

School of Architecture at Taliesin

Interim Progress Report for Year Five

Instructions and Template

November 30, 2020

Contents

1. Instructions and Template Guidelines
2. Executive Summary of the Two Most Recent NAAB Visits: 2009 and 2015
3. Template
 - a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria identified in the review of the Interim Progress Report for Year 2
 - b. Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
 - c. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
 - d. Summary of Preparations for Adapting to 2020 NAAB Conditions
 - 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; samples of required student work).
4. Requirements for the Use of Digital Content in Interim Progress Reports

1. INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES

Purpose

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of interim progress reports at defined intervals of 2 years and 5 years after an eight-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

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

1. The program's progress in addressing not-met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria (SPC) from the Interim Progress Report Year 2 review.
2. Progress in Addressing Causes for Concern.
3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program.
4. Summary of Preparations for Adapting to 2020 NAAB Conditions.

Supporting Documentation

1. The narrative should describe in detail all changes in the program made in response to not-met Conditions and Student Performance Criteria, including detailed descriptions of changes to the curriculum that have been made in response to not-met SPC that were identified in the review of the Interim Progress Report Year 2. Identify any specific outcomes expected to student performance. Attach new or revised annotated syllabi identifying changes for required courses that address unmet SPC.
2. Evidence of student work is only required to address deficiencies in the following cases: (1) If there are any SPCs that have not been met for two consecutive visits; (2) If there are three not-met SPCs in the same realm in the last visit.
 - Provide three examples of minimum-pass work for each deficiency and submit student work evidence to the NAAB in electronic format. (Refer to the "Guidelines for Submitting Digital Content in IPRs" for the required format and file organization.)
 - All student work evidence must be labeled and clearly annotated so that each example cross-references the specific SPC being evaluated and shows compliance with that SPC.
3. 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.
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.¹ 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 report of the Interim Progress Report Year 2.
2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies but require the program to provide additional information (e.g., actions taken to address deficiencies). This report shall be due within six weeks of the receipt of this outcome report.
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, thereby shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified and a copy of the decision 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 2014 Conditions) is still required.

¹ 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.

Deadline and Contacts

IPRs are due on November 30. They shall be submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report System (ARS). As described in Section 10 of the 2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation "...the program will be assessed a fine of \$100.00 per calendar day until the IPR is submitted." If the IPR is not received by January 15 the program will automatically receive Outcome 3 described above. Email questions to forum@naab.org.

Instructions

1. Reports shall be succinct and are limited to 40 pages/20 MBs, including supporting documentation.
2. Type all responses in the designated text areas.
3. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format. Pages should be numbered.
4. Supporting documentation should be included in the body of the report.
5. Remove the #4 "Requirements for the Use of Digital Content in Interim Progress Reports" pages before submitting the interim progress report.

2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE TWO MOST RECENT NAAB VISITS: 2015 and 2012

CONDITIONS NOT MET

2015 VTR	2012 VTR
None	None

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA NOT MET

2015 VTR	2012 VTR
A. 11 Applied Research	A. 4 Technical Documentation
B. 1 Pre-Design	B. 2 Accessibility
B. 4 Site Design	B. 6 Comprehensive Design
	B. 10 Building Envelope Systems
	B. 12 Building Materials and Assemblies Integration

CAUSES OF CONCERN

2015 VTR	2012 VTR
Fiduciary Independence	Preservation Efforts at Taliesin West
Growth of Program and Facilities	Planning for Growth
Administrative Structure and Governance	Student Recruitment
	Faculty Balance
	Technology

3. TEMPLATE

Interim Progress Report Year 5
School of Architecture at Taliesin
M. Arch. [pre-requisite undergraduate degree plus 79 graduate credits]

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:

Name: Chris Lasch
Title: President
Email Address: clasch@theschoolofarchitecture.edu
Physical Address: 8776 E Shea Blvd, Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Any questions pertaining to this submission will be directed to the chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located.

Chief academic officer for the Institution:

Name: Stephanie Lin
Title: Dean
Email Address: slin@theschoolofarchitecture.edu
Physical Address: 8776 E Shea Blvd, Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Text from the previous VTR and IPR Year 2 Review is in the gray text boxes. Type your response in the designated text boxes.

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

a. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Conditions

N/A

b. Progress in Addressing Not-Met Student Performance Criteria

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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 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

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

Since the School's 2017 NAAB IPR, it has continued to assess and fine tune its approach to addressing Pre-Design within its curriculum. The School has made several changes in this respect.

