

**Frank Lloyd Wright
School of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture (undergraduate credit hours plus 79 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
3 March 2010

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Team Findings	
1. Team Comments	
2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	
3. Conditions Well Met	
4. Conditions Not Met	
5. Causes of Concern	
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation	
III. Appendices	
A. Program Information	
1. History and Description of the Institution	
2. Institutional Mission	
3. Program History	
4. Program Mission	
5. Program Self Assessment	
B. The Visiting Team	
C. The Visit Agenda	
IV. Report Signatures	

This page is left blank intentionally.

FINAL DRAFT

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The uniqueness of the Frank Lloyd Wright (FLW) School of Architecture program must be mentioned at the outset of any evaluation, as well as the environment which offers students the opportunity to 'live architecture' within two internationally recognized historic sites. In addition to the physical setting for the program is the social and cultural context of the program, which affords students the opportunity to live and work alongside each other, faculty and staff, as well as former apprentices (Fellows) of Frank Lloyd Wright's. Many of these Fellows have personal history with the sites that stretch over many decades. This continuity of place and culture provide students with a context for the study of architecture that takes place within a true community that derives architectural direction and meaning from design principles set forth by Mr. Wright.

Since the last team visit, the school has experienced a more than one hundred fifty percent growth with a fifty percent growth of the student body in the past year, a renewed and revised curriculum, new faculty members, new foundation board members, the appointment of an interim CEO of the foundation, as well as an interim director of development, and the formation of a new school board responsible for the oversight of the school. The team has viewed all of these changes and developments as highly positive and anticipates more positive changes in the coming months. Both boards are engaged in a strategic planning process that will influence the financial and academic stability of the school, as well as define the relationship between the foundation board and the school.

Through group meetings as well as individual discussions, the team found faculty, students and staff to be extremely open about both the strengths and weaknesses of the school and its facilities. The team was struck by the passionate commitment of all of these constituencies to the program. Students are clear about their reasons for choosing this program, and are fully dedicated to being here in a year-round context. There is a shared sense of understanding of the uniqueness and significance of their ability to live and work within historically significant architecture that holds meaning for contemporary design. Their passion seems to mitigate the apparent shortcomings of the physical facilities, with students willingly working to assist with needed repairs and maintenance of their surroundings. In addition as part of the school's design build program, students have constructed shelters in the natural areas on campus in which they reside during the school seasons. These are seen as learning opportunities that have much to offer, in terms of problem solving and design. Faculty and staff are likewise committed to their work in the school, and equally sharing of the vision of providing an architectural education within this context.

There is a culture of mutual respect and trust that permeates this community. This also fosters close working relationships between Fellows, faculty, staff, and students. In addition, this culture has generated industrious students who demonstrate natural leadership abilities and tolerance. This manifests itself through committed ownership on the campus and in the academic achievements.

Dean Sidy has taken seriously the concerns and challenges of the NAAB and Higher Learning Commission's visits, and has instigated and implemented the many positive changes noted in this report. His leadership of the school is widely and enthusiastically supported, and much valued by faculty, staff and students.

At this time the strategic planning process of the foundation and school Boards leaves an uncertainty about the long-term relationship and support of the foundation for the school. Had this visit occurred at a later date, following the completion of the strategic plans, the team would have been much better situated to evaluate the long-term stability of the school. It is hoped that

this report will provide positive influence to the ongoing strategic planning processes occurring at this time.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment Procedures (2007): *The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.*

Previous Team Report (2007): Professional Studio—Learn-by-experience is a fundamental aspect of the FLLW education. Thus, the dissolution of Taliesin Architects, which provided an on-campus architectural practice in which to learn, was a fundamental loss. Based on conversations with the faculty and students, and our individual observations, it appears that such loss cannot be replicated in a series of off-campus offices without a critical evaluation process for the offices involved and an accountability process to ensure that each student can achieve the learning objectives provided in this venue. The School is encouraged to carefully reassess how the objectives previously met by the Taliesin Architects can be met in a changed environment and, in addition to exploring other alternatives, at least consider a required series of core classes that provide demonstrable evidence that required areas of professional practice are being met.

Plan for Growth—Within the last two years, several major changes have occurred that affect the administration of the school. These include the appointment of a new Dean of the School, a new CEO of the Foundation, and the wholesale restructuring of the Foundation Board of Directors. These actions have stabilized both the School and the Foundation to the point that expectations about future growth are credible. The team has identified a number of items that require close examination as the School plans for its projected growth: faculty expansion with a focus on the appropriate academic background and credentials; regular processes for faculty, staff and students to engage in both governance and strategic discussions; regular assessment practices, especially for the Professional Studio; a plan to accommodate the projected expansion of the student population; and regular opportunities for faculty and staff career advancement.

2010 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is now met. The process and assessment described in the APR are deemed to be accurate and honest assessments. The input from faculty, students, administration, school board and foundation board has been considered. However, the school board and the foundation board are both in the process of completing and beginning to implement new strategic plans. These determinations will set the direction and establish the policies that will have a significant impact in determining the school's future. See Causes of Concern, Strategic Institutional Decisions for additional comments.

Criterion 13.2, Critical Thinking Skills (2007): *Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards*

Previous Team Report (2007): Students are deeply engaged in learning as a 24-7 process. When accompanied by proper reflection, any activity, trip or reading appears fair game for entry in a student's educational portfolio. Although this approach provides an exciting foundation for learning, it tends to shift attention away from sustained, analytic and critical thinking. Evidence of such thinking could be provided by, for example:

- A thoroughly considered research paper

- An in-depth bibliography
- Literate and forceful concept statements for box projects
- Persuasive essays on topics of architectural interest
- Evidence of sustained investigation of technical or social matters

2010 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now well met. - See Student Performance Criterion 13.2, Critical Thinking Skills, for additional comments.

Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions (2007): Understanding of *parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world*

Previous Team Report (2007): The team could not find sufficient evidence of compliance with this criterion in the material presented. The NAAB list two criteria, one for Western and one for non-Western traditions that the School combines into a single criterion entitled "History of Architecture." Although the description of the rubric for these criteria mentions "non-Western cultures of the past" we were unable to find evidence that the students had an understanding of this material. A more rigorous process for requiring student learning in this area is recommended.

2010 Visiting Team assessment: This criterion is now met. - See Student Performance Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions, for additional comments.

Criterion 13.18, Structural Systems (2007): Understanding of *principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems*

Previous Team Report (2007): The team, while knowing 1) that the exhibited work was produced by students with a maximum of 16 months in the program, and 2) that some of the Shelter Projects showed a sophisticated structural development, believe that the level of structural understanding shown and the rigor applied to the analysis of structural behavior was not sufficiently evident.

2010 Visiting Team assessment: This criterion remains unmet. See Student Performance Criterion 13.18 for additional comments.

While structural concepts and engineering computational analysis are part of the structures courses' syllabi, the evolution, range and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems are not evidenced as part of instruction in either the structures courses, or within the design studios. However, promising progress is evident in the current offering of the Advanced Design Studio, which is producing student work that exhibits the understanding of contemporary structural systems that is not (yet) evidenced by the student work in the Structures courses, or in other studio work.

[Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated March 15, 2007]:

As the "causes of concern" below are reviewed, and as they relate to satisfaction of the Student Performance Criteria, the team agreed that it would be unfair to evaluate the student work at a "completion" level when the student body was less than one-half through their course of study. The specific criteria where the team thought this factor applied is identified by a caveat which restates our reasoning.

Following are the 2007 Visiting Teams Causes of Concern:

Academic Rigor and Student Assessment

The school's portfolio review process is an excellent vehicle for enabling diverse, self-directed study and evaluating that study using agreed-upon criteria. There is evidence, however, that this educational philosophy and assessment process has not provided sufficient rigor in some areas of the curriculum. For example, the fact that students include so many activities in each portfolio can result in a narrative writing style more appropriate for a diary than for an M. Arch. level evaluative mechanism.

2010 Visiting Team assessment: The portfolio assessment system is augmented with course evaluation sheets completed by the faculty responsible for the course. These evaluations are based upon the Eight Summary Performance Criteria established by the school (which represent groupings of the NAAB SPC's). In addition, the student meets individually and discusses the "season" with three members of the school faculty consisting of the academic advisor, another pertinent faculty member, and an administrative representative either the dean or the academic coordinator. This cause of concern is deemed to have been satisfied.

Downtime

The intensity of daily program activities is a significant resource. However, the 24/7 lifestyle could be productively adjusted to provide more opportunity for reflection about academic work and personal fulfillment in living architecture.

2010 Visiting Team Assessment: The intensity of the program is significant and further modifications are still being considered to the annual schedule. During the the period from 2007 until 2010 downtime has been added to the schedule so that there are now three weeks at the end of December/beginning of January, a week in the spring and the migrations from and to Spring Green are now multi-week periods. This Cause of Concern is deemed to have been satisfied.

Program Finances

Financial planning for the school has improved but needs ongoing attention. In the recent past, School accounts were not separated from Foundation accounts making it impossible to undertake School-based financial planning. The School budget projection for 2005- 2009 is a step in the right direction. This budget, however, is rudimentary and subject to unknowns. It excludes a number of indirect costs such as physical space and contributions of administrative overhead. Its assumptions concerning program faculty and staff costs may be low for a complex, staff intensive program with high standards for student service and educational quality. Projected enrollments are always estimates. The presence of these unknowns underscores the importance of ongoing, realistic program financial planning.

