and expression
• Technical issues including: code requirements, parking, zoning, mechanical needs, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, and barrier-free (ADA) design.
• Understand site analysis and its potential impact on design.
• Understand the necessity of pre-design work as a foundation for further design exploration.
• Understand the use of concept, creating a design intention, and the representation of concept in model and drawing.
• Understand and utilize the diagram as a means of design exploration, and the testing of design ideas.
• Understand the importance of community, and its insertion into the urban fabric.

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
20% Site research and analysis
10% Diagramming
20% Visual Communication and presentation
50% Schematic Design

Prerequisites: ARC 231, ARC 204. Concurrent with ARC 332

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Precedents in Architecture: Analytic Diagrams, Formative Ideas, and Partis, Clark

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 306, Architectural Design V (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
A continuation of ARC 305 with more emphasis on conceptual design with increased social content

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Gain a more independent responsible approach to design work.
- Better understand site analysis and its potential impact on design.
- Understand program analysis and its potential impact on design.
- Understand the necessity of pre-design work as a foundation for further design exploration.
- Understand the use of concept creating a design intention, and the representation of concept in model and drawing.
- Understand the relationship of structure to design.
- Understand the importance of community, and its insertion into the urban fabric.

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
50% Schematic Design
20% Site research and analysis
20% Visual communication and presentation
10% Use of diagram

Prerequisites
ARC 305, Architectural Design IV
ARC 332, Structures II

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Varies depending on project types assigned

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 322, Concepts of Structures II (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course expands upon the analysis of architectural structures through exploration of design of structural components including: wood, composite materials, reinforced concrete and steel members.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Understand shearing unit stress analysis and connectors
• Understand criteria and demonstrate design of wood beams
• Understand concept of working stress and Internal Couple method of analysis
• Understand composite sections and steel beam design
• Understand and demonstrate ultimate strength design method for concrete
• Understand concept of deflection of symmetrically and asymmetrically loaded structural members
• Understand concept of structural continuity and methods of analysis
• Understand concept of columns versus beams
• Understand effect of end conditions on bending

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
B9. Structural Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
10% Review of Structures I 5% Deflection of Structural Members
10% Frames, cables and arches 5% Structural Continuity
15% Shearing Unit Stress and Bending Stress 10% Design of Columns
10% Design of Wood Beams 5% Combined Stress and Prestressing
5% Combined Materials 10% Composite Sections and Steel Beams
15% Reinforced Concrete Working Stress & Ultimate Strength Design

Prerequisites
MAT 112, College Algebra
PHY 115, General Physics I and Lab
ARC 221, Concepts of Structures I

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Structural Principles; I. Engel
Fundamentals of Structural Analysis, Third Edition; Leet, Uang, Gilbert
ASD Manual of Steel Construction; AISC 13th Edition

Offered (semester and year)
Fall Semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 332, Construction Techniques (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Introduction to working drawings as a means of communicating architectural intent through construction methods

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• The student shall develop a basic understanding of site design
• The student shall understand the relationships between components and materials within a building
• The student shall develop a basic understanding of some common construction methods – steel structure, concrete masonry, wood frame

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A4. Technical Documentation
B10. Building Envelope Systems
B11. Building Service Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
20% Site planning – approximately 9 hours in class.
25% Commercial construction – approximately 12 hours in class
55% Residential construction – approximately 25 hours in class

Prerequisites
ARC 231, Architectural Materials and Methods
Second year design studio

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Handouts from various sources

Offered (semester and year)
Annually Fall semester

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Morris C. Hancock AIA, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 341, Introduction to Sustainability (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Introduction to sustainable design concepts and inter-relationships of built and natural environments. Course includes LEED green building standards, indoor air quality, and mechanical systems.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- How to approach sustainable opportunities to provide an appropriate solution
- The importance of indoor air quality regarding health and the environment
- The critical importance of energy consumption and opportunities to provide savings through heat loss analysis and selection of building materials systems
- Energy source alternatives and associated advantages and disadvantages
- Value of incorporating green design issues from very start of project
- The importance of proper materials choices and the effect on the environment
- Understanding the relationship between green design and architectural goals
- Definition and goals set by USGBC LEED design standards

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
- A11. Applied Research
- B3. Sustainability
- B8. Environmental Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
- 5% Introduction to Sustainable Design
- 5% Sustainable Process Guidance
- 10% Sustainable Sites
- 10% Water Efficiency
- 10% Energy & Atmosphere
- 10% Term Project & Site Visits

Prerequisites
PHY 115 General Physics & Lab, Junior Standing

Textbooks/Learning Resources

Offered (semester and year)
Spring Semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 350 Mechanical Systems in Architecture (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Introduction to basic mechanical systems for a modern building to function. Focus is given regarding design process and integration of mechanical and related spatial requirements.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Understand integrated design process with sustainable sites and resources
- Design incorporating comfort and indoor air quality needs
- Be able to calculate solar geometry and design shading devices
- Calculate heat loss based on a variety of wall section details and illustrate the temperature gradient along with dew point and location of condensation
- Understand the variety of heating and cooling systems available and appropriate installations based on type of building, sustainability goals, and climate
- Understand fundamentals of lighting design, acoustics, water and waste systems
- Understand principles of fire protection, signals, and building transportation systems
- Develop building section with innovative 3-D model to illustrate concepts including environmental design, solar geometry, thermal mechanical systems and lighting sources for a sustainable building

Student Performance Criterion/ addressed (list number and title)
B8. Environmental Systems
B11. Building Service Systems

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
10% Design Context
30% Thermal Control
10% Illumination
5% Acoustics
10% Water & Waste
5% Fire Protection
5% Signal Systems
5% Transportation
20% Term Project – Building Section & Site Visits

Prerequisites:
PHY 115 General Physics & Lab, Junior standing

Textbooks/Learning Resources:
Mechanical and Electrical Equipment for Buildings: Grondzik, Kwok, Stein, Reynolds; Builder’s Guide to Cold Climates: Lstiburek; Architectural Graphic Standards: Ramsey Sleeper

Offered (semester and year)
Fall Semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Daniel C Moreno, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 361, Portfolio Development (1 credit)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course will aid students in building a portfolio of work and other related documents in preparation for employment or further study of architecture.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
Students will produce a digital portfolio
Students will produce a hard-copy portfolio
Students will produce resumes for various types of application
Students will produce draft cover letter

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A3. Visual Communication Skills

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
40% Portfolio – online
40% Portfolio – hard copy
10% Resume
10% Cover Letter

Prerequisites
Junior Standing

Textbooks/Learning Resources
To be determined

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 406, Architectural Apprenticeship (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Apprenticeship emphasis to provide student with firsthand experience concerning the workings of a professional office and exposure to professional practice in an architectural design career

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Enhance interpersonal and professional skills necessary for intern roles
- Carry out internship responsibilities in a productive, effective, and positive manner while insuring a positive internship experience
- Apply academic preparation and practical skills in actual work settings
- Aid in transition from student role to that of an independently functioning employee
- Facilitate students’ increased understanding of themselves in the field of professional architecture and the skills necessary in self-promotion
- Presentation of apprenticeship experience through supervisor and intern evaluations, daily logs, journals, summary report, photographic documentation, sketches, models, drawings, handouts

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10% Develop Base Resume and Portfolio for apprenticeship search
20% Finding, applying for, and securing the internship
10% envelop registration documents and outline of apprenticeship experience
40% Apprenticeship experience minimum of 100 hours
20% Documentation of Apprenticeship: Daily Log, Reflective Journal, Exit Response Paper, Student & Host Evaluation Forms, Visual Examples including drawings, models, photographs and site visits

Prerequisites
ARC 204, Architectural Design III

Textbooks/Learning Resources:

Offered (semester and year)
Fall and spring, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Robert J. Sherman, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 407 (previously ARC 420), Architectural Design VI (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
A continuation of the design studio process with an emphasis on complex urban program and multi-unit housing

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Continued independent responsible approach to design work
- Understand site analysis and its potential impact on design
- Understand program analysis and its potential impact on design
- Understand the use of concept creating a design intention, and the representation of concept in model and drawing
- Understand the relationship of structure to design
- Understand mechanical systems and relationship to design
- Understand the importance of community, and its insertion into the urban fabric
- Understand the complexities of multi-unit typologies

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

|----------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
50% Schematic Design
20% Site research and analysis
20% Visual communication and presentation
10% Use of diagram

Prerequisites
ARC 306, Architectural Design V

Textbooks/Learning Resources
To be determined

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 408, (previously ARC 430) Architectural Design VII (4 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
A continuation of the design studio process with an emphasis on community-based projects and client integration; focus will be on affect of architecture on the social environment

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- Continued independent responsible approach to design work
- Understand site analysis and its potential impact on design
- Understand program analysis and its potential impact on design
- Understand the relationship of structure to design
- Understand mechanical systems and relationship to design
- Understand the importance of community, and architecture’s responsibility to assist in the betterment of the community

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
50% Schematic Design
10% Site research and analysis
20% Visual communication and presentation
20% Community based research and analysis

Prerequisites
ARC 407, Architectural Design VI

Textbooks/Learning Resources
To be determined

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 421, Professional Practice, (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Students will study various roles and responsibilities of an architectural practice. The course will expose students to the process and management of a project and project delivery.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- To expose students to various elements of architectural practice
- To expose students to consultants who regularly work with architects
- Explore firm types and structures, and common issues with each
- Discuss office and project management
- Discuss IDP, the ARE, and professional licensure
- Discuss personal goals and the exploration/finding of one’s path in architectural practice

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
B7. Financial Considerations
C4. Project Management
C3. Client Role in Architecture
C5. Practice Management
C7. Legal Responsibilities
C8. Ethics & Professional Judgment
C9. Community & Social Responsibilities

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
20% Architectural practice, firms, structure
20% Consultants and collaboration
20% Firm and Project management
15% Path to licensure
5% Personal goals and path

Prerequisites
ARC 306, Architectural Design V (third year of study)

Textbooks/Learning Resources
The Architect's Handbook of Professional Practice, Demkin
Guest lectures and readings as required

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 431, Architectural Seminar, (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
An advanced seminar in architecture that will work in tandem with design studio offerings in the same semester, topics vary but will typically relate to an annual University academic theme.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Investigate and select a topic
• Develop analysis and research
• Development of a methodology for research
• Engage fellow students in discussion and critique
• Create a comprehensive study paper

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
25% Topic Investigation
25% Research and analysis
10% Creating methodology and schedule
15% Class discussions
25% Research Paper

Prerequisites
ARC 407, Architectural Design VI
Co-requisite, ARC 408, Architectural Design VII

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Varies, depending on topic

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 441, Foreign Travel Experience, (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course is an extended educational travel experience for students to visit meaningful works-of-architecture from outside the United States. Coursework includes history and exposure/study of other cultures.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
- To broaden the students’ knowledge and understanding of architectural principles by first-hand experience of meaningful buildings (historic and modern) in other countries/cultures that form the basis of modern architectural expression
- To embrace architecture as a continuum of response to social forces
- To develop skills in free-hand drawing, and photography and spatial awareness
- To develop writing skills in descriptions of meaningful spaces and different cultures
- To discover the larger world and some of what it can offer
- To serve as “ambassadors” of our school and society to other societies

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A9. Hist. Traditions & Global Culture
A10. Cultural Diversity

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
25% History and Culture
25% Architectural precedents, landmarks
25% Design – photography, drawing, diagramming
25% Travel writing about experiences, journaling

Prerequisites
ARC 306, Architectural Design V
ART 115, Drawing 1

Textbooks/Learning Resources
To be determined depending on country and program

Offered (semester and year)
Summer semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
To be determined
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 489, Topics in Architecture (3 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
This course is for students interested in exploring architecture or an architecturally related course to satisfy the electives required in the general program. The course pertains to subject matter related to design development or other academic advancement in architecture.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
Varies depending on course topic

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
Not listed for elective courses

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
Varies depending on course topic

Prerequisites
ARC 204, Junior standing

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Varies depending on course topic

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually
Multiple offerings possible

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Varies depending on course topic
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 509, Architectural Design VIII, Pre-Thesis (6 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Selection, research and analysis – in a seminar format – of the student’s Thesis project to be conducted in the following semester.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Gain a more independent responsible approach to design work, including the management of schedule and research methodology
• Selection of site, and understand its ability to argue for a conceptual intention.
• Create a design program, and understand its ability to argue for a conceptual intention.

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)
A5. Investigative Skills   A9. Hist. Traditions & Global Culture

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
10% Create scope, schedule, and methodology of research
45% Conduct research and analysis
45% Produce a research paper – a combination of written and visual argument

Prerequisites
ARC 408, Architectural Design VII
ARC technology courses (Structures, Mechanical Systems, Construction Techniques)

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Image of the City, Lynch
The Death and Life of Great American Cities, Jacobs
The Concise Townscape, Cullen
Writing a Thesis: Substance And Style, Van Wagenen (or similar)

Offered (semester and year)
Fall semesters, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture
Amy Hinkley, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Additional faculty advisers and outside readers as required
Number and Title of Course (total credits awarded)
ARC 510, Architectural Design IX, Thesis (8 credits)

Course Description (limit 25 words)
Students will engage in a semester-long thesis project in which the student will explore, design, and present in depth their design project chosen in previous semester.

Course Goals and Objectives (list)
• Evidence of a student’s ability to conduct independent research
• Demonstration of essential design concepts including: Space, Scale, Light, Structure, HVAC, Materials, Construction, and Design with Intention
• Develop and understand the creation of an architectural problem, and the search and representation of its solution
• Successfully argue for the students’ respective design intention as it is realized in the final design project
• Understand how a design argument is made, and make it clearly, concisely, to the chosen intention
• Engage the practice of design through formal critique of other students’ work

Student Performance Criterion/a addressed (list number and title)

Topical Outline (include percentage of time in course spent in each subject area)
100% Students develop and design a comprehensive architectural solution in response to the issues/project developed in the previous semester

Prerequisites
ARC 5XX, Architectural Design VIII, Pre-Thesis

Textbooks/Learning Resources
Varies, depending on student research topic

Offered (semester and year)
Spring semester, annually

Faculty assigned (list all faculty assigned during the two academic years prior to the visit)
Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture
Amy Hinkley, Adjunct Professor of Architecture
Various faculty members serve as primary advisers to individual students/projects
PART FOUR (IV): SECTION 3 – FACULTY RESUMES
Following are Faculty Resumes for all full-time and part-time faculties that have taught at our existing BA in Architecture degree program over the last two years.

Name: Lawrence Bartlett

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 489, Architectural Lighting

Educational Credentials:
Bachelor of Architecture, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, 1976
Master of Architecture, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA, 2004

Teaching Experience:
Instructor, University of Maine at Augusta, spring 2012

Professional Experience:
President, Bartlett Design, Inc. /Lighting and Electrical Engineering, Bath, ME 1996 – present
Lighting Designer, Enterprise Engineering, Inc., Yarmouth, ME 1986-1996
Architectural Department Head, Wright-Pierce /Architects and Engineers, Topsham, ME, Portsmouth, NH, Boston, 1984 – 1986
Lighting Department Head, Ewing Cole Cherry Parsky /Architects and Engineers, Philadelphia, PA 1979-1984
Lighting Designer, Gulf South Engineers, New Orleans, LA 1976-1979

Licenses/Registration:
Maine – Licensed Architect
Maine – Licensed Engineer
New Hampshire – Licensed Engineer

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Speaking Engagements:
AIA 2030 Professional Series, February 2013
Maine Dept. of Environmental Protection Workshop, May 2011
Eastern Electric Utilities Outdoor Lighting Council, October 2008
Maine Governor’s Energy Efficiency Summit, April 2008

Professional Memberships:
Illuminating Engineering Society of North America
Section President 1996-98
International Association of Lighting Designers
Corporate Member
National Fire Protection Association
National Trust for Historic Preservation
Northeast Sustainable Energy Association
National Society of Professional Engineers
Maine State Board of Licensure for Professional Engineers
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta
ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Rosemary Needham-Curtis

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 203, Architectural Design II

Educational Credentials:
BS Hons Architecture, Building and Environmental Studies. UCL, London, UK, 1993
BA Architecture. University of Maine at Augusta, 2009

Teaching Experience:
Adjunct Professor, University of Maine at Augusta – present
Teaching Assistant, University of Maine at Augusta – 2009

Professional Experience:
Designer/drafter, Beckstrom Architecture and Planning, 2005-08
Designer/drafter, Landworks Design, 2008-10
Architectural Coordinator, Phi home Designs, 2010-11
Designer/project manager, Higgins and Merriam Architects, 2011-12
Drafter/project manager, Houses and Cottages, Present
Project manager, Beckstrom Architecture and Planning, 2010-Present

Licenses/Registration:

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Masters thesis on the role of daylight and health in architecture

Professional Memberships:
Name: Daelynn A. Elizabeth, AIA

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 203, Architectural Design II
ARC 204, Architectural Design III

Educational Credentials:
Assoc. Arch., University of Maine at Augusta 1990
B.Arch., Norwich University, 1999
M.Arch., Norwich University, 2001

Teaching Experience:
Adjunct Professor, University of Maine at Augusta 2004-present

Professional Experience:
Intern, Port City Architecture, Portland, Maine 2000-2004
Project Architect, PDT Architects, Portland, Maine 2005-2006
InspireDesign Solutions, Owner Architect, Portland, Maine 2006-present

Licenses/Registration:
Maine

Selected Publications and Recent Research:

Professional Memberships:
American Institute of Architects,
Member Board of Directors
Secretary for Executive Board
Founder/co-chair of AIA Maine Outreach Committee
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta
ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Morris C. Hancock AIA

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 231, Architectural Materials and Methods, annually since 1993
ARC 332, Construction Techniques, annually since 2006

Educational Credentials:
A.B. in Architecture, University of Pennsylvania 1974
B. Arch., Cornell University 1981

Teaching Experience:
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta, 1993 – present
Teaching Assistant, Cornell University, 1979 – 1981

Professional Experience:
Sole proprietor, Morris C. Hancock, AIA – Architects, 1988 – present
Employed by several architecture firms since 1976

Licenses/Registration:
Maine Licensed Architect #1350

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Ongoing research in building science for cold climates

Professional Memberships:
American Institute of Architects, 1985 – present
Richard Upjohn Fellow of AIA since 1995
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Amy Hinkley

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
Arc 101: Introduction to Visual Communication
Arc 102: Architectural Design 1
Arc 420: Architectural Design VI/Seminar
Arc 430: Architectural Design VII/Senior Thesis

Educational Credentials:
B.Arch., Cornell University, 1994

Teaching Experience:
Architecture Instructor, Deerfield Academy 2001
Adjunct Professor, University of Maine, 2006 – present

Professional Experience:
Intern Architect, Media 5 Architecture, Honolulu, HI, 1990
Project Architect, Margo Jones Architects, Greenfield, MA 1998-2001
Project Architect, Theodore and Theodore Architects, Wiscasset, ME 2002-2005
Architectural Consultant, Spencer Architects, Honolulu, HI 2005-2006
Architect (Principal), Amy Hinkley Architect, Waldoboro, ME 2006-present

Licenses/Registration:
Maine

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Visual Journal Research – Developed a series of Praxis to be used in the ARC 101 and 102 sequence that focus on architectural sketching as way of seeing, analyzing, and understanding.

