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A Proposal to Improve Architectural Education

12 steps to provide design students, educators and professionals the best opportunities for success in a changing landscape.

— By James P. Cramer

You could argue that architectural education is pretty good the way it is. In fact, it is most likely the best that it has ever been. But it’s not good enough. Just as architects and designers need to deliver more value in the future, the education that supports and gives birth to the future of the profession needs to prove its relevance.

It is the profession’s responsibility to support the evolution of higher education. Human capital is in jeopardy. We have a talent supply problem as we look to the horizon.

There is a changing nature in the work of design. In this context many educators acknowledge that higher education has not kept up with the big changes taking place in the design professions. Who has? Change and uncertainty face all of us. Finger pointing is not going to advance us to a higher place. It is time for architects and educators to adopt a learning, non-blaming approach to change.

Who now doubts that we live in a time of massive change? While we may acknowledge that the future of our AEC industry is fiction, we can nevertheless imagine future relevance based on trends in technology, demographics, urbanization, construction delivery, globalization and economic shifts. The sober reality is that the game of professional practice is changing. It will become stronger or weaker, and education will play a major role in future success levels. We must also prepare for permanent cycles of disruptive changes. There are numerous strategic fronts that need to be addressed. Integrated and multidisciplinary practices have every changing business models. Sustainability is driving design. Practitioners are learning to give even more services and experiences for the money. Contractors are establishing design studios. Technology is showing signs of new artificial intelligence that will not only disrupt but also alter value propositions. We are at a crossroads.

The recent meeting of the Design Futures Council focused on steps to new health in the design professions. The point was made that “change will never again be as slow as it is today.” And so we must act. It won’t be easy for designers or educators or students. Some will say that design education has become too self-absorbed and without its own foresight. If this point of view is blindly accepted without action then it can only mean that the value of architectural education will surely diminish. If so, then the future of the profession will be in jeopardy. Complacency, if it settles into education, will be the enemy to successful transformation of the profession. Fast action is most certainly strategic. It must not be an option. The lack of commitment to con-
tinuous improvement alone could kill off future
generations of the architecture profession. The
profession doesn’t stand a chance to succeed in
the future if it can’t get the best and brightest
people — the top human capital — regenerating
the profession year after year.

I have a proposal. At the base, I believe that there
should be a fresh approach and that we should
question our current habit patterns. We should
do things differently. Call this a next-level ap-
proach or strategic alignment. To measure the
pulse of the potential of this, one only needs to
look at what we see in today’s best-of-class pro-
fessional firms. Innovation lives in these firms.
The fascinating thing is that in spite of the nay-
sayers, the design profession is pioneering into
new satisfying realities that include unexpected
upside scenarios in career satisfaction and mon-
etary remuneration.

We have discovered that those who embrace
entrepreneurialism in the profession are not
only dealing with the threats head on but, even
more importantly, they also are now focusing
on adjustments that will bring growth in the
future. They forecast growth for the profession.
Not merely survival. Understanding their ac-
tions provides us with a sense of the territory
ahead where there can be a more robust align-
ment between the academy and the profession.
This could become a sweet spot between the
profession and the academy. It is a choice that
we now have, to re-energize professional edu-
cation. Those participating will be rewarded.

Rather than perpetuating bygone and stale be-
liefs and dogmas, why not bring leadership dy-
namism to align with today’s construction in-
dustry and environmental realities? This could
mandate a new contextual competence in archi-
tectural education. Moreover, it implies satisfi-
ing the new social responsibility that goes with
students’ utopian aspirations. Indeed, schools
have many opportunities to align with and lead
the changing profession. This will mean side-
stepping the traps and conveniences of the clois-
tered villages within the university that in some
cases have lost sight of professional education.

Here’s a proposal to bring design education for-
ward into a position for increasingly indispens-
able value.

1. Obsess with keeping current. Provide a
campus program for faculties and staff that
updates the latest statistics and metrics about
the design profession. For instance, compensa-
tion metrics and the business metrics of success.
Bring students, faculty, and administration to-
gether to share knowledge on the current reali-
ties in the professions. Today’s graduates should
come to understand the real opportunities and
set goals accordingly. Get rid of the stale mythol-
ogy of a profession that doesn’t exist anymore.
Sadly, some educators are discouraging their
students for all the wrong reasons. For instance,
students should be provided with the transpar-
encies about latest benchmarks on designer com-
pensation, bonus and ownership equity models.
We don’t need to hear another story about Lou
Kahn’s business failures as if it’s the end of the story. It is only part of the story. The biggest part of the story is to learn from failure and to study success. Today there are hundreds of stories providing case studies about the successful architect. It’s time to understand this reality.

2 Teach leadership in addition to design education. Yes, business leadership and communication skills should be taught to every student before graduating. Every graduate should be able to stand up at an AIA or association meeting and provide a confident synopsis of their background and areas of interest. They should be able to establish eye contact and use the current language of professional practice. They should study video tapes of themselves in school (or enroll in a thespian acting or debate class) until they have confidence in their own communication skills. Students should learn that in reality, designers are in the communications business. Without this, the value of the designers in society and around the business table lacks the virility — the voice — to advance the future.

3 Learning by doing, hands on programs, cooperative education and the like may be difficult, but its value cannot be denied. For when it comes to areas like building on-site supervisory experience, cost analysis, fee and business adjustments to scope changes, and day-to-day project management, the best way to acquire the necessary understanding of how buildings are made is by practicing the art and science rather than studying it. This will not be easy. The recession has hit cooperative education models and internships hard. However, the tenets and principles will certainly evolve. Becoming a successful architect or running a design enterprise are not endeavors that translate well into lectures and academic analysis.

4 Maximize what I’ll call the design enterprise/continuing-education offerings that bring practitioners into school both digitally and to campus. Create social and intellectual programs that build bridges between the profession and education. A surprisingly small number of successful practitioners actively teach. It need not be a lost resource. The profession also needs high quality continuing education. This provides an opportunity to bring together compassionate and relevant activities between schools and the profession.

The best way to acquire the necessary understanding of how buildings are made is by practicing the art and science rather than studying it.

5 Veteran and tenured faculty are in need of renewal. Some schools admit to a percentage of dead-wood faculties. It doesn’t have to be this way. An exchange program between schools could be established for veteran and tenured faculty needing some regeneration and new surroundings. Every school can partici-
participate in this program, which could have a twelve month to twenty-four month schedule. This could be coordinated by one of the associations such as an AIA/ACSA joint staffing model. This initiative is important because complacency has no place in design education if students are to get the value they are paying for. Educators and practitioners alike should always be unsatisfied and hungry to participate in the unfolding future of the profession.

6 In studio, teach the current metrics in finance, marketing, professional services and operations. This is the Design + Enterprise model. Make it a part of every project in the studio environment. Imbedded into every studio should be lessons that reveal project management information that firms use now to stay accountable. This includes costs, construction time, design efficiency, square-foot metrics and the likely marketing overhead the project brought with it.

7 Special lecture programs should show the best talent in both design and business practices. Balance them. If for instance there are eight big-name lecture programs in a term, insert the practice management leaders in front of the students, too. The learning objective should be not just to understand what the firm does and its outputs but also how the firm does it and its processes. Ask the firms to cover the budgets of award winning projects and how they work. Ask them about profit and if they are meeting their goals. Ask them to have a candid conversation with students about value migration and strategic planning, fee shifts, social responsibility and new delivery process strategies. Ask them to cover the owner/leader transition issues in their firm.

8 Faculty should be encouraged to establish formal roles with firms. This would get educators into firms on a regular basis. The profession needs to reach out to educators on this — not unlike affirmative action. Educators can be on the policy board, perhaps, or an advisor on technology or as expert to the firm on a specialty area such as acoustics, lighting, contract negotiation, ethics, etc. There should be more give and take between professors and the professional practice. Firms need to pay for these policy and advisory services from the educators. Schools should set the goal that every faculty member becomes a board member or advisor to a professional practice, a construction firm, a product manufacturers or another industry player. This will provide relevant give and take and provide value and new insight into the system. It will also create rapport, respect and admiration, some things we need to have more of between schools and the profession.

9 Every firm should make a financial commitment to the college program of their choice. My own opinion is that every firm — even the smallest — should contribute a minimum of $2,500 per year to higher education. And for medium, large and extra-large firms I recommend setting a preliminary budget as a
percentage of net profits. A typical firm earns a profit of 9 percent. A percent of that could flow to schools of their choice. As the return on investment grows, even more investments can be made. Underlying this strategy is the attitude that there should be more development flowing from practice to education. Chairs and endowments should be much more aggressively established. Once this happens it will tend to make programs stronger and more valued within context of building the profession for the future. It takes only a little imagination to see how valuable this can be, and it can be argued that the future of the profession depends on it. With discipline, more than $25 million in annual gifts can be provided to our accredited schools of architecture annually.

10 Establish a meritocracy system of rewards with staff and faculty. It is not time well spent to challenge the tenure system, frankly, but there can be energized leadership coaching around meritocracy, high performance and pay for excellence. The focus should be on what can be done. The profession should support this with endowments and chairs and gifts without strings.

11 Facilities in colleges and universities should, at minimum, mirror those in professional practice. Good design, good housekeeping and the latest tools should be in place. Spaces in design school should inspire, be well designed, well curated and not be allowed to decline into an anything-goes mess.

12 Digital and distance learning is a reality and it should have a legitimate role as an option in architectural education. Set a marketplace responsive role to enable the non-accredited degree graduates to catch up and qualify for licensure.

There will always of course be better and worse schools. This is also true in practice. Just as some students get an inferior education, some employees in practice are not mentored well. The future demands more if we wish for a stronger profession. This is one of the biggest opportunities for change. It can re-energize the design profession of the future. Respect for design education can be exponentially enhanced. We should encourage leaders to set targets that they may never meet. We are in a race with change and as new value niches are discovered we need to seize and deploy these. We need a strong link between education and practice around the issues of shifts, foresight and actions that can improve the future.