2010 Visiting Team Assessment: Financial planning has been improved drastically as a result of increased tuition and expanded enrollment, but will need to be reassessed given the determinations stated in the 2010 Causes of Concern-Strategic Institutional Decisions. This Cause of Concern is deemed to have been satisfied.

Electives

The Program is unique and offers a variety of opportunities in areas inside and outside the realm of architecture. While the students find the electives in the form of special lectures and voluntary workshops interesting and enjoyable, there is no apparent underlying theme or order to how the electives are offered. The lack of cohesion between the timing of, and subject matter of the

electives, makes it problematic for a student to develop a concentration in a specific area of interest; a concentration that could potentially be analogous to a “minor.” The School is encouraged to continue to seek relationships with other organizations as a way to broaden their program offerings.

2010 Visiting Team Assessment: Electives and core courses have been expanded as a result of additional faculty. The school has accomplished this through expanded offerings in Integrated Studies and Professional courses. It is also working with nearby institutions to provide students with alternative learning opportunities. This Cause of Concern is deemed to have been satisfied

3. Conditions Well Met

- 1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context
- 1.2 Architecture Education and Students
- 5 Studio Culture
- 13.2 Critical Thinking Skills
- 13.3 Graphic Skills
- 13.8 Western Traditions
- 13.10 National and Regional Traditions
- 13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

4. Conditions Not Met

- 8 Physical Resources
- 13.14 Accessibility
- 13.18 Structural Systems
- 13.21 Environmental Systems
- 13.22 Building Service Systems
- 13.23 Building Systems Integration
- 13.28 Comprehensive Design
- 13.30 Architectural Practice

5. Causes of Concern

A. Strategic Institutional Decisions

Both the school board, which has been in existence for but a year, and the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation Board, which has been reformulated over the past several years, are now in the midst of envisioning new strategic plans. Establishment of priorities by the foundation including the definition of its primary long-range missions could have significant impact on the school related to facilities, funding, staffing and extent of administrative support. An outline of their strategic concerns includes vision and purpose, programs, partnerships, the FLW archives and preservation of the two Taliesin Properties (Arizona and Wisconsin). The foundation stated that the school is the most significant program which they support, but that it is just that, one of their programs.

At this time the interim foundation CEO is extremely supportive of the school and precedence holds the school as a top priority, but that position is not guaranteed. The eventual conclusion of the foundation strategic plan will determine much about the relationship between the school and its integral support organization. Deliberation on this issue could consider separation of the school from the foundation, the school being located on only one of the properties, charging rent, continuing the current arrangements and formalizing the support, as well as other options. These issues should be finalized during the remainder of 2010.

A parallel consideration is the strategic vision being developed by the school board. The historic precedents established by Frank Lloyd Wright and still revered are at times in conflict with visionary thinking regarding architecture of the twenty-first century, i.e. Does the school represent the legacy of Frank Lloyd Wright or does the school teach architecture as practiced in the twenty-first century with its complexities?

Decisions in the above areas will also affect the administrative structure. A new CEO is expected to be selected in 2010. Following that hire, a new development director, as well as potential additional administrative staff will be considered.

The accreditation team at times believed it was two years too early to conduct this review given the above discussions. Yet, perhaps the input from this accreditation cycle will provide positive input to the self-assessment process that will need to occur once the Boards set their strategic visions.

B. Financial Resources

The school has made great strides in three years due to increased enrollment and the doubling of tuition. Due to the structure of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation in which the school is one of several internal departments, the true financial status of the school is somewhat obscured.

While the school has current revenues of approximately \$900,000, the true cost of operation is calculated at \$1,300,000, and the resultant deficit of \$400,000 is made up for by the foundation. Although the foundation has never in its history failed to provide for a deficit of the school budget, there is no guarantee or written commitment that the foundation will do so in perpetuity. While the existing relationship between the interim foundation CEO and the school is positive, there is uncertainty due to a leadership transition that is a year from completion.

Significant capital issues in the form of facilities improvements will be required, causing further stress to the financial stability of the foundation and school. A 2008 facilities master plan study recommended a capital campaign goal for facility improvements of \$120 million. This goal included an endowment for maintenance purposes.

C. Human Resources

Although faculty members enjoy their roles within the school and are devoted to its success, there are current pressures within the school that warrant cause for concern, as they relate specifically to faculty.

Chief among these are the transitional issues resulting directly from the growth of the student body by 50% within the last year. The results of this sudden increase in student population within a small program include a negative impact on the workloads of faculty, and have created the need for systemic changes to the operation of the program that are still being navigated by faculty, staff and administration. In addition to creating the need for greater numbers of faculty and support staff, the increased numbers imply curricular changes that may take time to fully comprehend, design, and implement.

Therefore, continued growth, as stated as an upcoming goal/intention in the school's APR, may exacerbate the current situation. Although current faculty and support staff are dedicated and skilled, their respective workloads were not designed for a student body in excess of 30 students. In particular, the school would benefit all-around from at least one additional support staff position to serve the existing core administration, currently performed by two key individuals in addition to the dean. Additionally, an increased workload for faculty of teaching and advising that accompanies significant and large student population growth

decreases opportunity for faculty to engage in research and practice. It is suggested that these changed demands on faculty time require time for assessment and analysis prior to increased growth. Faculty, staff, and students, may be better served all-around by freezing growth until such time as the current situation stabilizes, in terms of administrative support and curriculum modification.

FINAL DRAFT

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

Well Met Not Met
[X] []

The FLW School of Architecture is unique in its complete immersion of students within the intellectual and social life of the school. Given its approach to architectural education, coupled with their year-round residence within the historic sites of Taliesin and Taliesin West, it is not appropriate to consider the architectural education of this program within the normative context of either other university institutions, nor other architecture programs. It is clear that the students within the FLW School are passionately devoted to the school, and benefit enormously from their immersion within the lifestyle afforded by the opportunity to live and work within these sites. In addition to student residence onsite, most faculty and staff also reside onsite, thereby creating a unique community of educators, scholars and students that contributes enormously to the education of the school's students. In fact, it is this community aspect of the program that strongly attracts the school's students, coupled with the philosophy of 'living architecture' that underwrites the program's curriculum. Due to both the communal and philosophical approaches of the school, students, faculty and staff are closely involved in the school's governance and planning.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program's mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students' diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

Well Met Not Met
[X] []

The Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture demonstrates an incredible dedication to the development of the students on every level. The students are proactive in directing their education within the one-on-one environment. All of the students take a leadership role at some point and many take on a series of roles in which they are called upon to

cook, clean, fix issues with the facilities, and make student governance decisions. There is a large amount of diversity within the student body culturally, ethnically, and philosophically. The school goes beyond accepting the differences by embracing each person as they are and understanding the unique gifts they offer to the community as a whole.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program's relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students' understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

In the school's tradition of "Learning by Doing", there continues to be a strong commitment and conscious effort by faculty and staff to bring practitioners and students together. This can be seen primarily through professional practice projects where students work on real life projects and interface with practitioners and those associated with the construction process.

From discussions with students it is clear they have a good understanding of IDP, when they can register and how it fits into the licensure process. During the student meeting almost every student that is eligible to be enrolled in IDP indicated that he or she is enrolled.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program's particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects' obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

The school pedagogy reflects strong ties to the profession and the practice of architecture that stems from its unique heritage as a teaching practice. The history of the program as Wright stated was a "little experiment" with education through doing, in an immersed cultural community of artists and professionals. That legacy continues today despite the demise of the teaching firm.

Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture remains a commune of individuals living architecture twenty-four hours a day. Students study, build, prepare their meals, perform maintenance and live architecture with their mentors and teachers.

Records indicate that the percentage of students that enter practice after graduation is unusually high. The community maintains strong ties with its graduates and tracks their professional status. Since 1986 when the school first conferred its M. Arch degree 68% of graduates are registered architects, 25% are architectural Interns, 6% are in academia and only 1% is unassociated with architecture.

The school has an active and vital AIAS Chapter, and the dean and the AIAS chapter president sit on the AIA Phoenix board of directors. Students are required to serve an internship in a firm as part of their studies, local practitioners participate in the academic courses and alumni return for workdays at the facilities.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Given the unique situation in which student box projects are self-defined, many of the projects presented demonstrated an innate desire to address social and environmental issues through the process of design.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

This condition has been addressed and met. See the discussion under Conditions Not Met from the previous team report (2007). See also Causes of Concern entitled the Strategic Institutional Decisions, which has some relationship to this Condition.

3. Public Information

To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs

and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Met Not Met
[X] []

The school has included the language required by NAAB in the *Student Handbook*. They have also directed students to the NAAB website through the *Student Handbook* as well as the school website. It is apparent that the school has communicated the skills required to constitute a professional education in architecture.

4. Social Equity

The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

Met Not Met
[X] []

The school has in place written policies and guidelines to provide faculty, staff and students with an educational environment where each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. Since the previous accreditation visit, regular meetings with and between stakeholders have been instituted to supplement the natural communication that occurs within a small campus.

More importantly, the legacy and culture of the school is one that was founded as a residential community, where faculty, staff and students, live work, and eat together, with on-going interaction and communication.

5. Studio Culture

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

Well Met Not Met
[X] []

The studio culture policy outlines all the qualities that are needed to ensure a safe and productive learning environment. However, the studio culture at FLW delves much deeper than a document posted on the wall. These students, faculty, and staff live architecture. Therefore, much of the learning takes place outside of the outlined studio spaces. This has created an unusual and exciting architectural community. This community aspect is the heart and soul of the school's culture.

6. Human Resources

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

Met [X] Not Met []

This condition is met. However, please see Causes of Concern, Human Resources for additional comments.