Professional Memberships:
USGBC, Maine Chapter
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Denis L. Lemieux, AIA, NCARB, CDT, LEED AP, DBIA

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 101, Introductions to Architectural Graphics & Design Communication
ARC 102, Architectural Design I

Educational Credentials:
B.Arch., Louisiana Tech University, 1973

Teaching Experience:
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta, 2007 – Present

Professional Experience:
Pittsfield Industries – Construction Co. Retail Development Corporation; 1973-74
Wright, Pierce, Barnes & Wyman - A/E; 1974-77
Aliberti, Larochelle, Hudson – Engineering, Construction Management; 1977-80
Harriman Associates – A/E; 1980-83
HBL Corporation – Architect, Engineer, Construction Management; 1983-89
Harriman Associates – A/E; 1989-2005
DLL Associates/Architects – Architecture; 1989- Present

Licenses/Registration:
NCARB Board Certified – Certification No. 34942
Construction Document Technologist CDT Certified
Design Build Institute of America DBIA Certified
USGBC – LEED AP Certified
Maine Registration No. 1437
New Hampshire Registration No. 2252
Vermont Registration No. 2268
Massachusetts Registration No. 9993
Connecticut Registration No. 8965
Rhode Island Registration No. 2919

Selected Publications and Recent Research:

Professional Memberships:
American Institute of Architects
Construction Specifications Institute
Design Build Institute of America
Maine Concrete Technician Certification Board
Lewiston Auburn Economic Growth Council
Auburn Business Corporation
Name: Daniel C. Moreno

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC261       Computer Aided Design (CAD)
ARC262       AutoCAD II
ARC350       Mechanical Systems

Educational Credentials:
A.A.S. Architectural and Civil Engineering Technology Degree
Central Maine Community College, 1985
B.A. Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta (anticipated degree completion Fall 2012)

Teaching Experience:
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta, 2003 – present
Professor, Architectural and Civil Engineering Technology, Central Maine Community College, Auburn Maine, 2000 – to Present

Professional Experience:
Sole Proprietor, DC Moreno Architecture and Master planning, Architect, Auburn, ME 2000-Present

Licenses/Registration:
Maine Licensed Architect #AR2409  (1998 to present)  
Architect through NCARB – IDP /apprentice approved by state board
Vermont Licensed Architect #2300 1998-2001 (inactive)

Selected Publications and Recent Research:

Professional Memberships:
American Institute of Architects
M. Architecture Program Report – Initial Candidacy

Name: Roger Richmond

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 203, Architectural Design II
ARC 204, Architectural Design III
ARC 123E, Philosophy and Theory of Architectural Design
ARC 420, (Thesis Advisor)

Educational Credentials:
Bachelor of Architecture, University of Florida, 1968
Master of Fine Arts in Architecture, University of Florida, 1970
PhD study… (ABD) (University of Pennsylvania, 1972)
   (Louis Kahn Master Class)

Teaching Experience:
Assistant Professor of Architecture, North Dakota State University 1977-1980
Assistant Professor of Architecture, University of Maine Augusta 1988-1995
Associate Professor of Architecture, University of Maine Augusta 1995-2003
Professor of Architecture, University of Maine Augusta 2003-present

Professional Experience:
Intern, Bower and Fradly, Philadelphia PA 1969-1970
Intern, West and Conyers, Sarasota, FL 1972-'74
Intern, Richmond Construction Corporation, Sarasota, FL
Consultant, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), Houston, TX, 1969-1970

Partnership in SpaceTherapy®, Post Occupancy Evaluation Consultation

Licenses/Registration:
Florida # 5928 (Inactive)
New York (Inactive)

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Interior Design of an Intermediate, Zero Gravity Earth Orbiting Space Station (NASA Internal Note 68-ET-18)
Manipulating Spaces…(written and reproduced, but unpublished)

Professional Memberships:
NA
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Robert J. Sherman, AIA

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 221, Concepts of Structures I
ARC 231, Architectural Materials and Methods
ARC 322, Concepts of Structures II
ARC 332, Construction Techniques
ARC 406, Architectural Apprenticeship
ARC 350, Mechanical Systems in Architecture

Educational Credentials:
BS of Civil Engineering, University of Maine, 1978
B.Arch, Syracuse University, 1981
M.Arch II, Syracuse University at Florence, Italy, 2003

Teaching Experience:
Assistant Professor of Architecture, fixed length, University of Maine at Augusta, 2003-2008
Assistant Professor of Architecture, Tenure Track, University of Maine at Augusta 2008 – present

Professional Experience:
King & King Architects, Syracuse, NY 1982
Sargent, Webster, Crenshaw & Folley Architects/Engrs, Syracuse, NY 1982-87
McDonald & Korman Architects, Syracuse, NY 1984-1986

Licenses/Registration:
New York State #019731

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Syracuse University Semester Document: March II “Firenze Confronta La Modernita: Galleria As Urban Armature”, Syracuse University 2004

Professional Memberships:
American Institute of Architects
Construction Specifications Institute
United States Green Building Council
American Institute of Architecture Students
Initial Candidacy Application: University of Maine at Augusta

ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT – INITIAL CANDIDACY

Name: Eric Stark

Courses Taught (Two academic years prior):
ARC 305, Architectural Design IV
ARC 306, Architectural Design V
ARC 420, Architectural Design VI, Pre-Thesis
ARC 430, Architectural Design VII, Thesis
ARC 213e, Building Community through Design & Construction

Educational Credentials:
Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies, (Theater Design & Shakespearian Literature), Magna Cum Laude, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, IA, 1989
Master of Architecture (with Letter of Commendation for Outstanding Achievement), Harvard University, 1998

Teaching Experience:
Associate Professor of Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta, 2011 – present
Assistant Professor of Architecture, University of Maine at Augusta, 2005 – 2011
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, Wentworth Institute of Technology, fall 2004
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, Rhode Island School of Design, summers 2003, 2004
Adjunct Professor of Architecture, The Boston Architectural College, 1998 – 2000
Teaching Assistant, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 1995 – 1998

Professional Experience:
Sole Proprietor, Eric Stark /architecture, Portland, ME 2005 – present
Project Designer, Perry Dean Rogers | Partners, Boston, MA 1998 – 2004

Licenses/Registration:
Maine

Selected Publications and Recent Research:
Hyper--Iteration: Connecting Architectural Pedagogy and Innovation Engineering to Foster Better Design Processes – Research funded summer/fall 2012
Intention in Architecture, Maine Home + Design, November 2010
Study of 3D rendering and the visual argument in client relations
Study of spatial flow as it relates to residential architecture and varying inhabitation

Professional Memberships:
Portland Society of Architects, Board Member
Greater Portland Landmarks
PART FOUR (IV): SECTION 4 – CATALOG
The UMA course catalog can be found online at: http://www.uma.maine.edu/catalogschedule.html.

PART FOUR (IV): SECTION 5 – ELIGIBILITY MEMORANDUM
Please see Appendix P for the Eligibility Memorandum dated February 8, 2012.
Part Five (V)– Timeline for Achieving Initial Accreditation

Below are goals and dates in the UMA timeline relating to the accreditation process and to the program’s goals in preparation of the start of the professional degree.

MAP: Accreditation Timeline
**Failure to achieve Initial Candidacy**
The University of Maine at Augusta, its administration and the existing architecture program are fully committed to creating an accredited professional degree in architecture. If, at the time of consideration, the university is deemed unready or in some way lacking to achieve the status of Initial Candidacy we will listen closely to whatever concerns may exist, specifically discuss and address those concerns, reconsider how we can best serve northern New England, and reapply at a later date hopefully better prepared for the responsibility of a NAAB accredited degree.

**Failure to achieve Initial Accreditation**
UMA and the Architecture program are fully committed to the goal of achieving NAAB accreditation. We do not come to this lightly, and fully accept the responsibilities in the creation and continued improvement of the proposed B.Arch. At this time we simply cannot contemplate the idea of failure, and will do what is necessary to achieve success.
Appendix A /  
Current Architecture Design Studio Policy
Architecture Design Studio Policy Studio etiquette is an introduction to the space/behavior connection that is at the very heart of architectural design. An ordered space often influences ordered thinking and doing.

PLEASE KEEP THE STUDIO NEAT FOR EVERYONE
- Your table is covered with a vinyl drawing surface. Please DO NOT USE this surface as a cutting mat for model building!!! There is a cutting mat supplied with your kit, please use it!
- Always Be Aware Of Other Student’s Work…you are, however, responsible for the protection of your own work if you should leave the studio.
- You may use an iPod or whatever for personal music, but please make sure that it is not too loud to disturb others…There may be ambient music in the studio.
- The studio supplies certain materials for student use…When You Finish Using Them, Please (!) Return Them

Professionalism
The Practice of Architecture is a profession. As such, part of what you are learning in class is How to be a Professional. This implies carrying yourself in a certain manner. It also requires that you treat your professors and your fellow students in a professional, respectful manner. For these reasons you are expected to
- Act professionally at all times including getting to class on time, turning in assignments when due, taking responsibility for your actions & education
- Treat your professors with respect
- Treat your fellow students with respect
- Dress accordingly and in a suitable manner
- Come to all classes with an attitude of respect and a desire to engage your subject, your professor, and your fellow students

With all supplies and materials: Reduce – Reuse – Recycle!!!

We are all in an age where recycling may be vital to our future environmental survival . . . You will certainly need this attitude to practice as a designer. Use any bins provided throughout the campus for recycling and please take the time to put the appropriate waste in the appropriate bin. If the bins are not available, please take stuff with you until you find an appropriate place to dispose of it. (Like the national parks, take out all the garbage you bring in or generate.)

- When building models, please clean up when you are finished. Model building often requires furniture rearranging. Please put the studio back in order. If you find a mess, and you had nothing to do with it, consider being proactive and clean up what you can.
- Working in a studio is often similar to working in a professional office. The space is for everyone to use, look at, experience, and inhabit, please act accordingly.
- If you see a way to improve the studio setting for all that hasn’t been mentioned here please take the initiative to do so.
- Protect and keep an eye on your own supplies. Equipment has been known to disappear from the studio.
Appendix B / Community Projects Undertaken by the BA in Architecture Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gateway to Downtown</th>
<th>Biddeford, Maine / Heart of Biddeford, partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project partnered my ARC 305 studio with the Town of Biddeford, and the non-profit business support group The Heart of Biddeford. The project asked the students to consider a key “gateway to the downtown”. This abandoned property was at a major intersection and as such offered more than simple development land. The students worked with the town and non-profit group, and eventually presented their design ideas to a meeting of the full Biddeford City Council. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hallowell Waterfront</th>
<th>Hallowell, Maine / Waterfront Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hallowell’s Waterfront Advisory Committee approached our program to generate ideas that might further the potential visions of their slowly developing waterfront. While they perceived a very active downtown Main Street, the area toward the Kennebec was underutilized. Our students spent 8 weeks researching, analyzing and designing, culminating in a presentation at the town City Hall to over 200 residents and city officials. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addition to Jewett Hall</th>
<th>Augusta, Maine / University of Maine at Augusta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For this project my third year design students work hand-in-hand with their own institution - UMA. At the request of the administration, the students researched and analyzed the potential of adding additional classroom and studio space to Jewett Hall - the first building on UMA's campus. At the time the project was “real” in so much as there was funding slated for construction. Unfortunately, the economic downturn removed any chance for the realization of the student's work. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Danforth Gallery</th>
<th>Augusta, Maine / UMA, Department of Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project partnered my ARC 305 studio with art professor and gallery director Peter Precourt. At his request, the studio explored the potential redesign and re-conceptualization of UMA's only formal gallery space. A primary goal was to make an under-utilized outdoor courtyard available and desirable to visiting artists as a potential display space. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation to Dyer Public Library</th>
<th>Saco, Maine / Town of Saco, Maine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project partnered our ARC 306 Advanced studio with the Town of Saco, and the head librarian of their public library. Built in what was once an important mansion in the city, the library needed major reorganization and rethinking as it continued to grow. Our students worked with city and library representatives to diagram and design new potential for this historic building. Led by Adjunct Professor Will Gatchell.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community-based Design Work

**Undertaken by the Upper Level Design Studios, University of Maine at Augusta, Department of Architecture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Client Project Description</th>
<th>Faculty Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Street Traffic Study</td>
<td>Augusta, Maine / Office of Economic Development</td>
<td>This one-day charette was conducted at the request of the City’s Office of Economic Development. The students gathered for this all-day event, studying traffic and pedestrian patterns along Water Street - the historic downtown “Main Street” of Augusta. The work concluded with designs of potential “bump-outs” and other traffic calming devices, designed to make the downtown more walking friendly. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td>spring 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bayside Neighborhood Study</td>
<td>Portland, Maine / East Bayside Neighborhood Org.</td>
<td>This project built upon work done by Adjunct Professor Alan Holt and his Muskie graduate students. East Bayside is the single most diverse area in Maine - representing 22 nationalities. The students researched and analyzed immense amounts of data including traffic, economic, historic, climate, and transportation. Their work with and presented to the East Bayside Neighborhood Organization, along with Portland City Officials. This work led to an AIA Sustainable Design Assessment Team grant. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td>fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway to Franklin Arterial</td>
<td>Portland, Maine / Muskie School of Public Policy</td>
<td>This project grew out of the work done on the East Bayside neighborhood. Taking the lessons learned through research and analysis, the students applied their understanding of the area to the very difficult task of “humanizing” the Franklin Arterial, specifically at the I-295 interchange. This new “gateway” to the city attempted to create a pedestrian friendly face and experience, while answering many of the issues facing all of Bayside. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td>fall 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Plan for Mill Island</td>
<td>Lewiston, Maine / Office of the City Administrator</td>
<td>For this project my fourth year thesis students tackled a large area of Lewiston located below the canals once used to power the mill infrastructure. Working closely with Ian Houseal, Special Assistant to the City Administrator, the students worked in small groups on this challenging project. Their final recommendations were given in the City Council Chambers, and were the lead story on the WCSH Channel 6 evening news. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td>fall 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Bread of Life Projects                                                  | Augusta, Maine / Bread of Life Ministries | This was actually *three projects*, all undertaken by UMA’s first “cluster course” - a new type of community-based learning, bringing together the disciplines of Art, Architecture and Philosophy. The projects were:  
A redesign of the Soup Kitchen as Art Gallery (construction complete)  
A new Child’s Play Space for the Homeless Shelter (design complete)  
The design and renovation of a New Life Skills Center (under construction)  
Led by Professors Greg Fahy, Peter Precourt, and Eric Stark | spring 2010                 |
## Community-based Design Work