James P. Cramer is founding editor of Design-Intelligence and co-chair of the Design Futures Council. He is chairman of the Greenway Group, a foresight management consultancy that helps organizations navigate change to add value.
DesignIntelligence 30 Most Admired Educators for 2013

Each year, DesignIntelligence honors excellence in education and education administration by naming 30 exemplary professionals in these fields. The 2013 class of education role models was selected by DesignIntelligence staff with extensive input from thousands of design professionals, academic department heads, and students. Educators and administrators from the disciplines of architecture, industrial design, interior design, and landscape architecture are considered for inclusion.

ALAN BALFOUR
Georgia Institute of Technology
Balfour has demonstrated courage, innovation and leadership in designing and implementing structural changes that have revitalized the College of Architecture and its programs at Georgia Tech, including such diverse areas as industrial design and music.

PHIL BERNSTEIN
Yale University
Bernstein has become a national treasure as a thought leader in technology and practice. This holds promise to extend the reach and success of the design professions while giving a unique and challenging focus to his students in professional practice courses at Yale and in his lecturing around the world.

DAVID BUEGE
University of Arkansas
Buege brings a clarity and consistency of rigor, focus and exploration to his work with faculty, administration and students. He has become well known for high standards and getting the best out of each person he works with. He makes the difficult easier to understand.

CONNIE CALDWELL
Syracuse University
A huge asset in design education, Caldwell opens doors for professional practices to access student strengths and sets interviews for employment. She coaches students on interview skills and helps firms on selection of talent, earning a high degree of trust.

ROB CORSER
University of Washington
Corser has become one of the leaders in design and digital fabrication. He has established an energetic presence on campus that brings infectious enthusiasm and breadth of knowledge to students and his colleagues.

MAURICE COX
Tulane University
With a strong educational foundation under John Hedjuk at Cooper Union, Cox has gone on to do great things educationally that include a Loeb Fellowship and teaching awards. He is also a former Mayor of Charlottesville, VA.

ROBERT DUNAY
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
A visionary leader with a proven ability to integrate teaching, research and professional practice, Dunay demonstrates how each year of service to students can be different, entrepreneurial and inspiring on a pathway of continuous change. He is a role model for inspiring authentic teamwork.

BRONNE DYTOC
Southern Polytechnic State University
Dytoc loves what he does and it overflows from him as he teaches. He is a brilliant person who approaches life with a willingness to help and he does so with humility. His is an enduring legacy at this Georgia college.
DAN HARDING
Clemson University
As director of the Community Research and Design Center, Harding focuses on utilizing the latest design build techniques as a tool to address community issues. He has a unique stature in his field as he gives students hands-on experience. The project assignments that he gives to the classes are client oriented and not frivolous; they are real world relevant and students are shown how to make themselves indispensable as they relate to economic scenarios of the future.

HEIDI HOHMANN
Iowa State University
Known by students to be one of the strictest professors, Hohmann is also one of the very favorite teachers on campus. With an incredible wealth of knowledge about the history of design she is also a creative designer of landscapes. Her reviews for final projects are always meaningful with lasting value. She doesn’t sugarcoat anything but always gives a profound educational experience.

CARLOS JIMENEZ
Rice University
An incredible teacher who has earned the admiration of his students because he maintains a rigor and level of detail with special attention to materiality. Jiminez demonstrates balance in life with vision for improving both education and professional practice.

TIN MAN LAU
Auburn University
Lau is a major influence, providing guidance and leadership to students as they navigate their journey through the design education experience. He consistently delivers inspiring, real world relevance.

JOANNA LOMBARD
University of Miami
Lombard engages her students in learning with a style that inspires, cajoles, builds confidence and leaves no student without focused attention. She transmits an awesome body of knowledge in sustainability and health care design and gets significant alumni praise.

ADAM MARCUS
University of Minnesota
Marcus provides his own brand of excellence that challenges students while trusting and respecting the unique differences they bring to the future of the profession. He has a work ethic that has brought success to the College of Design’s Catalyst Week and Digital Provocations Symposium.

BETH MEYER
University of Virginia
With a powerful network of thought leaders she is shaping the future of the design professions. Her energy for criticism, writing and teaching is unmatched. She not only pushes her students to develop their own voice and to take the lead role in the future development of cities, but also grounds this in her historical and theoretical knowledge. She always makes time for students and those in professional practice who will be hiring her students.
ERIC OWEN MOSS
Southern California Institute of Architecture
Unusually gifted, Moss has become a role model educator who continues to raise the bar for all in the architecture and design professions, inspiring thousands of students worldwide.

MOSHEN MOSTAFAVI
Harvard University
It’s not easy to lead Harvard, but Mostafavi has taken a courageous path to further advance the educational programs for students while providing strong support to his talented faculty. The design professions in planning, urban design, landscape architecture and architecture keep a hopeful and watchful eye on the progress at Harvard, all the time knowing that the future of the design professions is born here and on other leading campuses such as Harvard Graduate School of Design.

CAROLINE O’DONNELL
Cornell University
O’Donnell brings intelligence and is willing to challenge conventions. She organizes her teaching and studios carefully, guiding students’ individual style and raising the bar of projects. She is a person who demonstrates continuous improvement and daily shows how professionals can grow and have more influence.

ALEX PANG
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona
Pang uses an exploration technique that brings students into highly relevant conversations. His phenomenal knowledge of theory and history will serve the future of the design professions well. He encourages students to become genuine talents and offers up constantly refreshing insight while respecting all in the world of education and practice.

SHARRAN PARKINSON
Virginia Commonwealth University
Parkinson is an energetic and experienced educator in the field of design who has become a leader in one of the strongest interior design programs, now available on both VCU campuses, Doha and Richmond. She has forged relationships with the design associations to calibrate programs in ways students will have marketable skills upon graduation.

PATRICK J. RAND
North Carolina State University
Rand has a special ability to teach both traditional and modern applications of building materials and assemblies in a manner that allows students to develop a well-rounded store of knowledge to draw from when deciding ways to articulate or inform design concepts. His own personal brand reputation is to “welcome new ideas,” and students resonate to him.

DAN ROCKHILL
University of Kansas
Rockhill leads the design/build Studio 804, teaching students about development, design, financing and building. Leadership and entrepreneurialism fuse together under his teaching and mentoring excellence.

MICHAEL ROTONDI
Southern California Institute of Architecture
Rotondi is one of the most often mentioned for educator of the year awards. He stimulates learning on a broad level for human design that involves all the senses, including the intangible sixth sense. He is a joyful, guru-like educator who keeps an eye out for the future of the profession.
TONY SCHUMAN  
**New Jersey Institute of Technology**  
This professor is characterized as one of the most ethical, historically rigorous, humane and engaging educators in America today. Schuman is thoroughly committed to enhancing the lives of his students, including those who pursue non-traditional professional practice.

ALLAN SHEARER  
**University of Texas at Austin**  
Shearer brings a rare combination of interests to the design professions and an intellectual depth that is leading the discipline of landscape architecture into new territory in environmental security. His writing and teaching has brought the professions together for conversations between military theorists and planners, geographers and designers to deal with environmental changes.

ANYA SIROTA  
**University of Michigan**  
One of the role models in the academic community who is demanding, intelligent and passionate to create solutions for the future. Sirota is willing to thoroughly engage with students and strives to understand their unique potential. She changes the way people think about careers in architecture by offering a foundation of optimism beyond the borders of traditions to affect all things in the environment.

RUTH TOFLE  
**University of Missouri**  
As the department chair, Tofle has constructed an interior design program that is widely regarded by practitioners as one of the best in the United States. She is energetic, fair, knowledgeable and respected for her scholarship, teaching and leading abilities. Her guidance has established an alignment between the design professions and the academy.

PAULA WALLACE  
**Savannah College of Art and Design**  
Wallace has emerged as one of the world's strongest advocates for design excellence, interdisciplinary collaboration and teamwork ranging from digital design competencies to bold and beautiful historic preservation.

DICK WILLIAMS  
**University of Arizona**  
The teaching legend Professor Williams turned 98 in September. He fondly recalls his days on the faculty at the University of Illinois; he remembers the thousands of hours spent critiquing student projects and the names of so many who have continued on to contribute much to the architecture profession. He is now officially retired but is proud of his “family” at the University of Arizona where he still has voice and influence and continues as a role model for teaching faculty everywhere.

RANDALL WILSON  
**Art Center College of Design**  
For more than 30 years, Wilson has made significant contributions as an innovator of curriculum and pedagogy. There is excellence in every studio he teaches and he is always testing the periphery of design.
AMERICA'S BEST ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN SCHOOLS 2013

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

America’s Best Architecture & Design Schools is conducted annually by DesignIntelligence on behalf of the Design Futures Council. The research ranks undergraduate and graduate programs from the perspective of leading practitioners. This 13th annual survey was conducted in mid-2012.

Selected professional practice leaders with direct experience hiring and supervising the performance of recent architecture and design graduates are invited to participate in the research. Survey participants, who are drawn from the Greenway Group database of leading firms throughout the United States, must verify they are currently responsible for hiring or supervising design professionals in each of the design fields for which they respond: architecture, industrial design, interior design, and landscape architecture. Surveys from non-qualifying individuals, including those not invited by DesignIntelligence to participate, are excluded from the results.

For the four professions surveyed, a total of 392 professional practice organizations participated in the research. (See page 118 for a list.)

The professional practice survey queried participants on the question, “In your firm’s hiring experience in the past five years, which of the following schools are best preparing students for success in the profession?” In addition, they are queried about additional issues, such as how programs rate in teaching various skills.

DEANS AND CHAIRS SURVEY

In addition to the undergraduate and graduate school rankings by professionals, deans and chairs from 351 academic programs participated in surveys, the data from which is presented separately from the practitioner rankings.

STUDENT SURVEYS

More than 2,840 architecture and landscape architecture students completed satisfaction surveys about their education, and that data is also presented separately from the rankings.