7. Human Resource Development

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

Met [X] Not Met []

The school provides full-time faculty with “protected time”, typically 2 – 3 months of paid leave to support continued research and professional development. In addition, guest lecturers, field trips, visiting critics and architectural scholars are a few of the initiatives the school has in place to foster student and faculty development.

8. Physical Resources

The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.

Met [] Not Met [X]

This condition is not met. It must be said that the environment of the school is outstanding, in terms of both physical setting and the unique and significant historic nature and quality of both campuses. However, there are serious causes for concern with the physical facilities, identified by both the NAAB visiting team, as well as the school itself in its 2009 APR.

There are three primary areas of concern regarding the School’s physical resources:

- The deteriorating physical state of the facilities.
- The available space for teaching and living, particularly as the program continues to grow in size.
- The immediate fundraising potential for addressing the needs related to the physical resources.

Firstly, there is extensive decay and deterioration of both structures and systems, particularly at the Taliesin campus in Wisconsin. The structures at both campuses exhibit routine and extensive leaking in many areas, including those dedicated to teaching, studying and living. A 2008 commissioned study for the complete and comprehensive rehabilitation and maintenance/upkeep of both campuses estimated the total cost at \$120 million.

In addition, there are safety concerns that result from the visual observation on both campuses of water leakage in many teaching and living spaces, exposed electrical devices and splices, and mold resulting from water penetration and saturation. In one area in particular on the West campus, the odor of mold at the entrance to the men's locker area was noticeable.

Accessibility continues to be a challenge for both campuses, both in terms of the financial support for changes as well as the sensitive design issues related to making historic sites accessible for habitation and visitation. At present, both campuses do not conform to accessibility requirements.

The current school budget allocates approximately \$215,000 for physical plant costs for the Arizona campus. However, the budget does not indicate a separate annual line item for physical maintenance on the West campus, and discussions with school and foundation administration indicate that budget amounts allocated in any given year for upgrades and new equipment/furniture may be diverted for emergency maintenance needs as they arise. The Wisconsin campus maintenance needs are currently covered by the TPI (Taliesin Preservation Incorporated) budget of approximately \$300,000 per year for the upcoming 3 years.

The second area of concern relates to the physical resource implications of the growth in the program. Increased student population growth has implications for both teaching and living space. During the course of conversations, the faculty and students suggested that, at present time, there appears to be a shortage of teaching space. In addition, living space on both campuses is currently at maximum capacity. It is suggested that plans for continued growth need to account for the requisite physical facilities related to increased student and faculty numbers.

There is a question of the placement of facilities maintenance and upgrades for the West campus within the foundation's priorities. At this time, there is some indication that it may be competing with other priorities, but the team realizes that both the foundation and school boards are currently in a transitional mode and establishing their strategic direction.

The final concern regarding physical resources is the indication from the school and foundation leadership that large-scale fundraising for facilities will be on hold until the positions of foundation CEO and development director are filled in the coming calendar year. It should also be noted that a major fundraising campaign would necessitate additional staffing and administrative infrastructure. Current economic conditions are also not conducive to large-scale capital campaigns.

9. Information Resources

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

Met Not Met
[X] []

The information resources found on the Taliesin West campus are vast and clearly satisfy this condition. The William Wesley Peters Library contains a large number of NA category volumes. Important additions to the resources located in the library are the archives of Taliesin Architects and Frank Lloyd Wright. The students have full access to all the resources located on the campus.

However, the migration from Taliesin to Taliesin West has left an unequal allotment of resources. Taliesin suffers from this movement in regards to its library. However, the school has found a creative way to scan documents located in Arizona and e-mail them to students that are at the Wisconsin campus.

There is concern regarding the funding that the library receives. It is apparent that the expense of digital media, including online database subscriptions, is affected by the insufficient funds.

10. Financial Resources

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

Met Not Met
[X] []

This condition has been met. However, please see Causes of Concern, Financial Resources for additional comments.

11. Administrative Structure

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

Met Not Met
[X] []

This condition has been met. However, please see Causes of Concern, Strategic Institutional Decisions for additional comments.

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are

strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Met Not Met
 [X] []

The school utilizes the degree nomenclature correctly. The M. Arch. program admits students through a stringent process of credentials review and submission of a portfolio. During the visit, admission folders were reviewed to assure that adequate collegiate credit hours were attained prior to admission, so that total credit hours met the 168 requirement, general education credit hours exceeded 45 and Master's level courses met the 30 required. The analysis revealed that total hours of graduates checked ranged from 193 to 259. General education courses for incoming students were a minimum of 36 hours although the majority far exceeded this total. The school requires 9 graduate hours of general education courses to be taken within the program. 79 total graduate hours are required for graduation.

As a result of the individualized evaluations of students, the staggered admission dates, and fluctuations in enrollments, the school does not offer courses on a set pattern over a three-year period. Thus courses are scheduled on an inconsistent basis to fulfill graduation requirements, while others are on a regular seasonal basis. Schedules of course offerings for the next season are not issued until two months before the start of classes. Therefore it is difficult for students to plan ahead or even assure themselves that they will fulfill all necessary credits without having at least one overloaded season. A more regular course pattern would facilitate student curricular planning.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

Well Met Not Met
 [X] []

Writing compliance is evident in history papers, the Shakespeare course and Season Portfolios. Speaking eloquence and listening skills are evident in interactions with the student population. The students are required to serve as tour guides for the Taliesin complexes, thus developing their verbal skills.

13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

Well Met Not Met
 [X] []

The student writing samples contained within the Critical Writing II course, as well as the Design Proposals, consistently evidence writing and thinking that is critical, clear, independent, thoughtful, and well written, with sound conclusions.

Students' ability to think critically was evident within the essays produced in the writing course as well as the seasonal learning portfolios. Several box projects contained well-reasoned questions that served as jumping off points for the further exploration of the design.

13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

Well Met
[X] Not Met
[]

The evidence regarding Graphic Skills was found in all Design Studios, Perspective Drawing/Rendering, and Nature Patterns. There is clear evidence of mastery of freehand, technical, and digital drawing techniques.

13.4 Research Skills

Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework

Met
[X] Not Met
[]

Background work contained within the capstone and final box projects consistently evidence sound research skills and results. Additional work in the design proposals also presents sound research skills.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Met
[X] Not Met
[]

An understanding of Formal Ordering Skills is demonstrated in the following courses: nature patterns, hand rendering, advanced design studio and box projects.

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

Met
[X] Not Met
[]

The ability to use basic architectural principles is apparent within the student box projects, design studios and architectural practice projects.

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to *recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team*

Met Not Met
[X] []

The team found evidence of collaborative skills present within the work presented in the group projects displayed such as the Mod.Fab and Architectural Practice projects. Collaboration was also evident, to a lesser extent, within the student's box projects. Living in a community on a 24/7 basis cultivates collaboration.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of *the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them*

Well Met Not Met
[X] []

Contained within the work of both the History of Architecture 1-3 courses, as well as Writing 1-3 courses, student work clearly reflects an understanding of Western traditions. In addition, the student work indicates the ability to apply these concepts to critically conceived approaches to architectural work.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of *parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world*

Met Not Met
[X] []

Architectural history lectures include non-western examples, integration of diverse cultural standards are discussed in student writings and student projects reflect considerations based upon non-western precedents. In addition there were group projects within design studio that were located in non-western cultures and the solutions reflected the cultural forms and traditions of those regions

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of *national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition*

Well Met Not Met
[X] []

Contained within the work of the History of Architecture 1-3 courses, the Writing 1-3 courses, and numerous design studios, concepts of national and regional traditions are consistently and clearly well understood.

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to *incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Students demonstrated an ability to analyze and employ architectural precedents within the advanced design studio, research design studio and seasonal box projects.

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of *the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Student work in both the Capstone and Final Box projects clearly evidence an understanding of the relationships between human behavior and architectural design. Some students choose final projects that explicitly examine and explore these relationships through their design.

13.13 Human Diversity

Understanding of *the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

This school consists of more than 25% international students living together in a community where they prepare their own food, maintain their surroundings and find common understandings. This criterion is part of their lives and is evident in the assessments of the box projects and portfolios, several of which require understanding of international culture and traditions.

13.14 Accessibility

Ability to *design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities*

Met	Not Met
[]	[X]

While the team identified two studio projects specifically investigating the concepts of accessibility as interpreted through the application of Universal Design, they did not find sufficient evidence of students' ability to incorporate ramps, turn-around radii, accessible restrooms and parking and other site amenities for the impaired in the majority of the work presented.

13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

Met Not Met
[X] []

There is clear evidence in Sustainability courses I, II, and III, that students acquire an understanding of Sustainable Design principles.

13.16 Program Preparation

Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

Met Not Met
[X] []

Components of programs are evident in most Box Projects, the Architectural Practice Course and in many student portfolios. The best representation of a complete program is contained in the Eagle Valley collaborative project.

13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

Met Not Met
[X] []

Student projects demonstrated a desire to respond to natural and built site characteristics, particularly within the Foundation and Advanced Design studios, the Box projects, as well as the landscape course. The Taliesin shelter programs in both the Sonoran Desert and Wisconsin Prairie offer an exceptional opportunity to gain an innate understanding of differing site conditions as they pertain to the students' daily living and the option to design and construct their own shelter.