Undertaken by the Upper Level Design Studios, University of Maine at Augusta, Department of Architecture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Center at Mill Park</th>
<th>Augusta, Maine / Friends of the Heritage Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We were put in contact with this non-profit by the Economic Development office of the City of Augusta. The existing “carpenter’s shop” is the last remaining mill building on either side of the Kennebec in Augusta. This once thriving area is trying to revitalize itself using its history and wonderful outdoor spaces as a catalyst. The students spent 7-weeks on this project, presenting their final designs to a very impressed group of volunteers. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master Plan for Tissue Mill Site</th>
<th>Augusta, Maine / Office of the Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with the Augusta Office of Economic Development, my fourth year thesis class designed a master plan for the now vacant Statler Tissue Mill site, located on the east side of the Kennebec River. As all structures, save for a one foundation, have been removed from the site, the students faced the daunting task of creating a new “neighborhood” from scratch. The “3-node” scheme puts housing, arts, and retail in close proximity to each other thereby creating a new draw to the surrounding region. Led by Assistant Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A New Synagogue</th>
<th>Augusta, Maine / Temple Beth El</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project paired third year design students and Rabbi Susan Carvutto together to work on the potential designs for a new Temple in Augusta. The existing temple is in a residential area, and lacks both space and amenities required by the congregation. In all, the students created eleven dramatically different designs all of which captured the light and essence of spirituality. The two best projects were additionally presented to the Temple’s Board. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Richmond Public Library</th>
<th>Richmond, Maine / Public Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This most recent project put my third year design students and Rabbi Susan Carvutto together to work on the potential designs for a new Temple in Augusta. The existing temple is in a residential area, and lacks both space and amenities required by the congregation. In all, the students created eleven dramatically different designs all of which captured the light and essence of spirituality. The two best projects were additionally presented to the Temple’s Board. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Charette for Expansion</th>
<th>Fairfield, Maine / Kennebec Montessori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project grows out of a 4 year relationship with Rebecca Green, Director of the Kennebec Montessori School. She has opened her classrooms to our students to explore the Montessori education as it happens. This project allowed UMA/ARC to give back. The students, working in groups of four, conducted a 3 hour program exercise, leading to a one-week design charette. The projects were presented to the School’s board of directors and faculty to wonderful response. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Area</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Offices + Community Center</td>
<td>Livermore, ME / Town of Livermore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care + Meeting Space</td>
<td>Augusta, ME / Bread of Life Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office + Welcoming Space</td>
<td>Augusta, ME / Bread of Life Ministries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place: Investigation + Analysis</td>
<td>Rockland, ME / Town of Rockland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synagogue: a New Birth</td>
<td>Augusta, Maine / Temple Beth El</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community-based Design Work
Undertaken by the Upper Level Design Studios, University of Maine at Augusta, Department of Architecture

### A War Memorial
**Clinton, ME / Town of Clinton**

Clinton, Maine contacted UMA/ARC to help design a memorial to their fallen townspeople. The idea of erecting a war memorial to the fallen soldier as opposed to a war victory is a relatively modern one, and can be traced to World War I. Today indeed, it is the soldier and human being that is honored and not the war, victory or otherwise, putting a face and name on the real losses suffered across any military campaign. The first part of the assignment focused on a precedent study of the memorial as a type. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.

*spring 2012*

### School Reuse Ballot Measure
**Burnham, ME / Town of Burnham**

UMA/ARC was contacted by Burnham, Maine to help collect and share information related to a pending ballot measure. The town was voting on whether or not to move the existing town hall into a school recently shutdown due to consolidation. The Town Hall needed more space, and specifically more secure storage, to properly operate. This project asked students to help research and analyze issues in hopes of helping the town’s constituents make a more informed decision as to how to use limited resources. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.

*spring 2012*

### Downtown Revitalization
**Augusta, ME / 275 Water Street**

Water Street is on the brink of a resurgence marked by new restaurants, new developers, city involvement and beautification. 275 Water Street is a 33,000 square foot building whose upper floors, now empty, once were full with active non-profit tenants. The project asked students: What could this corner building become? What is the right use for the ground floor as well as the upper floors? Something the city lost or maybe something always lacking? The work investigated and argue for a specific use, and subsequently designed that use into the building. Led by Assistant Professor Eric Stark.

*fall 2011*
Appendix C / 
UMA Assessment Plan, Guidelines + Forms
THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT AUGUSTA’S ASSESSMENT PLAN

Introduction:
"Assessment is the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving learning and development.” (Palomba, C.A. & Banta, T.W., p 4) Formative assessment guides effort. It is often done at the beginning and during a program evaluation. At the beginning of program evaluation it is used to decide what needs to be done, and how it should be done. During program evaluation it is used to assist in deciding if it is being done and if it is succeeding. Summative assessment is done at the end to determine if important needs were met, and if the effort was well-designed and well-executed and did it succeed.

The University of Maine at Augusta (UMA)’s assessment plan is based upon the CIPP (Context, Input, Process and Product) model developed by Daniel Stufflebeam (2003). This is a comprehensive assessment model that encompasses the entire institution. The intent of this model is to link evaluation with decision making to improve both programs and policies. There are four aspects to the CIPP model:

1. Context evaluation assesses needs and opportunities and assists in setting and assessing goals.
2. Input evaluation determines how to use resources, and guides and assesses planning.
3. Process evaluation assesses the implementation of strategies
4. Product evaluations identify and assess out comes and assists in documenting success.

The CIPP model is currently being used by several institutions of higher education, including: The University of Wisconsin – Stevens Point, Western Michigan University, and Rush University. The following tables were adapted from the Rush University’s Assessment Plan.

UMA’s Assessment Plan – 2010
Adapted from Rush University’s Assessment Plan
# THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT AUGUSTA’S ASSESSMENT PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MISSION and INTEGRITY | -Mission documents of each college are linked to the mission of the university, are accurate and accessible.  
-Faculty, staff and students indicate familiarity and understanding of the mission, vision, values and goals of their college and university.  
-Assessment plans for each college are linked to their mission, goals and objectives for student learning and academic achievement.  
-University promotional materials accurately reflect program offerings, outcomes, accreditation/approval status, academic calendar, admission and progression policies, degree requirements, tuition and fees. | -Mission statement and the UMA Website  
-Minutes of the Faculty Senate/Assemblies and Committees  
-Student and faculty surveys  
-College assessment plans | | |
| GOVERNANCE | -Faculty, students and staff are informed of and given opportunity to participate in and influence decisions and policies that impact the university and its impact on educational programs. | -Minutes of the Faculty Senate/Assemblies and Committees  
-Student and faculty surveys | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUT PLANNING</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Strategic initiatives at the college level align with the university’s mission, are approved through designated channels and give consideration to the resource demands of the university. -Evaluation of strategic initiatives is reflected in the university and college documents. -Faculty are given an opportunity to participate in programmatic and resource planning, whether for on-site or distance offerings.</td>
<td>-University and college level strategic plans and budgeting. -Minutes of faculty senate, assemblies, committee meetings and Provost’s staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCES</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Quality, availability, functionality, and adequacy of learning labs, equipment, educational technologies, practice sites and academic support services for both on-site and distance offerings are assessed.</td>
<td>-Annual capacity analysis of university resources and services (library, academic support services and student counseling). -Student and faculty surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACULTY and FACULTY DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</th>
<th>DATA SOURCES</th>
<th>ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Faculty, including adjunct faculty, receive an orientation to the university and its educational programs. -Faculty involves in clinical and/or didactic teaching of students, whether on-site or through electronic format, meet the degree, credential and/or licensing requirement. -Faculty development programs are responsive to faculty needs and designed to facilitate improved teaching and evaluation strategies with diverse student bodies, and varied learning environments, including online and clinical teaching. -Faculty development programs are responsive to the scholarship and research development needs of the faculty.</td>
<td>-Faculty orientation program -Faculty vitae -Minutes of the faculty development committee. -Faculty surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</td>
<td>DATA SOURCES</td>
<td>ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>TIMELINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Curriculum and Evaluation    | - Each degree program has clearly stated learning outcomes to guide assessment of student learning.  
- Faculty use direct and indirect measures that align with course and program objectives to assess student learning and teaching effectiveness.  
- Each college maintains a system of quality assurance which includes regular review of the curriculum, course offerings, teaching effectiveness, and student learning.  
- Each program provides evidence of how assessment data are used for program improvement and enhanced student learning. | - Curriculum review policies and procedures  
- Program review reports |                                        |                       |
| Engagement                   | - The university’s outreach programs and co-curricular activities support the education of its students. | - Number and description of community outreach programs in which students, staff and faculty participate. |                                        |                       |
| Institutional Performance | Colleges and programs of the university meet or exceed their benchmarks relative to: | -Faculty, student and alumni surveys  
-Reports of review and outcomes assessment |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          | -Student and faculty diversity  
-Enrollment, graduation and attrition rates  
-Certification and licensure rates of graduates  
-Job placement rates  
-Faculty, student and alumni scholarship, research, professional accomplishments and community service  
-Satisfaction rates of faculty, students, staff and employers of UMA graduates | |

**References:**


Suhayada, R. (2008). Rush University Assessment Plan,  

UMA’s Assessment Plan – 2010  
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Appendix D /
UMA Core and General Education Requirements
Following is the descriptive information on Core and Gen Ed requirements that will appear in the next edition of the catalog.

**Core and General Education Requirements**

It is the intention of the University of Maine at Augusta that every degree graduate will be prepared to function in our society as an effective and informed citizen. To this end, the faculty has designed a set of minimum expectations that students are expected to satisfy. These aspirations are defined by core skills, competencies, and abilities as well as knowledge based learning experiences that are the grounds for the General Education Requirements.

**Learning Outcomes for Core Skills, Competencies, and Abilities:**

**Written Communications:** The UMA graduate will demonstrate the skills to write clearly and effectively. Each baccalaureate degree contains a minimum of four writing intensive courses with at least two at the upper level (300-400). Associate degree programs require a minimum of two writing intensive courses. The UMA graduate will be able to:

- write effectively in the following formats: essay, research report, literature review;
- organize and manipulate sentences, paragraphs and documents to achieve coherence and clarity, using correct diction and grammar;
- find, evaluate, integrate, and site sources, using an appropriate citation style;
- evaluate the needs, background, and values of an audience and adapt the writing accordingly;
- revise and edit written documents as well as produce documents in electronic format;
- demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in the academic discipline of rhetoric;
- demonstrate an understanding of and effectively employ the vocabulary of one’s major and/or minor when writing discipline-specific documents.

**Oral Communications:** The UMA graduate will be able to communicate clearly and effectively in a variety of settings and will be able to:

- organize and present complex material at appropriate levels of abstraction and technical detail for the audience;
- communicate clearly, concisely, and effectively with clarity, tone, diction, gesture, affect, volume, and presence suitable to the situation;
- process information with others in a productive manner as well as practice active and appropriate listening skills;
- evaluate the needs, background, and values of an audience and adjust communications as necessary;
- make a persuasive and logical case for a plan of action and/or a particular point of view;
- recognize the strengths, weaknesses, and assumptions of oral arguments;
- demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in the academic discipline of oral communications;
- demonstrate an understanding of and effectively employ the vocabulary of one’s major and/or minor in oral discourse.

**Quantitative Skills:** The UMA graduate will possess competence in quantitative reasoning and will be able to:

- demonstrate a variety of problem-solving strategies needed to analyze quantitative problems and determine appropriate solutions;
- evaluate practical quantitative problems and translate them into appropriate mathematical statements and their solutions;
- “use technology appropriately to assist in representation, organization, and data collection” as per the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Principles and Standards 2000;
• use statistical and numerical data and sound reasoning skills to discuss effectively and write convincing mathematical arguments;
• perform arithmetic operations, develop relationships between abstract variables and concrete applications, recognize mathematical functions, and draw appropriate conclusions from numerical information;
• demonstrate an understanding of and effectively employ the language and vocabulary used in the academic discipline of mathematics.

Natural Scientific Inquiry: The UMA graduate will demonstrate an ability to apply scientific knowledge and methodologies to practical problems and issues related to personal and societal needs and will be able to:
• work effectively with others to analyze scientific problems and apply scientific methodologies;
• articulate the relationships among observed phenomena and the scientific principles those observations inform;
• demonstrate an understanding of natural diversity and of how knowledge about the natural world is organized;
• demonstrate an understanding of laws, theories, models, and the effect of new technologies used in analyzing the natural world;
• demonstrate an understanding of the dynamic nature of scientific inquiry;
• demonstrate an understanding of the unifying concepts and processes that transcend all scientific disciplines; these are: causality and consequence, dynamic equilibrium, scale and proportion, change and evolution, evidence and explanation;
• demonstrate an understanding of the interrelationships of human beings with the natural world;
• demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in at least one of the scientific academic disciplines.

Social Science: The UMA graduate will understand how anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science, geography, and/or economics shape culture and will be able to:
• demonstrate an understanding of basic theories within one or more social science, including anthropology, psychology, political science, sociology, economics, and geography;
• acknowledge the variability and complexity of human societies and cultures;
• demonstrate an understanding of social science information resources available through the library as well as other information sources’
• demonstrate an understanding of social systems, including their biological and psychological determinants;
• demonstrate an understanding of social and cultural value systems;
• demonstrate an understanding of the social institutions that shape our society;
• apply social science perspectives, research, and information to other disciplines and professional studies;
• demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in one of the social science disciplines.

Humanities: The UMA graduate will exhibit an understanding of ideas, events, cultures and languages through which societies have evolved and will be able to:
• evaluate, analyze and compare significant texts, using historical contexts and a variety of cultural perspectives;
• describe and analyze how texts reflect the culture(s) that produced them within a global context;
• analyze and interpret the ideas of “value” and “meaning” from a variety of humanities perspectives;
• articulate and defend a thoughtful assessment of these ideas;
• interpret meaning from a variety of media and construct, as well as appreciate alternative interpretations;
• demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in one or more of the disciplines within the humanities (e.g., literacy or historical terminology).

**Fine Arts:** The UMA graduate will understand the modes of expression within one or more areas of art (including, but not limited to visual arts, architecture, music, dance, theater, and cinematography) and will be able to do four of the following:
• demonstrate an understanding of the compositional elements within a work of art;
• identify and describe important works of art within a given genre;
• demonstrate an understanding of cultural influences on artworks;
• demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which art influences society;
• provide a cogent interpretation for a chosen work of art;
• demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in one of the disciplines within the arts.

**Cultural Diversity:** The UMA graduate will be able to identify, discuss, analyze and evaluate issues pertaining to diversity and will be able to:
• demonstrate an understanding of diversities within and among cultures, religions, races, ethnicities, genders, sexual preferences, abilities, ages and/or socioeconomic groups;
• demonstrate an understanding of the scope and limitations of one’s own cultural perspective;
• identify issues and problems that people from minority cultures have negotiating the dominant culture;
• engage in critical inquiry into the problems, challenges and possibilities inherent in a diverse society;
• demonstrate an understanding of the vocabulary used in one or more of the interdisciplinary studies of diversity.

**Computer Literacy:** The UMA graduate will be able to use basic computer technology required to communicate in a technology-based society and will be able to:
• demonstrate the function of computer hardware components required to input, store, and process data, including appropriate peripheral devices;
• perform basic operating systems file maintenance commands;
• use a word processor to create, edit, and save a short research paper;
• manage and comprehend a spreadsheet to organize/summarize/visualize quantitative data;
• build an electronic database to store and use information;
• professionally present information using presentation software;
• use appropriate technology to communicate electronically.

**Critical Thinking:** The UMA graduate will be able to think critically and to:
1. develop well-reasoned arguments;
2. demonstrate evaluative skills such as the ability to distinguish fact from opinions, identify central issues and problems, classify data, judge credibility, predict consequences, recognize assumptions and inconsistencies, detect bias, plan alternate strategies, and evaluate arguments and hypotheses;
3. demonstrate thinking skills such as flexibility, precision, accuracy and reflection;
4. identify and solve a variety of types of problems;
5. demonstrate the use of both inductive and deductive reasoning;
6. demonstrate creative thinking.

**Information Literacy:** The UMA graduate will be able to find, evaluate, and use information from traditional and new technology sources and be able to:
1. determine the extent of information needed;
2. access the needed information effectively and efficiently;
3. evaluate information and its sources critically and constructively;
4. retain and integrate selected information into his or her knowledge base;
5. use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose;
6. demonstrate the ethical use of information.

**Baccalaureate Degree Core and General Education Requirements (40 credits)**
A. Core Skills, Competencies, and Abilities (15 credits)
   1. Written Communication (6 credits) - ENG101 and 3 credits from ENG102W, 111W, or 317W
   2. In addition to ENG101 each student must successfully complete one writing intensive course
   3. Oral Communication (3 credits)
   4. Mathematics (3 credits) - MAT100 or higher
B. General Education Requirements (25 credits)
   1. Fine Arts and Humanities - 9 credits to include: 3 credits fine arts and 3 credits humanities
   2. Mathematics, Natural and Computer Sciences - 10 credits to include a natural science with a laboratory
   3. Social Science - 6 credits
      • All core and general education courses will address issues of diversity.