1. The Codes course is now a Primary evidence source for Pre-Design. The School has updated its SPC matrix to promote ARC-621: Codes to the status of Primary evidence, based on the activities undertaken in that course to understand the regulatory environment in which a project unfolds, as described in the School's 2017 IPR.
2. In addition to other design studios throughout the curriculum, the School has also added the first semester of its design-build Thesis course to the SPC Matrix for Pre-Design. During that semester, students practice elements of their prior learning in the Codes course. At both Taliesin and Taliesin West, the student shelter-building landscape has been designated by the local authorities under an "experimental architecture" zoning, meaning that, as long as work is conducted under the supervision of the School and its faculty, the School's 144 SF student shelters, which do not include power or plumbing, do not require a permit. However, the School and the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation has devised a series of internal regulations and processes to ensure that structural and other life-safety issues are reviewed and assessed for compliance. As part of the learning program, this process is designed to mimic a professional permit review process as closely as possible. During the preparation of their construction documents, students must evidence that they have understood and applied the pre-design regulations and standards required for building on campus. They must show that their project takes account of regulations including building footprint and size limitations, material standards

for safety and health, engineering -- especially structural approvals, site restrictions, etc. Students must also include a site selection rationale, as-built drawings and a site analysis.

In addition, though the student thesis shelter brief is limited essentially to housing for only for the student herself, it also functions as a proof-of-concept for larger ideas for how to live in the modern world. The final exercise of the Thesis is to extend the ideas that underly it through the design of a speculative project sited in the real world at a place of the student's choosing. The student must design the whole of the project program for themselves in consultation with faculty and their thesis advisor.

3. ARC-622: Contracts added new content to this year's syllabus to address Pre-Design, helping students learn to assess a project's sustainability requirements. During a class exercise, students roleplay between Owner and Architect, they practice articulating sustainability requirements and planning to achieve the best mix of sustainability measures and alternative energy sources for the project.

Also, in this class, students practice drafting the AIA B103 Agreement between Owner and Architect by drafting a speculative contract for their current design studio project. They explore the description of existing site conditions through incorporation of ALTA survey documentation, annotated site adjacency mapping of existing structures, and written narratives about site conditions that affect the Project. In that same assignment, students examine existing Owner programming for the studio project and explore refinement of it as a preliminary task before contracting, as well as part of the scope of Basic Services under the Agreement they are drafting.

4. ARC-721 Construction Documents Technology (CDT) is a course at the School which looks at the life cycle of a construction project from conception to facility management and how construction documents are used throughout the process with a focus on the role of the architect. The course now includes a module of lectures assessed through a quiz that covers the following as the second module in the course:

Owner requirements and design objectives

- Service life and facility management requirements
- BIM requirements
- Due diligence investigations
- Project cost and schedule considerations
- Site evaluation and selection
- Facility programming and performance criteria
- Preparing for commissioning

5. Beginning in the Fall of 2017, the School has added ARC-723: Urbanism to the curriculum. In this course, students learn about the history and dynamics of urban form through each of the key development industry segments. They learn how to evaluate districts and sites based on their physical constraints, urban context, and connectivity. Students gain insight as to how basic human needs and tendencies shape the urban form; the same principles may be used in the design of individual buildings. Finally, with an understanding of the basic development rules, students grapple with how to propose new "rules" to find new forms and paradigms. This new course also helps to address its delivery of SPC B.4 Site Design.

6. Landscape 2: Landscape Integration has now been incorporated into our comprehensive ARC 602: Integrated Design Studio, which has moved from the 7th to the 5th semester. This integration is achieved by creating a collaborative teaching environment with the lead design instructor in coordination with the School's Landscape Architecture instructor within the same design studio and project. This is meant to include site and landscape issues as core components of the overall building design brief and, within the context of a comprehensive design studio, to echo the process that students are likely to encounter in the profession. One of the first assignments in the course called "Understanding Site" asks the students to work in pairs or small groups and research the project site's physical, cultural, and environmental conditions. Outputs include site plan models, plan and section drawings, diagrams, and mappings of the cultural context.

7. Building on the School's 4-year community design project sited in Globe-Miami, AZ, as noted in the School's 2017 IPR, the School has continued to engage regularly in community design projects. The School believes that these types of projects engaging diverse groups of real-world stakeholders are excellent exercises in Pre-Design for our students. For example, in the fall of 2018, the School participated in the design of a new public park in Bartlesville, OK. The new park connects Frank Lloyd Wright's iconic Price Tower to the nearby community center, designed by one of Wright's apprentices. The project began with a two-day public listening session convened by the School's students and faculty to learn about the history of the site along with community's hopes and requirements for the new park. After gathering public input and analysis of the site and surrounding context, the students embarked on a three-day design charrette that culminated in a public presentation to a town committee tasked with overseeing the process along with the general public. Feedback from this presentation was incorporated into subsequent design refinements. The park is now complete and open as of the summer of 2020. More information can be found at <https://www.unitysquarebville.com/>.