13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

Met Not Met
[] [X]

While structural concepts and engineering computational analysis are part of the structures courses' syllabi, the evolution, range and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems are not evidenced as part of instruction in either the

Structures courses, or within the design studios. However, promising progress is evident in the current offering of the Advanced Design Studio which is producing student work that exhibits the understanding of contemporary structural systems that is not (yet) evidenced by the student work in the structures courses, or other studio work.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope*

Met [] Not Met [X]

While many projects demonstrated an ability to employ passive environmental systems, the team could not find evidence of students' understanding of the environmental systems included in this criterion in projects.

13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of *the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress*

Met [X] Not Met []

Although not evidenced through the work within courses, the ability to apply the concepts of the basic principles of life-safety systems is clearly evidenced across the studio projects.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies*

Met [X] Not Met []

The Technical Drawing Course and the Design-Build Studio present the evidence to support this criterion as met.

Both an understanding and ability to apply the concepts of building envelope materials and assemblies within studio and other design projects are evidenced. This is most clearly demonstrated in some of the design build projects of student shelters, which require design, fabrication and construction of the designs.

13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems*

Met [] Not Met [X]

The team could not find sufficient evidence of students understanding of building service systems' within the studio projects, process work, student notes or course syllabi.

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

Met Not Met

No real evidence of this ability is present in the materials. Project displays do not show structural, mechanical, electrical, lighting or life-safety systems. A new course in its first season, Technical Drawing, is currently in the process of integrating these systems in a small project and a new lighting design course may aid this criterion in the future, but still needs to be incorporated into larger scale projects.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

Well Met Not Met

Students are immersed in the application and performance of construction materials, components and assemblies. Evidence of this can be found in the classroom in courses like the Construction Document Technology and Technical Drawing Workshops and in the studio in Preservation and Design/Build. Both campuses are populated with examples of student projects, especially at Taliesin West where shelters are built and inhabited by students. Shelters have won design awards and clearly show the creativity and ingenuity of how students explore and use building materials.

13.25 Construction Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

Met Not Met

The team found relevant understanding of the concepts of construction cost control within the box projects, group projects and design build studios.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

Met Not Met

The Technical Drawing Workshop, which is in its first season, requires each student to prepare a set of working drawings for a small project. The work is quite thorough although the completion of the course has not yet been achieved. Construction Document Technology introduces the student to the CSI specifications system and requires the drafting of specifications using Masterspec.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of *the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Evidence of understanding this criterion is present in materials from the Construction Documents Technology course, the Box Projects and Architectural Practice Projects.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

Met	Not Met
[]	[X]

While many aspects of design are addressed throughout the multiple courses and educational offerings, the team could not find evidence of comprehensive design assembled in the form of a single project.

There is an expectation by the school that the “Capstone” and “Final Box” projects satisfy the comprehensive design criteria, but there is no evidence in the students’ work displayed that consistently incorporates structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies into projects.

13.29 Architect’s Administrative Roles

Understanding of *obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

The Construction Documents Technology course provides the evidence of meeting this criterion.

13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of *the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such*

as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Met Not Met
[] [X]

Project delivery methods are discussed and related exercises are included in the Construction Documents Technology course. However, evidence of understanding of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation and mediation and arbitration along with trends in practice are not evidenced in student work. It is our understanding that a class in this subject was last offered in 2006.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

Met Not Met
[X] []

All students were aware of IDP and the registration process. Of the students eligible to participate in IDP all but one were enrolled.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

Met Not Met
[X] []

The environment of "living architecture" immerses the student in a peer environment that includes faculty, administration and staff. Students are expected and to take responsibility for their environment, from aiding in maintaining the grounds and facilities, to cooking meals and providing formalized input to educational decisions. A student meeting is held weekly, to discuss all aspects of life at Taliesin. It is the norm for the students to resolve many of the social and relational issues that arise. They lead in a natural manner brought on by the cultural and communal environment.

In addition, the students have an established AIAS Chapter, participate in the community activities and service.

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

Met Not Met
[X] []

Student assignments from Construction Documents Technology and Contract Lectures substantiates the majority of this material. A specific course on codes is being planned for fall 2010.

13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of *the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice*

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Students demonstrated an understanding of ethics pertaining to the practice of architecture within the written assignments presented in the contract document course. Many of the student projects also propose architectural solutions to significant social issues.

While not explicitly evidenced within the teaching of the Course Documents course, exposure to the ethical dimensions of architectural design and practice are clearly reflected in the writing assignments produced by the students within the course. It is lived out on a daily basis by the way the students, faculty, and staff interact with a level of mutual trust and respect.

This page is left blank intentionally.

FINAL DRAFT

III. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2010 Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Program Report.

The Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture traces its origins to 1932 when twenty-three apprentices came to live and learn at Taliesin, near Spring Green, Wisconsin. The sources of this educational philosophy have roots that go back much further than the 1930s. The program of the School, while remaining remarkably true to its heritage, has evolved through experience and through changing times.

In 1931, Frank Lloyd Wright and his wife, Olgivanna, circulated a prospectus to an international group of distinguished scholars, artists, and friends, announcing their plan to form a school at Taliesin in Spring Green, Wisconsin to "Learn by Doing."

"The fine arts," they asserted, "should stand at the center as inspiration grouped about architecture... (of which landscape and the decorative arts would be a division)." Education at Taliesin would emphasize painting, sculpture, Music, drama, and dance "in their places as divisions of architecture."

Each of these elements of the fine arts, as the Wrights conceived them, would lead to broader learning: "Drama would be studied as the essential structure of all great literature," while "music would mean the fundamental study of sound and rhythm as an emotional reaction both as to original character and present nature." They anticipated a core faculty, "resident foremen," at Taliesin supplemented by "a guest-system of visitation, consultation, and criticism" who would make philosophy, psychology, and other disciplines available "by extension work."

The students, or "apprentices," would round out their education in the spirit of Tolstoy's "What to Do." "The entire work of feeding and caring for the student body so far as possible should be done by itself... work in the gardens, fields, animal husbandry, laundry, cooking, cleaning, serving should rotate among the students according to some plan that would make them all do their bit with each kind of work at some time."

The ambitious plan for an endowed school exceeded the Wrights' capacity to attract funds in the second full year of the Great Depression. In 1932, they issued a more modest circular announcing the formation of the Taliesin Fellowship and inviting young people to venture to Taliesin. The Fellowship would organize around the principles they had articulated in 1931, and the program, now called the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture, has generally evolved along these lines.

But the sources of these ideas go back much further than the early 1930s. They rested on the Wrights' own experience. In 1886, Jane and Nell Lloyd Jones, Frank Lloyd Wright's aunts, founded the Hillside Home School, a coeducational country boarding school dedicated to education of children, based on the principle of "Learning by Doing," a radical departure from most educational practices in those times. This philosophy made a profound impact on Frank Lloyd Wright, himself an indifferent student impatient with formal academic requirements and the rigid educational settings of his youth. After a brief stay at the University of Wisconsin, he left Madison to learn the profession of architecture in active Chicago offices. When he opened his own independent practice, Frank Lloyd Wright strongly supported the traditional training of

architects in the apprentice system that he, himself, had experienced. Apprentice draftsmen and women always worked in his Oak Park Studio.

After the closing of the Hillside Home School in 1915, for which he had designed buildings and the Romeo & Juliet windmill, Frank Lloyd Wright continually pursued the idea of establishing a school for architects using the Hillside Home School buildings. By then he had built his home "Taliesin" on a nearby hillside and had taken up residence there. In 1926, he invited the internationally known architect H. Th. Wijdeveld to join him in establishing a school. Frank Lloyd Wright had observed educational experiments in the United States and abroad, and the Arts and Crafts movement had clearly influenced his thinking. Although Wijdeveld declined Wright's offer to help found a school, he encouraged Wright to develop his ideas.

The first twenty-three apprentices who formed the Taliesin Fellowship in 1932 and other pioneers who joined them in the early 1930s included some remarkably talented men and women. At first, Frank Lloyd Wright had few commissions through which to teach the apprentices, and he put them to work in the construction, operations, and maintenance of the School. The apprentices quarried the stone and burned limestone and sifted sand from the adjacent Wisconsin River to make mortar. They cut trees and sawed them into dimensional lumber, and along with the masonry, built the large studio, now on the National Register of Historic Places, that continues to serve as the center of learning on the Spring Green campus and as an active architectural studio. The apprentices worked on all aspects of life at Taliesin, developing a largely self-sufficient school and community that operated successfully with a very low budget.

Surrounded by bright, committed, and energetic apprentices, Frank Lloyd Wright's career as an architect found new vigor, and soon the apprentices could learn as they worked on some of the most innovative buildings in America. The celebrated master of the Prairie School had expanded his vocabulary, and apprentices under his direction created renderings, made models, did the engineering, and produced construction drawings. They supervised construction on projects like the Johnson Wax headquarters (Racine, WI), Fallingwater (Bear Run, PA) and the first Usonian houses. They produced the first perspectives of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum (New York, NY) and Monona Terrace (Madison, WI). The Taliesin Fellowship had with astonishing speed developed into an exciting architectural laboratory that attracted some of the nation's best work and hosted many of the world's great artists and great minds.

In the winter of 1935, Frank and Olgivanna Lloyd Wright moved the entire Fellowship to Chandler, Arizona. While there, they constructed the model of Broadacre City, Frank Lloyd Wright's concept of the integration of living and working in successfully planned communities. This first winter in Arizona inaugurated the tradition of moving the School between Wisconsin and Arizona that still continues. After the first two winters in temporary quarters, he purchased land in Scottsdale and, in 1937, with the apprentices, began the construction of a new kind of desert architecture at Taliesin West.