**Associate Degree Core and General Education Requirements (25 credits)**
A. Core Skills, Competencies, and Abilities (12 credits)
   • Written (3 credits) - ENG101, College Writing
      • In addition to ENG101 each student must successfully complete one writing intensive course
      • Oral Communication (3 credits)
      • Mathematics (3 credits) - MAT100 or higher
B. General Education Requirements (13 credits)
   1. Scientific Inquiry (4 credits)
   2. Social Science (3 credits)
   3. Humanities (3 credits)
   4. Fine Arts (3 credits)*
      • All core and general education courses will address issues of diversity.

*In certain professional degree programs this requirement has been waived.
Appendix E /
Comparative Research: United States Bachelor of Architecture Programs
# B.Arch Comparison

## June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th># of B.Arch Students Total</th>
<th># of FT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of PT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of B.Arch Degrees</th>
<th>No. FT Faculty</th>
<th>No. PT Faculty</th>
<th>No. FT Students</th>
<th>No. PT Students*</th>
<th>No. FT + 1/3PT Students per FT Faculty</th>
<th>No. PT + 1/3PT Students per PT Faculty</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT &amp; PT</th>
<th># Degrees/ # Students (B.Arch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NE Private B.Arch Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Boston Architectural College</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE The Cooper Union</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Cornell University</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Drexel University</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Pratt Institute</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE Syracuse University</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* UMA numbers based on fall 2010, PT = 1/3FTE

| Average | 26 | 10 | 23 | 6 |

## Eastern Public B.Arch Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th># of B.Arch Students Total</th>
<th># of FT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of PT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of B.Arch Degrees</th>
<th>No. FT Faculty</th>
<th>No. PT Faculty</th>
<th>No. FT Students</th>
<th>No. PT Students*</th>
<th>No. FT + 1/3PT Students per FT Faculty</th>
<th>No. PT + 1/3PT Students per PT Faculty</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT &amp; PT</th>
<th># Degrees/ # Students (B.Arch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC City College of New York</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC Temple University</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average | 22 | 14 | 22 | 9 |
### Student:Faculty Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th># of B.Arch Students Total</th>
<th># of FT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of PT B.Arch Students</th>
<th># of B.Arch Degrees</th>
<th>No. FT Faculty</th>
<th>No. PT Faculty</th>
<th>FT + 1/3PT Students per FT Faculty</th>
<th>Pt + 1/3PT Students per FT Faculty</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio FT &amp; PT</th>
<th># Degrees/# Students (B.Arch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>California State Polytechnic University, Pomona</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Tennesssee-Knoxville</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Public Non-Eastern</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Dedicated Studio?</td>
<td>Dedicated Studio post-1st</td>
<td>Arch Library</td>
<td>Arch Computer Lab</td>
<td>Material Resource Center</td>
<td>Model Shop</td>
<td>Laser Cutter</td>
<td>CNC Machine</td>
<td>Photo Lab</td>
<td>Gallery</td>
<td>Annual Tuition Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US</td>
<td>University of Maine at Augusta</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Private B.Arch Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Boston Architectural College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>The Cooper Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-NE</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Public B.Arch Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC</td>
<td>City College of New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC</td>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,675.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-EC</td>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,784.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Eastern Public B.Arch Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# B.Arch Comparison
## June 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Dedicated Studio?</th>
<th>Dedicated Studio post-1st Year</th>
<th>Architecture Library</th>
<th>Architecture Computer Lab</th>
<th>Material Resource Center</th>
<th>Model Shop</th>
<th>Laser Cutter</th>
<th>CNC Machine</th>
<th>Photo Lab</th>
<th>Gallery</th>
<th>Annual Tuition Resident</th>
<th>Annual Tuition Non-Resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Auburn University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,625.00</td>
<td>$7,875.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,689.00</td>
<td>$14,859.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US California State Polytechnic University, Pomona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2,772.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,150.00</td>
<td>$15,090.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,689.00</td>
<td>$17,417.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Iowa State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,360.00</td>
<td>$17,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Louisiana State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Mississippi State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$4,978.00</td>
<td>$11,469.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US North Carolina State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,118.00</td>
<td>$17,316.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,201.00</td>
<td>$16,556.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,232.00</td>
<td>$13,220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,142.00</td>
<td>$19,276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$6,142.00</td>
<td>$19,276.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
<td>$16,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Houston</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,834.00</td>
<td>$17,826.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,423.00</td>
<td>$17,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$7,423.00</td>
<td>$17,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,321.00</td>
<td>$19,530.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Tennessee-Knoxville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,972.00</td>
<td>$18,174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$3,945.00</td>
<td>$12,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-US Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$8,189.00</td>
<td>$20,825.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Public Non-Eastern: 95% 100% 76% 86% 76% 95% 71% 71% 43% 76%
% Public B.Arch: 96% 100% 85% 95% 85% 98% 77% 76% 38% 75%
% All US B.Arch: 91% 97% 71% 85% 68% 91% 74% 68% 32% 68%
Appendix F / Global University Draft Collaborative Agreement
COLLABORATIVE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
University of Maine in Augusta (UMA)
Department of Architecture (UMA ARC)
UNITED STATES
And
Slovak Technical University (STU)
Faculty of Architecture
Slovenska Technicka Univerzita (STU)
Fakulta Architektury (FA)
Slovak Republic

Preamble:
The Establishment of Collaborative Relationship between STU FA Slovak Republic and University of Maine in Augusta, Maine, USA reflects general consensus resulting from meetings between these institutions in which they have agreed to pursue the future establishment of a formal collaborative relationship between the two universities.

1. UMA and STU FA agree to co-operate in discussions to identify areas where staff and students of both institutions can work together through the Global Understanding Programs to promote international excellence in higher education.

2. UMA and STU FA seek to foster collaborative educational opportunities including conferences, international exchange lectures, and international exchange courses, exchanges of students, and faculty, and research projects. Any of these activities will be the subject of a future agreement.

3. UMA and STU FA based on principle of equality have reached an agreement to continue this partnership offering jointly a course in Global Understanding using videoconferencing and other internet based tools. The Global Understanding course will begin during the Spring Semester, 2013. English will be used in teaching this course. This course will be also offered continually. Participation in this course will require each university to maintain internet connectivity that supports H.323 videoconferencing and IRC based chat. This course will provide partnerships between the students and faculty at the STU University and UMA for the duration of the course.

4. UMA and STU FA will respect the name and high reputation of the other, and will consult with the other regarding any publicity or external reference to this memorandum of understanding.

5. UMA and STU FA will share information with the other to help promote mutual understanding, and each will respect the confidentiality and intellectual ownership of this information.
The details of how to carry out this Memorandum of Understanding will be discussed further by the two parties and the responsible to do so will be:

**University of Maine in Augusta**
Name: Eric Stark  
UMA, Maine  
USA

**STU FA**
Name:
Bratislava, Slovakia

By written mutual consent, this agreement shall go into effect from the date of the last signature. If it is deemed necessary by either party, new ideas can be put forth in writing according to the situation to enhance or extend the agreement. The agreement will remain in effect for 3 (three) years, and may be renewed, subject to renegotiation (6) six months prior to the date of expiration.

For the purpose of implementing this agreement the responsible parties are:

Signed on behalf of:  
University of Maine in Augusta  
Signed on behalf of:  
STU FA (Dean of STU FA)

Dr. Joseph Szakas  
Provost and Vice President of UMA  
Place: ______________________
Date: ______________________

Place: ______________________
Date: ______________________
Appendix G / Testimonials and News Articles
Dear Dr. Handley,

In the fall of 2009, I had the pleasure of taking a call from Professor Peter Precourt regarding the possibility of a new 9 credit course to include departments from Art (Professor Peter Precourt), Architecture (Professor Eric Stark), and Philosophy (Professor Gregory Fahy). If approved, this advanced course would collaborate with a local non-profit to implement and provide for real-life learning between the students and the non-profit. We were pleased and honored to be selected and offered the opportunity to work together starting in January of 2010. Special thanks to you and the University for approving this new course offering, it has been amazing!

Since January, I must share with you that this experience for our organization and staff, along with the UMA students and professors has been nothing short of amazing and astounding. The goals were to integrate actual research, dialogue, work and learning for each discipline of art, architecture and philosophy such that one or multiple facilities could have their space redesigned and maximized. My expectations were and continue to be far exceeded by such amazing professors and students.

After much dialogue, instruction, and cooperation, the following results have taken place, or are in the process of being finalized due to the hard work of the professors and students:

- Our soup kitchen has been renovated which includes being repainted (by students & volunteers) with new & lively colors, new display cases for our notices/recognition, tracks for holding art displays are in place in order to offer the first art gallery in downtown Augusta — which students and professors may take advantage of, and new track lighting for the gallery/soup kitchen is being ordered. This will allow the soup kitchen to have a dual usage and will make the space more welcoming and enjoyable for our clients. This is an exciting and new addition to our downtown!

- Our homeless shelter had a need to provide an outside play area and a parent/smoking area that was safe and convenient. A new design has been created and will be implemented by the students this summer. It will incorporate a "natural" play area with a creative sitting space that will be covered to help with rain/snow elements.

- Our shelter and soup kitchen has a need for ongoing vegetables to provide healthy, nutritious meals. A new area behind our shelter is planned and designed to offer a raised bed vegetable garden and fruit/berry trees. This is to be completed with donations which will also provide appropriate drainage and area utilization.

- The final and largest project was to redesign the JTG House. This is a facility that we recently bought next to our shelter that will have additional shelter beds, a day shelter, and a Center for Life Skills (through a Network of Volunteer Professionals - NVP's) - provides education for homeless families and individuals on life skills such as parenting, budgeting, housekeeping, job...
search, interviewing skills, resume writing, etc.). The students and professors have created a completely new design for our facility which will maximize the facility, meet all the qualifications for use, offer safety and accessibility features, and provide for all the needs required of a multiuse facility. This will clearly be one of the most unique and creative facilities to be found anywhere, especially serving the homeless!

We are fortunate that during this process, we at Bread of Life Ministries have been able to be awarded grants to fund these projects. In fact, I believe that because we have had such a successful collaborative effort with the UMA course, that it has enhanced our ability to apply and be awarded grants. Currently, we have been awarded $70,000 toward purchase of the JTG House, $150,000 towards renovations, and we await the results of another $140,000 worth of grants toward long term staffing, and $6,000 toward an inside children’s play area, reading area, and nursery room.

This course and project has been a phenomenal and exceptional experience! I can not overstate the value, energy and solid results that have come from these past 6 months. You have an amazing set of professors in Peter, Eric and Greg. They have had the insight and foresight to put together, and pull off an amazing course and a cooperative project with a local non-profit that will positively impact our community and homeless population for years to come. It has also provided real-life learning experiences for the students who can take pride in their accomplishments for years to come.

I highly recommend and hope that the University will continue to pursue such partnerships in our community. I would be honored to have our organizations work together in the future for a similar/creative adventure. Know that you have my deepest appreciation and inspiration which has been provided by the leadership of three outstanding professors and their dedicated students.

I would like to personally invite you to share in this amazing experience by visiting our sites, and seeing the work in process and the work to be done first hand. It would be great if the professors and you (and any additional staff/deans, Provost Nadel) could join us for a visit. Might your assistant coordinate with you and the professors a time convenient for a visit? I look forward to hearing from you and sharing in person the exciting accomplishments brought forth from this cooperative venture and some amazing people.

My Sincerest Regards and Appreciation,

Dean Lachance
Executive Director
Bread of Life Ministries

O - 626-3434
C - 242-9483
lachancedean@apol.com

cc: Provost Josh Nadel
    Professor Peter Precourt
    Professor Eric Stark
    Professor Gregory Fahy
    Board of Directors - Bread of Life Ministries
MEMORANDUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>Eric Stark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FROM:</td>
<td>Ian Houseal, Special Assistant to the City Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>June 8, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE:</td>
<td>Recommendation of Erick Stark’s Fall 2009 Senior Thesis Architecture Preparation Course on the Riverfront Area of Lewiston, Maine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project had an important role to play in Lewiston’s still developing master plan for its Riverfront area. Eric Stark is to be commended for his work in seeing the opportunity for real world learning for his students, application of architecture to a real world situation for a municipal client, and the value that a student project could bring to the design of the downtown of Lewiston.

Through Mr. Stark’s course, the City of Lewiston received three significantly different, well thought out, and considerate master plans for Lewiston’s Riverfront area. These projects are being used as concept designs for Lewiston’s downtown as it begins the development of a full build-out master plan for its Riverfront area including planning for the use of its canals, traffic flow, future real estate development, open space, and urban design.

These plans have generated much excitement in the community surrounding the future of Lewiston’s downtown. This project got architects, developers, and community members thinking about the future of downtown Lewiston. And the very positive press generated in the newspaper and on television may have contributed to Lewiston’s recent receipt of a congressional earmark for downtown planning.

Sincerely,

Ian Houseal
M.R.P., M. Arch., LEED AP
Special Assistant to the City Administrator
City of Lewiston
Lewiston, Maine
University of Maine Augusta
C/O Professor Eric Stark
46 University Drive
Augusta, Me. 04330

November 20, 2009

Dear Professor Stark,

On behalf of the City of Hallowell I would like to express great appreciation for the work that the students of the University of Maine’s architecture program have done for the Waterfront project in our community. The ideas generated by your students have been very well received by the community, and are most certain to have an impact on the final plan that comes together for this location.

Enclosed please find a check in the amount of $700.00, authorized by the Hallowell City Council, to be used to purchase classroom materials to further assist these students in the task of becoming the architects of tomorrow. It is the will of the Council that these funds be spent in a manner that will benefit the architecture program to the greatest extent.

Once again, on behalf of the City Council, I extend a sincere thank you to these students. The City looks forward to the possibility of calling upon them for future projects.

Sincerely,

Todd Shea
Interim City Manager
Chosen Land  
22 June 2009  

Eric Stark  
Assistant Professor of Architecture  
University of Maine at Augusta  
46 University Drive  
Augusta, ME 04330  

Dear Friend:  

I hope this finds you well and thriving and not too soggy from all this rain.  

I am writing to you as a follow up on an e-mail I sent you last month. We would be very pleased to have you and any of your colleagues come down to visit and tour the Village.  

We would also like to see if there is any possibility of your students using some of our resources within your curriculum. We feel we might have something to offer to you and would like to develop some sort of ongoing relationship.  

Michael Graham, our Curator, and myself were so impressed with your entire program and the presentations we were able to see and hear that we felt we would really like to initiate some form of interaction with you all.  

We are going to be undertaking a two-year exhibition beginning in 2010 on the architectural history of this Community. We will also be holding a conference based on this subject most likely in the summer of 2010.  

If you have any interest or ideas at all please do be in contact with us, at least come by for a tour.  

I look forward to hearing from you.  

Peace,  

[Signature]  

Brother Arnold for  
The Community
December 4, 2008

Eric Stark  
Assistant Professor of Architecture  
University of Maine at Augusta  
46 University Drive  
Augusta, Maine 04347

Dear Professor Stark:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the assistance provided to the City of Hallowell's waterfront planning process by the Architecture Department of UMA. As you noted, the program was enthusiastically received in Hallowell and generated a good deal of public interest in what might be accomplished along our riverfront. Several favorable articles appeared in the local press which suggested that the collaboration was a good thing for the community, as well as for the University. We are pleased to learn that our success prompted UMA/ARC to work with the Kennebec Valley Art Association in Hallowell, as well as with other communities.

Your information regarding the UMA/ARC Gift Program has been provided to the City Council and that information will be added to the agenda of our Budget Committee when we meet in the spring to consider allocations to community services. We will advise you of action taken and hope that there will be opportunities in the future to collaborate on matters of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

Anthony L. Masciadri
Mayor
April 15, 2008

President Allyson Hughes Handley
University of Maine at Augusta
Robinson Hall
46 University Drive
Augusta, Maine 04330

Dear President Handley,

As Chairman of the City of Hallowell's Waterfront Advisory Committee, I am writing to express our appreciation to the University as a whole and to the Architecture Department in particular, for the outstanding services they have provided to our community in the past year in connection with our riverfront development project.

For the past seven years Hallowell has worked to develop a riverfront park that will serve a wide range of community interests and uses. Last year at this time we approached the Architecture Department and asked if it would be possible to engage architecture students in the development of a final park design. When we were informed that our proposal had been accepted we were delighted and looked forward to our collaboration with great anticipation.

In the fall we had a "Meet The City" event at City Hall auditorium, and early in the new year a second public meeting took place in which eight student teams presented final plans for review and comment by the community. Between those two events, members of the Advisory Committee acted as "clients" and spent two full class days interacting with the student teams and commenting upon their preliminary and final plans. Everyone who was involved in this process was taken with the enthusiasm, energy and imagination of the students, and I am happy to report that we will be incorporating some of the ideas that were presented in our final park plan. From our perspective it would be hard to imagine how this collaboration could have been more successful.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the work of Assistant Professor Eric Stark for his direction of this project. He did a particularly good job in the public meetings in describing to the community how this project would work, and in outlining to the class how to go about
community analysis, program development and final design. The “real world” challenge here seemed one that Eric and his class truly enjoyed. It was a pleasure to work with him.

