

**Frank Lloyd Wright**

**Interim Progress Report for 2017**

**Instructions and Template**

Submitted 11/30/2017

## **Contents**

1. Instructions and Template Guidelines
2. Executive Summary of the Most Recent Visit
3. Template
  - a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria
  - b. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
  - c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
  - d. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)
  - e. Appendix (include revised curricula, syllabi, and one-page CVs or bios of new administrators and faculty members; syllabi should reference which NAAB SPC a course addresses)

# 1. INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

## Purpose

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of interim progress reports at defined intervals after an eight-year or four-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

This narrative report, supported by documentation, covers three areas:

1. The program's progress in addressing not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, or Causes of Concern from the most recent Visiting Team Report.
2. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.
3. Responses to changes in the NAAB Conditions since your last visit (Note: Only required if Conditions have changed since your last visit)

## Supporting Documentation

1. The narrative should describe in detail all changes in the program made in response to not-met Conditions, Student Performance Criteria, and Causes of Concern.
2. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the anticipated contribution to the program for new hires and include either a narrative biography or one-page CV.
3. Provide detailed descriptions of changes to the curriculum that have been made in response to not-met Student Performance Criteria. Identify any specific outcomes expected to student performance. Attach new or revised syllabi of required courses that address unmet SPC.
4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the NAAB team at the next accreditation visit.

## Outcomes

IPRs are reviewed by a panel of three: one current NAAB director, one former NAAB director, and one experienced team chair.<sup>1</sup> The panel may make one of three recommendations to the Board regarding the interim report:

1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR.
2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies but require the program to provide additional information (e.g., examples of actions taken to address deficiencies).
3. Reject the interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year but not more than three years, thereby shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified and a copy sent to the program administrator. A schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an Architecture Program Report. The annual statistical report (see Section 9 of the 2015 Conditions) is still required.

## Deadline and Contacts

IPRs are due on November 30. They are submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report System (ARS). Contact Kesha Abdul Mateen ([kabdul@naab.org](mailto:kabdul@naab.org)) with questions.

## Instructions

1. Type all responses in the designated text areas.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format. Pages should be numbered.
3. Reports are limited to 25 pages/10 MBs.
4. Supporting documentation should be included in the body of the report.
5. Student work is not to be submitted as documentation for a two-year IPR.

---

<sup>1</sup> The team chair will not have participated in a team during the year in which the original decision on a term of accreditation was made.

## 2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF 2015 NAAB VISIT

### CONDITIONS NOT MET

<b>2015 VTR</b>
None

### STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

<b>2015 VTR</b>
A. 11 Applied Research
B. 1 Pre-Design
B. 4 Site Design

### CAUSES OF CONCERN

<b>2015 VTR</b>
Fiduciary Independence
Growth of Program and Facilities
Administrative Structure and Governance

### 3. TEMPLATE

**Interim Progress Report**  
**Frank Lloyd Write**  
**School of Architecture**  
**M. Arch. [undergraduate degree + 72 credits]**  
*Last APR submission: September 5, 2014*  
*Year of the previous visit: 2015*

*Please update contact information as necessary since the last APR was submitted.*

**Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located:** Chris Lasch; Director of Academic Affairs

**Provost:** N/A

**President of the institution:** Aaron Betsky, President

**Individual submitting the Interim Progress Report:** Robin Vanhof, Director of Admissions and Student Services

**Name of individual(s) to whom questions should be directed:** Aaron Betsky, President

**Current term of accreditation:** 8-year term

Text from the most recent VTR or APR is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

#### a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria

##### A.11 Applied Research

*2015 Visiting Team Assessment:* Consistently in low-pass work, the team did not find evidence that students were applying investigative skills at the required ability level, and the criterion is, therefore, Not Met. However, the high-pass work in the Final Box Project and the Capstone Project did illustrate applied investigative skills, but there was not sufficient evidence that all the students were meeting this criterion.