RESEARCH ASSISTANCE

Research assistance was provided by the American Institute of Architecture Students, the American Society of Interior Designers, the American Society of Landscape Architects, and the Industrial Designers Society of America. Research is aided by information from the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, the National Architectural Accreditation Board, the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board, and the Council for Interior Design Accreditation. DesignIntelligence and Greenway Group staff conducted each phase of research.
In your firm’s hiring experience in the past five years, which schools are best preparing students for success in the profession?

### UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Southern California Institute of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>California Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Boston Architectural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Cooper Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Southern California Institute of Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Rice University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Princeton University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents selected from lists of programs accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board.
## HISTORICAL RANKING OF LEADING PROGRAMS

### UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cornell University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Southern Calif. Institute of Architecture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rice University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Syracuse University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Calif. Polytechnic State U., San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Va. Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Iowa State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Auburn University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pratt Institute</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of Oregon</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Boston Architectural College</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. University of Southern California</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Cooper Union</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. University of Arkansas</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs without numerical ranking in past years scored below the top 20 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
### GRADUATE ARCHITECTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Columbia University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yale University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cornell University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Southern Calif. Institute of Architecture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Kansas State University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of Kansas</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rice University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Princeton University</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Iowa State University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Va. Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Clemson University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs without numerical ranking in past years scored below the top 20 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
ARCHITECTURE SKILLS ASSESSMENT

The collegiate programs that hiring firms deem strongest in educating for each skill area.

ANALYSIS AND PLANNING
1. Harvard University
2. Cornell University
3. Southern California Institute of Architecture
4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. Columbia University

COMMUNICATION
1. Harvard University
2. Southern California Institute of Architecture
3. University of Cincinnati
4. Columbia University
4. Yale University

COMPUTER APPLICATIONS
1. Southern California Institute of Architecture
2. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
3. Columbia University
4. Harvard University
4. University of Cincinnati

CONSTRUCTION METHODS & MATERIALS
1. Southern California Institute of Architecture
2. California Polytechnic State University, San Louis Obispo
3. Harvard University
4. Syracuse University
5. Auburn University

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY TEAMWORK
1. Southern California Institute of Architecture
2. Harvard University
3. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. University of California, Los Angeles
5. University of California, Berkeley

DESIGN
1. Harvard University
2. Southern California Institute of Architecture
3. Columbia University
4. Yale University
5. Cornell University

RESEARCH & THEORY
1. Harvard University
2. Columbia University
3. Princeton University
4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. Southern California Institute of Architecture

SUSTAINABLE DESIGN PRACTICES & PRINCIPLES
1. University of Oregon
2. University of California, Berkeley
3. Harvard University
4. Southern California Institute of Architecture
5. University of Cincinnati
5. Auburn University
The design professions’ biggest concerns *(Multiple responses)*

Aging of the population .................................................................................................................... 5.5%
Globalization .................................................................................................................................. 18.8%
Integrated design .......................................................................................................................... 52.1%
Licensing issues ............................................................................................................................. 10.3%
Maintaining design quality ............................................................................................................. 58.8%
Retaining quality staff in design practices ..................................................................................... 27.9%
Safety/security ................................................................................................................................. 1.2%
Speed of technological change ...................................................................................................... 41.2%
Sustainability/climate change ........................................................................................................ 48.5%
Urbanization .................................................................................................................................. 17%
Other ............................................................................................................................................. 18.8%
REGIONAL RANKINGS
Top schools in each geographic region based on all responses.

TOP SCHOOLS IN THE MIDWEST

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Iowa State University
2. University of Notre Dame
3. Illinois Institute of Technology
4. Drury University

GRADUATE
1. Washington University in St. Louis
2. University of Cincinnati
3. University of Michigan
4. Kansas State University
5. University of Kansas
6. Iowa State University
7. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
8. Illinois Institute of Technology
9. University of Minnesota
10. Ball State University
10. North Dakota State University
10. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

MIDWEST
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

TOP SCHOOLS IN THE WEST

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Southern California Institute of Architecture
2. Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo
3. University of Oregon
4. University of Southern California
5. Calif. State Polytechnic University, Pomona
6. University of Arizona
7. Woodbury University
8. NewSchool of Architecture & Design
9. California College of the Arts

GRADUATE
1. Southern Calif. Institute of Architecture
2. University of California, Berkeley
3. University of California, Los Angeles
4. University of Oregon
4. University of Southern California
6. University of Washington
7. Arizona State University
8. Calif. State Polytechnic Univ., Pomona
9. Woodbury University
10. Montana State University
10. Washington State University

WEST
Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming
TOP SCHOOLS IN THE EAST

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Cornell University
2. Syracuse University
3. Rhode Island School of Design
4. Pratt Institute
5. Carnegie Mellon University
6. Boston Architectural College
7. Cooper Union
8. Pennsylvania State University
9. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
10. New Jersey Institute of Technology

GRADUATE
1. Harvard University
2. Columbia University
3. Yale University
4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
5. Cornell University
6. Princeton University
7. University of Pennsylvania
8. Pratt Institute
9. Syracuse University
10. Boston Architectural College
10. Parsons The New School for Design
10. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

TOP SCHOOLS IN THE SOUTH

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Rice University
2. University of Texas at Austin
3. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
4. Auburn University
5. University of Arkansas
6. Oklahoma State University
6. University of Tennessee, Knoxville
8. Louisiana State University
9. North Carolina State University
10. Mississippi State University
10. University of Houston
10. University of North Carolina, Charlotte

GRADUATE
1. University of Virginia
2. University of Texas at Austin
3. Rice University
4. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.
5. Clemson University
5. Savannah College of Art and Design
7. Georgia Institute of Technology
8. Texas A&M University
8. Tulane University
10. Louisiana State University
10. Texas Tech University

SOUTH
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
**REGIONAL RANKINGS**

Top schools as ranked by firms in regions. It’s not uncommon for firms to prefer and recruit from schools outside of their own geographic region.

**FIRMS IN THE MIDWEST RANK THESE SCHOOLS BEST**

**UNDERGRADUATE**
1. Iowa State University  
2. Cornell University  
3. Rhode Island School of Design  
4. Illinois Institute of Technology  
4. University Notre Dame  
4. University of Texas at Austin  
7. Boston Architectural College  
7. Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo  
7. University of Arkansas  
10. Drury University  
10. Rice University  
10. University of Southern California  
10. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.

**GRADUATE**
1. University of Kansas  
2. Kansas State University  
3. Iowa State University  
3. University of Cincinnati  
3. Washington University in St. Louis  
6. Illinois Institute of Technology  
6. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
8. Yale University  
9. Columbia University  
9. Harvard University  
9. Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
9. North Dakota State University  
9. University of Michigan  
9. University of Minnesota  
9. University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

**MIDWEST**  
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

**FIRMS IN THE WEST RANK THESE SCHOOLS BEST**

**UNDERGRADUATE**
1. Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo  
1. Southern California Institute of Architecture  
3. Cornell University  
4. University of Oregon  
5. Syracuse University  
5. University of Southern California  
7. California State Polytechnic, Pomona  
8. Rice University  
9. Woodbury University

**GRADUATE**
1. Southern Calif. Institute of Architecture  
2. Harvard University  
2. University of California, Berkeley  
4. University of Oregon  
5. Columbia University  
5. Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
7. University of California, Los Angeles  
7. University of Southern California  
7. University of Washington  
10. Cornell University  
10. University of Michigan  
10. Yale University

**WEST**  
Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming
FIRMS IN THE EAST RANK THESE SCHOOLS BEST

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Cornell University
2. Syracuse University
3. Rhode Island School of Design
3. Rice University
5. Cooper Union
5. Pratt Institute
7. Pennsylvania State University
8. Carnegie Mellon University
8. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
8. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.

GRADUATE
1. Columbia University
2. Yale University
3. Harvard University
4. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
4. University of Virginia
6. Cornell University
7. Princeton University
7. University of Pennsylvania
9. University of Michigan
10. Syracuse University

REGIONAL RANKINGS

EAST
Connecticut, Delaware, D.C., Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire,
New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont

SOUTH
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi,
North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia
ARCHITECTURE DEANS SURVEY

This year 133 participated in the DesignIntelligence Survey of Architecture Deans and Department Heads They answered questions about their own and peer accredited programs in the United States.

Most admired undergraduate architecture programs

1. Cornell University
   For its strong curriculum and outstanding students and faculty.

2. University of Cincinnati
   For its work-study opportunities, linking education and practice.

3. Auburn University
   For its community engagement and great design-build program.

3. Cooper Union
   For its location and high quality design leadership.

3. Rice University
   For its strong foundation in innovative practice.

3. Syracuse University
   For its multiple international programs and its extensive breadth of design.

Most admired graduate architecture programs

1. Harvard University
   For its exceptional reputation, students and faculty, and its multidisciplinary program.

2. Massachusetts Institute of Technology
   For its strength in technical expertise, design quality, and international focus.