Pre-Design aligned courses:

- ARC 502: Studio 2 (Secondary)
- ARC 601: Studio 3 (Secondary)
- ARC 602: Integrated Design Studio, with Landscape Integration (Primary)
- ARC 541: Landscape 1 - Landscape Architecture Workshop (Primary)
- ARC-551: Sustainability 1 - Principles of Sustainability (Secondary)
- ARC-621 Codes (Primary)
- ARC 651: Sustainability 2, Applied Sustainability (Secondary)
- ARC-721 Construction Documents Technology (CDT) (Secondary)
- ARC-723: Urbanism (Secondary)
- ARC-731 Shelter Thesis – Design/Construct (Secondary)
- ARC-622: Contracts: Ethics of Construction Contracting

Relevant Supporting Documents Attached to this Report

- Updated NAAB SPC Curriculum Matrix
- ARC 602 Integrated Design Studio, with Landscape Integration syllabus
- ARC-621 Codes Syllabus
- ARC-622 Contracts Syllabus
- ARC-721 Construction Documents Technology (CDT) syllabus

- ARC-723 Urbanism Syllabus
- ARC-731 Shelter Thesis Syllabus

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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 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

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

Since the School's 2017 NAAB IPR it has continued to fine tune its curriculum and SPC matrix to better address B.2 Site Design (per the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation). Three significant changes involve:

1. As noted in the response to B.1 above, rearranging the design studio sequence to allow

for a year-long, two-studio sequence for our design-build thesis focused on the research, design, construction and inhabitation of an approximately 144 SF student shelter. Students still complete seven design studios (including a summer studio) within 3.5 years but Studio 4 has been replaced by ARC-731: Thesis - Design/Construct.

2. Landscape 2 – Landscape Integration has now been incorporated into our comprehensive ARC 602: Integrated Design Studio, which has moved from the 7th to the 5th semester. This integration is achieved by creating a collaborative teaching environment with the lead design instructor in coordination with the School's Landscape Architecture instructor within the same design studio and project. This is meant to include site and landscape issues as core components of the overall building design brief and, within the context of a comprehensive design studio, to echo the process that students are likely to encounter in the profession.

3. The School has added ARC 632: Building Construction Technology (CDT) to its SPC curriculum matrix. CDT includes a 3-class module on foundations that includes an examination of soils, foundation types, slabs and subgrade enclosures.

Site Design is now addressed through the following courses in the School's curriculum:

- ARC 501: Studio 1 (Secondary)
- ARC 601: Studio 3 (Secondary)
- ARC 602: Integrated Design Studio (Primary)
- ARC 531: Communicate Design 1 (Secondary)
- ARC 541: Landscape 1 - Landscape Architecture Workshop (Primary)
- ARC 623: Building Construction Technology (Secondary)
- ARC 651: Sustainability 2, Applied Sustainability (Secondary)
- ARC 522: Structures 2 (Secondary)
- ARC 596: Reading the Landscape, Elective (Secondary)
- ARC-723: Urbanism (Secondary)
- ARC-731 Shelter Thesis – Design/Construct (Primary)

In an effort to weave site design throughout the curriculum, students are introduced to issues of site design within the development of a project at key points in their learning path, progressively engaging with increased complexity. Beginning with the fall of 2019, the School revised the syllabus for Studio 1, dedicated to introducing the fundamentals of architectural design and representation through the design of a single-family home. Studio 1 is now designed to work hand-in-hand with Landscape 1 to introduce issues of site analysis and design as a fundamental part of the design process. Student Studio project work is examined within the context of the Landscape class, and landscape workshops are conducted within the Studio at certain points in the process. Further, because Studio 1 traditionally begins while the students are in residence at Taliesin in Spring Green, Wisconsin and ends after the students have moved to Taliesin West in Arizona, the studio brief is designed to take advantage of the School's migration by having students engage in site design activities iteratively within two very different biomes.

In the comprehensive design studio, in an effort to improve the focus on site design and in response to specific concerns by the 2015 visiting team, the ARC 602: IDS (Integrative Design Studio) course has instituted specific assignments. First, the "Understanding Site" assignment asks the students to work in pairs or small groups and research the place's physical, cultural, and environmental conditions. This assignment is one of the earliest tasks in the course, and the outputs include site plan models, plan and section drawings, diagrams, and mappings of the cultural context. Active and passive environmental design responses are considered within the context of orientation, existing vegetation, and an understanding of the prevailing climatological conditions. Next, through the integration of Landscape 2, an assignment titled "Site Conceptualization and Planning" seeks to articulate responses (through drawings and diagrams) to issues surrounding site grading and drainage, utility infrastructure placement, and hardscape and landscape designs. Finally, the studio is also presently focused on employing more complex, diverse sites with unique zoning and adjacency considerations, steeper challenging grades.