This criterion calls for ***understanding*** the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** The School's approach to addressing its Not-Met A.11 Applied Research SPC (now C.1 Research under the NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation) involves realignment of the School's curriculum with regard to NAAB SPC C.1 Research. It is introducing research methodologies earlier in the curriculum, and instituting a new course "Pre-Thesis Seminar" designed specifically to initiate students into a range of theoretical and applied research methodologies for architectural design. The course matrix submitted as part of our 2015 APR claimed to address A.11 Applied Research in the following courses: Research studio, Final Box Project or Capstone Thesis To better address architectural Research and to align with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, the School now addresses C1. Research through the following courses: Studio 1 (Primary), Studio 2 (Secondary), Architectural History 1 (Secondary), Architectural History 2 (Secondary), Pre-Thesis Seminar (Primary) As noted in the updated NAAB curriculum alignment, the School is now introducing research in the first design studio, setting the foundation of a research-based design process that students will develop throughout their time at the School. For example, recent introductory studio exercises have involved precedent research of iconic pieces of residential architecture where students first analyze key aspects of a chosen work, such as historical context, circulation, envelope, spatial relations etc., and are then asked to apply their research through a creative transformation of their precedent. The aim of this exercise is to introduce the role of applied research in the design process and provide research-based design methodologies within the context of an elemental architectural type of a manageable scale, the home. The School is committed to ensuring that an understanding of research practices in architecture extends throughout the student body, acknowledging the visiting team's observation that applied investigative skills were largely evidenced only in high-pass work associated with Capstone or Final Box Projects. By introducing research practices early in the curriculum and regularly expanding on and reinforcing this material as students' progress, the School aims to develop a robust research culture that all students draw from as they embark on their advanced studios and Thesis projects toward the end of their matriculation. The School has also instituted a new class devoted to exploring research traditions and practices in architecture in the form of a thesis preparation class called Pre-Thesis Seminar. As noted in detail in the response to B1. Pre-design below, the School's Thesis Program is now focused on the design, construction and inhabitation of small student shelters installed on the School's campus. Students are required to formulate a scalable theoretical position that is explored and evidenced through the design and construction of a small structure but expounded upon through additional design documents and an extensive written component. Pre-Thesis is designed to give students the historical, theoretical and methodological background to help prepare them to formulate, research and apply an original thesis developed through a comprehensive creative project that includes writing, design and construction. Evidence attached includes the School's NAAB Course Matrix as included with its last APR in 2015, its current NAAB Course Matrix along with syllabi for the current courses noted in this narrative. The evidence also includes relevant project or exercise descriptions if referred to in the narrative. In an effort to further clarify course content and its relationship to NAAB SPCs, the School introduced a new syllabus template in the Fall of 2017. All courses are migrating to this format but some of the evidence attached

here may pre-date the syllabus template or may not yet be utilizing the template. In addition, a policy detailing the School's Thesis program as described above is still in process. The policy is scheduled to be completed before the start of the Spring 2018 semester. In order to give reviewers a general sense of the current process involved with building a student shelter on campus, a current shelter program handbook along with a sample evaluation form are included with this report. Syllabus Studio 1 – Fa 2016 Studio 2 – Sp. 2017 History 1 – Fa 2017 -History 2 – Sp 2017 – Pre-Thesis – Sp 2017 Matrix 2015 Matrix 2016

## B.1 Pre-Design

*2015 Visiting Team Assessment:* The team did not find evidence in coursework that students had achieved the ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including items such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, and an analysis of site conditions and their implications for the project. While the Codes course covered some of this information, there was not sufficient evidence that students had achieved the ability level required.

This criterion demands **ability** to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** The School's approach to addressing B.1 Pre-Design, includes aligning an expanded array of courses throughout the curriculum to progressively expose students to the many dimensions of Pre-Design activities. The course matrix submitted as part of our 2015 APR claimed to address B1. Pre-Design in the following courses: Foundation Studio (now referred to as Studio 1), Codes. Since our last NAAB visit, the School has updated the alignment of its course curriculum with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. In addition, the School has instituted a progressive system of student SPC engagement in the form of Primary Criteria (Must Evidence) and Secondary Criteria (Could Evidence). This more nuanced approach to addressing SPCs allows for progressively formative and summative assessment of an SPC and gives instructors more flexibility, allowing them to address aspects of a particular SPC as best fits the overall content of their course and their particular disciplinary specialty. The current list of courses aligned with B1. Pre-Design are Studio 2 (Secondary), Studio 3 (Secondary), Studio 5 Integrated Design Studio (Secondary), Landscape 1 - Landscape Architecture Workshop (Primary), Sustainability 1 - Principles of Sustainability (Secondary), Codes (Secondary), Landscape 2 - Landscape Integration (Primary), Sustainability 2 (Secondary). This curriculum-wide distribution of B1 helps the School to ensure a comprehensive engagement with Pre-Design activities including assessment of client and user needs, inventory of space and equipment requirements, and site analysis. Site analysis includes both an assessment of the existing natural and human-made conditions that might impact the project as well as the legal and regulatory environment in which a project exists. To examine a site's legal and regulatory environment, the Codes course allows students to exercise Pre-design code application activities given the limited set of information typically available during this phase. This includes owner supplied information such as a list of programmed spaces and their approximate locations, a property plan, and an approximate building height in stories. Given this information Pre-design code analysis involves 8 of the 28 steps code application steps involved in the entire design process. These Pre-design activities include determining applicable codes, occupancy groups, special uses and occupancies, determining allowable height and area, and calculating approximate occupant load among other tasks. In addition to ongoing curriculum alignment and review, the School has initiated two programs that provide students opportunities for