As the work of the architectural office expanded, some of the apprentices decided to stay at Taliesin to continue their professional development as practicing architects in Frank Lloyd Wright's firm, marry, and raise families. Others left Taliesin and began successful careers in architecture with other firms and on their own. New apprentices replaced those who left; the talented group who stayed became the Senior Fellowship. They also became the "resident foremen," the faculty that the Wrights had envisioned.

Following a hiatus during World War II when new construction all but ceased and rationing precluded the cross country excursions between Arizona and Wisconsin, the demand for Frank Lloyd Wright's services returned in force and accelerated until his death in 1959. The post-war influx of commissions reaffirmed the need for permanent members of the Fellowship to produce architectural work and to mentor the growing number of young men and women seeking to experience the concepts embodied in organic architecture. During these exciting years, the fellows and the apprentices worked on more than 100 houses, including the Usonian Automatics and other experiments with concrete blocks. They also worked on the Guggenheim Museum, the Price Tower (Bartlesville, OK), the Florida Southern College campus (Lakeland, FL), the Grady Gammage Auditorium (Tempe, AZ), the Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church (Wauwatosa, WI), several planned communities (Pleasantville, NY and Kalamazoo, MI) and the expansion of Taliesin West.

Young men and women could come to Taliesin and receive firsthand training by working with outstanding architects on some of the nation's most visible and important projects. With the growing life at Taliesin, they would also participate in music, drama, and other fine and performing arts. They interacted with the constant parade of the world's best minds who came to visit the Wrights and the Fellowship. When their skills developed and they had sufficient experience, some would stay and join the Senior Fellowship, but most would leave, pass the registration examinations, and become registered, practicing architects. In recent years, these former apprentices have organized as the Taliesin Fellows. They hold reunions, conduct meetings, publish a journal, and, in 1996, became the official alumni organization of the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture.

After Frank Lloyd Wright's death, the Senior Fellows incorporated an architectural firm to continue the practice and to mentor the apprentices. These activities now took place under the umbrella of The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation (the "Foundation") which Frank Lloyd Wright established in 1940 by bequeathing to it all of his personal and intellectual property. His will confirmed his gift to the Foundation, and after 1959 it became the governing entity for all of the activities at Taliesin with Olgivanna Lloyd Wright serving as its president until her death in 1985. Richard Carney, a Senior Fellowship member, succeeded her as President and CEO.

As with other professions, the practice of architecture became increasingly structured during the 1970s and 1980s. The American Institute of Architects (AIA), the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the National Council of Architecture Registration Boards (NCARB), and other organizations that govern the standards of architectural practice increasingly required graduation from an accredited institution of higher education and an accredited architectural program as a prerequisite to sit for the Architectural Registration Examination (ARE). These exams have become the sole gateway to licensure and professional practice in most states. In response to this changing climate, the Foundation stepped forward to formalize the apprenticeship program into the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture. Apprentices, however talented and well trained, could not become licensed architects in many states without the approved degree. In recognition of this fact, Olgivanna Lloyd Wright initiated the process of seeking institutional accreditation and appointed E. Thomas Casey as the School's first Dean in 1982.

Under his direction, together with professional advisors and new staff, the educational program adapted many of the basic tenets of Learning by Doing and the educational philosophy of the Taliesin Fellowship to the range of institutional characteristics required of an accredited institution of higher education. The new Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture expanded academic offerings and experiences, developed a library, added facilities, and placed the essential elements of student life — counseling

and advising, admissions, and financial aid — on a much more formal basis. Both campuses, which have earned National Historic Landmark status from the National Park Service, now have many of the elements of a small college. From 1985 until 1996 the School underwent a rigorous process of reporting towards accreditation, which was earned successfully at both the institutional level and the professional architectural level.

The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, as the broader institution that houses the School, has similarly changed over time to adapt to the public interest in Frank Lloyd Wright which has steadily increased since the 1980s. Whereas for many years, the architectural practice of Taliesin Architects represented the primary source of income for the operations of the Foundation, the revenue stream expanded in the early 1990s towards tourism and the licensing of Frank Lloyd Wright-designed products. The Board of Trustees of the Foundation, which had, since Olgivanna Lloyd Wright's death in 1985, been primarily comprised of the Senior Fellows, now accepted public members into its ranks and increasingly interacted with outside entities in order to strengthen the Foundation.

In 1993, the Foundation, working with the Governor's Commission on Taliesin in Wisconsin, initiated by then-Governor Tommy G. Thompson, helped create the Taliesin Preservation Commission (now Taliesin Preservation Inc. (TPI), a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation). TPI works to preserve the Taliesin Estate in Spring Green, Wisconsin as an eminent example of the vision of Frank Lloyd Wright and to educate the public about the history and importance of Taliesin and Wright. The Taliesin Estate includes more than 600 acres and five Frank Lloyd Wright designed building complexes. During this time, the Foundation increased the size of the Wisconsin campus by acquiring adjacent property. Grants from the Getty Foundation also provided funds to bolster the activities of the Frank Lloyd Wright Archives. During the 1990s, however, the Senior Fellowship lost several of its key members to death, including William Wesley Peters, Kenn Lockhart, John DeKoven Hill, Richard Carney, and Kay Rattenbury.

In 1996, the first non-Fellowship President and CEO, Dr. H. Nicholas Muller III, was appointed and oversaw steady growth in the organization until his retirement in 2002. During this time, public visitation to Taliesin West exceeded 100,000 per year and public visitation to Taliesin in Wisconsin exceeded 30,000 per year, levels which were consistently maintained in the subsequent years. Dr. Muller's successor, James Goulka, had less success with the Board of Trustees, and was terminated in April 2004. This event prompted the Foundation Board to embark on a series of critical steps which included the revision of the Foundation by-laws in June 2005 to define the relationship between the Senior Fellowship and the Foundation Board. June 2005 also marked several critical decisions regarding the School, including the selection of Victor Sidy as Dean.

In April 2006, the Board appointed Philip D. Allsopp, RIBA to fill the vacant position of President and CEO. Mr. Allsopp oversaw several critical initiatives in the Foundation, including the removal of veto power by the Senior Fellowship, thereby ensuring full public accountability of the Foundation Board. Mr Allsopp engaged the Foundation more fully with strategic partner organizations such as the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, and brokered a significant reduction in property taxes at Taliesin West.

In 2008, in response to recommendations by the School's institutional accrediting body, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the Foundation approved the formation of a new subsidiary board for the School, which has been in place since September 2008. *This is presented in further detail in Section 3.11*

In March 2009, Anne Maley was appointed by the Foundation Board as Interim President/CEO to replace Mr. Allsopp. Since then, many of the School's concerns related to the financial sustainability and operational support of the Foundation for the School have been addressed, and the School is on track to continue to grow its programs.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2010 Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Program Report.

Unlike many other architectural programs accredited by NAAB, the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture is an independent program, unaffiliated with a college or university. The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation acts as the parent organization; the School is a key program of the Foundation, overseen by the School Board (see Section 3.11). The Mission Statement of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, adopted by the Foundation Board of Trustees in September 2008, is as follows:

Vision

The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation will be a leading, global, multi-disciplinary center for education, scholarship, debate and research committed to the place of architecture and the arts in enriching the quality and dignity of life.

Mission

Educate and engage diverse audiences, including scholars, architects, students, and the general public, through programs that encourage innovative thinking about the relationships between architecture and design and the natural environment, and inspire a quest for beauty, balance and harmony in the creation of buildings and spaces that enrich daily life.

Preserve the works, ideas, and innovative spirit of Frank Lloyd Wright for the benefit of all generations.

The three core concepts of *Conserve, Create, Educate* represent the means by which the Foundation realizes this mission. The Foundation's mission is supported through the following programs:

- The continued operation, maintenance, and preservation of Taliesin (Spring Green, WI) and Taliesin West (Scottsdale, AZ) as architectural, educational, environmental, and cultural centers
- The education of men and women in the field of architecture and related arts through the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture
- A community of practicing architects, artists, scholars and students that promotes creativity and the growth of organic architecture
- The preservation of Wright's vast archives
- The planning and operation of public access programs that provide education about organic architecture and offer visitors the opportunity to experience Taliesin and Taliesin West
- The generation of financial resources from both the public and private sectors to meet the Foundation's mission and goals

As set forth above, the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture is central to the Foundation's Mission. The School maintains a privileged relationship with the Foundation as the key academic program and interacts closely with all other components of the institution.

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2010 Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Program Report.

The Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture and its programs have evolved to the present form over the past 77 years. The programs have adapted to new conditions from time to time, but the essential philosophy and pedagogy of learning by doing form the basis of the School's academic commitment. The School's identity is linked with its main campus, Taliesin West, and Taliesin (Wisconsin).

The evolution of the School is tightly intertwined in the architectural practice of Frank Lloyd Wright and the existence of the Taliesin Fellowship as described in Section 1.1. The following chronicles the history of the School program since its formalization as an accredited institution.

As mentioned in Section 1.1, one of Mrs. Olgivanna Lloyd Wright's requests before she died in 1985 was that the apprenticeship program be formalized as an accredited School of Architecture under the umbrella of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. She chose E. Thomas Casey, a long-time Senior Fellowship member, Taliesin Architect, and talented structural engineer, to lead this charge as Founding Dean. With the assistance of progressive educators at other alternative schools, including Alverno College in Milwaukee, the culture of education at Taliesin was reinterpreted into the context and conditions of formal higher education. The challenge was to enable the existing culture, which had a long record of success in training architects, to interface with the requirements of accrediting bodies.