Finally, site design plays a crucial role within the conception and execution of student's built shelter thesis project. In this capstone project, students must grapple with multiple aspects of applied site design in the development of a built project that they will inhabit. Issues of topography, hydrology and building orientation within a detailed climate analysis are crucial to ensure that their resultant design is ultimately inhabitable. Depending on what they are proposing, a soils analysis might be necessary as well. In addition, students are asked to consider the ecology of their site and to ensure that their design is minimally disruptive to the landscape and as sustainable as possible. Finally, the design of the shelter extends beyond the built structure to integrate it into the immediate landscape, the design of the site around the shelter is also evaluated through design documentation and a standard set of construction documents.

Outside of design studios key aspects of site design including urban contextual issues, geotechnical analysis and design, foundation systems, ecology and climate are explored through technical classes as outlined in the School's SPC Matrix.

Relevant Supporting Documents Attached to this Report

- Updated NAAB SPC Curriculum Matrix
- ARC 501 Studio 1 Syllabus
- ARC 541 Landscape 1 syllabus
- ARC 602 Integrated Design Studio, with Landscape Integration syllabus
- ARC 623: Building Construction Technology
- ARC-723 Urbanism Syllabus
- ARC-731 Shelter Thesis Syllabus

II. Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern

Fiduciary Independence

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: 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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

Fiduciary Independence

Since the School's 2017 IPR, the HLC conducted its comprehensive reaffirmation visit to the School in February of 2018, after which the School was informed that the June 11, 2018 HLC Institutional Actions Council voted to continue the accreditation of The School of Architecture at Taliesin on the Standard Pathway with the next Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2027-28. The HLC found that the School met every Core Component except for 5A, which deals with assuring adequate financial resources for the program. Component 5A was "met with concerns." The HLC's report noted that "as a new institution, the School of Architecture at Taliesin is in a critical period of its life" and requested the School produce Interim Monitoring reports on enrollment and finances in 2019 and 2020, which the School has done. Accredited institutions are required each year to provide data to the HLC which reviews financial and non-financial data for specific risk indicators and conducts follow-up with institutions when certain indicators occur. The purpose of this process is to identify institutions that may be at risk for not meeting components of the criteria for accreditation. The financial data submitted by institutions generates a composite financial index score. For the fiscal year 2019, the school had a Higher Learning Commission composite score of 2.52, well above the 1.0 minimum score threshold for follow-up action by the accreditor.

This year, as of August 1, and as detailed in Item III, Changes or Planned Changes in the Program, the School became completely independent of the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation as the Foundation resigned their position as sole member of the School's 501(c)3, along with their two board seats. The School is now a fully independent entity. Given that the School's business entity did not change, the School has confirmed that a change of control is not needed by the HLC and our accreditation remains intact as the School changes its name and location. On May 29, after a presentation to the board discussing the School's future plans and finances, the Arizona Board for Private Postsecondary Education (AZPPE) approved the School's Accredited Degree License Renewal until March 31, 2021. The AZPPE did require a change of control, which was approved on December 10, 2020.

Enrollment, Finances and Fundraising

Since the School's fiduciary independence from the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation in 2017 and its reaffirmation of accreditation from the HLC, it has continued to build its enrollment, develop its funding model and secure its financial viability. In the three years since independence, the School increased enrollment by 43%, steadily building its numbers of incoming students year upon year from 12 in the spring of 2017 to 21 full time M.Arch students in the spring of 2020, not including two visiting semester students. In August of 2019, the School secured a \$250,000 line of credit with J.P. Morgan Chase. The school has a scholarship endowment of approximately \$245,000 to provide financial assistance to prospective students and merit scholarships to current students in attendance. This year, the School has continued to build its fundraising capacity. The School has