engagement in Pre-Design work. In January of 2016, the School started a four-year engagement with the twin communities of Globe and Miami, Arizona. These are rural towns that have experienced a hollowing out of their industrial base and decrease in their population in recent years, contributing to a dereliction of their historic downtown cores. The School has committed to initiating four-years of design studios aimed at the development of small-scale design interventions that probe the potential roles that architecture might play in community-led urban revitalization. As part of this program, students do extensive field work in the assessment of user needs. They do this through programmatic research, by looking into historical and contemporary occupancy and use patterns, and by direct engagement with residents and stakeholders through interviews, surveys and more informal engagement with the community. Over the course of the program, students have been responsible for site evaluation and selection for projects ranging from event based projects to small temporary or permanent design interventions to significant adaptive reuse projects. Beginning with the graduating class of 2019, student Thesis is being reformulated around the School of Architecture at Taliesin's Student Shelter Program. While they are at Taliesin West in Scottsdale, Arizona throughout the fall and spring months, the vast majority of the School's students live in student-built shelters scattered in the Sonoran Desert around the campus. These small structures, designed and built by students in response to the landscape and desert climate, have been a hallmark of the program since its inception in the 1930s. As the focus of the student Thesis Program, students will formulate the entirety of their shelter project themselves, from site selection through space and use programming through to design, construction and inhabitation (students are required to live in their shelters for a minimum of three months). All of this work will happen within a regime of broad and scalable architectural ideas that are first embodied and tested through the creation –or, more often, recreation of existing shelters that are disused-- of these small, environmentally astute dwellings, but which also might form the foundation of a critical practice that students develop throughout their careers. The ability to initiate and execute a small comprehensive project while still at the School will provide a rigorous platform for student to investigate Pre-Design in a holistic manner. As noted in the answer to A.11 Applied Research, a policy detailing the School's Thesis program as described above is still in process. The policy is scheduled to be completed before the start of the Spring 2018 semester. In order to give reviewers a general sense of the current process involved with building a student shelter on campus, a current shelter program handbook along with a sample evaluation form are included with this report. Evidence: All relevant syllabi (B.1.!), Studio 3 for landscape integration, NAAB Matrix, Current Capstone description, Shelter building process policy, GM year-end report, Syllabus template

#### B.4 Site Design

*2015 Visiting Team Assessment:* The team did not find evidence in coursework that students had achieved the ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, and watershed in the development of a project design. Projects in the Comprehensive Design Studio and other projects were primarily on level sites, and coursework in the First/ Foundation Design Studio and the Sustainability class did not provide sufficient evidence of this ability.

This criterion demands **ability** to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** Over the past two years, the School has worked to address its Not-met B.4 Site Design SPC (Now B.2 Site Design per NAAB 2014 Conditions for Accreditation) by re-aligning its curriculum, incorporating two new classes designed to focus on issues of site and landscape specifically, and adjusting the content of courses tasked with evidencing Site Design, including directly addressing observations made by the visiting team in 2015. The course matrix submitted as part of our 2015 APR claimed to address B4. Site Design in the following courses: Foundation Studio (now referred to as Studio 1), Sustainability To better address Site Design and to align with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, the School now addresses Site Design through the following courses: Studio 1 (Secondary), Studio 3 (Primary), Studio 4 (Secondary), Communicate Design 1 (Secondary),