3. Columbia University
   For its dedicated faculty and dynamic, intellectually challenging program.

4. Yale University
   For its variety of viewpoints in the program as well as its diverse and talented faculty.

5. Princeton University
   For its small class sizes, high-powered faculty, and great new leadership.

5. University of Michigan
   For its innovative curriculum, and excellent facilities and resources.
Average number of full-time faculty ................................................................. 32.9
Average percentage of faculty who are adjunct professors ............................ 26.5%
Average teaching load per academic year for full-time equivalent faculty ........... 16.5 hours
Average percentage of faculty who are licensed .............................................. 61%
Proportion of graduates that deans expect will take the Architect Registration Exam (forecast) ........ 66.8%

The most significant changes in course offerings in the past five years (Multiple responses)

- More emphasis on sustainable design ............................................................... 64.6%
- More emphasis on urban design ................................................................. 23.1%
- More emphasis on global issues/international practice .................................... 33.8%
- More emphasis on professional practice ......................................................... 15.4%
- More emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration and integrated practice .......... 64.6%
- More technology integration ................................................................. 44.6%
- More integrative projects ................................................................. 23.1%
- More community engagement ................................................................. 41.5%
- Upgrades in technology (hardware or software) ........................................... 32.3%
- Study abroad opportunities ................................................................. 32.3%
- Retention of quality teaching staff ............................................................ 26.2%
- Other ........................................................................................................ 12.3%

The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population .................................................................................. 12.2%
- Globalization ................................................................................................. 38.3%
- Integrated design ........................................................................................... 39.1%
- Licensing issues ............................................................................................. 11.3%
- Maintaining design quality ........................................................................... 33%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices ..................................................... 12.2%
- Safety/security ................................................................................................ 0%
- Speed of technological change ..................................................................... 44.3%
- Sustainability/climate change ...................................................................... 67.8%
- Urbanization ................................................................................................. 38.3%
- Other ........................................................................................................... 10.4%
SAMPLING OF ARCHITECTURE STUDENT SURVEYS

This year 2,151 B.Arch, M.Arch, and D.Arch students registered their opinions in the DesignIntelligence student survey. (The number of D.Arch students participating was too small to equal 1 percent of the total survey population, however.) Here is what students said, both overall and by school. Only those NAAB-accredited schools with at least 10 survey participants are represented individually here.

RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How they grade the quality of their program overall</th>
<th>Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A  Excellent .............................................. 58.1%</td>
<td>Yes ................... 92.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B  Above Avg. ........................................... 32.9%</td>
<td>No ................... 7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C  Average ............................................... 7.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  Below avg. ............................................ 1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F  Failing ................................................ 0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What they’ll do after graduation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pursue an advanced degree in architecture</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in private practice</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for a corporation</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in academia</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in government</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in a field other than architecture</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How they grade the quality of their program overall

A  Excellent .............................................. 58.1% |
B  Above Avg. ........................................... 32.9% |
C  Average ............................................... 7.5% |
D  Below avg. ............................................ 1% |
F  Failing ................................................ 0.4% |

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ................................................. 81.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No .................................................. 4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided ........................................... 13.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to become a LEED accredited professional</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes .................................................. 58.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No .................................................... 7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided ........................................... 29.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED AP .................................... 4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ball State University**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

![Ball State University](image)

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ....... 53%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ...................... 2%
- Work in a private practice ........................................ 32%
- Work for a corporation ........................................ 0%
- Work in academia ...................................................... 0%
- Work in government ................................................. 0%
- Self-employment ..................................................... 2%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 4%
- Work in a field other than architecture ............... 2%
- Undecided ............................................................ 4%
- Other ........................................................................ 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Boston Architectural College**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

![Boston Architectural College](image)

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ....... 27%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ...................... 52%
- Work in a private practice ........................................ 17%
- Work for a corporation ........................................ 4%
- Work in academia ...................................................... 0%
- Work in government ................................................. 0%
- Self-employment ..................................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 6%
- Work in a field other than architecture ............... 6%
- Undecided ............................................................ 6%
- Other ........................................................................ 23%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Already LEED........ 13%
CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they'll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes.........95%
No.........5%

What they'll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 11%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .................. 10%
Work in a private practice ............................ 59%
Work for a corporation ................................ 2%
Work in academia ........................................ 0%
Work in government .................................... 2%
Self-employment ........................................ 0%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .......... 3%
Work in a field other than architecture ............ 0%
Undecided ................................................. 10%
Other ....................................................... 2%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes .................. 86%
No .................. 2%
Undecided ........ 12%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes .................. 54%
No .................. 5%
Undecided ........ 40%
Already LEED ...... 1%

CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, POMONA

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they'll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes.........97%
No.........3%

What they'll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 24%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .................. 6%
Work in a private practice ............................ 46%
Work for a corporation ................................ 7%
Work in academia ........................................ 1%
Work in government .................................... 1%
Self-employment ........................................ 1%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .......... 1%
Work in a field other than architecture ............ 0%
Undecided ................................................. 10%
Other ....................................................... 3%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes .................. 85%
No .................. 1%
Undecided ........ 13%
Already LEED ...... 1%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes .................. 67%
No .................. 2%
Undecided ........ 27%
Already LEED ...... 4%
CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes...........98%
No............2%

What they’ll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 8%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ............... 2%
Work in a private practice .................................. 52%
Work for a corporation ........................................ 2%
Work in academia .............................................. 4%
Work in government ......................................... 2%
Self-employment ............................................. 0%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 4%
Work in a field other than architecture ................ 6%
Undecided ...................................................... 15%
Other ............................................................. 6%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes .................. 68%
No .................. 4%
Undecided .......... 28%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes .................. 64%
No .................. 0%
Undecided .......... 36%
Already LEED ....... 0%

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes...........93%
No............7%

What they’ll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 28%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ............... 2%
Work in a private practice .................................. 61%
Work for a corporation ........................................ 2%
Work in academia .............................................. 5%
Work in government ......................................... 0%
Self-employment ............................................. 2%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 0%
Work in a field other than architecture ................ 0%
Undecided ...................................................... 0%
Other ............................................................. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes .................. 86%
No .................. 0%
Undecided .......... 14%
Already LEED ....... 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes .................. 71%
No .................. 2%
Undecided .......... 14%
Already LEED ....... 12%
**CORNELL UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 85%
- Above avg.: 13%
- Average: 0%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 2%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 18%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 3%
- Work in a private practice: 49%
- Work for a corporation: 3%
- Work in academia: 5%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 2%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 3%
- Undecided: 15%
- Other: 3%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 84%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 12%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 61%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 27%
- Already LEED: 5%

---

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 95%
- Above avg.: 0%
- Average: 3%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 2%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 93%
- No: 8%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 3%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 73%
- Work for a corporation: 3%
- Work in academia: 5%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 2%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 3%
- Undecided: 15%
- Other: 3%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 82%
- No: 10%
- Undecided: 8%
- Already LEED: 5%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 28%
- No: 30%
- Undecided: 35%
- Already LEED: 8%
**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

| Yes | 98% |
| No | 2% |

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 4%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 2%
- Work in a private practice: 83%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 11%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 96%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 4%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 67%
- No: 4%
- Undecided: 30%
- Already LEED: 0%

**KENT STATE UNIVERSITY**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

| Yes | 91% |
| No | 10% |

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 62%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 19%
- Work in a private practice: 0%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 5%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 5%
- Undecided: 10%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 76%
- No: 14%
- Undecided: 30%
- Already LEED: 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 62%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 33%
- Already LEED: 0%
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes...........90%
No............10%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ...... 25%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .............. 12%
- Work in a private practice .................... 40%
- Work for a corporation .......................... 0%
- Work in academia .................................. 6%
- Work in government ............................... 4%
- Self-employment ................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .......... 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture .......... 0%
- Undecided ........................................... 8%
- Other .................................................. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ............... 76%
- No .................. 14%
- Undecided .......... 10%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes ............... 68%
- No .................. 8%
- Undecided .......... 22%
- Already LEED ...... 2%

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes...........94%
No............6%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ...... 42%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .............. 2%
- Work in a private practice .................... 46%
- Work for a corporation .......................... 2%
- Work in academia .................................. 0%
- Work in government ............................... 2%
- Self-employment ................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .......... 4%
- Work in a field other than architecture .......... 0%
- Undecided ........................................... 2%
- Other .................................................. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ............... 77%
- No .................. 8%
- Undecided .......... 13%
- Already LEED ...... 2%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes ............... 98%
- No .................. 0%
- Undecided .......... 2%
**PRATT INSTITUTE**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

![Graph showing Pratt Institute grades with categories: Excellent 63%, Above avg. 30%, Average 5%, Below avg. 2%, Failing 0%]

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 21%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 2%
- Work in a private practice: 56%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 3%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 5%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 13%
- Other: 0%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 88%
- No: 2%
- Undecided: 10%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 54%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 36%
- Already LEED: 3%

---

**RICE UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

![Graph showing Rice University grades with categories: Excellent 85%, Above avg. 15%, Average 0%, Below avg. 0%, Failing 0%]

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 23%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 2%
- Work in a private practice: 54%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 8%
- Work in government: 4%
- Self-employment: 8%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 5%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 13%
- Other: 0%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 81%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 19%
- Already LEED: 31%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 54%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 31%
- Already LEED: 8%
**SCHOOL OF THE ART INSTITUTE OF CHICAGO**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 23%
- Above avg.: 62%
- Average: 15%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 70%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 8%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 23%
- Other: 0%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 85%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 15%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 70%
- No: 23%
- Undecided: 8%
- Already LEED: 0%

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTURE**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 77%
- Above avg.: 21%
- Average: 1%
- Below avg.: 1%
- Failing: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 18%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 1%
- Work in a private practice: 58%
- Work for a corporation: 3%
- Work in academia: 3%
- Work in government: 2%
- Self-employment: 4%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 8%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 23%
- Other: 0%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 83%
- No: 3%
- Undecided: 14%
- Already LEED: 6%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 50%
- No: 10%
- Undecided: 34%
- Already LEED: 6%
**Southern Illinois University**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 21%
- **Above avg.**: 51%
- **Average**: 19%
- **Below avg.**: 6%
- **Failing**: 2%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 65%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 10%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 6%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 13%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 65%
- No: 17%
- Undecided: 19%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 53%
- No: 11%
- Undecided: 36%
- Already LEED: 0%

**Southern Polytechnic State University**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 33%
- **Above avg.**: 51%
- **Average**: 15%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 2%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 12%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 49%
- Work for a corporation: 9%
- Work in academia: 6%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 10%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 14%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 82%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 18%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 56%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 36%
- Already LEED: 3%
TULANE UNIVERSITY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes .......... 94%
No ............ 7%

What they’ll do after graduation

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes ............ 78%
No ............ 3%
Undecided ........ 36%
Already LEED .... 12%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes ............ 45%
No ............ 8%
Undecided ........ 36%
Already LEED .... 12%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes ............ 82%
No ............ 16%
Undecided ........ 2%
Already LEED .... 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes ............ 49%
No ............ 47%
Undecided ........ 1%
Already LEED .... 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes .......... 98%
No ............ 2%