added several notable members to the Board of Governors with access to considerable resources along with expertise in fundraising for academic institutions and enrollment, they are committed to investing in the School to ensure its financial sustainability and its future. Since the start of the fiscal year in August 2020, the School has already received \$157K in donations from the new members. The School has also received a \$95k bequest to the school scholarship endowment to aid in increasing enrollment. Moreover, for the fiscal year, the School received \$500k in federal CARES Act grant funding to support operations to offset the impact on enrollment from travel restrictions due to the Covid-19 pandemic. In addition to building our fundraising capacity, the School has also drastically cut its costs through ending the School's contractual commitments to the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation. In 2017, when the School moved to fiduciary independence from the Foundation, it entered into an agreement for shared services on the Taliesin sites which grew to be exceedingly financially burdensome. Since breaking completely with the Foundation, the School has undergone a complete cost restructuring reducing overhead expenses by over \$700,000 annually in costs attributed directly to the Foundation, \$470,000 in rent of the Taliesin sites and \$300,000 for shared services and dining services to the Foundation. With the cost restructuring, the school can now support ongoing operations with only 20 students, down from the target of 45 students called out in the School's 2017 NAAB IPR. Through a combination of recent fundraising and additional fundraising planned this fiscal year along with our recent overhead restructuring, the School is confident that we have the support needed to weather the School's transition and the hardships of the Covid-19 pandemic. Though significant challenges remain for the rebranding of the School and recovery from the Covid-19 pandemic, without the exorbitant overhead required by the FLW Foundation, the School has never been in a stronger financial position. The School's current equivalent overhead costs, including rent for its new learning sites are approximately 46% of previous expenses. With its reduction in base enrollment target, the School has accelerated its goal for achieving sustainable enrollment from 2023 to next year, in spite of setbacks incurred by the School's break with the Foundation and the ongoing global Covid-19 pandemic -- the School did experience some attrition this summer during the pivot to remote learning, and the School decided not to enroll an incoming class this fall. In January 2021, the School will have 14 students enrolled. The School has rebranded, launched a new website and worked with a professional consultant to develop a marketing campaign to build back enrollment going forward. In addition to traditional recruitment for our M.Arch program, when Covid-related travel restrictions are lifted, the School will continue its ongoing international and visiting programs along with a new cooperation with the American Academy in China slated to begin in the academic year 2021-22. This program is projected to enroll a minimum of 12 students for the next academic year. The Academy is founded and led by new School Board of Governors member Qingyun Ma, former Dean of USC's architecture program. The school is actively recruiting and anticipates enrolling approximately 6 new M.Arch students and 2 visiting semester students in the fall. With these new students along with its international partner programs and continuing students, the School will conservatively have 26 enrolled students for the 2021-2022 academic year, with the potential for more. The School is currently developing a Staffing and Facilities plan for in cooperation with the Cosanti Foundation (please see II.B) to account for both low and high student population scenarios as we grow through the coming years.

Relevant Supporting Documentation Attached to this Report

- 2018 HLC Reaffirmation of Accreditation
- 2019 HLC Reporting (excerpt)
- 2020 AZ State License 2020
- Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation Separation Agreement
- School Board of Governors Roster
- TSOA 2-Year Cash Forecast

Growth of Program and Facilities: 1. Progress toward meeting enrollment targets and 2. Status of facilities in response to expected enrollment growth

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: 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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 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.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

As noted in Item II.A, with the transition of the School off of Taliesin and Taliesin West properties, the expense associated with using those sites have been eliminated from the school budget, this has allowed the School to revise its base enrollment target to 20 students. The school intends to grow beyond that rate and will conservatively see 26 students enrolled in the next academic year of 2021-22. The School has entered into an initial 5-year lease with the Cosanti Foundation to

allow the School use of their two sites – Cosanti, in Paradise Valley, AZ (about 15-minutes from Taliesin West) and Arcosanti, in Mayer AZ, about 1-hour north of Phoenix.

This spring, the School will be in residence in Arcosanti, Paolo Soleri's experimental city in the high desert of Arizona. Arcosanti has adequate studio, classroom and outdoor space for student shelter-building and construction experiments. According to our lease, Arcosanti has initially set aside for the School, residential space with capacity for 25 students and faculty (our enrollment in the spring will be 14). In the Spring, as the School builds its initial group of student shelters, the School's initial residential capacity on site will grow to 30. The student-built shelters have traditionally served as the core of the School's student housing stock and as the focus of the School's Thesis, we are determined to continue this program on our new learning sites and grow our inventory of student shelters over time. Arcosanti currently has shared kitchen, bathroom and locker room facilities for students living in the shelters, which can be expanded as needed as the School grows. Arcosanti also features a large shared workshop with facilities for woodworking and ceramics along with a dedicated metal fabrication space. The School has transferred its tools and equipment from Taliesin and has recently raised \$7,500 to add to its fabrication and construction capacity. In the future, as needed, the School has the option to negotiate additional residential space at Arcosanti. The site has a residential capacity of approximately 90 not including the School's student shelter program, to accommodate the School and Arcosanti's own residential community.

The Cosanti site in Paradise valley also contains adequate studio, workshop and outdoor space and its current facilities are zoned for an additional residential occupancy of up to 14 students and faculty. As we grow, additional housing will be found off-site, Cosanti is located in the heart of the Phoenix metro area. Adequate parking has been set aside for the School at both sites. Given the School's new location and enrollment targets, it is currently revising its Facilities and Recruitment Plans, but we anticipate that our current facilities agreements and staffing will be adequate to serve our students as we grow through at least the end of the 2021 – 2022 academic year.

The School's Change of Location applications are in process. The Arizona State Board for Post-Secondary Education has approved the School's application for Arcosanti and we expect approval for Cosanti shortly. The Higher Learning Commission has approved both sites at the staff level and we expect formal board approval at its next board meeting. Once these approvals are in hand, the relevant applications will be submitted to NAAB as well.