Landscape 1 - Landscape Architecture Workshop (Primary), Landscape 2 - Landscape Integration (Primary), Sustainability 2 (Secondary), Structures 2 (Secondary), Reading the Landscape, Elective (Secondary) The School has instituted two new Core (required) classes, Landscape 1 - Landscape Architecture Workshop and Landscape 2 - Landscape Integration (starting in the Spring of 2017 Landscape Integration has been integrated into Studio 4, to better provide communication of site and landscape issues in the advanced design studio). These two landscape classes had existed as elective workshops in years prior, but have now been integrated into the core curriculum. They focus on introducing students to site analysis and design, including the examination of site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation and watershed, with an emphasis on regional sustainability practices in landscape design. The 2015 visiting team remarked on the relative simplicity of the project sites chosen as the subject of the School's design studios, wherein students were presented with primarily level sites. In the four semesters since the Team Report was delivered, the School has endeavored to present more challenging sites, both in terms of topography and urban conditions, as the basis of design projects. These sites have ranged from the suburban sprawl of Phoenix, Arizona to dense urban sites in Manhattan and downtown Chicago. They also include a hillside site in rural Miami, Arizona and the McDowell Mountain Park, a vast desert wilderness on the outskirts of Scottsdale, Arizona. While the School is committed to exposing students to a variety of site conditions in places around the world, we are also developing a rigorous regional approach to site that is informed by the diverse places and landscapes that surround our three historic campuses, from the rolling hills of the rural Wisconsin around Taliesin, to the rugged deserts at Taliesin West, to our future new learning site at the David and Gladys Wright House in central Phoenix, the fastest growing urban area in the United States. By leveraging its three locations, the School is in a good position to offer its students a deep first-hand engagement with a diversity of project sites. Evidence: NAAB matrices, syllabi

#### **b. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern**

- **Fiduciary Independence**

*2015 Visiting Team Comments:* According to recent changes in the HLC accreditation requirements, the school must transition to fiduciary independence, which will require a change in governance and the way the school receives funding. As of now, a clear understanding or assurance regarding the future funding of the program has not emerged; however, the ongoing plan and negotiations that are underway are expected to address the matter in the near future. Without resolution of the requirement for the school's fiduciary independence, the HLC accreditation will not be extended beyond July 2016.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** As of August 1, 2017, the School of Architecture at Taliesin (formerly the Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture) is an independent subsidiary of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, with full control over all its own academic, institutional, and financial matters. It is incorporated in the State of Arizona and is currently in the process of acquiring status from the Internal Revenue Service as a 501(c)3 organization. The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) approved the transfer of its accreditation to the new entity in February of 2017, and the Arizona Post-Secondary Commission (APSC) did so in August of 2017. We informed the NAAB of these (then pending) approvals in March of 2017. In order to achieve this status, the School first engaged in an extensive review of its academic, institutional, and financial systems and standards, a process that was underway during the NAAB visit. The School answered specific questions from the HLC about these systems and standards over a two-year period, and adjusted them as necessary to fulfill HLC criteria. At the same time, the School raised \$2.1 million by December 31, 2015. The amount raised in 2015 and beyond fully offsets projected losses through 2019 as the School rebuilds its student body size, which has shrunk drastically during the period of uncertainty about the School's future in 2013-2015. The Foundation and the School have also both signed a Memorandum of Understanding that lays out the two organizations' relationship moving forward, guaranteeing the School the use of its historic campuses of Taliesin and Taliesin West.

Since January, 2016, the School has continued to raise money, both for its continued operations and to build an endowment with the dual purpose of funding future facility improvements and increasing the amount of monies available for scholarships. The current endowment stands at around \$800,000, with a goal of \$5 million by 2023. The School is operating on a five-year budget that foresees scenarios for high, and low enrollment, and scales investments in both personnel and facilities to the realization of these goals. The School's projections, backed up by extensive peer analyses, market research, and cost calculations, shows that it will be able to support ongoing operations with an enrollment of 45 students, and it aims to reach this goal no later than 2023 while continuing to raise funds for operations in the meantime. It just recently received a pledge of \$1 million, which will largely cover such expenses through this period. Having received approval of its Change of Control from the HLC, the School of Architecture at Taliesin now looks forward to a reaffirmation visit from the HLC in February of 2018, which we hope and trust will lead to a five-year reaccreditation.