In 1987, the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture was granted accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (now referred to as the Higher Learning Commission, or HLC). Accreditation of the seven-year Master of Architecture degree was granted by NAAB in 1992. In 1992, the institution was granted approval by the North Central Association to begin providing an undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies degree and a graduate Master of Architecture professional degree.

During the 1990s, the program attracted an increasingly sophisticated student population who were drawn to the program because of its unique history and pedagogy, but who might have been unwilling to attend had the program not been accredited. Opportunities abounded within Taliesin Architects to learn the practice of architecture. However, the principal architects were generally uninterested in the new directions in architecture that captivated the younger associate members of the firm as well as the students. Unwilling to give the younger associates design freedom or increased responsibility, the firm gradually lost many of its talented young architects and project managers, who were also the key interface between the students and the senior architects. Faced with dwindling revenues, Taliesin Architects was formally dissolved in 2003, and the architects were encouraged to form their own small, independent firms.

The School had already taken measures to augment students' architectural education as the work of Taliesin Architects decreased. Under the oversight of Dean Arthur Dyson, who succeeded Dean Casey upon his retirement in 2000, the Box Project (an independent student design project presented each season) was expanded and emphasized as the equivalent of a typical university design studio, and a full-time faculty position was created to oversee these projects. The Desert Shelter program had also become a more centralized component of the program. This unique opportunity to design, build, and live in experimental structures on the fringes of the campus had existed since the founding of Taliesin West. In the late 1990s, the program evolved into a highly visible venue for architectural innovation, gathering international press attention and interest for the School.

Dean Dyson was succeeded several years later by Academic Dean John Alan Wyatt, who, although a charismatic thinker, had difficulty navigating the architectural curriculum, particularly with the dissolution of Taliesin Architects. His staff routinely neglected certain key aspects of the program, notably the portfolio method of assessing students' progress through the program. Not long after President and CEO James Goulka was terminated in April 2004, Dean Wyatt resigned, along with many in his administration and faculty. Eighty-year old Emeritus Dean Casey was asked by the Foundation Board to step in to provide interim leadership, and the Board initiated the search for a new Dean.

In March 2005, a comprehensive visit by an accreditation team of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools visited the School and noted significant causes for concern. The School was subsequently placed On Notice. The School was at a low point, still suffering from the loss of key administration and faculty and from a gap in important program documentation of the period 2002-2004, and concerned about declining enrollment. On the heels of the HLC visit, the scheduled focused visit by NAAB was generally positive, but made mention of concerns with human resources, finances, and curriculum. The NAAB Board moved to advance the originally scheduled 2008 Team Visit to 2007.

The School's difficulties caught the attention of the alumni, several of whom asked Victor Sidy, an alumnus from the 1990s, to consider taking on the challenge of School leadership. Other alumni pledged financial and instructional assistance to the School. In June 2005 the Foundation's Board of Trustees made several critical decisions regarding the future of the School. They resoundingly voted to prioritize the rebuilding of the School, pledging financial and operational resources to initiate the process. In addition, they approved the appointment of Victor Sidy as Dean.

Between 2005 and 2007, the School hired new faculty and staff, engaged in a comprehensive strategic planning process, and revised the curriculum and evaluation structure. The spring 2007 accreditation visits by the HLC and NAAB teams were highly positive, and the HLC removed the School's 'On Notice' status, while citing Governance and Finances as key concerns.

Since the 2007 accreditation visits, the School and Foundation have made a number of key changes and additions to the program:

- Formed a School Board to oversee the School, comprising a majority of public members
- Increased the Education Fee (tuition, room, and board) from \$17,088 to \$30,000
- Enrolled in the Federal Title IV program to provide Federal Financial Aid to students

- Hired additional highly qualified faculty
- Formalized the curriculum structure and refined the assessment process
- Purchased key digital output and fabrication equipment for student use
- Substantially improved key academic buildings on the Wisconsin campus
- Empowered the alumni to more fully participate and contribute to the program

School leadership and personnel have remained stable since 2005. The School has gradually increased enrollment, maintains a remarkably high student retention rate, and has recently engaged in a number of high-profile initiatives and collaborations. The School expects that it will continue to attract a growing number of high-caliber students and has increased financial resources to support programs.

Looking forward, the School aims to reinforce its position as a center for innovative, sustainable, and human-oriented architecture and broaden its leadership role within architectural education, within the profession, and within the communities surrounding each of its campuses.

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2010 Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Program Report.

In January 2006, a Strategic Planning Task Force appointed by the Dean reviewed, updated, and revised the existing strategic planning documents. The Task Force consisted of architects and educators, faculty and administrators, representatives from all key operations of the School, and a student representative. The resulting Mission Statement is as follows:

The Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture builds architects of the future through:

- *theoretical, professional, and hands-on application of innovative design*
- *artistic, scholarly, and social inquiry*
- *experiential learning*
- *living and learning in architectural masterpieces with an intergenerational and multicultural community of architects, artists, and scholars.*

The Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation Board of Trustees formally adopted the Mission Statement in April 2006. The School publishes its Mission Statement in the School Bulletin and on its website.

The four bullet points of the Mission Statement are the springboard for the Strategic Plan and Vision Statement, which provide the foundation for all aspects of the School's planning and operation, including curricular design, budget processes, outreach programs, and Taliesin community life. The Vision Statement is: "Taliesin. Live Architecture." The idea of the intertwining of Life and Architecture is central to the legacy of Taliesin, visible in the intensity of day-to-day activity of the School, and core to the future of architectural education at Taliesin.

The faculty and staff review the mission documents, particularly the strategic plan, each year. In the summer of 2008, a comprehensive evaluation and revisions were made to recognize accomplishments, set new goals, and adapt to changes within academia and the profession.

5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2010 Frank Lloyd Wright Architecture Program Report.

The following section describes the perceived Strengths and Challenges of the School as identified by faculty and staff during the preparation of this report.

Strengths of the School

Pedagogy

A core educational value of the School is experiential learning, which calls on the learner to approach his or her education with a sense of responsibility and self-determination. This value is interpreted as a pedagogical approach that is purposefully integrated in both the structured curriculum and the independent initiatives undertaken by students. Through this, the School aims to cultivate original thinking, responsibility, and leadership – attributes critical to the professional practice of architecture. The drive for life-long learning and innovation is a characteristic of graduates of the program and is fostered throughout the institution.

Sense of Place

The campuses, cultural treasures and object lessons in the power of architecture, are key to the identity, function, and spirit of the School. Shaped by several generations of effort and by the uninterrupted presence of caring people, the campuses set the tone for architectural experimentation and creative activity.

Studio Culture

The Studios at both campuses have always been the center of thought and industry within the organization. They could be seen as sacred spaces during the time of Frank Lloyd Wright, a place where ideas were brought into being and projects to life. Work within the studio is central to the lives and education of the students. In the drafting studios in Arizona and Wisconsin, students share the space with architects and scholars, working together on both professional and student projects. The culture of the Studio and the Community are intertwined. The phrase: "What a Man Does, that He Has" is emblazoned in the beams of the Wisconsin studio, and is meant to encompass the many fields of endeavor in which one engages as a member of the Taliesin community.

Small Scale

The small scale of the institution underpins the individualized nature of the program. All faculty, staff, and students are on a first-name basis with each other. Strong bonds form between these individuals, forming a core of mutual support and learning. Class sizes are small, learning experiences are customized to individual students when appropriate, and opportunities for leadership abound. In addition to course evaluations and group critiques, each student is assessed individually in portfolio reviews that are not unlike thesis defenses.

Shelter Program

At Taliesin West, students are provided the opportunity to live in experimental structures built over the years by previous students. These rough dwellings, absent water and other creature comforts, compel the student to question the essential characteristics of Shelter, a subject architects must face in their own work. They are encouraged to study the qualities of the particular site on which they live, and to understand the effects the sun, wind, animals, and distant views have on the experience of a specific place. As students progress through the program, they have the opportunity to propose, design, and build shelters of their own. This endeavor challenges students to define their architectural response to a specific place, enables them to test the limits of building materials and fabrication techniques, and rewards them with work that might gain them notice in the architectural world and withstand the forces of time.

Engagement with the Public

Both campuses are venues for architectural education accessible to the general public. Students are required to give tours of the campuses to the public, including tours to schoolchildren. They are routinely interviewed for articles or features, and provide weekly tours of their Desert Shelters to the paying public. In every case, students are asked to interpret architectural ideas to a lay audience. Their ability to convey complex ideas to an audience beyond their faculty and peers contributes to their future success working with clients and interpreting their ideas to society at large. Students are encouraged to participate in activities that benefit the larger community as well, through volunteering, and through initiatives such as assisting with flood relief re-building projects, work with Habitat for Humanity, and design services for educational non-profits.

Environmental Responsibility

The architecture at both campuses challenges students to engage with nature and the environment. Both in their architectural projects and in their day-to-day life, students are encouraged to be highly committed to ecological sustainability. A significant portion of the curriculum features design and construction strategies that reduce the use of high embodied-energy building materials in new buildings and the consumption of energy in heating, cooling, and lighting. The organization of the community itself forms an economy of scale that conserves resources. Students as well as most faculty and staff live within walking distance of all activities on campus. In Arizona, some of the food is purchased from local community-supported organic farms. Much of the food in Wisconsin comes from a large organic garden on-campus grown by students, staff, and community members. The seasonal migration patterns enable the School and Community to consume dramatically less energy by decommissioning about 10,000 square feet of classroom, office, and residential space on each campus during off seasons. This has been calculated to easily offset the fuel consumption associated with the twice annual transportation between campuses.