I have enclosed copies of some of the newspaper coverage of the project which reflect the positive responses our collaboration received. Thank you once again for this community service.

Sincerely

Gerald T. Mahoney, Chair
Waterfront Advisory Committee

Enclosures (4)
University using its new space

UMA making plans for downtown building; open house Thursday

BY MATTHEW STONE
Staff Writer

AUGUSTA — Eric Stark took a tumble when he moved his two fall-semester University of Maine at Augusta architecture classes from familiar classrooms of UMA's campus to a downtown space that was only beginning to take shape.

The Gannett Building on Augusta's Water Street was under renovations throughout the semester, and many logistics related to using the building for classes had to be figured out.

But the move was something that needed to be done, Stark said. UMA had to start making use of the 5,000-square-foot downtown Augusta building it received earlier this year as a donation from a Portland developer.

"It was important to me that we start working down here, even if it's not perfect," said Stark, an assistant architecture professor.

While the renovations are far from complete, UMA is already planning to show off its new downtown Augusta space, at 331 Water St., at an open-house event slated for Thursday.

Thus far, Stark's upper-level architecture students are the only ones from UMA who have started using the building — going about their architectural design work in an environment that's constantly changing.

In the coming weeks, Stark said, students will have to shift to the building's lower levels to allow workers to renovate the fourth floor they've occupied since the start of the semester.

Come January, he said, the plan is to have painting and printmaking classes join the architecture sessions in the building. An admissions office staff member will have a desk on the building's first floor. And there will be display space for student work and higher ceilings on every level.

"We're pushing hard to finalize drawings and furniture purchases," said Stark, the primary architect for the building's renovation.

For architecture students attending class in a space that's evolving has proven a learning experience.

"Seeing it all happen will definitely be a teaching tool," said Charissa McCarver, a third-year architecture student from West Gardiner.

When they arrived for the first day of class, "we had folding chairs and the tables were against the wall, so we had to design our spaces," said Brenton Dinsmore, a third-year architecture student who lives in Augusta. "We can see what we're learning put to practice while we're learning the theory."

Now, students are appreciating the expanded space the Gannett Building affords them - an improvement over the cramped studio space where they worked on UMA's campus.

"It's nice to be able to leave your

HITTING THE BOOKS: Architecture majors Nick Hersom, left, and Jenn Sullivan chat while working on their fourth-year thesis project recently in the Gannett Building in Augusta.

RELATED STORY

The University of Maine at Augusta must overcome one local zoning hurdle. A6

NEW HOME: The University of Maine at Augusta plans to move more classes to the Gannett Building at 331 Water St. in downtown Augusta.

PLEASE SEE UMA A6
Stuff here and not have to carry it back and forth,” said Shannon Gebo, of Augusta.

UMA received the Gannett Building in January as a gift from Richard McGoldrick, a Portland developer who owns a handful of other downtown Augusta properties.

The building’s assessed value is almost $700,000.

Built in 1875, the structure housed some KeyBank operations more than two decades ago as the bank awaited construction of its current Water Street offices. Since then, it’s struggled to retain long-term tenants, save for the United Way of Kennebec Valley, which has offices on the fifth floor.

Ultimately, Stark said, the fall semester spent in the evolving building will prove fruitful. The experience will pave the way for the students and professors who will take up posts downtown in the winter, he said.

“It’s been great to be downtown because, you know, what do you do about parking? Where do you eat?” Stark said. “It’s in dealing with things that we learn.”

The presence of a few additional students downtown hasn’t yet translated into significantly more foot traffic, said Louanne Manter, who owns Downtown Gifts and Crafts. But the volume of foot traffic and the associated benefit to downtown businesses should only grow as more students take classes at the Gannett Building, Manter said.

“I think it definitely will be a boost for downtown,” she said. “Anytime you have people downtown, I think that’s a good thing.”

Matthew Stone — 623-3811, ext. 435
mstone@centralmaine.com
Lewiston becomes classroom

UMA architecture professor to begin yearlong project Tuesday

BY SCOTT TAYLOR
Sun Journal

LEWISTON — Downtown Lewiston will serve as a living laboratory for a group of University of Maine architecture students this year.

Professor Eric Stark said his senior-level class will begin a yearlong project Tuesday, creating a master plan of their own for the area between Park Street and the river. Then they'll come up with some specific design treatments.

"I like to have my students work out in the public each year, but this is the first time we've had everybody working on the same community," said Stark, professor of architecture for the University of Maine's Augusta campus. "I think it's going to have interesting results."

Students previously developed senior projects on parts of Biddeford and for the waterfront area of Hallowell. The projects have never led to actual development projects, but they have changed the way some people looked at those areas.

"We had one city councilor that changed his entire thinking because of a student's work," Stark said. "It gave him perspective he'd never had before, and he said he was looking at the area completely differently because of this."

This year, Stark said he'll be leading a team of 13 students. They begin their work Tuesday with a walking tour of the area. He expects the group will spend the fall semester familiarizing themselves with the area and developing a design master plan for the buildings, roads, sidewalks, canals and parks.

Each student will pick one aspect of the downtown and work on architectural designs.

"Usually, with master planning, you simply say, 'A walking path goes here,'" Stark said. "At this level, they don't always get the opportunity to design the actual walking path and think about what goes into it."

Stark said he expects the students will spend about one-third of their class in Lewiston.
Vision
CONTINUED FROM PAGE B1

"One of them drew a boat house on the river, near the south bridge, something you’d be able to see as you came across from Auburn," Houseal said. "It could house a crew team from Bates College or something like that. Another one reordered the street network on both sides of the river and others talked about getting a downtown supermarket or grocery store."

Students previously developed senior projects on parts of Biddeford and for the waterfront area of Hallowell.

Next, students will begin designing buildings to fit in with their master plans. At the end of the class, Houseal said the group hopes to come up with three different scenarios for the area, as well as 13 designs for buildings there.

staylor@sunjournal.com

Build on an idea

Architecture class gives Lewiston a few possibilities

BY SCOTT TAYLOR
Staff Writer

LEWISTON — A group of architecture students will present their visions for Lewiston’s downtown at a special meeting on Nov. 13.

"They came up with some great ideas, very interesting but modest, too," said Ian Houseal, assistant to the Lewiston city administrator.

The 13 students from the University of Maine-Augusta architecture program began using downtown Lewiston as a living laboratory in August. The senior-level students of professor Eric Stark have spent the last few months creating master plans of their own for the area between Park Street and the river. Next, they’ll come up with some specific design treatments.

The students will unveil their master plans to the public beginning at 9 a.m. Nov. 13 in the Lewiston City Council chambers in City Hall. Those sessions are designed to get public comment and criticism on the plans.

SEE VISION PAGE B2
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LEWISTON — Downtown Lewiston will serve as a living laboratory for a group of University of Maine architecture students this year.

Professor Eric Stark said his senior-level class will begin a yearlong project Tuesday, creating a master plan of their own for the area between Park Street and the river. Then they'll come up with some specific design treatments.

"I like to have my students work out in the public each year, but this is the first time we've had everybody working on the same community," said Stark, professor of architecture for the University of Maine's Augusta campus. "I think it's going to have interesting results."

Students previously developed senior projects on parts of Biddeford and for the waterfront area of Hallowell. The projects have never led to actual development projects, but they have changed the way some people looked at those areas.
AUGUSTA -- The University of Maine at Augusta is preparing to accept the donation of a downtown Augusta building.

For UMA, the Gannett Building at 331 Water St. offers additional space for the college's growing architecture and art programs, relieving those departments of the cramped spaces they occupy on its Civic Center Drive campus.

For the city, UMA's move downtown means another occupied building and more activity along the city's struggling Water Street.

"It's really got wonderful potential," UMA President Allyson Hughes Handley said. "We are just totally maxed out in terms of space here."

University of Maine System trustees gave conditional approval Monday to accepting the real estate gift, pending a more thorough analysis of operating costs and needed upgrades.

Owner Richard McGoldrick, a developer who owns five downtown properties including the Gannett Building, offered UMA the building earlier this fall after hearing about the college's space needs.

"I've made a lot of investments in downtown Augusta, and I'd love to give something back," he said. "I'm also a little self-interested to get more people in downtown Augusta."

The 25,000-square-foot structure's one tenant, the United Way of Kennebec Valley, will stay and continue to pay rent, Handley said.

Built in 1875, the building housed some KeyBank operations more than two decades ago as the bank awaited construction of its current Water Street building.

Handley said the structure has six usable floors.

University officials haven't formally decided which academic programs will occupy the new space, she said, but professors from the art and architecture departments have been most involved in planning for the downtown move.

The programs' current space allows students limited workshop space and no storage space, said Peter Precourt, an assistant professor of art.

"Students really need space to make the work, show the work, have discussions about the work," he said. "We have a fair amount of space limitations on the campus."

Handley said architecture and natural sciences students could be involved as UMA officials plan upgrades to the space.

The building will require a new heating, ventilation and air-conditioning system, she said, and science students could play a part in finding the most energy-efficient system. Architecture students, she said, might take part in designing classroom spaces.

"It would be such an interesting project for those students to be engaged in," Handley said. "I think there's some pretty amazing academic potential."

And once classes move into the Gannett Building, which could be as soon as summer 2010, Handley said, the downtown location will provide some advantages, including proximity to state offices and social service agencies.

For art students, Precourt said, the Water Street location could offer some important lessons.

"One thing you never learn in a lot of art schools is ... you don't figure out how to integrate what you do into the community," he said. "When classes stop ... people haven't figured out, 'How do I move in the world as an artist?'"

Augusta Mayor Roger Katz said UMA's downtown presence "will help energize our riverfront and will be an important piece in bringing renewed life to downtown."

McGoldrick told university officials the building's operating costs total $85,000 annually, including $11,600 in property taxes.

The assessed value is $695,000, according to city records. Handley said UMA has $560,000 in a special account that could cover many of the operating expenses.

But the nonprofit university would not have property taxes as one of its expenses.

"That's the one downside," Katz said of that lost revenue. "On balance, it's good for the city."

Matthew Stone -- 623-3811, ext. 435
mstone@centralmaine.com

Architecture program builds toward sustainability

AUGUSTA — The University of Maine at Augusta Architecture Program is sponsoring a year-long lecture series titled, "Sustainable Practices: Architects Working in Maine."

The series, which includes three lectures, one gallery exhibit and a concluding all-day symposium, focuses on alternative design and building practices, maintaining a practice in varying economic times, and sustaining a professional practice over time.

"The Sustainable Practices lecture series will both look at and go beyond what it means to practice 'green' building in Maine," said Eric Stark, UMA assistant professor of architecture.

"The series is designed to engage architects statewide, those in related fields, the wider community, and our own faculty and students."

All lectures in the series begin at 5:30 p.m. and take place in Jewett Auditorium. The schedule is as follows:

- Thursday, Oct. 22 - Steve and Wiebke Theodore, Theodore + Theodore Architects, Bath
- Thursday, Dec. 10 - Kevin Moquin and Claire Betze, Taggart Construction, Freeport
- Jan. 18 - Feb. 12 - Architects Working in Maine, an exhibit showcasing the work of all three presenting firms
- Feb. 12 - Scott Simons, Scott Simons Architects, Portland
- April 15 - Sustainable Community Symposium: Panel presentations, individual speakers and small group discussions on Sustainable Economics, the building environment, and much more.

First in the series Oct. 22, Theodore and Theodore Architects was founded in 1988. The company has been engaged in a wide range of building types, including institutional, commercial and residential projects. All have in common a search for strong and simple solutions to program, site and construction.

"Working in New England requires both the careful consideration of context, as well as an ability to provide innovative and resourceful solutions to contemporary issues," said Steven and Wiebke Theodore.

"We consider the buildings we design as part of an infrastructure, incorporating energy efficiency and sound construction techniques, which are adaptable for multiple uses, like the row houses, mills, factories, barns and farmhouses, found along the Eastern seaboard."

UMA has the lone architecture program in the state of Maine and all of northern New England. Emphasizing a creative and behavioral design approach, the program compares to and often exceeds the highest established national standards for student work and architectural training.

For more information, contact Stark at 621-3249 or eric.stark@maine.edu
UMA architecture students unveil designs for Hallowell waterfront

By Bob Stein

HALLOWELL — When over 100 people took their seats at Hallowell City Hall on the evening of Jan. 30 to hear UMA architecture students present proposals for redeveloping the town's historic waterfront, it was neither the beginning nor the end of a story.

The story actually began last spring when Gerry Mahoney, chair of Hallowell’s Waterfront Advisory Committee, placed a call to UMA Assistant Professor of Architecture Eric Stark. Mahoney asked Stark if UMA’s Architecture Program would be interested in putting together some waterfront designs that might stimulate the thinking of the town.

“It’s something our architecture students have done before for other towns,” Stark said. “UMA has the only architecture program in the state and we do periodically get calls for help. Last year our students worked on a project for the town of Biddeford.”

“These types of projects,” Stark said, “provide a great opportunity for our students to take what they learn in the classroom and create something for the outside world. It provides them with tremendous experience, and I am very proud of what our students have consistently demonstrated they can do.”

The students’ task this time was an exciting and intriguing one. Although Hallowell’s historic waterfront park is currently used as a gathering space for music, fireworks and other town events, it is an underused and underdeveloped parcel of important town land with tremendous potential.

In putting together their proposals, the students were instructed to make sure their designs acknowledge the importance and historical context of the site, and ideally incorporate a performance space, a path along the waterfront, a public restroom facility, some parking, and possibly the inclusion of a replica crane that was used to haul granite on 18th century ships sailing the Kennebec.

In their designs students also needed to address the fact that the site is in a flood hazard area, which presented its own set of unique challenges and design constraints.

For the Hallowell project, Stark broke his Architectural Design class into teams of two to three students each. Over seven weeks during the fall semester, each team developed its own unique proposal.

In December, the students unveiled their designs on the UMA campus, and then on Jan. 30, 2008, seven student teams formally presented their proposals to the Waterfront Advisory Committee, the mayor, city councilors and scores of interested town residents.

The feedback was overwhelmingly positive. “I can’t tell you how many people came up to the students to thank them and say they really opened the town’s eyes to some wonderful possibilities,” Stark said.

The story does not end here. Next step for Hallowell is to develop its own formal plan for the site. In doing that, the town will have to consider building material costs and other budget issues, which is something the students did not have to do. Still no one would be surprised if elements of the student proposals popped up in parts of the final plan.

UMA Architecture students who participated in the Hallowell project were Cindy Bossie, Donald Elliot, William Foley, Brianna Harriman, Thomas Hillis, Rosalea Kimball, Nichole Lemieux, Rosemary Needham-Curtis, Megan Thompson, Devon Thornton, Erin Eldridge, Jerromey George, Nathan Gordon, Toby Isbart, Sebastian Jerosch, Aubrey Lajoie, Jason Pica, Mark Prescott, Katie Sloat, Matthew Thompson and Meranda Tucker.
Hallowell sees waterfront ideas

By GARY REMAL  
Staff Writer

01/31/2008

HALLLOWELL -- One group of students suggested a historic granite crane be used as the focal point for a water inlet with cables suspending a walkway along the city's waterfront.

Another team suggested ghost images of Hallowell's waterfront past etched on glass overlooking the Kennebec River.

And a third of eight teams from the University of Maine at Augusta proposed using the city's antique granite derrick as the arms of a giant sundial -- "one of the best ideas and most original ideas we've heard," Hallowell's Waterfront Advisory Committee Chairman Gerald Mahoney said at a presentation of the designs Wednesday.

Mahoney said the student's plans for the park brought new ideas that will enlighten his panel's talks on the final shape of Hallowell's riverfront.

Hallowell resident and professional planning guru Frank O'Hara questioned some of the students' plans for parking in the limited space of the waterfront park.

But several teams defended their decision to retain and in some cases double parking, explaining that cars may be necessary for some people to use the park.

Mayor Anthony Masciadri said the future of the waterfront park has been discussed for so many years that coming up with new ideas can be a challenge.

He pointed out that most of the park area is within the 100-year flood plain, limiting some uses.

"I've lived here all my life and I've gotten my feet wet a number of times, so some of their ideas may not be practical," Masciadri said.

But he credited the students with generating new interest and discussion in the project. "This has some value," he said.

UMA architecture professor Eric Stark said he plans to compress the plain, limiting some uses.

Stark thanked Hallowell officials for inviting his class to participate:

"It's not often an architecture class of students gets to work with a real community."
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Gary Remal -- 621-5642
gremal@centralmaine.com
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE AT AUGUSTA ARCHITECTURE STUDENTS present their ideas for the Hallowell waterfront park to city leaders Monday at the school. Sebastian Jerensch, second from right, and Jason Pica, far right, were joined by Matt Thompson, not pictured, in presenting one proposal.

Kennebec Journal Image
Presentation to Hallowell Committee
December 18, 2007
HALLOWELL — Architecture students from the University of Maine at Augusta began a project Monday to come up with ideas for development of the city’s waterfront park.

Gerry Mahoney, chairman of the city Waterfront Advisory Committee, said city officials asked UMA professor Eric Stark to put his students on the project to broaden the range of ideas considered before a final design is adopted.