- **Growth of Program and Facilities**

*2015 Visiting Team Comments:* The Long-Term Plan and vision for the school includes growth in the number of students from the current 18-20 students to 40-45 students, as well as growth in the number of faculty members. As a result of that potential growth, the visiting team is concerned about gender equality and the possibility that the existing facilities and the restrictions imposed by campus preservation may limit the ability to accomplish this goal. The need for increased facilities includes student and staff living accommodations, shower and locker space, studio space, equipment, digital resources, shops, and designated student parking.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** As part of the process of gaining its independence, the School of Architecture created several related documents that lay out the current and future state of its facilities. First, the Memorandum of Understanding, signed with the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, defines exactly which areas the School may use either exclusively or in a sharing arrangement with the Foundation. The Foundation also pledges to maintain these spaces. They are currently adequate for the student body, and will remain so until the student count rises above thirty. The School has also produced a Facility Plan, linked to its multi-year budget, that outlines the nature, timing, and funding of future facility enlargements and upgrades as the student body grows. However, in the meantime, the School recognizes that it needs to improve several of those facilities. During the spring and summer of 2017, it created new digital and power tool shops at both Taliesin and Taliesin West. However, these facilities both need further expansion and outfitting, and the School has reserved funds in its budgets over the next three years to effect such increases in the quality and quantity of both space and tools. The students have expressed a strong desire for a exclusively designated student lounge at Taliesin West, and this space is currently being planned, although funding is still a year away. The third priority for facilities will be improvements in both female and male locker and shower facilities at Taliesin West, which are currently planned for subsequent years. The School has not found a need to define specific student parking spaces, as the Foundation has produced an overall parking plan that envisions sufficient space for students. Studio and classroom spaces are currently fully adequate, though the Foundation plans major renovations to the Taliesin West facility in coming years. The School has worked with the Foundation to ensure that its renovation plans take full account of the School's needs in the future wherever possible. In June of 2017, the School also received the promised use of the David and Gladys Wright House, a structure Frank Lloyd Wright designed for one of his sons, and which sits on a six-acre site in Arcadia, about twenty minutes away from Taliesin West. The House will be given to a new Foundation for the School of Architecture at Taliesin to be administered by the Arizona Community Foundation. This Foundation's charge is to raise the funds the School needs for both academic purposes and student and faculty facilities. The School worked with the donor to produce a Business Plan that foresees the House being self-sustaining through tours and rentals once this work is complete and the funds have been raised, and the gift will only take place at that time. In the meantime, however, the School is free to use the facility for events, academic purposes, and housing, and is doing so currently. The School of Architecture recognizes that it is not nearly diverse enough in its student, faculty, or staff make-up as it should be to

serve its audience and communities. As the Visitation Team noted, the issue of gender imbalance is particularly troubling in comparison with peer institutions, and the School has identified measures for addressing this imbalance in its Recruitment Plan, while also paying special attention to the needs of women in its Facility Plan. For the 2017-2018 academic year, over half of the incoming students were female, and the School looks forward to maintaining this balance in the future while also addressing imbalances in racial and economic background.

- **Administrative Structure and Governance**

*2015 Visiting Team Comments:* The administrative structure and governance of the program are adequate for the program as they currently stand. However, until the final negotiation of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Foundation and the School Board is finalized and accepted, the status of these two factors is still in a state of flux.

**FLW, 2017 Response:** As part of the transition to independent status, the School of Architecture has also developed its own administrative structure and governance. In February of 2015, it hired Aaron Betsky as its Dean. Betsky brought several decades of both administrative and teaching experience to the position, and coordinated the efforts that led to the School achieving its independence, while also teaching at the School. After the Change of Control was implemented in August of 2017, he transitioned to the role of President, leading the School as its Chief Executive Officer. In July of 2016, the School hired Chris Lasch, a renowned academic and architect, as its Academic Coordinator, and he took charge of curricular issues. In August of 2017, Lasch transitioned to the role of Dean, taking full control of such matters. In June of 2017, the School also hired its first Chief Financial Officer, Lisa Murphy, who was previously Chief Financial Officer and Chief Operating Officer of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. Other personnel now include the Director of Development, Jason Donofrio, the Director of Admissions, Robin Vanhof, the Director of Residence Life, Jason Silverman, and the School's Administrative Coordinator, Tasha Thompson. The multi-year budget foresees increasing this staff as the student body grows. Upon completion of the Change of Control, the advisory Board of Directors transitioned into a Board of Governors with full fiduciary control. Going forward, up to one-third of its members will be appointed by the Board of the Foundation, while the remainder will come from the Board of Governors' own Board development. In effecting this transition, the School staff and Board worked to insure the presence of adequate financial, institutional, and professional knowledge, while also creating a plan that looks towards improving Board diversity, financial capacity, and knowledge of the field of architecture. The Board of Governors had its first meeting in October of 2017 and immediately set about laying the groundwork for a Strategic Plan, which it has asked staff to complete by the end of the 2017-2018 academic year.