Resources

The Frank Lloyd Wright Archives in Arizona and the Taliesin Preservation organization in Wisconsin are highly professional on-site resources available to faculty, staff, and students. The Archives, which house some of the most comprehensive collections of work of any single artist, provides internship opportunities to students within its offices and vaults. Taliesin Preservation provides internship opportunities documenting and re-constructing historic buildings.

The Construction Workshop at Taliesin West is a focal point for student activity in

Arizona. The construction program comprises a portion of the curriculum that is based on the idea that architectural innovation comes from a deep understanding of the building blocks of architecture, particularly the construction materials and methods out of which buildings are made. The Workshop has ample space to build mock-ups, fabricate components for the desert shelters, and assemble installations and furniture.

The William Wesley Peters Library, and the Taliesin Architects/ School Archives are another important resource available to faculty and students. This resource is described more fully in Section 3.9.

Passion

The faculty, staff, and students are joined in their passion for the legacy and future of the school by Foundation staff and leadership, emeritus Fellowship members, former students, and a host of outside architects and other professionals. There is an unusually high level of enthusiasm and support for the School's well-being by persons committed to ensure the sustained growth and viability of the School.

Taliesin has been and continues to be a center for cultural activities that provides a highly energizing environment for lifelong learning (see Section 3.7). Members of the residential community are heavily involved in a variety of activities encompassing all aspects of living and learning.

Residential Community

Students live on campus and participate in the day-to-day activity of community life, closely engaged with their peers, faculty, staff, emeritus fellowship members, and visiting luminaries. This community of learners is multigenerational and international, comprised primarily of architects, artists, and leaders within the organization. The culture of learning permeates all aspects of life as an student, including mealtimes, informal discussions, music, performance projects, social events, and routine maintenance.

Challenges

Resources

The School has operated on an extremely tight budget for a number of years. The School has a financial plan in place (see Section 3.10) that includes improving revenues and economies of scale by increasing tuition and enrollment. In both respects these are successfully being accomplished, and the reliance on support from the Foundation has markedly decreased. However, the Foundation remains a cash-poor institution, and limited resources have strained the School's ability to fund reasonable salaries for its faculty and staff, and prevented the School from hiring additional staff to reduce individual work loads. As well, the facilities in Arizona (though not Wisconsin) have suffered as a result of deferred maintenance (see *Facilities* concerns below).

As program enrollment increases, there will be an increased strain on faculty, staff, and facilities. The School is optimistic about its ability to hire additional faculty and staff to help accommodate growth, but needs to have resources to manage growth effectively.

Fundraising/Development

Between 2006 and mid-2009, the Foundation engaged the services of outside development counsel, and though this counsel provided a number of services to the

Foundation, the School benefited very little from their engagement. Despite the lack of external support for development and fundraising, the School continued to build its restricted funds (including endowment funds) at a rate of about 15% per year through the generosity of long-time supporters and alumni. In-kind support for School projects has increased markedly in recent years, with projects such as shelters and the Mod.Fab design/build project receiving substantial donations of materials and services.

Recently, the Foundation Board and Interim CEO have been proactive in bringing the School into the fundraising spotlight, as evidenced recently at a fundraising gala at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum where the School received equal billing with the Foundation and helped raise over \$400,000 after costs. The Foundation is run by an Interim President/CEO; during this time, School staff, faculty, and students continue to cultivate existing and potential donors, and the School is exploring an option to evolve a staff position to support the Dean in development, alumni relations, and other functions in coordination with Foundation staff.

Support functions of the Foundation

The Foundation and School work together in a number of reciprocal ways. At times in recent years, the School has experienced frustration in the areas of facilities management, human resource support, finance office support, and information technology support. These concerns are gradually being worked out with new Foundation leadership, but in some cases continue to be exacerbated by lack of resources.

Facilities

The campuses are a major part of the School's identity, and despite their architectural significance, their physical condition does not match the quality standards of the School's brand, particularly at Taliesin West. Though most of the publicly visible buildings at Taliesin West are in decent condition, much of the infrastructure and many of the non-public spaces used by faculty and students are in need of repair or expansion.

Improved locker room and housing facilities in Arizona would improve the living conditions of students commensurate with the expectations set by the increase in tuition. Faculty and staff housing is another critical need on both campuses, which would enable the School to be more competitive with its hiring practices and attract faculty with families or higher standard of living demands.

The Foundation is very aware of these needs. However, lack of facilities planning for the Taliesin West campus has set back any major future facilities improvements. To address that, School faculty and students have stepped in to fill a void, but this has not yet been fully integrated into the long term planning at the Foundation level. Particularly at Taliesin West, basic sustainability measures proposed by faculty and students have been inconsistently implemented, in part due to short resources, but also in part due to facility management shortcomings.

Leveraging Strengths

The School can increase its leadership role within architectural education, given its legacy, human and physical resources, and small size, in at least the following four areas:

- Sustainability
- Innovation through Design/Build

- Integrated Professional Practice
- Preservation Philosophy and Technology

Though certain accomplishments in these areas have been made in recent years, such as with the Mod.Fab design/build project and preservation work on the Wisconsin Campus, much more can be done to leverage strengths by hiring faculty and staff to realize the potential of these programs.

Professional Practice Opportunities for Students

Students often work with architects who are external to the organization. Although this has been beneficial in that it provides a range of opportunities for students and engagement with the practicing architectural community, it can also fragment the integrated and community-based experience that is a hallmark of the educational program. Work with external architects also has the possibility of reducing the School's ability to tailor an experience to a student's individual educational needs, to control the nature of the mentorship, and to adequately assess student learning.

To address this challenge, the School has worked closely with its external architects to orient them to the learning and assessment program. This effort has been moderately successful, but remains contingent on the fate of specific projects, many of which can be variable in nature and subject to the whims of particular clients.

Public Perception /Admissions

The School has engaged in a number of initiatives that aim to position the School as a forward-looking organization, such as the Mod.Fab and the exhibition of student shelters at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum. As well, the faculty, staff, and students have been very active with their respective professional organizations (ACSA, AIA, AIAS). However, in some cases there continues to be public misperception of the School as a relic of a past era, which undermines the changed nature of the institution. Ultimately, this affects numbers of applicants to the program, and rates are still below expectations, though on the increase.

Planning

The School has in place strategic planning documents that are regularly reviewed and updated, has a realistic financial plan in place, and has developed a prioritized list of facility improvements to address short-term needs. Until recently, the Foundation has not provided equivalent leadership in planning for the future. Despite having had a Vice President of Campus Planning, Restoration & Development for nearly two years, very little campus planning took place during this period, particularly at Taliesin West. A realistic, incremental, and sustainable strategy of planning will help the School address its goals for increased enrollment and program excellence. The School is willing and able to partner in these types of initiatives, as has been done in the successful integrated planning and restoration initiative with the estate manager on the Wisconsin campus.

Challenges Identified by the Higher Learning Commission during its 2007 Team Visit

The following concerns were identified by the 2007 HLC Visiting Team, who visited the School one week prior to the 2007 NAAB Visiting Team. Their comments and the School's responses are provided for informational purposes with the intention to

broaden the discussion of opportunities for institutional improvement.

From the 2007 HLC Visiting Team Report:

Governance and Administration.

There are a number of indications that the Foundation has attempted to deal with the issue of governance raised by the last team. There are by-laws; however, they do not fully outline the function of many of the office positions or the relationship among the Foundation Board, the Education Committee of the Board or different School personnel. The by-laws need considerable work and further development to define roles, relationships and responsibilities of the key personnel. Board and committee minutes should be more detailed. (Core Component 1d)

The CEO of the Foundation still functions as the President of the College and the Dean of the College works with—i.e. has a "dotted line" reportage—the Education Committee of the Board. It appears that the personalities are such that at this time the work of the College is respected by the Foundation Board. However, as the CEO of the Foundation is also the President of the College, this relationship sets a potential for confusion of roles and conflict of interests to arise. Many of the issues which are inherent in the present governance structure could be alleviated through the establishment of a separate governance board for the School. This board would operate under the Foundation Board, which could retain certain reserve powers. All functions would need to be clearly delineated within by-laws. (Core Component 1d)

School Response:

In the year following the receipt of the HLC Visiting Team Report, the School and Foundation took a series of steps that led to the approval in June 2008 of the creation of a School Board comprised of a majority of public members (refer to Governance Document, Section 3.11). The School Board has since its formation in September 2008 met regularly, three times per year.

A focused visit by the HLC in March 2009 determined that the formation of the School Board had adequately addressed these governance concerns.

From the 2007 HLC Visiting Team Report:

Planning, Financial, and Educational Resources.

The School's finances and its financial planning processes are too closely linked with those of the Foundation. This emerges from the existing governance structure, in which the School falls directly under Foundation authority, with limited self governance, and in which the School is merely one operational item on the Foundation's fiscal agenda. Interviews with the President, the Dean of the School and the Board Chairperson indicate that, currently, the School remains the "centerpiece" of the Foundation's fiscal planning. Nonetheless, for the School to become and remain self-sustaining, a greater degree of fiscal self governance is critical. (Core components 2a and 2b)

School Response:

The School Board is now driving the long-term financial planning of the School vis-a-vis the Foundation; this has promoted greater fiscal self-governance for the School and enables decisions made by School administrators, in concert with the School Board, to be implemented.

A focused visit by the HLC in March 2009 determined that changes in governance contributed to addressing this issue, although the visiting team recommended that the Foundation's financial condition continue to be monitored.