“We met with them in the spring and asked if a practical project for the students would be possible,” Mahoney said.

Work crews have been installing a $592,000 bulkhead to replace a deteriorated log-crib wharf, the first phase of the park’s redevelopment, he said.

Now, city planners are seeking the best ways to develop the park, including new parking and performing arts areas.

Mahoney hopes students will provide food for thought as well as visual aids that could be used to chase grants that help pay for the project.

He envisions the architecture students melding ideas from his committee, other city officials and residents with their own to come up with a number of designs.

“We’re kind of excited about it,” Mahoney said. “You never know there might be an idea that gets into the final project, or all of them.”

Students in the UMA program have provided similar services in Biddeford,

Stark said.

“I try to do more and more with our students to work with real land, for a real client in a real town,” Stark said.

He urged his third-year architecture students to listen closely to the aspirations of their “clients.” But he also challenged his students to provide the city with fresh sets of eyes.

“That’s part of any designer’s job, to come up with new ideas,” Stark said. “So I’d say to the students, don’t be timid.”

Rosie Curtis, one of Stark’s third-year architecture students from Washington, said students in the program appreciate real-world experience.

A native of England, Curtis said she believes the high cost of fuel will force more and more American cities to develop what Hallowell already has: a more European-style compact urban environment. She said development of the riverfront park will help that flourish.

“This could be a fairly significant fo-
BID WALK: University of Maine at Augusta architecture students tour the bulkhead being rebuilt on the Kennebec River in Hallowell Monday. The students are putting together a variety of plans to utilize the site.
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cal point for the riverfront,” Curtis said.

In addition to being a student, she works with a Rockport architect.

But she said when she heard about the Hallowell project she turned to a real expert — her 10-year-old son, who has been attending bandstand concerts in the park for much of his young life.

“The first thing I did was ask my 10-year-old what he liked and what he didn’t like to get the view from someone who was looking at it without bias. That was the starting point of my analysis,” Curtis said.

The 22 participating students are expected to split into between eight and 11 teams, each to come up with its own proposal for the entire parcel. Stark said. He said he hopes they’ll complete their work in about 6 1/2 weeks.

“They’re basically trying to fit our request in with their fall semester,” Mahoney said. “It’s a challenge because it’s in the flood plain and there are restrictions on what they can do.”

Stark cautioned that what his students can accomplish is limited, both by experience and the relatively short period of time they have to work.

“What they’re really trying to do here is a schematic design,” the UMA professor told the committee.

He cautioned his students to integrate their designs into the unique character of downtown Hallowell but not to be limited by it.

“That doesn’t mean you have to copy what’s already here,” he said. “You have to remember it’s 2007.”

Gary Gemal — 621-5642
gemal@mainesetnet.com
Many drawn to UMA’s architecture program

By MECHELE COOPER
Staff Writer

AUGUSTA — “I realized when I was five years old, what I most desired was to draw houses and buildings,” said Sunny Stevens. “It’s what I’ve been doing all my life, so I figured I had to come to school for it.”

The school Stevens chose is the University of Maine at Augusta.

The 46-year-old Fairfield resident is enrolled in the architecture program, which this year celebrates its 20th anniversary.

One of the program’s older students, Stevens said she hasn’t decided what she will specialize in, possibly pediatric architecture. She would design pediatric hospitals and medical facilities, schools and playgrounds.

She has worked at a number of jobs, including as an inspector at Solon Manufacturing Co. in Skowhegan.

When the program began, it offered an associate's degree. Four years ago, it switched to a bachelor's degree and enrollment has increased significantly.

“Six years ago, we had 35 ongoing students and now it’s about 110,” said Rob Sherman, assistant professor of architecture and program coordinator. “So it’s a great increase. BAC (Boston Architectural College) worked hard with us to get that through.”

Many UMA students go on to Boston Architectural College to earn their master's degree, he said, and then find jobs in Maine.

“That program is very important to us,” Sherman said.

Stevens attended an orientation for architecture students last week, along with 80 classmates, including 40 new students.

The presentation touched on academic exceptions, the “nuts and bolts” of studying architecture, career potentials and employment opportunities. Students in the program range in age from 18 to their mid-50s.

“We’re hoping it’s going to help prepare new students for the onslaught of hours they’re going to have to put into the program, which is compared to the medical field,” Stevens said. “The hours are unreal. My first semester I only slept two hours every night during the whole semester. By the time the semester was over, my brain was fried.”

Enrolled in the program halfway through the school year, Jaclyn Vassallo missed last year’s orientation for incoming architecture students.

“She felt it was so important this year, the 22-year-old from New Milford, Conn., made it a point to attend Wednesday’s orientation at UMA’s Student Technology Center.

College officials say orientations give new students an opportunity to meet future classmates and discuss the design and content of the program.

“So far, it’s really interesting,” Vassallo said Wednesday before she sat down to the buffet provided for the students who attended.

“I’m excited to see old faces and meet new people.”

Back in June, architecture students presented a conceptual design to reinvent a Main Street lot in Biddeford.

The students’ design generated interest from other cities, including Augusta, regarding possible downtown renovations projects.

Eric Stark, assistant professor of architecture at UMA, said that advanced students in the program this fall will design a portion of the Hallowell waterfront project.

“The great thing about working with a community is it allows students to see possibilities they didn’t ever know existed,” Stark said.

Giovanni Morabito, 19, of Peaks Island, who lives in Augusta during the school year, said he considered other schools, but chose UMA because it was closer to home.

He also said the program has great professors and the college itself, an exceptional staff.

“Not only that, but (the professors) are accessible,” Morabito said. “You can spend quality time with them.”

University of Maine at Augusta classes begin Sept. 4.
Students envision a new day for 315 Main St.

By CASS SANFORD
Journal Tribune Intern

BIDDEFORD — Local architects and city planners envision the site of the community garden at "Le Parc Interim" — at the intersection of Main Street and Route 1 — as a gateway to Biddeford, hopefully the future site of a building that will draw visitors into the downtown.

The City Council got a first look at some of the possibilities for the lot at its meeting on June 19. After spending two weeks creating three different building proposals, Eric Stark, professor of architecture at University of Maine at Augusta, introduced five of his students at the meeting, who presented their conceptual designs to reinvent the 315 Main St. lot.

"I was overwhelmed with (the students') presentations," said Council President Kenneth Farley. "I was really, really impressed and I strongly think a building should be there."

The architecture class was asked by the Heart of Biddeford Committee to create theoretical building designs which will help the City Council envision what sorts of structures might occupy the lot.

"We've asked our students to look beyond the building."

See 315 Main St.
315 Main St.

From Page A1

said Stark. “Architecture needs to respond to a community.”

To get a feel for the community they would be designing for, the students spent a day touring the downtown Biddeford area, finding architectural and historical elements that defined the city.

The first students to present their proposals at the meeting were Jason McClusky and Chris Grotton. The concept for their design was inspired by many of the “towering elements” in Biddeford’s architecture, showcased in an impressive digital presentation of a three-story building.

Next, student Jason Ryan explained how he had found a “common thread” that seemed to run through the city in the image of its river. His concept features a sculptural representation of the Saco River.

The final presentation, by students Alinda Stevens and Teresa Macias, also focused on a specific theme.

“We didn’t see (the intersection) as a gateway; we saw it as more of a crossroads,” said the designers, referring to the pivotal location of the lot.

Their design concentrated on relieving traffic congestion at the intersection by proposing a roundabout that would redirect traffic.

Stark said his students were thrilled with the experience they gained.

“The students had an opportunity to interact with a real community,” says Stark.

Since working with Biddeford, Stark has been contacted by several other cities, including Augusta and Rumford, regarding possible downtown renovation projects for his classes in the future.

The students’ designs have generated much positive interest and anticipation around the future possibilities of 315 Main St.

“It is very exciting,” says Mayor Wallace Nutting on the possibility of a building there. “This site is a gateway to the downtown, which we are trying to revitalize.”

The Heart of Biddeford committee is currently working on assembling a request for proposal to turn the student’s creative ideas into a plan they can present to the City Council. A meeting is scheduled on July 2, open to all members of the community, where ideas and suggestions will be gathered regarding the request for proposal.

Executive Director of the Heart of Biddeford Rachael Weyand says that the primary purpose of the designs was to gather ideas from an architectural viewpoint.

“We need to come up with a plan that the city council can say ‘yes’ to,” said Weyand.

Local architect Caleb Johnson also advocated for thoughtful planning of Biddeford’s downtown.

Johnson said that, although the city has a comprehensive plan for details, zones, and financial issues, there is no “master plan” that projects a future for the city.

“A master plan is overdue and very badly needed,” says Johnson, “Most beautiful cities have some sort of a master plan.”

Johnson urges the city to take the lead on the issue of 315 Main St.

“It deserves our care and attention,” he said. “This corner of the city is too important to have a ‘let’s-see-what-happens-there’ kind of attitude.”
Appendix H /
Exhibition + Lecture Series Marketing Materials
UMA/ARC’s primary goal is to engage community. This means exposing our students to architects and those in related fields, while simultaneously promoting the UMA Department of Architecture to the larger Maine community. Through this lecture series and gallery exhibition we begin the process of making UMA/ARC a fixture in the professional architectural community throughout mid-coast Maine and beyond. When people think architecture, we want them to think UMA.

**Sustainable Practices: Architects Working in Maine**

The “Sustainable Practices” lecture series both looks at, and goes beyond, what it means to practice “green” building in Maine. The series focuses on alternative design and building practices, maintaining a practice in varying economic times, and how a professional practice is sustained over time.

The Danforth gallery show in January will showcase works from all three lecturing firms, giving us the opportunity to compare and contrast work from a varied group of architects. This will engage our students in discussion, while bringing a whole host of other community members to the UMA campus to see the work.
SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES: ARCHITECTS WORKING in MAINE

All lectures are free and open to the public, starting at 5:30pm in the Jewet Hall Auditorium.
LIVE web cast + information @ www.uma.edu/arc

Opening reception Jan 21 4PM, Danforth Gallery

Sustainable Community: Past, Present, Future: working collaboratively in Maine
Richard J. Randall Student Center

contact Asst. Professor Eric Stark for more information or to become part of the Sustainable Community Symposium:
Eric.Stark@maine.edu  207.621.3249

UMA/ARC 2010 Lecture Series Poster
The Danforth Gallery will showcase works from all three lecturing firms from the SUSTAINABLE PRACTICES Lecture Series. The exhibit focuses on architectural processes, and creates a platform for a comparison of a varied group of architects. Join us for the opening reception on Jan 21 at 4pm.

Kevin Moquin, AIA, LEED AP is the resident architect at Taggart Construction. He has worked extensively in Maine and Western Massachusetts, and brings a passion for environmental and sustainable, high-performance building practices. Claire Betze, P.E., is the senior Project Manager at Taggart. She has 20+ years in project management experience.

Scott Simons, AIA began Scott Simons Architects in 1983. He has over 25 years of professional experience and is well known for his thoughtful and innovative solutions to complex projects. Scott’s extensive project management experience and his commitment to designing buildings of exception beauty and substance underscore all of SSA's projects. His drive to

for LIVE web cast + information + updates
www.uma.edu/archcourse  contact Eric.Stark@maine.edu  207.621.3249

UMA/ARC 2010 Exhibition Postcard
Please join the Department of Architecture as we welcome Steven Theodore to our campus. He will discuss the work of his firm, Theodore + Theodore Architects, over a lunch time presentation. All are welcome.

Theodore + Theodore Architects was founded in January of 1988, and has since engaged in a wide range of building types including institutional, commercial and residential projects. All have in common a search for strong and simple solutions to program, site and construction. They collaborate as a team on all commissions in the office. The size of their studio allows them to focus on the careful production of architecture.

Working in New England requires both the careful consideration of context, as well as an ability to provide innovative and resourceful solutions to contemporary issues.

They consider the buildings they design as part of an infrastructure, incorporating energy efficiency and sound construction techniques which are adaptable for multiple uses, like the row houses, mills, factories, barns and farmhouses found along the Eastern seaboard.

Steven Theodore
Tuesday, February 9, noon-1
Danforth Gallery

Presented by the Department of Architecture / University of Maine at Augusta
What is the goal of exploring architectural CONCEPT?

When we say, “the ‘concept’ for a design project is such and such,” what do we really mean by that? What are we trying to convey? I believe we are searching for essential ideas that guide a specific design process. These ideas can be practical or abstract; this guide can be someone or something that has experience and leads the way. In a sense it is the delimitation of a path – of a vision – although it likely does not reveal its conclusion.

A concept is an inspiration, an idea, a vision. It comes from within and is necessarily based in one’s experiences, gaining credence from exposure to the architectural world. If the architectural concept is formulated in inspiration, then its inspiration can come from almost anywhere: a project’s site, an element of the program, some desire of the client, or perhaps a consideration of a larger social construct. It is the inspiration that suddenly comes to one’s mind after working arduously on a project, seeking a solution. I would argue that it could be any idea the designer can imagine as long as it lies within the context and construct of the given project.

It is apparent from this exhibit that each individual or firm has her own view or interpretation of what is “concept”. We may even conclude this to be typical in architectural practice. However we may all agree, as the great Louis Kahn said, “A great building must begin with the unmeasurable, must go through measurable means when it is being designed and in the end must be unmeasurable.”
an Architectural IDEA
3 lectures / 1 exhibit

lectures
feb 3 + 10 + 17, 4:30 PM
uma / gannett building gallery
331 water str., augusta, maine
FREE + open to the public

exhibit
jan 31 through feb 28
uma campus / jewett hall
danforth gallery

opening reception
monday, jan 31, 4 PM
university of maine at augusta
department of architecture

info @ www.uma.edu/archlectures
Carol A. Wilson Architect, Falmouth, ME  Carol A. Wilson FAIA has been working in Maine since 1981. Her work is deeply tied to the landscape of Maine, with a desire to produce buildings worthy of this place. She established her own firm in 1986. In addition to the work of her studio, she teaches, lectures and is an active force in the storefront for architecture maine. Her work has been published and widely recognized for its excellence in design.

Barba + Wheelock Architects, Portland, ME Nancy L. Barba, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP is an architect, writer, photographer and principal of Barba + Wheelock Architecture + Preservation, a mission-driven, women-owned firm. Her work focuses on contextual design and sustainable alternatives for historic and existing properties. Many of these projects involve her strength in historic preservation and community as well as her commitment to projects that affect social change.

Redtop Architects, New York City, NY is an innovative architectural design firm founded in 2003. Partners Virginia Kindred and Amy Shakespeare have established a reputation for creating unexpected solutions to design challenges of all scales. Projects range from master plans to low-income multi-family housing, commercial and institutional spaces, and highly particularized private residences.
What is the impetus for starting a new firm given the economic climate? What are the goals and aspirations of these bold designers? What separates these new firms from others? And how does one judge success in the ever-changing 21st century design environment? These questions formed the basis for a lecture series held at the Gannett Building downtown Augusta in the fall of 2011. As a school working towards professional accreditation, the UMA Department of Architecture is inherently invested in the workplace that our graduates encounter in Maine and beyond. In bringing newly formed architecture and landscape architecture firms to campus our attempt is to learn first-hand the impetus as well as the results of starting one’s own design-related endeavor.

Having experienced the fall lecture series, we can look at this subsequent exhibit with some expectation and a basis of knowledge as to what these new firms have endured and continue to endure as they walk their respective paths of self-employment. Questions relating to the amount and types of work, keeping potential employees fully engaged, and holding true to the mission each firm has set forth all are at the forefront of what they each have experienced.

And while there are certainly questions as they continue forward - that after all is part of the responsibility of “being in charge” - these young firms also serve as an inspiration. They demonstrate that at any time, and perhaps even more so when times are tough, one’s reliance on oneself is the ultimate “best bet.” In these firms we see not only the desire and ability to design the next generation of university student unions, or terraced landscapes, or assisted living facilities, but also the fortitude and determination to take up the mantle of design and put oneself at the head of what the future of design might hold. As a school of architecture we could hardly ask for any better torchlight to hold up before our students.
What is the impetus for starting a new firm given the economic climate? What are the goals and aspirations of these bold designers? What separates these new firms from others? And how does one judge success in the ever-changing 21st century design environment?

November 17
Soren Deniord
Soren Deniord Design Studio
Portland, Maine

October 20
Rick Jones
Jones Architecture
Salem, Massachusetts

University of Maine at Augusta
Department of Architecture presents

New Ideas: New Firms
UMA/ARC Fall Lecture Series

The Space
UMA Gannett Building, 1st floor
331 Water St, Augusta, Maine
All lectures 4:30 PM start
Info @ www.uma.edu/archlectures

Free & open to the public
new ideas: new firms

What is the impetus for starting a new firm given the economic climate? What are the goals and aspirations of these bold designers? What separates these new firms from others? And how does one judge success in the ever-changing 21st century design environment?