What they’ll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 14%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ......................... 4%
Work in a private practice ......................... 61%
Work for a corporation .............................. 8%
Work in academia .................................. 0%
Work in government ................................ 0%
Self-employment .................................... 0%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .................. 2%
Work in a field other than architecture ............. 4%
Undecided ........................................... 8%
Other .................................................. 0%

Syracuse University

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes .......... 98%
No ............ 2%

What they’ll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in architecture .......... 14%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ......................... 4%
Work in a private practice ......................... 61%
Work for a corporation .............................. 8%
Work in academia .................................. 0%
Work in government ................................ 0%
Self-employment .................................... 0%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization .................. 2%
Work in a field other than architecture ............. 4%
Undecided ........................................... 8%
Other .................................................. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes ............ 85%
No ............ 2%
Undecided ........ 13%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes ............ 59%
No ............ 2%
Undecided ........ 19%
Already LEED .... 0%
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Excellent</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Above avg.</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Average</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Below avg.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Failing</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes: 83%
No: 17%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 4%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 56%
- Work for a corporation: 2%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 6%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 4%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 15%
- Other: 6%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes: 77%
No: 4%
Undecided: 19%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes: 52%
No: 10%
Undecided: 33%
Already LEED: 4%

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Excellent</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Above avg.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Below avg.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes: 79%
No: 21%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 4%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 56%
- Work for a corporation: 2%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 6%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 4%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 15%
- Other: 6%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes: 77%
No: 46%
Undecided: 4%
Already LEED: 12%
### UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes .......... 97%
- No ........... 3%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ...... 49%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ................. 3%
- Work in a private practice .................. 39%
- Work for a corporation ...................... 0%
- Work in academia ................................ 1%
- Work in government ................................ 0%
- Self-employment .................................. 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ...... 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture .......... 1%
- Undecided .................................... 6%
- Other ........................................ 1%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes .......... 92%
- No ........... 1%
- Undecided ...... 7%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes .......... 59%
- No ........... 8%
- Undecided ...... 19%
- Already LEED ........ 14%

### UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes .......... 90%
- No ........... 10%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ...... 5%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture ................. 2%
- Work in a private practice .................. 31%
- Work for a corporation ...................... 0%
- Work in academia ................................ 1%
- Work in government ................................ 0%
- Self-employment .................................. 2%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ...... 1%
- Work in a field other than architecture .......... 3%
- Undecided .................................... 8%
- Other ........................................ 1%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes .......... 85%
- No ........... 8%
- Undecided ...... 2%
- Already LEED ........ 13%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes .......... 72%
- No ........... 4%
- Undecided ...... 19%
- Already LEED ........ 5%
**UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes........100%
No........0%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ....... 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .............. 0%
- Work in a private practice ............................................. 42%
- Work for a corporation .................................................. 8%
- Work in academia ...................................................... 17%
- Work in government ...................................................... 0%
- Self-employment ....................................................... 8%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 8%
- Work in a field other than architecture ............... 0%
- Undecided ................................................................. 0%
- Other ......................................................................... 17%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes ................ 55%
No ................ 36%
Undecided ...... 9%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes ................... 25%
No ................... 42%
Undecided ........ 25%
Already LEED ...... 8%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Yes........100%
No........0%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture ....... 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture .............. 0%
- Work in a private practice ............................................. 91%
- Work for a corporation .................................................. 0%
- Work in academia ...................................................... 0%
- Work in government ...................................................... 0%
- Self-employment ....................................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture ............... 0%
- Undecided ................................................................. 5%
- Other ......................................................................... 17%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

Yes ................... 91%
No ................... 0%
Undecided ........ 0%
Already LEED ...... 10%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

Yes ................... 71%
No ................... 0%
Undecided ........ 19%
Already LEED ...... 10%
**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

![Michigan Logo]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Excellent</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Above avg.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Average</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 90%
- No: 10%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 18%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 2%
- Work in a private practice: 46%
- Work for a corporation: 4%
- Work in academia: 10%
- Work in government: 1%
- Self-employment: 6%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 1%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 5%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 77%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 15%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 56%
- No: 12%
- Undecided: 24%
- Already LEED: 8%

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

![Minnesota Logo]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Excellent</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Above avg.</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F: Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 78%
- No: 22%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 26%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 6%
- Work in a private practice: 40%
- Work for a corporation: 4%
- Work in academia: 10%
- Work in government: 1%
- Self-employment: 2%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 3%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 2%
- Undecided: 14%
- Other: 4%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 72%
- No: 13%
- Undecided: 16%
- Already LEED: 8%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 44%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 43%
- Already LEED: 6%
UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture …… 28%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture …………….. 0%
- Work in a private practice ……………………. 44%
- Work for a corporation ……………………… 8%
- Work in academia …………………………… 4%
- Work in government ………………………… 0%
- Self-employment ……………………………. 4%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ……… 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture ……… 0%
- Undecided …………………………………. 12%
- Other …………………………………………. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to take</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to become</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture …… 59%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture …………….. 0%
- Work in a private practice ……………………. 24%
- Work for a corporation ……………………… 3%
- Work in academia …………………………… 3%
- Work in government ………………………… 0%
- Self-employment ……………………………. 3%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ……… 0%
- Work in a field other than architecture ……… 0%
- Undecided …………………………………. 7%
- Other …………………………………………. 0%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to take</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to become</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 87%
- Above avg.: 12%
- Average: 1%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation
- Yes: 98%
- No: 3%

What they’ll do after graduation
- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 11%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 61%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 1%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 5%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 10%
- Other: 1%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam
- Yes: 89%
- No: 4%
- Undecided: 7%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional
- Yes: 62%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 26%
- Already LEED: 5%

UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 19%
- Above avg.: 38%
- Average: 43%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation
- Yes: 71%
- No: 29%

What they’ll do after graduation
- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 14%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 57%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 1%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 10%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 10%
- Other: 1%

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam
- Yes: 75%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 20%
- Already LEED: 5%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional
- Yes: 48%
- No: 14%
- Undecided: 33%
- Already LEED: 5%
**UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 64%
- **Above avg.**: 31%
- **Average**: 6%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 23%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 3%
- Work in a private practice: 57%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 3%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 3%
- Undecided: 9%
- Other: 3%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 61%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 31%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 51%
- No: 9%
- Undecided: 4%
- Already LEED: 0%

**VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIV.**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 79%
- **Above avg.**: 17%
- **Average**: 2%
- **Below avg.**: 2%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 96%
- No: 4%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in architecture: 16%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture: 3%
- Work in a private practice: 57%
- Work for a corporation: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 3%
- Work in a field other than architecture: 3%
- Undecided: 9%
- Other: 3%

**Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 81%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 15%
- Already LEED: 1%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 65%
- No: 5%
- Undecided: 30%
- Already LEED: 1%
**WENTWORTH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they’ll do after graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Path</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pursue an advanced degree in architecture</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue an advanced degree in something other than architecture</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in a private practice</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for a corporation</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in academia</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in government</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in a field other than architecture</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to take the Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEBT LOAD**

Upon graduation, architecture students anticipate an average debt load of

**$38,175**

**B.ARCH SALARY**

The average salary upon graduation for those with a B.Arch: *

**$40,122**

**M.ARCH SALARY**

The average salary upon graduation for those with an M.Arch: *

**$43,645**

* Source: “2012 Compensation and Benefits Survey,” DesignIntelligence, March/April 2012. Does not include bonus which is typically 3-4 percent during internship.
ARCHITECTURE DEGREE TUITION SUMMARY

SUMMARY - REGIONAL MAP

**MIDWEST**
Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

**EAST**
Connecticut, Delaware, D.C., Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont

**WEST**
Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, Wyoming

**SOUTH**
Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia

SUMMARY - TUITION COST INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.ARCH</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-Of-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M.ARCH</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-Of-State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$$$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ < $8,000   $$$ $8,001-$16,000   $$$$ $16,001-$24,000   $$$$$ $24,001-$32,000   $$$$$$ $32,001+

The entire 2013 Architecture School Tuition & Fee Report is available at www.di.net
B. ARCH
SUMMARY - AVERAGE TUITION + FEES

IN-STATE
$21,093

OUT-OF-STATE
$27,996

PUBLIC
$8,738

PRIVATE
$34,248

OVERALL AVERAGE

B. ARCH
SUMMARY - CHANGE IN AVERAGE TUITION + FEES
2011-2012 TO 2012-2013

IN-STATE
+6.58%

OUT-OF-STATE
+6.64%

PUBLIC
-.26%

PRIVATE
+9.48%

= % CHANGE

= FEES
B. ARCH
REGIONAL SUMMARY - AVERAGE TUITION + FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>IN-STATE</th>
<th>OUT-OF-STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>$29,690</td>
<td>$31,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>$12,820</td>
<td>$23,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>$29,452</td>
<td>$33,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>$23,319</td>
<td>$29,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. ARCH
REGIONAL SUMMARY
CHANGE IN AVERAGE TUITION + FEES | 2011-2012 TO 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>IN-STATE</th>
<th>OUT-OF-STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>+9.90%</td>
<td>+8.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>+11.25%</td>
<td>+7.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>+8.57%</td>
<td>+11.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>+5.70%</td>
<td>+4.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**M. ARCH**

**SUMMARY - AVERAGE TUITION + FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN-STATE</th>
<th>OUT-OF-STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. ARCH</td>
<td>$20,868</td>
<td>$27,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>$12,358</td>
<td>$23,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M. ARCH**

**SUMMARY - CHANGE IN AVERAGE TUITION + FEES**

2011-2012 TO 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IN-STATE</th>
<th>OUT-OF-STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. ARCH</td>
<td>+5.63%</td>
<td>+4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL AVERAGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC</td>
<td>-1.06%</td>
<td>+2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
<td></td>
<td>+4.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECTURE**
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**M.Arch**

**Regional Summary - Average Tuition + Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>$31,717</td>
<td>$33,786</td>
<td>$20,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>$14,060</td>
<td>$23,825</td>
<td>$20,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>$20,229</td>
<td>$27,730</td>
<td>$20,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>$18,860</td>
<td>$27,249</td>
<td>$20,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Change in Average Tuition + Fees | 2011-2012 to 2012-2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In-State</th>
<th>Out-of-State</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>+9.04%</td>
<td>+7.79%</td>
<td>+9.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>+3.21%</td>
<td>+3.62%</td>
<td>+3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDWEST</td>
<td>+5.05%</td>
<td>+4.09%</td>
<td>+5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>+7.16%</td>
<td>+0.61%</td>
<td>+7.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Fees

= % Change
A Sampling of Architecture School Brand Strengths Based on Surveys and Interviews by DesignIntelligence editors.