This fall, the School currently has 10 enrolled students. Given the School's move and the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, the School decided not to enroll an incoming class this fall, our ten current students are all continuing students and represent 66% of the students enrolled at the start of spring 2020 that were not scheduled to graduate in May 2020. This Spring, two of the students who took time off during remote learning this fall will return, meaning that 80% of the students ultimately decided to stick with the School through all of the tumult of this year. Three new students will join our current and returning students this spring, and one current student will graduate this December. Of the 14 students enrolled for the spring, 43% are women, 29% Hispanic, 7% African American and 7% Asian. While these statistics represent improvement, we continue to strive to increase diversity in our student body. In addition to our student body, the School is also actively working to increase diversity and gender equity in its faculty and staff, especially in leadership roles. When President Betsky stepped down in May, he was replaced by the immediate former Dean, Chris Lasch. In January Stephanie Lin will join the School as Dean, bringing our full-time faculty to 50% women. Lin is an accomplished and award-winning teacher and practitioner who will continue the School's tradition of design excellence as leader of our academic program. Besides Lasch, all of the School's staff and leadership are currently women, including the Dean, Chief Financial Officer and Director of Admissions.

Relevant Supporting Documentation Attached to this Report

- Cosanti and Arcosanti Facilities Maps
- Stephanie Lin CV

III. 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).

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

There have been a few significant changes at the School in the past year, though impact on the School's learning program and curriculum have been minimal. The major changes are as follows: The School has moved from its historic campuses at Taliesin and Taliesin West to new learning sites; the School has changed its name; and the School's President decided to move on and has been replaced by the School's immediately former Dean. The following will serve as a reiteration and update of a letter from the School to NAAB sent on July 15, 2020 which explained these changes in depth.

The following will review the relevant events that have led to the necessity for the School to find a new location and a new name and then describe our plans for the future including our proposed new locations, the state of the School's leadership, curriculum continuity and marketing. Financial planning and enrollment are covered specifically in Section II of this report.

The School has changed its location and its name, but most everything else has remained the same and in compliance with the NAAB Conditions and Procedures under which it is accredited. The outgoing President was replaced by the immediately former Dean and there have been no changes in the leadership of the School's governing board. There are no fundamental changes to the School's existing programs, curriculum or financial model. Existing policies and procedures are remaining intact and we are largely maintaining our human, physical, informational and financial resources.

The School has changed its name from the School of Architecture at Taliesin (SOAT) to the School of Architecture, Founded by Frank Lloyd Wright. When referring to events before our official name change, this report uses the former name of the School.

Relevant Recent Events

On January 25, 2020 SOAT's Board of Directors voted to close the school because the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation, which owned the land the school was on, informed the School it would not renew the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two parties. That Memorandum acted as the School's lease, and its termination as of July 31, 2020 left the Board with the belief that it had no clear path to continue the School without access to its campuses.

The School's closing came as a shock to the architectural world, which saw the school's closure as a major loss to Wright's legacy and to the culture of architectural education in general. After a groundswell of public support, the School Board voted to reverse its decision to close the School on March 5.

The Board cited several factors in voting for the reversal:

1. The School has the strong possibility of major additional funding and students from several sources;
2. Students, alumni and the community had voiced their concern and wish to continue the School in very clear terms;

3. The Board determined that it could ask for mediation to resolve any issues that might prevent the renewal of the MOU. In late February, the School secured the pro-bono services of the Kirkland & Ellis law firm to help with this legal process related to keeping the School going in light of its dispute with the Foundation; and

4. The Board confirmed that its financial situation is such that it has long-term viability, especially in light of new support that had come forward since January of this year.

In late March, the School moved toward the activation of the dispute settlement mechanisms provided for in the MOU -- mediation possibly followed by arbitration. The Foundation agreed to participate in mediation, but unfortunately, mediation was ultimately unsuccessful in finding a way to keep the School at Taliesin.

While mediation was in progress, a small group of alumni and supporters of the School, in coordination with the School's Board leadership, continued to negotiate with the Foundation's CEO and members of its Board, looking for an agreement that would allow the School to continue in residence at Taliesin and Taliesin West. After initial positive discussions, the group lost confidence that an agreement could be reached and, because the legal process would likely extend past the expiration of our MOU with the Foundation, the School began to shift its plans to finding an alternative location. The School negotiated an agreement for the long-term use of facilities owned and operated by the Cosanti Foundation, namely the Cosanti property in Paradise Valley, Arizona and Arcosanti, outside of Cordes Junction, Arizona. Both locations we're founded, designed and built by Paolo Soleri after he left Taliesin West, where he was an apprentice of Wright's in the late 1940s. Both locations were designed for the learning and practice of architecture in much the same way as Taliesin West with spaces and studios for learning and project work along with generous outdoor space for experimental building and construction. Though the School would have preferred to stay at Taliesin, we believe that due to Cosanti's shared history, ethos, and similar physical plant, the transition will be relatively smooth and will enable us to deliver our current programming without significant interruption.