Jones Architecture, Salem, MA  Rick Jones’ mission is to support clients in the broadest sense as they seek to shape their environment. This service oriented approach is grounded in strong design principles. Their design is responsive to context: environmental, societal, cultural, architectural, and historical. Good design should not imitate context, but must recognize and respond to it.  www.jonesarch.com

Soren DeNiord Design Studio, Portland, ME  Soren DeNiord has over 10 years experience designing a range of project types and scales from residential design to state land planning. His design approach is rooted in a quest for quiddity - the true nature of something...its "whatness."  www.sorendeniord.com

Bild Architecture, Portland, ME  Evan Carroll is cofounder and principal of Bild Architecture. His experience in the practice of architecture and in advocacy has led him to the strong belief that good solutions come from a holistic approach to project planning and management.  www.bildarchitecture.com
Appendix I / Admissions Documents for the B.Arch Degree
The UMA/Bachelor of Architecture  

Artistic Review Challenge (ARC)

The Artistic Review Challenge (ARC)
In keeping with UMA/ARC’s desire for diversity and access, we ask prospective students of our BArch program to demonstrate their imaginative potential by responding to the Artistic Review Challenge (ARC). These are a series of questions primarily requiring a visual response (with a limited amount of writing). Should you already have a portfolio, you may submit that in lieu of the ARC, but should not submit both. Please see Portfolio guidelines online.

As an applicant to UMA’s BArch, we want to understand who you are and how you see your world. Your inventive answers to the four design questions will help us to better know you and your potential. Please understand, there are no “right” answers – we truly want to “see” you and your creativity expressed in your submission. Please enjoy and have fun!

Please honor these rules when responding to the Artistic Review Challenge:
1. You may respond to each question using any medium or technique that you believe to be most appropriate.
2. Responses to each question must be recorded on the corresponding sheet and wholly contained therein. (One design “problem” = one sheet of paper)
3. You may not draw on the back of the sheets.
4. Be sure to include your name and email address on the back of each page.
5. Please read and sign the honor statement of authorship below and return it in the envelope with your responses to the five questions.
6. Mail submission in a flat envelope.

(Failure to follow these rules may result in your Design Documents being rejected)

Honor Statement of Personal Authorship
My creativity is expressed through my work. My success is based on my personal effort. I hereby declare that all of the responses to the Artistic Review Challenge represent my own work and that I have received no help from any outside party.

_________________________                 _____________
Signature                              Date

Mail completed flat (not folded) documents to:

University of Maine at Augusta
Architecture Program - Design Documents Submission
331 Water Street
Augusta, Maine 04330
Frequently Asked Questions:

Q: Do my responses need to be realistic representations?
A: No. We want to see your creativity in any way that you wish to share it. Responses can be realistic, abstract, or anything at all. There are absolutely NO "right" answers.

Q: Can I glue things onto the paper?
A: Yes, as long as it remains flat enough to be mailed in a normal 9 x 11.25 envelope. We would prefer not to receive your Artistic Review Challenge (ARC) in any bulky or special mailing boxes.

Q: Can I use color in my responses?
A: Yes

Q: Can the page layout of my responses be either portrait or landscape?
A: Yes. You are free to express your answers in any way you like.

Q: Can I scan the sheets into the computer and work digitally (such as in Photoshop)?
A: Yes. As long as your final submission is printed out in the same size and format in which you received it before being mailed back to us. WE WILL NOT ACCEPT ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS OR DISKS. WE WILL ONLY ACCEPT 8.5 x 11 PAPER SHEETS.

Q: Can I add additional pages to my answers?
A: No. One page per answer.

Q: Can I draw on the back of my ARC sheets?
A: No. Only your name and email address should be on the back.

Q: Do I need to work within the black rectangular border on each sheet?
A: Yes.

Q: Should I call to confirm that the school has received my ARC?
A: No. We will notify you if we do not receive the ARC by the deadline.

Q: Can I call the school with specific questions about my answers to the ARC questions?
A: No. We are not allowed to provide any information about how you should respond to the questions. That is up to you. Please see the rules listed on the first page of this download.

Q: Is a portfolio required for admission to UMA’s BArch program?
A: The Artistic Review Challenge takes the place of a portfolio. If you would rather submit a portfolio, please see those instructions online. (Please see application requirements if applying as a transfer or UMA alumni looking for studio credit)

Q: Should any other documents be sent with the ARC?
A: No. Please include your 4 responses and your signed Statement of Authorship only.

Creativity should be enjoyable! Have fun!
Artistic Review Challenge 1: Type two to three paragraphs that describe your favorite natural light. (This is a writing assignment)
Artistic Review Challenge 2: Record a space that creates a specific emotion. (This is not a writing assignment)
Artistic Review Challenge 3: Represent something moving in time. (This is not a writing assignment)
Artistic Review Challenge 4: Represent an object at two scales simultaneously. (This is not a writing assignment)
The UMA/Bachelor of Architecture

Portfolio Requirements

A portfolio of creative work may be required for admission to UMA’s Architecture Program. This is a personal statement about you, your visual training, interests, values and aspirations. It is to your advantage to take the time to present yourself well.

Contents

Your portfolio should contain a minimum of 12 and a maximum of 20 pieces of your best and most recent artwork. We especially encourage you to submit work from real-life observation such as still life, figure drawing, portraits/self-portraits, and landscapes. In addition to observational drawing, we look for work in other media, including painting, 2D and 3D designs, photography, woodworking and sculpture, or other digital media. Freehand drawings are strongly encouraged. CAD or drafting assignments are not required and should not be part of your submission.

All students must include a one-page statement outlining your interest in architecture.

Portfolios should be neat, clean, and organized, as good design also incorporates presentation and proper editing. Works copied from photos, magazines, and masterworks and work exclusively from imagination are not considered strong portfolio material. Mechanical and architectural drawings are not recommended. If included, they should exemplify design and creativity, not simply technical drawing skills. Slides and electronic media will not be viewed and therefore should not be included in the portfolio. UMA/ARC does not accept digital portfolios.

- Clearly indicate your name, mailing address, e-mail address, phone number, and “UMA Architecture Program” on the outside of portfolio.
- Submit in black or white binder no larger than 10" w x 13" h x 1/2" d, horizontal or vertical. (Large Portfolios with glass or protruding metal parts, slides, DVD's, or CDs are not acceptable.)
- Include a one-page statement outlining your interest in architecture.
- Do not mail original work. Reproductions should be high-quality photographs, photocopies, or prints.
- Label each portfolio item with information about the medium used, original size, and whether project was done on your own or in class.
- Include a one- to two-sentence comment about each piece you submit.

Portfolios will be returned at the beginning of the next academic year if you include a stamped, self-addressed envelope or mailing packet. All Architectural portfolios will be discarded May 15 unless return is requested prior to this date.

Mail your complete portfolio to:

University of Maine at Augusta
Architecture Program – Design Document Submission
331 Water Street
Augusta, ME 04330
**The Bachelor of Architecture requires two (2) formal recommendations.**

**RECOMMENDATION FORM #1 - Faculty**

Print name in full

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Name used on previous record (e.g., maiden) __________________________ Date of Birth __________________

Permanent Mailing Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Home Phone ( ) ___________________ Cell Phone ( ) ___________________

Work Phone ( ) ___________________

Please attach the formal faculty recommendation to this sheet.

Faculty Signature

Faculty Printed Name

Institution Affiliation

Institution Address and Phone Number

Date of Signature

Please return forms to: Application Processing, University of Maine System, PO Box 412, Bangor, ME 04402-0412
**The Bachelor of Architecture requires two (2) formal recommendations.**

RECOMMENDATION FORM #2 – Faculty or Other Professional

Print name in full

___________________________________________________________________________________

Last                                                   First                                      Middle

Name used on previous record (e.g., maiden)_________________________ Date of Birth ____________________

Permanent Mailing Address ___________________________________________________________________________

Street                                                              City                                             State                              Zip

Home Phone(    )_________________     Cell Phone (    )_________________     Work Phone (   )__________________

Please attach the formal recommendation to this sheet.

_____________________________________________________________________________

Signature

_____________________________________________________________________________

Printed Name

_____________________________________________________________________________

Institution Affiliation

_____________________________________________________________________________

Institution Address and Phone Number

_____________________________________________________________________________

Date of Signature

Please return forms to: Application Processing, University of Maine System, PO Box 412, Bangor, ME 04402-0412
Appendix J / UMA Building Plans, Student Support Spaces
Appendix K /
Design Studio ARC

SHOWING STUDIO OBJECTIVES AND POTENTIAL COLLABORATIONS
Appendix L / 
Bachelor of Architecture Program Check Sheet
 Admission to the Bachelor of Architecture program is selective. Students must complete the above requirements to be eligible for review.
Appendix M /
First Year Studio Transfer Guide

A BASIS FOR TRANSFER GUIDES IN ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY
Transfer Student Guide
Placing out of ARC 101

ARC 101, the studio introduction to architectural communication, is designed as a course that develops a facility with a broad spectrum of graphics techniques and conventions through a series of design and drawing exercises. If you want to transfer into ARC 102, we assume you have taken a similar studio course that has introduced you to concepts in architectural design and communication through drawings and models. You will need to present a portfolio of your work in that course that demonstrates proficiency in creating:

1. Plans, Sections, and Elevations to scale.
2. Graphically projected shadows on floor plans and elevations.
3. Axonometrics and Isometrics of complex shapes constructed using plans, sections, and elevations.
4. Constructed perspectives, created from plans and elevations. The creation of one point and two point perspectives, and the manipulation and understanding of the picture plane, station point, and horizon line according to intent, must be demonstrated through drawings.

All of these drawings need to demonstrate an understanding of how to use line weight and tone to show space and depth in two dimensional drawings. Most importantly, the student must also demonstrate an understanding of how drawings are used to communicate architectural ideas.

ALL FIRST YEAR WORK IS DONE BY HAND. COMPUTER AIDED DRAWINGS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE PORTFOLIO.

In addition to the portfolio, the transfer student must present a sketchbook of work that demonstrates ability to, IN FREEHAND ARCHITECTURAL SKETCHES:

Sketch accurate plans, sections, and elevations from primary experiences. Show relationships and reciprocities between the orthographic drawings.

Use tone in a sketch to show light, shadow, surface, and material.

Use line weight and line type in the sketching process to show space and depth, as well as hierarchy.

Use the sketching process to observe, compare, and contrast similar elements in different buildings.

Construct, in a freehand sketch, a building section from both one and two point perspective views by observing proportions of space, materials, light, and construction methodology. Make inferences about building materials and construction through observation.

Construct, in a freehand sketch, a detailed section from observation.

Sketch freehand axonometric and/or isometric sketches to record three dimensional spaces and forms. Use line weight, ghosted lines, and hidden lines to show spatial relationships in the axonometric sketch.

Use an analytical thinking process to dissect and scrutinize the plan, section, and elevation of a building. Use line weight, tone, hidden lines, and color to clarify the analytical process and record visual observations.

If you do not have a portfolio and sketchbook that demonstrates these abilities, you should enroll in ARC 101. If you do have a portfolio and sketchbook that demonstrates these abilities, we can review and evaluate that portfolio to determine if you are ready for ARC 102.
ARC 102 is the second semester of the studio design sequence at UMA. As a transfer student from another program, you are responsible for making sure you have covered the technical requirements of ARC 101, and be able to demonstrate proficiency in them, in order to transfer out of ARC 102.

To place out of ARC 102, the student must also present a portfolio of work that demonstrates their proficiency at solving simple design problems, and communicating design intent through architectural drawings and models.

A minimum of three design projects must be presented, through both drawings and models. These projects must demonstrate an ability to manipulate space, form, scale, light, and order, and communicate design intent through drawing. The development of these ideas is at the core of the first year program.

All of the architectural drawing work to place out of the ARC 101 & 102 sequence needs to be hand drafted: not computer generated.
Appendix N / Studio Design Review Evaluation Sample
DESIGN REVIEW EVALUATION SHEET for ADVANCED STUDIO

The following evaluation will be used as the basis for your grade on each assignment. Before any presentation, please arrange with another student to take notes for you of comments while you explain/present your design. Those notes will be added to this evaluation for a more complete record of your assignment.

Date

Presenter

Assignment

The following will serve as the evaluation criteria (where applicable) for all design projects. It is based on a 1-5 scale.

1 = unacceptable (F)  2 = unsatisfactory  3-5 = satisfactory to excellent

I DESIGN AND DESIGN DEVELOPMENT  25%

1) Problem Investigation—Research 1 2 3 4 5
2) Site Influence, Integration, and Analysis (sun angle consideration, context, site condition, views, features, climate, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5
3) Conceptual Content (concept depth/ board) 1 2 3 4 5
4) Concept Translation (concept to realization) 1 2 3 4 5
5) Space, Scale, Light Awareness and Development 1 2 3 4 5
6) Use (awareness of human use in the design) 1 2 3 4 5
7) Material and Structural Consideration 1 2 3 4 5
8) Program Requirements Satisfaction 1 2 3 4 5
9) Creativity/Risk/Going Beyond The Program 1 2 3 4 5

Evaluation

II PRESENTATION  25%

1) Schedule Satisfaction (Presentation of preliminaries and final on time) 1 2 3 4 5
2) Presentation Requirements Satisfaction (Shades, shadows, scale figures, evidence of human use)  
   1  2  3  4  5

3) Graphics/Model(s) (Organization, consistency, accuracy neatness, clarity, readability, craft, overall appearance)  
   1  2  3  4  5

4) Organization of Ideas (composition)  
   1  2  3  4  5

5) Organization /Conciseness of Oral Presentation  
   1  2  3  4  5

6) Class Participation/Attendance  
   1  2  3  4  5

7) Professionalism (desk crits, attitude, listening)  
   1  2  3  4  5

8) Written Communication (where applicable)*  
   1  2  3  4  5

9) Growth (Presentation/Thought Improvement)  
   1  2  3  4  5

Evaluation ________________

III   FINAL PROJECT  

The actual project is, of course, the true test of the success or failure of the thesis semester. The project should be a coherent, beautifully realized argument for the support and study of your thesis proposal. Does the final project ‘sing?’

IV   Final Project Evaluation  

   1  1.5  2  2.5  3  3.5  4  4.5  5

* Studying architecture means adopting a professional approach in our communication with others. Some of the projects in 3rd year will also require a written description of the basic design and ideas that is clear, grammatically correct, and evocative.

Note:
All of these elements belong, at some level, in every project. This sheet has been designed to aid you in the process of producing your work and to help you focus on important things to consider. Use this sheet as a check sheet for your own project process evaluation. Of course in the end, YOU, the designer, must decide what is important to your project and to what degree.
Appendix O / Faculty Guide for Development of INT Courses
FACULTY GUIDE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF INT COURSES

GUIDING DEFINITION
Interdisciplinary work (teaching, researching, learning) integrates concepts between and among different disciplines toward a broader and fuller understanding of the topic, problem, or subject being considered.

TYPES OF INT COURSES
There are several ways we might consider INT education at UMA; all of these include working both between and among the disciplines. The following definitions and examples are meant to be instructive but not inhibitive. While some courses are interdisciplinary by nature (for instance, AME, HGH, and WST), we might also create one or more courses that are INT through collaboration.

Linked INT courses: two (or more) courses with one or more faculty sharing some aspect of the course content or assignments, students choose to link courses when enrolling. Separate grade for each class. Listed separately in the catalog with the option to link. Not all students have to take both classes. For instance, Introduction to American studies linked with College Writing allows students to practice their writing skills using American studies content to generate ideas.

Fused INT courses: one class sharing two or more disciplinary perspectives, 3 or more credits with one or more faculty, one group of students. One grade. For instance, the "Wham, Bang, Pow!" graphic novels course which fuses an ART and ENG course into one six-credit course, team-taught by two professors, with one grade.

Integrated INT courses: two (or more) classes sharing some aspects of content or assignments, two or more professors, one group of students. Separate grade for each class. All students should be enrolled in both/all the classes. For instance, the ART, ARC, and PHI--the first "cluster course" offered at UMA (Spring 2010) or the "Prisms on Culture" cluster (Spring 2011) or the "UMA Revolution" integrated course module (Spring 2012). Such courses may include civic engagement or international travel but don't have to.

SUGGESTED TIMELINE FOR PROPOSAL & DEVELOPMENT
Spring/Summer 20XX INT course: proposal should be submitted to the INT Council for review by April 20XX of the previous calendar year. For instance, a course offered Spring 2013 should have a course proposal submitted by April of 2012. This course would be developed in the Fall of 2012 and offered in the spring of 2013. Option to apply for 1.5 credits of release time for each semester, Fall of 2012 and Spring of 2013, OR release time of 3 credits for either spring (implementation) OR fall (development).
**Fall 20XX INT course:** proposal should be submitted to the INT Council for review by November 20XX of the previous calendar year. For instance, a course offered Fall 2013 should have a course proposal submitted by November of 2012. This course would be developed during the Spring of 2013 and offered in Fall of 2013. Release time option as stated above.

**GUIDING ADVICE FOR DEVELOPING INT COURSES**

We encourage the development of manageable models for INT courses and suggest that faculty consider the INT arrangement that most closely fits the needs of the students, faculty, and subject matter. The course proposal form will help you to think through some of the aspects of your proposed course. We have found that INT courses of 3 or 6 credits are most manageable for faculty and that working with one other faculty member is most conducive to the INT course experience.