**c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program**

*Please report such changes as the following: faculty retirement/succession planning; administration changes (dean, department chair, provost); changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures); new opportunities for collaboration; changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures); significant changes in educational approach or philosophy; changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building planned, cancellation of plans for new building).*

**FLW, 2017 Response:** As part of the transition to independent status, the School of Architecture has also developed its administrative structure and governance. In February of 2015, it hired Aaron Betsky as its Dean. Betsky brought several decades of both administrative and teaching experience to the position, and coordinated the efforts that led to the School achieving its independence, while also teaching at the School. After the Change of Control was implemented in August of 2017, he transitioned to the role of President, leading the School as its Chief Executive Officer. In July of 2016, the School hired Chris Lasch, a renowned academic and architect, as its Academic Coordinator, and he took charge of curricular issues. In August of 2017, Lasch transitioned to the role of Dean, taking full control of such matters. In June of 2017, the School also hired its first Chief Financial Officer, Lisa

Murphy, who was previously Chief Financial Officer and Chief Operating Officer of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. Other personnel now include the Director of Development, Jason Donofrio, the Director of Admissions, Rob Vanhof, the Director of Residence Life, Jason Silverman, and the School's Administrative Coordinator, Tasha Thompson. The multi-year budget foresees increasing this staff as the student body grows. Core faculty currently consists of Chris Lasch, Matthew Trzebiatowski, and Ron Geren, as well as a Visiting Teaching Fellow who changes every semester. Michael DesBarres and Ari Georges are no longer members of the faculty. Current student enrollment stands at fourteen and will rise to seventeen in January of 2018. The linked Recruitment Plan and multi-year budget foresee student enrollment rising to twenty-five for the 2018-2019 Academic Year. Over the last three years, the School of Architecture has developed an extensive collaboration with the twin communities of Miami and Globe, Arizona. Located an hour drive to the east of the campus at Taliesin West, these are depressed mining communities with highly diverse populations. The School is committed to four years (2016-2020) of research and development, leading to the creating of small-scale tactical improvements to the environment of these two towns. Currently, a pollinator garden in Globe is under construction, and plans for improvements in that town's main street are under funding review. During the Spring of 2017, students designed proposed renovations for the former Inspiration High School building in Miami, and those are currently under feasibility study with the help of local architects. In addition, the School is working with faculty members on the design of a Unitarian Church in Tucson and a Desert Discovery Center in Scottsdale. Planning is underway for similar projects in and near Taliesin in Wisconsin. In June of 2017, the School also received the promised use of the David and Gladys Wright House, a structure Frank Lloyd Wright designed for one of his sons, and which sits on a six-acre site in Arcadia (a Phoenix neighborhood), about twenty minutes away from Taliesin West. The House will be given to a new Foundation for the School of Architecture at Taliesin to be administered by the Arizona Community Foundation. This Foundation's charge is to raise the funds the School needs for both academic purposes and student and faculty facilities. The School worked with the donor to produce a Business Plan that foresees the House being self-sustaining through tours and rentals once this work is complete and the funds have been raised, and the gift will only take place at that time. In the meantime, however, the School is free to use the facility for events, academic purposes, and housing, and is doing so currently. Starting in the Fall of 2015, the School has organized its Taliesin Forum lectures series. Funded by the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the History of Art and the Rio Salado Architecture Foundation, these highly successful events have brought architects ranging from Frank Gehry to Thom Mayne to Liz Diller and Ric Scofidio to the School, while also showcasing the work of younger and experimental designers. These events are free and open to an invited public. In addition, during 2017 the School organized three symposia in honor of Frank Lloyd Wright's 150th birthday; one on Wright's influence around the world; one on the current meaning of organic architecture; and one on shelter. These events are currently being prepared for publication. Inspired by the Taliesin Forum, students have started their own magazine, Wash, whose second issue will appear by the end of 2017. In the summer of 2015, the faculty, with participation from students and other stakeholders, intensified its review and streamlining of the curriculum. This led to revisions that make the course of study clearer, as well as better aligned with both NAAB criteria and the School's mission. After approval by the Board, these changes were implemented starting in the fall of 2015. They clarify the sequence of studios and ensure the correct placement of support courses in the curriculum. They also institute a thesis project, built around the School's traditional shelter design and construction, which will be fully implemented during the 2018-2019 academic year. A formalization of the Architecture Projects credits, which mandates students' participation in community design-build work, was instituted in the fall of 2017. These changes in the curriculum were also aligned with a more formalized assessment process.