**Top Brands in Architectural Education Show Diversified Strengths**

**THE GOLD STANDARD:** Harvard, Yale, Columbia

**CRYSTAL CLEAR VISION:** Virginia Tech, SCAD, Cooper Union

**VIBRANT HIGH-TECH CULTURE:** MIT, Carnegie Mellon, SCI-Arch

**MAKING A STRONG GLOBAL STATEMENT:** Harvard, USC, Virginia Tech

**CONSTRUCTION LEADERSHIP:** Iowa State, Cal Poly-SLO, Clemson University

**EXPENSIVE & WORTH IT:** Harvard, Tulane, Washington University – St. Louis

**HEART OF A PIONEER, SOUL OF AN ARCHITECT:** University of Puerto Rico, University of New Mexico, North Dakota State University

**TOP RESEARCH REPUTATION:** Princeton, University of Michigan, Columbia

**TOP FOR REGIONAL RESPECT & ADMIRATION:** University of Arkansas, Cal Poly-SLO, University of Oregon

**STRONG TRADITIONS:** University of Virginia, Illinois Institute of Technology, Notre Dame

**ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP:** Oregon, Virginia Tech, University of California – Berkeley

**ELITE SCHOOL WITH INFLUENTIAL VOICE:** Princeton, University of Pennsylvania, Yale

**BEST SMALL SCHOOL DESIGN PROGRAM:** University of Arkansas, Rice, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee

**PROGRESSIVE & OPINIONATED:** Tulane, Columbia, New Jersey Institute of Technology

**CUTTING EDGE DESIGN:** SCI-Arch, Cincinnati, Cornell

**STRONGEST COMMUNITY RELATIONS:** University of Minnesota, University of Texas at Austin, Auburn University

**EMBRACING DESIGN ENTREPRENEURSHIP:** Kansas State, University of Illinois Champaign-Urbana, Boston Architectural College

**STRONG INTEGRATOR OF DESIGN DISCIPLINES:** North Carolina State, University of Minnesota, Virginia Tech

**TEACHING INNOVATION IN METHODS & MATERIALS:** Rensselaer, MIT, Syracuse

**BEST BUILDINGS & FACILITIES:** University of New Mexico, University of Minnesota, SCAD

**TOP CANADIAN ARCHITECTURE PROGRAMS**
Dalhousie University (Halifax), Carleton University
University of British Columbia

**CANADA’S TOP INTERIOR DESIGN SCHOOLS**
Ryerson University, University of Manitoba, Mount Royal
# Landscape Architecture

## Top 15 Programs 2013

In your firm’s hiring experience in the past five years, which schools are best preparing students for success in the profession?

### Undergraduate

1. Louisiana State University
2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
3. Pennsylvania State University
4. Kansas State University
5. Texas A&M University
6. Cornell University
7. Calif. Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
7. Purdue University
7. University of Georgia
10. Ball State University
11. Iowa State University
11. Texas Tech University
13. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
13. Michigan State University
13. Ohio State University

### Graduate

1. Harvard University
2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
3. Cornell University
3. Louisiana State University
5. University of Virginia
6. University of Pennsylvania
7. Pennsylvania State University
7. Rhode Island School of Design
7. Texas A&M University
10. University of California, Berkeley
11. Kansas State University
11. University of Georgia
13. Auburn University
13. University of Texas at Arlington
13. University of Texas at Austin
13. University of Washington

---

Note: Respondents selected from lists of undergraduate and graduate landscape architecture programs accredited by the Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board.
## HISTORICAL RANKING OF LEADING PROGRAMS

### LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

#### UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Va. Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kansas State University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cornell University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Calif. Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Purdue University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ball State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Iowa State University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Texas Tech</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Calif. State Polytechnic University, Pomona</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Michigan State University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ohio State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs without numerical ranking in past years scored below the top 15 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
### Historical Ranking of Leading Programs

#### Landscape Architecture

##### Graduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Va. Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cornell University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Virginia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Kansas State University</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. University of Georgia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Auburn University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. University of Washington</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs without numerical ranking in past years scored below the top 15 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE SKILLS ASSESSMENT

The collegiate programs that hiring firms deem strongest in educating for each skill area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>DESIGN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Harvard University</td>
<td>1. Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>2. Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>3. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Virginia</td>
<td>4. University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kansas State University</td>
<td>5. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPUTER APPLICATIONS</th>
<th>RESEARCH &amp; THEORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>1. Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>2. University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Harvard University</td>
<td>2. University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>2. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kansas State University</td>
<td>5. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>5. University of California, Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CROSS-DISCIPLINARY TEAMWORK</th>
<th>SUSTAINABLE DESIGN PRACTICES &amp; PRINCIPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>1. University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Harvard University</td>
<td>2. Louisiana State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>3. Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. University of Virginia</td>
<td>4. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>5. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population ................................................................. 10.3%
- Globalization .................................................................................... 10.3%
- Integrated design ........................................................................... 36.8%
- Licensing issues ............................................................................. 8.8%
- Maintaining design quality ............................................................. 51.5%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices ..................................... 33.8%
- Safety/security ................................................................................. 1.5%
- Speed of technological change ....................................................... 38.2%
- Sustainability/climate change ......................................................... 48.5%
- Urbanization .................................................................................... 29.4%
- Other .............................................................................................. 14.7%

Rate your satisfaction with the state of landscape architecture education in the United States today.

- Dissatisfied ...................................................................................... 1.5%
- Neutral ............................................................................................ 18.2%
- Very satisfied .................................................................................. 15.2%
- Satisfied .......................................................................................... 65.2%

Is your firm benefiting from an infusion of new ideas about sustainability from recent graduate new hires?

- No .................................................................................................. 38.2%
- Yes .................................................................................................. 61.8%

Are students graduating with an adequate understanding of biology, biodiversity, and environmental degradation?

- Inadequate understanding ................................................................ 20.3%
- More than adequate understanding .................................................. 13%

Is it beneficial to your firm when recent graduate new hires had study abroad experience while they were in school?

- It doesn’t really benefit our firm ..................................................... 15.9%
- It’s somewhat beneficial to our firm .............................................. 36.2%
- It’s very beneficial to our firm ......................................................... 47.8%
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE DEANS SURVEY

The responses of 57 education leaders were tallied in the DesignIntelligence Survey of Landscape Architecture Deans and Department Heads. These individuals offered their opinions about programs in their own institutions as well as other departments across the United States.

Most admired undergraduate landscape architecture programs

1. Louisiana State University
   For its excellence in design and collaboration across disciplines.

1. University of Georgia
   For its depth and breadth of faculty, and strong design education.

3. Pennsylvania State University
   For the quality of its graduates and interdisciplinary courses.

4. University of Oregon
   For its focus on sustainability and its broad spectrum of expert faculty.

4. University of Washington
   For its strong design-build program and community engagement.

Most admired graduate landscape architecture programs

1. Harvard University
   For its long standing strength in design, students, and global outreach.

2. University of Pennsylvania
   For its outstanding faculty and its integration of ecology in the program.

3. University of Virginia
   For its excellence in interdisciplinary design work and professional practice.

4. University of Washington
   For its highly acclaimed faculty, community engagements and international opportunities.

5. Texas A&M University
   For its balanced curriculum and high attention to design standards.
Average number of full-time faculty ................................................................. 8.6
Average percentage of faculty who are adjunct professors .................................. 18.6%
Average teaching load per academic year for full-time equivalent faculty ...................... 16 hours
Average percentage of faculty who are licensed landscape architects ......................... 48%

Compared to 2012, deans expect their program’s 2013 budgets to be

- Lower 15.8%
- Similar 63.2%
- Higher 21.1%

Compared to 2012, deans expect their 2013 student enrollments to be

- Lower 7.7%
- Similar 59%
- Higher 33.3%

The most significant changes in course offerings in the past five years (Multiple responses)

- More emphasis on sustainable design ................................................................. 59%
- More emphasis on urban design .......................................................................... 41%
- More emphasis on global issues/international practice ........................................ 35.9%
- More emphasis on professional practice ............................................................ 7.7%
- More emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration and integrated practice ............... 61.5%
- More technology integration ................................................................................ 35.9%
- More integrative projects .................................................................................... 28.2%
- More community engagement ............................................................................. 30.8%
- Upgrades in technology (hardware or software) ................................................ 28.2%
- Study abroad opportunities ................................................................................ 35.9%
- Retention of quality teaching staff ..................................................................... 25.6%
- Other .................................................................................................................. 20.5%

The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population ..................................................................................... 18.5%
- Globalization ...................................................................................................... 35.2%
- Integrated design ............................................................................................... 38.9%
- Licensing issues ................................................................................................. 5.6%
- Maintaining design quality ................................................................................. 25.9%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices ....................................................... 9.3%
- Safety/security ................................................................................................... 5.6%
- Speed of technological change .......................................................................... 33.3%
- Sustainability/climate change ......................................................................... 88.9%
- Urbanization ..................................................................................................... 51.9%
- Other .................................................................................................................. 20.4%
SAMPLING OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE STUDENT SURVEYS

This year 676 students registered their opinions in the DesignIntelligence landscape architecture student survey. Here is what students said, both overall and by school. Only those LAAB-accredited schools with at least 10 survey participants are represented individually here.