Since the 2009 HLC visit, the Foundation has taken a number of steps to improve its financial condition, including layoffs and realignment of certain positions. Throughout this process, the School has been largely immune to personnel cuts, though it was asked to limit non-essential expenditures. This process has underlined the commitment of Foundation leadership to the School and to the authority of the School Board.

For the upcoming 2009-10 academic year, the School is in line with its enrollment projections, promising to enable the School to achieve a more self-sustaining economy of scale and increased resources.

From the 2007 HLC Visiting Team Report:

Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge.

The institution needs to insure that its general education offerings derive from an overall understanding of what general education is supposed to accomplish. This understanding should undergird all general education requirements and should be articulated in institutional documents. For example, a writing requirement was recently added, emerging out of faculty perceptions about writing weaknesses in the student portfolios. While this is a good example of how the faculty uses the portfolios to assess student work on a comprehensive level, it is less clear about the relationship of this particular requirement to the School's Performance Criteria. (Core Component 4b)

The institution has established a solid baseline for general studies at FLLWSA in its identification of pre-requisites and distribution requirements within those; all bachelors degree students who are accepted at the School will have completed a minimum of 27 hours of general education. However, there is less structure for general studies coursework once students have matriculated at FLLWSA. The institution needs to insure that its general education has both appropriate distribution and appropriate levels within its general education and that its assessment processes reflect these. (Core Component 4b)

School Response:

The General Education ("Integrated Studies") component of the curriculum explores architecture in the context of nature, people, culture, and the environment. This generally happens in a more traditional class or workshop setting. The General Education curriculum provides depth and breadth in relation to:

- The fertility of imagination and cultivation of curiosity,
- the understanding of oneself and the world in which we live,
- the dimension of time and the lessons of precedent,
- the mapping of human knowledge, and
- the capacity to communicate clearly through writing, speaking, and listening.

Students are required to have completed a significant level of prerequisite coursework prior to acceptance in the degree programs, and are required to complete the equivalent of nine credit hours of general education (135 contact hours) while enrolled at the School (see section 3.12 for further discussion on this topic).

FINAL DRAFT

This page is left blank intentionally.

Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA
Principal & Director of Architecture
O'Brien Atkins Associates, PA
204 Hardwick Drive
Durham, NC 27713
(919) 941-9000 ext. 2020
(919) 941-9000 fax
kmontgomery@obrienatkins.com

Representing the ACSA
Lorraine Fowlow, MRAIC, Interim Dean
Faculty of Environmental Design
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive, NW
Calgary AB T2N 1N4
Canada

Representing the AIAS
Jessica A. Hester
607 S. Lahoma Avenue
Norman, OK 73701
(405) 943-7206
(405) 317-5706 mobile
jahester@ou.edu

Representing the AIA
Douglas L. Steidl, FAIA
2492 West Main Street
Peninsula, OH 44264
(330) 657-2152
(330) 963-3801 mobile
dlssrs72@roadrunner.com

Observer
Michael Des Barres
425 Holly Street
Denver, CO 80220
(608) 334-2661 mobile
Mjd2333@gmail.com

This page is left blank intentionally.

FINAL DRAFT

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture
Taliesin West
Scottsdale, AZ
February 25 – March 3, 2010

Team Room

Taliesin West Pavilion
12621 N. Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd.
Scottsdale, AZ 85259

Lodging

COURTYARD BY MARRIOTT - MAYO
13444 East Shea Boulevard
Scottsdale, Arizona 85259
480.860.4000
<http://www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/phxmy-courtyard-scottsdale-at-mayo-clinic/>

Team

Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA, representing NCARB (Team Visit Chair)
919.656.5507 cell

Arrive in Milwaukee	Thurs. 2.25.10	US Air flgt 3659	9:04 PM
Depart Milwaukee	Sat. 2.27.10	Aitran flgt 490	8:35 AM
Arrive in Phoenix	Sat 2.27.10	Airtran flgt 490	11:27 AM
Depart Phoenix	Wed 3.3.10	US Air flgt 1540	4:33 PM

Loraine Fowlow, representing the ACSA
403.819.6361 cell

Arrive in Milwaukee	Thurs. 2.25.10	Air Canada flgt 7939	5:25 PM
Depart Milwaukee	Sat. 2.27.10	Aitran flgt 490	8:35 AM
Arrive in Phoenix	Sat 2.27.10	Airtran flgt 490	11:27 AM
Depart Phoenix	Wed 3.3.10	Air Canada flgt 5140	1:20 PM

Douglas L Steidl, FAIA, representing the AIA
330-962-3801

Arrive in Phoenix	Sat 2.27.10	Continental flgt 189	11:26 AM
Depart Phoenix	Wed 3.3.10	Continental flgt 363	12:25 PM

Jessica Hester, representing the AIAS
405.317.5706 cell

Arrive in Phoenix	Sat 2.27.10	Southwest flgt 1486	1:55 PM
Depart Phoenix	Wed 3.3.10	Southwest flgt 132	5:45 PM

Michael Joseph DesBarres, Observer
608.334.2661 cell

Will arrive in Phoenix substantially prior to visit

School Contacts

Victor Sidy, AIA

Head of School and Dean
Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture
vsidy@taliesin.edu
608.588.4220 cell

Anne Maley

Chief Executive Officer
Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation
amaley@franklloydwright.org
520.780.6868 cell

Pamela Stefansson (Staff for Team Visit Logistics)

Director of Admissions & Financial Aid, Student Services, and Registrar
nikita@taliesin.edu
608.588.4770 cell

Thursday, February 25

Evening

Arrive in Wisconsin for Auxiliary Campus Site Visit
Montgomery, Fowlow, and Sidy

Overnight in Clarion Hotel Airport 5311 S. Howell Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53207

Friday, February 26

10:00 – 4:00

Auxiliary Campus Site Visit – Spring Green, Wisconsin
Travel time Milwaukee to Spring Green: approx 2 hours 15 min
Montgomery, Fowlow, and Sidy

Overnight in Clarion Hotel Airport 5311 S. Howell Ave., Milwaukee, WI 53207

Saturday, February 27

Morning

Flight from Milwaukee, WI (MKE) to Phoenix, AZ (PHX)
Montgomery, Fowlow, and Sidy

Afternoon

Team Arrival

2:00 pm

Team Room Visit
Montgomery and Sidy

5:00 – 6:30

Team Meeting - Hotel
Team

7:30

Dinner – ZuZu Restaurant at the Valley Ho Hotel
Team on its own

Sunday, February 28

- 7:30 – 9:00** **Breakfast** - Courtyard by Marriott - Mayo
Team and Sidy
- 9:15 – 11:00** **Facilities Tour**
Team and Sidy
- 11:00 – 12:00** **Introduction to Team Room**
Team and Sidy
- 12:00pm** **Lunch** – Dining Room
Team, Sidy, Board, Faculty and Staff
- 1:00 – 4:30** **Team Room Review**
Team
- 4:30 – 5:30** **School Board** – Board Room
- 5:30 – 7:30** **Reception / Dinner** – Sunset Terrace, Taliesin West
with Board, Alumni, Faculty, Staff, and AIAS Students

Monday, March 1

- 7:00 – 8:15** **Breakfast** – Courtyard by Marriott- Mayo
Team and Sidy
- 8:30 – 12:30** **Work Session/ Meetings** – Wes Peters' Room
8:30 – 9:30 Anne Maley, Interim CEO
9:30 – 10:00 Pamela Stefansson, Director of Admissions
10:00 – 10:30 Madalena Maestri, Education Coordinator
11:00 – 11:30 Ralph Phillips, Interim Development Director
11:30 – 12:00 Elizabeth Dawsari, Librarian + Tour of Library
12:00 – 12:30 Tour of Workshops and FLW Archives
- 12:30 – 1:00** **Lunch** – Board Room
Team with Faculty
- 1:00 – 2:00** **Faculty** – Board Room
- 2:00 – 4:45** **Work Session** – Team Room
Visit to Studios
* Sustainability I Class, 2:30 PM - 4:30 PM, Board Room
- 4:45 – 5:30** **Tour of Student Shelters**
- 5:30 – 6:30** **Students – Undergraduate and Graduate**
Team Room
- 7:00** **Dinner** – George Sons Restaurant
Team on its own

Tuesday, March 2

- 7:00 – 8:15** **Breakfast** - Courtyard by Marriott - Mayo

Team on Dean Sidy

- 8:30 – 12:30** **Work Session** – Team Room
 Technical Drawing Class 10:30 AM - 12:30 PM, Reading Room
- 12:30 – 1:30** **Lunch** – Dining Room
 Team with Students, Faculty and Staff
- 1:30 – 9:00** **Work Session** – Team Room
 * Hand Rendering 2:30 PM - 4:30 PM, Board Room
- 10:00** **Dinner** – Maggiano Restaurant
 Team on its own

Wednesday, March 3

- 7:30 – 8:30** **Breakfast** - Courtyard by Marriott - Mayo
 Team and Dean Sidy
- 8:30** **Hotel Check Out**
- 9:00 – 9:30** **Exit Meeting**
 Team with CEO Anne Maley
- 10:00 – 10:30** **Exit Meeting** with Faculty, Staff, and Students
 Team Room
- 10:30** **Team Departures**

* * *

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin G. Montgomery, FAIA
Team Chair

Representing the NCARB

Loraine Fowlow, MRAIC
Team member

Representing the ACSA

Jessica A. Hester
Team member

Representing the AIAS

Douglas L. Steidl, FAIA
Team member

Representing the AIA

Michael Des Barres
Observer