The School is currently on a distance learning waiver provided by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) in light of the global pandemic and we are currently working through Change of Location applications with the State of Arizona Board of Private Postsecondary Education (AZPPE) and the HLC. The change of location has been approved by HLC staff and we are waiting for their next board meeting to gain final approval. AZPPE has approved our application for Arcosanti, where we will conduct our spring semester, and expect our application for Cosanti to be approved soon. On May 29, after a presentation to the board discussing the School's future plans and finances, AZPPE approved the School's Accredited Degree License Renewal until March 31, 2021. AZPPE has also approved the School's name change and its Change of Control. All changes have also been approved by Veterans Affairs.

Following mediation, the School signed a settlement agreement with the Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation wherein the Foundation resigned as the sole member of the School's existing 501(c)(3) entity. This being the case, the School has confirmed with the HLC that a Change of Control is not required.

As the School relocates, it is our intention to maintain as much of its structure, curriculum and leadership as possible while we add new members in key positions critical to the School's ability to sustain and thrive.

Leadership and Personnel

School Board

The Chair of the School's Board of Governors is still in place. In addition, the Board is being joined by the group of alumni and supporters mentioned earlier. They include 6 new members including the former Dean of the School Victor Sidy (who led the development of the School's last NAAB APR), two prominent alumni and two prominent local business people, one with significant

experience in fundraising for academic institutions, all with access to extensive financial resources. The new board members also include the former Dean of the architecture program at USC and the founder of the American Academy in China. He has committed to act as a conduit for a new student exchange program with a number of Universities in that country. Together these additions represent a team dedicated to ensuring the longevity of the School through expanded fundraising and increased enrollment.

School Leadership and Personnel

The former President of the School, Aaron Betsky moved on to a new position on May 15 and Chris Lasch, the School's immediately former Dean stepped in as Interim. In October, Lasch was made the permanent President by the School's Board of Governors. The School's CFO, Academic Coordinator and all other faculty are still with the School.

The School has hired a new Director of Admissions on July 20th. In January we are planning to complete our staff roster with a new a Student Services Coordinator and a new Dean. Stephanie Lin, has agreed to serve as the School's new Dean, her CV is included with this report. Lin is an accomplished and award-winning teacher and practitioner who will continue the School's tradition of design excellence as leader of our academic program.

Curriculum and Programming

The School will continue to build upon its strengths and the curriculum it has continued to develop over the last five years as described in the School's 2015 NAAB APR founded, as ever, on the work and thoughts of Frank Lloyd Wright and the practice of learning-by-doing with emphasis on sustainability, material experimentation and design-build, both on campus and for and in the communities that it serves.

A priority for the School as it determined the site for its new campus is that there will be outdoor space on campus sufficient to continue its thesis program, focused on the design, construction and inhabitation of small student dwellings. The Student Shelter Thesis is the School's flagship program and is the reason that many of our current students chose the School. Both Cosanti and Arcosanti have ample space to support this program. The construction costs of this program are being underwritten by a new member of the School Board.

The School is committed to continuing its existing 3+ M.Arch program. All of the School's current students are scheduled to graduate on time according to the curriculum they have been following since they enrolled in the program. The School's learning program will not significantly change during this transition. In 2015, the School was granted an 8-year accreditation term by NAAB. In 2018, after reviewing the School's Interim Progress Report, NAAB concluded that the program had demonstrated progress toward addressing the deficiencies identified in the 2015 report. In 2018 the HLC also granted the School continuing accreditation after a scheduled comprehensive evaluation following the School's fiduciary independence from the Foundation in 2017. The program and administrative model described in our latest accreditation self-study reports will continue in our new location.

SOAT's proposed facility is similar and nearby to our previous facility, furthermore the School has maintained almost complete continuity of its staff and faculty as well as its academic policies, procedures and course curriculum. The School has always been a nomadic institution, moving annually between its learning sites in Arizona and Spring Green, Wisconsin. Now, all of the School's classroom equipment has simply be moved to its new facility. In addition, besides the FLW Foundation's collection of Frank Lloyd Wright books and materials, and its core collection of material on organic architecture, all of the School's library will also be moved to its new facility. The School is also working with its alumni association to rebuild its Frank Lloyd Wright reference collection. The School is working diligently to ensure that its learning program remains intact during this transition, and we are confident that we can continue to support the achievement of our program's Student Performance Criteria.