RESPONDENTS

Undergraduate students ................................................................. 45.9%
Graduate students ................................................................. 49.9%
Doctoral students ......................................................................... 0.6%
Other (including dual-degree and certificate) students ..................... 3.5%

How they grade the quality of their program overall

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

What they’ll do after graduation

Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture......................... 5.9%
Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture 5.8%
Work in private practice ........................................................................ 60.6%
Work in academia ........................................................................... 2.7%
Work in government ........................................................................... 4.2%
Self-employment ................................................................................... 1.9%
Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization 3.5%
Work in a field other than landscape architecture ....................... 1.1%
Undecided ................................................................................. 11.8%
Other ......................................................................................... 2.4%
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes ........... 75%
- No ........... 25%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture ................. 6%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture .......... 19%
- Work in a private practice ................................ 50%
- Work in academia ......................................... 0%
- Work in government ........................................ 6%
- Self-employment ........................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture .. 0%
- Undecided ................................................... 19%
- Other .......................................................... 0%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ..................... 100%
- No ...................... 0%
- Undecided ............ 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes ............... 69%
- No ................... 6%
- Undecided .......... 25%
- Already LEED ...... 0%

CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes ........... 83%
- No ........... 17%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture ................. 17%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture .......... 17%
- Work in a private practice ................................ 33%
- Work in academia ......................................... 0%
- Work in government ........................................ 6%
- Self-employment ........................................... 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ........ 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture .. 11%
- Undecided ................................................... 11%
- Other .......................................................... 6%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ..................... 44%
- No ...................... 6%
- Undecided .......... 50%
- Already LEED ...... 0%
**CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, POMONA**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 11%
- **Above avg.**: 67%
- **Average**: 11%
- **Below avg.**: 11%
- **Failing**: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes...........63%
- No...........38%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture ................. 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture ........... 11%
- Work in a private practice ........................................ 56%
- Work in academia .................................................. 0%
- Work in government ................................................ 11%
- Self-employment ....................................................... 11%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ............. 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture .. 0%
- Undecided ................................................................. 0%
- Other ........................................................................... 11%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ....................67%
- No ....................... 0%
- Undecided ............ 33%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes ......................87%
- No ..............2%
- Undecided ......... 11%
- Already LEED .......... 0%

**CORNELL UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 79%
- **Above avg.**: 19%
- **Average**: 2%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes...........100%
- No...........0%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture ................. 8%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture ........... 4%
- Work in a private practice ........................................ 60%
- Work in academia .................................................. 2%
- Work in government ................................................ 4%
- Self-employment ....................................................... 2%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization ............. 4%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture .. 0%
- Undecided ................................................................. 13%
- Other ........................................................................... 4%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes ....................55%
- No ....................... 4%
- Undecided ............ 38%
- Already LEED .......... 4%
**HARVARD UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 71%
- Above avg.: 29%
- Average: 0%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 96%
- No: 4%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 4%
- Work in a private practice: 68%
- Work in academia: 14%
- Work in government: 4%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 4%
- Undecided: 4%
- Other: 4%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 82%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 18%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 22%
- No: 15%
- Undecided: 52%
- Already LEED: 11%

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- Excellent: 51%
- Above avg.: 46%
- Average: 3%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 95%
- No: 5%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 14%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 11%
- Work in a private practice: 62%
- Work in academia: 14%
- Work in government: 4%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 4%
- Undecided: 4%
- Other: 4%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 78%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 35%
- Already LEED: 0%
### KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

#### How they grade the quality of their program overall

- **Excellent:** 80%
- **Above avg.:** 18%
- **Average:** 2%
- **Below avg.:** 0%
- **Failing:** 0%

#### Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

#### What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 71%
- Work in academia: 2%
- Work in government: 5%
- Self-employment: 2%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 11%
- Other: 2%

#### Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 91%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 9%

#### Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 54%
- No: 9%
- Undecided: 38%

### NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

#### How they grade the quality of their program overall

- **Excellent:** 41%
- **Above avg.:** 47%
- **Average:** 12%
- **Below avg.:** 0%
- **Failing:** 0%

#### Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 88%
- No: 12%

#### What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 12%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 65%
- Work in academia: 12%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 6%

#### Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 59%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 35%

#### Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 88%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 12%

#### Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 59%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 35%

### Other

- **Excellent: 80%**
- **Above avg.: 18%**
- **Average: 2%**
- **Below avg.: 0%**
- **Failing: 0%**

- **Excellent: 41%**
- **Above avg.: 47%**
- **Average: 12%**
- **Below avg.: 0%**
- **Failing: 0%**

- **Excellent: 80%**
- **Above avg.: 18%**
- **Average: 2%**
- **Below avg.: 0%**
- **Failing: 0%**

- **Excellent: 41%**
- **Above avg.: 47%**
- **Average: 12%**
- **Below avg.: 0%**
- **Failing: 0%**
**Pennsylvania State University**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 67%
- **Above avg.**: 27%
- **Average**: 7%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 12%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 65%
- Work in academia: 12%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 6%
- Other: 6%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 88%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 12%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 58%
- No: 3%
- Undecided: 39%
- Already LEED: 0%

**Rutgers University**

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 50%
- **Above avg.**: 36%
- **Average**: 14%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**
- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 71%
- Work in academia: 12%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 7%
- Other: 7%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 0%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 64%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 29%
- Already LEED: 0%
### UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 71%
- Work in academia: 7%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 7%
- Other: 7%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 0%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 87%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 7%

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 67%
- No: 33%

**What they’ll do after graduation**

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 7%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 7%
- Work in a private practice: 71%
- Work in academia: 7%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 7%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 20%
- Other: 7%

**Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam**

- Yes: 87%
- No: 7%
- Undecided: 7%

**Plan to become a LEED accredited professional**

- Yes: 80%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 20%
- Already LEED: 0%
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they'll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they'll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 5%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 13%
- Work in a private practice: 70%
- Work in academia: 3%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 3%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 5%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

How they grade the quality of their program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above avg.</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below avg.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Believe they'll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What they'll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 15%
- Work in a private practice: 70%
- Work in academia: 3%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 8%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 8%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already LEED</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 80%
- Above avg.: 20%
- Average: 0%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 20%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 10%
- Work in a private practice: 50%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 20%
- Other: 0%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 80%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 20%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 30%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 70%
- Already LEED: 0%

**UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 50%
- Above avg.: 38%
- Average: 13%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 96%
- No: 4%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 9%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 65%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 9%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 13%
- Other: 4%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 83%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 17%
- Already LEED: 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 65%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 35%
- Already LEED: 0%
### University of Michigan

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 46%
- **Above avg.**: 55%
- **Average**: 0%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

### University of New Mexico

**How they grade the quality of their program overall**

- **Excellent**: 8%
- **Above avg.**: 58%
- **Average**: 33%
- **Below avg.**: 0%
- **Failing**: 0%

**Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation**

- Yes: 83%
- No: 17%

### What they’ll do after graduation

- **Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture**: 0%
- **Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture**: 0%
- **Work in a private practice**: 36%
- **Work in academia**: 0%
- **Work in government**: 9%
- **Self-employment**: 0%
- **Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization**: 9%
- **Work in a field other than landscape architecture**: 0%
- **Undecided**: 46%
- **Other**: 0%

### Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 91%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 9%

### Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 75%
- No: 17%
- Undecided: 27%
- Already LEED: 9%

### Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 42%
- No: 17%
- Undecided: 42%
- Already LEED: 0%
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 64%
- Above avg.: 27%
- Average: 9%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 100%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 0%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 90%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 10%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 36%
- No: 18%
- Undecided: 46%
- Already LEED: 0%

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 92%
- Above avg.: 8%
- Average: 0%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 0%
- Work in academia: 0%
- Work in government: 0%
- Self-employment: 0%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 0%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 17%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%
- Undecided: 0%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 42%
- No: 17%
- Undecided: 42%
- Already LEED: XX%
**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 68%
- Above avg.: 14%
- Average: 14%
- Below avg.: 5%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 82%
- No: 18%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 50%
- Work in academia: 5%
- Work in government: 9%
- Self-employment: 9%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 9%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 9%
- Other: 9%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 77%
- No: 9%
- Undecided: 14%

Plan to become a LEED accredited professional

- Yes: 50%
- No: 9%
- Undecided: 36%
- Already LEED: 5%

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON**

How they grade the quality of their program overall

- Excellent: 50%
- Above avg.: 50%
- Average: 0%
- Below avg.: 0%
- Failing: 0%

Believe they’ll be well prepared for their profession upon graduation

- Yes: 100%
- No: 0%

What they’ll do after graduation

- Pursue an advanced degree in landscape architecture: 0%
- Pursue an advanced degree in something other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Work in a private practice: 50%
- Work in academia: 5%
- Work in government: 9%
- Self-employment: 9%
- Volunteer or work for a non-profit or community service organization: 9%
- Work in a field other than landscape architecture: 0%
- Undecided: 9%
- Other: 9%

Plan to take the Landscape Architect Registration Exam

- Yes: 42%
- No: 8%
- Undecided: 50%
- Already LEED: 0%
INTERIOR DESIGN

TOP 10 PROGRAMS 2013
In your firm’s hiring experience in the past five years, which schools are best preparing students for success in the profession?

UNDERGRADUATE
1. Savannah College of Art and Design
2. University of Cincinnati
2. Rhode Island School of Design
4. Pratt Institute
5. Auburn University
6. University of Texas at Austin
6. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
8. Boston Architectural College
8. Cornell University
8. Kansas State University
8. Parsons The New School for Design

GRADUATE
1. Savannah College of Art and Design
2. Rhode Island School of Design
3. Pratt Institute
4. Cornell University
4. Parsons The New School for Design
6. New England School of Art & Design at Suffolk Univ.*
6. School of the Art Institute of Chicago
8. Boston Architectural College*
9. Kansas State University*
9. University of Oregon*

*(CIDA-accredited)

Note: Respondents selected from a list of undergraduate programs accredited by the Council for Interior Design Accreditation. Because there are few CIDA-accredited graduate programs, many non-accredited programs were listed as choices, and write-in responses were allowed.