Here is some other helpful advice:

~~Skills courses pair nicely with content courses. For instance, introductory skills courses like ENG 101, COM 1XX, CIS 100, ART 1XX pair nicely with content courses like AME, BUS, ENG, HTY, SOC, VTE, WST. A nutrition course or global health course might pair nicely with a SOC or POS course. Really, the combinations here are endless but we have found that having skills through which to apply the learning of content and content through which to practice skills can be highly successful.~~

~~Courses might be organized around cross-disciplinary perspectives of a particular topic. For instance, EDU 366 and ILS 202 offer different perspectives on, and approaches to, children's literature. And toward these ends, new courses might be developed for the chosen topic or courses might be developed around a service learning project or travel.~~

~~Consider whether your course might have open or closed enrollment and whether you might have an application process.~~

~~Plan ahead in order to 1) apply for course release time for development and 2) have ample planning time.~~

~~Find ways to recruit students in addition to the schedule of classes. For instance, informational meetings, posters, visiting classes, talking with colleagues and staff~~

~~Consider programmatic and general education/core requirements in order to maximize enrollment.~~

~~As you develop your syllabus, you might consider including guidelines for the integrated course aspects, a breakdown of the ways in which assignments are related and what is expected of students, or a disclosure statement about sharing information about students' work with the other instructors for the course.~~

**INT COUNCIL PROCEDURES FOR PROPOSING INT COURSES**

The INT Council will review all proposals for new INT courses, programs, initiatives, etc. This review will consider viability of the course or program, impacts on other courses or programs, availability of resources, appeal to the UMA student body, possible conflicts of interest, fit with our UMA strategic plan and vision, and other elements of the proposal. The INT Council will also provide advice for the development of the INT course and support requests for course release for development and implementation of INT courses. Faculty should use the attached INT Course Proposal Form that differs from the regular course proposal form.
Based upon this review, the INT Council will either:
Vote to forward the course proposal to relevant college(s) for review/approval.
OR
Return the proposal for revision.
After the college(s) approves the proposal, it will be forwarded to the curriculum committee for approval. It will then be forwarded to the Provost for final approval.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please use this form to propose new INT courses. Changes in course designation, number, title, credit hours, or significant changes in content, etc., must be submitted on a Curriculum Change Form. Be sure to respond to each item listed and, if not applicable, indicate so by writing "N/A" in the space provided. Before proposing a new INT course, please consult the "Faculty Guide for Development of INT Courses" above.

1. Course designation, number, title (if more than one course is involved in this INT course, please indicate this below, question 3):

2. Provide a catalog description, including prerequisites and credit hours (five lines or fewer recommended).

3. Please state which general education requirements this course will fulfill (if any).

4. Is this a linked, fused, or integrated INT course?:
Is this one course or multiple courses?
If multiple, how are these courses related?
How will courses share content and assignments?
If more than one course is involved, will students be required to enroll in all of the courses?

5. Name of instructor(s) who will teach the course(s) and the role that each instructor will fulfill to make this course interdisciplinary and collaborative.

6. State the time of initiation (i.e. Fall 2011) and frequency of offering (i.e. every other Fall). If relevant, indicate when requested course release time will be taken. If the INT course is approved, the faculty will then be able to request 1.5 hours of release time/$ for development the preceding fall and 1.5 hours of release time/$ for spring implementation. Alternately, faculty may elect to take three credits of course development (the proceeding semester) OR planning (the semester the
7. Attach a syllabus for the course including a statement of learning outcomes and the typical texts to be used. Also, describe and explain any civic engagement, travel aspects, or other special circumstances for this INT course. (For instance, will students be required to apply for the course or will they be able to self-enroll?)

8. State why you wish to add this particular course to the curriculum and whether the proposed course will supplement current curriculum or be used in the development of a new area or program.

9. If the course has relevance to other programs, briefly discuss the relevance and indicate to what extent the proposed course has been discussed with the department(s) involved. Include any decision or recommendations made and give dates whenever possible.

10. List financial, library, and other resources necessary to support the addition of the course.

11. Indicate whether a course fee is required and, if so, the amount to be charged. If relevant, indicate whether there are other sources of financial support that supplement the course fee.
12. Endorsements of Approval:

A. Course Sponsor:

______________________________________________________________________________

(Please Print) (Signature) (Date Submitted)

B. INT Council:

______________________________________________________________________________

(Signature) (Council Approval Date)

C. Dean of College of Arts & Sciences (if relevant)

______________________________________________________________________________

(Signature) (Approval Date)

D. Dean from College of Professional Studies (if relevant)

______________________________________________________________________________

(Signature) (Approval Date)

E. Curriculum Committee:

______________________________________________________________________________

(Signature) (Approval Date)

F. Provost & Vice President for Academic Affairs:

______________________________________________________________________________

(Signature) (Approval Date)
Appendix P /
NAAB Eligibility Memorandum
March 5, 2012

Dr. Allyson Handley
President
Robinson Hall
University of Maine at Augusta
46 University Drive
Augusta, ME 04330-9410

Dear Dr. Handley:

At the February meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the memorandum prepared by the panel assigned to review the candidacy application submitted by the University of Maine at Augusta. As a result, the professional degree program

Bachelor of Architecture

has been accepted as eligible for candidacy. A visit for initial candidacy has been added to the schedule for a spring 2013 visit. This visit will be conducted under the terms of The NAAB 2009 Conditions for Accreditation and Section 3 of The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition (currently available for public comment).

The Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy is due on September 7, 2012. A letter with the proposed chair for the visit for initial candidacy will be sent in early August.

If you have other questions, please feel free to contact the office.

Very truly yours,

Keelan P. Kaiser, AIA
President

cc: Eric Stark, Architecture Program Coordinator
    Miguel Rodriguez, FAIA
    Stephen Parker, FAIA
February 8, 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR THE NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD

FROM: MIGUEL A. "MIKE" RODRIGUEZ, FAIA
BOARD REPRESENTATIVE

STEPHEN PARKER, AIA, LEED*AP
BOARD REPRESENTATIVE

ANDREA S. RUTLEDGE, CAE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: Eligibility for Candidacy — University of Maine at Augusta, B. Arch. (152 credit hours)

On November 17, 2011, the University of Maine at Augusta filed a completed application for candidacy for an accredited Bachelor of Architecture degree program. This application was filed under the terms of the 2011 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, Section 3.

The next step is to determine whether the proposed degree program is eligible for candidacy. The application was reviewed by a panel consisting of the executive director, Mike Rodriguez, FAIA, and Stephen Parker, AIA LEED AP.

Because U. Maine at Augusta does not currently offer a NAAB-accredited degree, an eligibility visit was required. The visit was conducted on January 30, 2012 by Miguel A. "Mike" Rodriguez, FAIA.

The purpose of the eligibility visit is three-fold:

- To review the Conditions and Procedures with the proposed program’s administrators, faculty, staff and students.
- To confirm the institutional commitment to the implementation of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.
- To review the physical, financial, human, and information resources committed to the program.

Upon completing the visit, the reviewer is required to submit a memorandum to the NAAB Directors addressing four areas:

1. A review of the resources committed to the program
2. Commitment of the institution to implementation of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.
3. Assessment of the readiness of the program to complete a visit for initial candidacy.
4. Recommendation to the NAAB Board to accept or not accept the program as eligible for initial candidacy. The recommendation will also identify the length of time that should elapse before scheduling the initial candidacy visit.
General Information

In 1965 the 102nd Maine Legislature established the University of Maine at Augusta as a community-based institution offering associate degrees under the auspices of the University of Maine at Crono. In 1971, soon after moving to its present location in Augusta, UMA became an autonomous institution, the seventh campus of the University of Maine System. In 1975, UMA offered its first baccalaureate degree program and began building an integrated faculty community, with appropriate terminal degrees, to teach both baccalaureate and associate degree courses.

Due to its location and given responsibilities to the state, UMA developed a statewide interactive television system as well as a network of over 100 off-campus centers and regional sites, and coordinated the delivery of university programs, courses, and services at these centers and sites. Now called University College, this statewide alternative delivery teaching method is today still part of UMA. The university is seen as a pioneer of distance education and continues to be a leader in using modern technologies to provide innovative and quality learning environments for faculty and students.

Today as the third largest campus in the University of Maine System, the University of Maine at Augusta offers undergraduate degrees and professional certificates to prepare graduates for the 21st century. Located in Augusta, the state's capital city, and in Bangor, the university leverages its relationships with state government and communities in central Maine to increase opportunities for students in all programs to be civically engaged, both on campus and in the worldwide community.

The first architecture program was envisioned over 25 years ago by Professor Roger Richmond who remains on faculty and is a valuable resource. At first structured as a two-year associate of arts degree, the program grew to a four-year bachelor of arts, non-professional curriculum in 2001.

Maintaining its core values of Space, Scale, and Light, and the necessity to Design with Intention, the program is committed to the advanced tools and language of architecture, instilling in students an awareness of the importance of architecture in the development of society, and architecture's power to affect the quality of individual lives as they move on to further study or immediate employment after graduation.

Those core ideals are the foundation of the formation of the proposed B. Arch. degree. The program is seen as having three essential elements; a mission to engage community, the desire to work in collaboration within and outside of the university, and fundamental design elements as the tools used to craft our collective built environment.

The program's mission: "We Engage Community" is consciously simple and desires to be universal. Looking to think beyond the classroom and even beyond architecture, it seeks to empower students, some of which may not become practicing architects, to be good citizens and stewards of the built environment.

1. **Review of Resources Committed to the Program**

**Human Resources**

Development of the program is led by the architectural program coordinator, Eric Stark, who is an experienced educator and heads the existing non-accredited Bachelor of Arts in Architecture. He leads a faculty consisting of two other full-time members and a cadre of adjunct faculty (currently 7) drawn from the local professional community.
In addition to current faculty, the university is now advertising for a tenure track full-time faculty member, expected to start in the fall of 2012. This timeline will allow the new hire to have a year’s time to settle into the program and provide the opportunity for them to contribute in the future development and long-term planning of the B. Arch. program. Another full-time faculty member is slated to be added as the program’s first cohort of students enters in the fall of 2013.

In separate meetings with the university president, provost, vice president of administration and finance, and the interim dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, it was clear that all understand the importance of a strong faculty and indicated their support in providing the wherewithal to accomplish that.

Financial Resources

Despite a faltering economy and stagnant state appropriations levels, UMA’s conservative and sound financial practices have allowed them to continue investing in their students through strengthening of academic programs, the creation of new baccalaureate offerings, expansion of student services and enhancement of the physical plant. The university’s financial position has remained relatively stable for many years.

Income is largely derived from tuition and related fees though the university strives to keep increases at levels that remain within reach of students. With the recent addition of a dedicated grant writer within the university’s advancement office, it is expected that the new B. Arch.’s focus on community engagement, its downtown location and the university’s tradition of service will enhance grant and other revenue generating opportunities.

At present the university allocates expenses to core functions, rather than on a per student basis. As a result, the current Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation does not present a clear picture of costs per student by degree program. During my meeting with the vice president of administration and finance, she indicated that they are currently analyzing this data and should have more definitive information upon completion of that work. We also discussed the need for a more direct correlation between the income and expense sides of the financial data presented.

Although enrollment numbers, shown with the income projections, show a decline over the first five years, the Plan notes that while actual student headcount is trending downward, an increase in the proportion of full-time students is actually driving an increase in the amount of credit hours taken. This information is not clearly discernible in the financial reporting or its potential effects on income projections. It is important that future reports and/or revisions to the Plan present this data in a format that is easier to track and compare.

Physical Resources

In the fall of 2011, the existing architecture program moved to the recently acquired and fully renovated Gannett Building in downtown Augusta. The street-fronting facility provides ample space for the current program and for its planned growth as a professional degree. Its location also affords it a very visible and valuable resource which aligns with the program’s mission of community engagement. In its present configuration, the building provides the existing program with comfortable and ample dedicated studio, critique space and offices for both full-time and adjunct faculty. A first floor gallery provides the opportunity to exhibit student work, host symposia and for other community-based, architecture related programming.
At present, the architecture program occupies the second and fourth floors of the building, with shared use of the ground level gallery. The third floor is utilized by the university's art department. The vacant upper (5th) floor is viewed as potential expansion room by the architecture program. As the program develops, there will be a need to identify how that expansion space is best used as well as how it will provide spaces for critical uses such as a materials laboratory or workshop. Program and university leadership are both well aware of these needs and are presently undertaking a needs assessment and studies to identify how best to develop available space. The results will be presented to the President for review and approval, then implementation.

Information Resources

The Bennett D. Kalz Library provides library resources for the Augusta campus and houses the Architecture collection. The dean of libraries and distance learning, an assistant dean of libraries and three additional masters-level librarians head the staff of 10. The assistant dean recently joined the Association of Architecture School Librarians and serves as the liaison to the architecture program for collections, reference and instruction matters.

Located on the main campus, it is approximately two miles from the Gannett Building in downtown Augusta. The physical building is open an average of 60 hours/week but considerable online resources are always available. Interviews with current students did not indicate any difficulty in accessing library resources and all indicated that the distance between the Gannett Building and main campus is easily travelled with ample parking at both locations and the availability of a university shuttle between both points. That said, program leaders recognize that the distance between them needs to be addressed and has begun investigating options.

Some solutions being considered include the scheduling of "office hours" during which the librarian liaison would be available to students and faculty, for resource and research questions, within the Gannett Building. Also under investigation is the development of an on-site reference library which would give students access to essential texts during all building hours.

Work continues and assessment is underway to determine the currency, range and quantity within specific subject areas to bring the holdings, physical and virtual, in line with the proposed professional degree. Library staff and architecture faculty are also exploring increasing their eBook holdings as a way of providing 24 hour access and minimizing distance issues. This assessment and other planned work is taking place in spring 2012.

Based on the work underway, the attention being given to this important resource, the level of support available and the commitment to finding creative solutions, this reviewer has every confidence that appropriate resources will be in place by the arrival of the program's first cohort of students.

2. **Commitment of the Institution to the Implementation of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation**

During my visit to UMA, I met with the following key individuals involved in the program's development:

Eric Stark, Associate Professor of Architecture and Architecture Program Coordinator
Dr. Allyson Handley, UMA President
Joe Szakas, Interim VP for Academic Affairs and Provost
Ellen Schneider, VP of Administration & Finance
Dr. Gillian Jordan, Interim Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences
Joyce Blanchard, Director of University Advancement
Lisa McDaniel, Assistant Dean of Libraries
Lauren DuBois, Director of IT
Roger Richmond, Professor of Architecture
Robert Shermen, AIA, Assistant Professor of Architecture
Amy Hinkley, Adjunct Professor of Architecture

Three current students in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of the BA in Architecture Program
Several local practicing professionals and/or BA alumni

Based on my review of the documents submitted and the visit itself, I believe all involved in the development of this program understand the implications of establishing a new accredited degree program in architecture and the steps necessary to earn initial candidacy.

3. Readiness of the Program to Complete a Visit for Initial Candidacy

The proposed timeline for achieving accreditation, found on page 39 of the Plan indicates a realistic timeline that conforms to the 2011 Procedures for Accreditation. The program plans to enroll its first cohort of undergraduate students into the professional B.Arch. in September of 2013 and is requesting an initial candidacy visit in 2013. Based on initial candidacy on this schedule, a second candidacy visit can be expected in 2015 and an initial Accreditation Visit in the Fall of 2018, immediately after graduation of their first cohort of students. This timeline would meet the 4-years of candidacy rule noted in Section 3 of The 2011 Procedures for Accreditation.

A visiting team conducting an initial candidacy visit in Fall 2013 can expect to see a program that is excited about the opportunity of accreditation with its first cohort of students enrolled and in class. While this will be the first accredited program for UMA, the team will witness a mature program that has been offering an non-accredited BA in Architecture for years with an experienced and expanding faculty assisted by practicing adjunct professors and a solid plan and components of accreditation coming into place as that first cohort begins its journey through it.

That team should expect to see a sharper focus for permanent facilities and growing library and media collections. The team room will still be short on student work but all other elements of a professional program should be well developed if not actually in place.

Other Comments From the Review Panel

The level of enthusiasm, excitement and anticipation for the planned B. Arch. program is evident from all involved in the development of this program, starting with university leadership at all levels and across departments, including the current program's existing faculty members and students. Along with that enthusiasm comes a strong understanding of the benefits that will accrue to both the university and the program itself.
This enthusiasm and the support it brings to this endeavor is a critical indicator of what I believe will become an incredibly successful program serving the people of Maine.

The author would like to thank university leadership, current faculty and students, particularly Eric Stark for their hospitality and eagerness to engage in a constructive and informative dialogue making for an effective and very enjoyable visit.

Respectfully submitted,

Miguel A. "Mike" Rodriguez, FAIA

Stephen Parker, AIA, LEED AP

Andrea S. Rulledge, CAE
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