Name Change and Marketing

Our official new name is the School of Architecture. Associated with this, our branding also includes the tagline Founded by Frank Lloyd Wright. The school of Architecture, Founded by Frank Lloyd Wright was chosen through an inclusive, student-led process that involved students, faculty and staff along with Alumni through a series of workshops and online surveys culminating in an ad hoc committee comprised of representatives of all of the School's stakeholders who recommended their selection to the School's Board of Governors who unanimously approved it. The School has secured theSchoolOfArchitecture.edu for its website and digital accounts. Working with a graphic design consultant, the School has redesigned its logo and its branding, redesigned its website and has completed a series of workshops with its marketing consultant to design a comprehensive marketing plan. The School is currently executing on that plan as well as working with a professional SEO and content consultant to build its new internet presence.

To build back our enrollment, we intend to capitalize on the outpouring of support from the architecture and design community sparked by the announcement of our closure this spring, and will use the same media channels that broadcast that support to continue to tell our story and let the world know that we are open and moving forward. These include online design channels that are heavily frequented by potential architecture students (an online petition to continue the School accumulated over 30,000 signatures). The School has also budgeted for a targeted social media advertising campaign and an activation of the School's network of journalistic and editorial contacts. The School has secured the pro-bono services of a prominent local public relations firm to work with the School through this transition.

In closing, though the School has been through extraordinary turmoil this spring, we are still here and we have a plan and the means to move forward. Though we will change our location and our name, there will be no fundamental changes to the School's leadership or governing board, existing programs, administration or financial model. Our existing policies and procedures are remaining intact and we are maintaining our human, physical, informational and financial resources. At the same time, we are working to expand our enrollment and to make our finances more robust. We have added expertise to our board to help us do both of those things. We are looking forward to advancing the School and continuing to serve our current and future students.

Relevant Supporting Documentation can be found in the NAAB reporting portal in folder:
II_1_FEDUCIARY INDEPENDENCE

- 2018 HLC Reaffirmation of Accreditation
- 2019 HLC Reporting (excerpt)
- 2020 AZ State License 2020
- Frank Lloyd Wright Foundation Separation Agreement
- School Board of Governors Roster
- TSOA 2-Year Cash Forecast

IV. Summary of Preparations for Adapting to [2020 NAAB Conditions](#)

Please provide a brief description of actions taken or plans for adapting your curriculum/ classes to engage the 2020 Conditions.

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Response:

This fall, faculty have been reviewing and discussing the 2020 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation document. Beginning with the Faculty Committee, the Core Faculty at the school have begun ongoing discussions to review and discuss the changes represented by the 2020 Conditions and how the School might address them within the unique culture of our institution and the specificities of our region. During the semester break this winter, the faculty committee will initiate guided discussions with the faculty as whole. During this time, a survey will be conducted asking

faculty to adapt the learning objectives targeted by their courses to the 2020 NAAB Conditions. These initial revisions will be discussed and coordinated through a series of regular faculty meetings throughout the start of the spring semester with the goal of producing a revised matrix of NAAB Program Criteria and Student Learning Objectives mapped throughout the curriculum through formative and summative assessment. The faculty will discuss how NAAB criteria may be addressed on both the course and program level – the School convenes regular faculty meetings every two weeks.

In addition to faculty, the School will endeavor to include a broad cross section of its stakeholders and community in its adaptation to the 2020 NAAB Conditions. Staff will be invited to key faculty meetings to discuss plans and initiatives to support student success, particularly at the program level. School programs are best supported when all departments within the school are informed and aligned, ensuring that School resources are spent on its priorities in the most efficient way possible.

The School's Student government will lead a series of discussions amongst the student body to elicit feedback on their learning experiences at the School. Using the 2020 Conditions as a structure for discussion, students will be asked to reflect from their experience on the effectiveness of the School in enabling students to achieve the School's student learning objectives, through course materials and through other experiences in the program.

In addition, School leadership participates in monthly conversations, facilitated by the state chapter of the AIA, with the heads of the two other architecture programs in the state along with AIA staff and the leadership. Beginning in January, time will be set aside during those regular meetings for discussion of the 2020 Conditions' Shared Values and Program Criteria with the aim of knowledge sharing and uncovering regional approaches to issues and concerns across state's academic institutions and its professional community. The School believes that a process that includes the professional community, which our students will soon join, will best inform the School how to most effectively serve its students particularly with regard to long-term planning.

At the conclusion of the process, the School's revised Learning Objective Curriculum Matrix along with any course or curriculum changes will be reviewed and ratified by the Academic Council, which includes representatives from the School's faculty, student body, staff and alumni.

- V. 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. Provide three examples of low-pass student work for SPCs in the following cases--if there are any SPCs that have not been met for two consecutive visits, or if there are three not-met SPCs in the same realm in the last visit--as required in the Instructions.)*

School of Architecture at Taliesin, 2020 Update: A collection of relevant supporting documents, including revised syllabi, CVs, relevant reports and financial forecasts have been uploaded separately to the NAAB portal organized by section.