INTERIOR DESIGN SKILLS ASSESSMENT
The collegiate programs that hiring firms deem strongest in educating for each skill area

COMMUNICATION
• Auburn University
• Pratt Institute
• Rhode Island School of Design
• Savannah College of Art and Design
• University of Cincinnati

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY TEAMWORK
• Auburn University
• Pratt Institute
• Savannah College of Art and Design
• University of Cincinnati

DESIGN
• Cornell University
• Pratt Institute
• Rhode Island School of Design
• Savannah College of Art and Design
• University of Cincinnati

RESEARCH & THEORY
• Cornell University
• Pratt Institute
• Rhode Island School of Design
• Savannah College of Art and Design
• University of Cincinnati

Note: Lists are alphabetical, not ranked
HISTORICAL RANKING OF LEADING PROGRAMS

**UNDERGRADUATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pratt Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Auburn University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Boston Architectural College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cornell University</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kansas State University</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Parsons The New School for Design</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADUATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pratt Institute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cornell University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parsons The New School for Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. N.England School of Art &amp; Design at Suffolk Univ.*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School of the Art Institute of Chicago</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Boston Architectural College*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kansas State University*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. University of Oregon*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (CIDA-accredited)

Note: Programs without numerical rankings scored below the top 10 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population: 16.4%
- Globalization: 23.6%
- Integrated design: 29.1%
- Licensing issues: 20%
- Maintaining design quality: 54.5%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices: 36.4%
- Safety/security: 1.8%
- Speed of technological change: 49.1%
- Sustainability/climate change: 30.9%
- Urbanization: 3.6%
- Other: 18.2%

Rate your satisfaction with the state of interior design education in the United States today.

- Very dissatisfied: 2%
- Dissatisfied: 8%
- Neutral: 16%
- Satisfied: 46%
- Very satisfied: 28%

Are students graduating with an adequate understanding of sustainable materials and the procurement and recycling processes?

- Inadequate understanding: 10.9%
- More than adequate understanding: 18.2%
- Adequate understanding: 70.9%

Is your firm benefiting from an infusion of new ideas about sustainability from recent graduate new hires?

- Yes: 61.1%
- No: 38.9%

Is it beneficial to your firm when recent graduate new hires had study abroad experience while they were in school?

- It doesn’t really benefit our firm: 18.2%
- It’s somewhat beneficial to our firm: 41.8%
- It’s very beneficial to our firm: 40%
INTERIOR DESIGN DEANS SURVEY

The *DesignIntelligence* Survey of Interior Design Deans and Department Heads collects the perspectives of 122 academic leaders weighing in on the status and progress of their own and peer programs.

**Most admired undergraduate interior design programs**

1. **University of Cincinnati**
   - For its extraordinary co-op program and integration with the profession.

2. **Pratt Institute**
   - For its great faculty and quality design work.

3. **University of North Carolina at Greensboro**
   - For its strong curriculum and engagement in the community.

4. **University of Texas at Austin**
   - For excellent faculty, resources, and studio culture.

5. **Savannah College of Art and Design**
   - For its invaluable art based program and location.

5. **Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University**
   - For its leadership and consistently strong and innovative program.

**Most admired graduate interior design programs**

1. **Florida State University**
   - For its faculty-student interaction and competent graduates.

2. **University of Minnesota**
   - For its strong research and faculty.

3. **Cornell University**
   - For the high quality of graduates and research.

3. **Savannah College of Art and Design**
   - For its excellent program and design skills.

5. **University of Oregon**
   - For its valuable collaborative curriculum and the breadth of subject matter covered.
Average number of full-time faculty ................................................................. 5.8
Average percentage of faculty who are adjunct professors ........................................ 23.9%
Average teaching load per academic year for full-time equivalent faculty ......................... 17.1 hours

The most significant changes in course offerings in the past five years (Multiple responses)

- More emphasis on sustainable design ............................................................ 66.7%
- More emphasis on urban design ..................................................................... 7.1%
- More emphasis on global issues/international practice ...................................... 32.1%
- More emphasis on professional practice ......................................................... 19%
- More emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration and integrated practice .............. 50%
- More technology integration ......................................................................... 44%
- More integrative projects ............................................................................... 22.6%
- More community engagement ....................................................................... 42.9%
- Upgrades in technology (hardware or software) ............................................. 46.4%
- Study abroad opportunities .......................................................................... 32.1%
- Retention of quality teaching staff ................................................................. 23.8%
- Other ............................................................................................................ 17.9%

The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population ............................................................................. 36.8%
- Globalization .............................................................................................. 42.7%
- Integrated design ......................................................................................... 43.6%
- Licensing issues ......................................................................................... 30.8%
- Maintaining design quality ......................................................................... 30.8%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices ................................................. 12%
- Safety/security ............................................................................................. 6%
- Speed of technological change .................................................................... 38.5%
- Sustainability/climate change ..................................................................... 49.6%
- Urbanization ............................................................................................... 3.4%
- Other ......................................................................................................... 12%

Compared to 2012, deans expect their program’s 2013 budgets to be

- Lower .................................................................................................... 19.8%
- Higher ..................................................................................................... 7.4%
- Similar .................................................................................................. 72.8%

Compared to 2012, deans expect their 2013 student enrollments to be

- Lower ..................................................................................................... 8.5%
- Higher .................................................................................................... 28%
- Similar .................................................................................................. 63.4%
INDUSTRIAL DESIGN

TOP 10 PROGRAMS 2013

In your firm’s hiring experience in the past five years, which schools are best preparing students for success in the profession?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Art Center College of Design</td>
<td>1. Art Center College of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>2. Pratt Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pratt Institute</td>
<td>2. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>4. Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td>4. Auburn University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Auburn University</td>
<td>4. Cranbrook Academy of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. College for Creative Studies</td>
<td>7. Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>7. Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Syracuse University</td>
<td>7. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDUSTRIAL DESIGN SKILLS ASSESSMENT

The collegiate programs that hiring firms deem strongest in educating for each skill area

COMMUNICATION
- Art Center College
- Auburn University
- Carnegie Mellon
- Savannah College of Art and Design
- University of Cincinnati

COMPUTER APPLICATIONS
- Art Center College
- Auburn University
- University of Cincinnati

Note: Lists are alphabetical, not ranked

CROSS-DISCIPLINARY TEAMWORK
- Arizona State University
- Auburn University
- University of Cincinnati

DESIGN
- Art Center College
- Auburn University
- Pratt Institute
- Savannah College of Art and Design
- University of Cincinnati
HISTORICAL RANKING OF LEADING PROGRAMS

UNDERGRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Art Center College of Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 University of Cincinnati</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Pratt Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Va. Polytechnic Institute and State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Auburn University</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 College for Creative Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRADUATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Art Center College of Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pratt Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Arizona State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Auburn University</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cranbrook Academy of Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Programs without numerical rankings scored below the top 10 or did not have an accredited program at that time.
Rate your satisfaction with the state of industrial design education in the United States today.

- Dissatisfied: 10%
- Very satisfied: 15%
- Satisfied: 40%
- Neutral: 35%

Are students graduating with an adequate understanding of material life cycles, recycling processes, design for disassembly, environmental impacts of materials and processes, and ecodesign principles?

- More than adequate understanding: 73.9%
- Adequate understanding: 21.7%
- Inadequate understanding: 4.3%

Is your firm benefiting from an infusion of new ideas about sustainability from recent graduate new hires?

- Yes: 56.5%
- No: 43.5%

Is it beneficial to your firm when recent graduate new hires had study abroad experience while they were in school?

- It’s very beneficial to our firm: 26.1%
- It’s somewhat beneficial to our firm: 21.7%
- It doesn’t really benefit our firm: 52.2%

The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population: 13%
- Globalization: 43.5%
- Integrated design: 43.5%
- Licensing issues: 0%
- Maintaining design quality: 69.6%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices: 30.4%
- Safety/security: 8.7%
- Speed of technological change: 39.1%
- Sustainability/climate change: 17.4%
- Urbanization: 4.3%
- Other: 26.1%
INDUSTRIAL DESIGN DEANS SURVEY

The DesignIntelligence Survey of Industrial Design Deans and Department Heads collects the perspectives of 39 academic leaders weighing in on the status and progress of their own and peer programs.

Most admired undergraduate industrial design programs

1. University of Cincinnati
   For its great co-op program and design excellence.

2. Rhode Island School of Design
   For its training and skilled graduates.

3. Carnegie Mellon
   For the quality of student work and relationships to the industry.

3. Pratt Institute
   For its focus on individual students and resulting innovative, creative graduates.

3. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
   For its strengths in cross disciplinary teamwork, design, and prototyping.

Most admired graduate industrial design programs

1. Illinois Institute of Technology
   For its well-structured curriculum and attention to business as well as design.

1. Rhode Island School of Design
   For its multidisciplinary approach to design and strong mentoring of students.

3. Art Center College of Design
   For its forward looking focus on the role of design in business and research.

3. Carnegie Mellon
   For its advanced use of technology and strong program.

5. Cranbrook Academy of Art
   For its unique studio culture and emphasis on design.

5. Pratt Institute
   For its strong and diverse faculty and professional program.

5. University of Cincinnati
   For its interdisciplinary research and industry connections.
Average number of full-time faculty ................................................................. 6.8
Average percentage of faculty who are adjunct professors ........................................ 25.8%
Average teaching load per academic year for full-time equivalent faculty ......................... 16.3 hours

The most significant changes in course offerings in the past five years (Multiple responses)

- More emphasis on sustainable design .............................................................. 46.2%
- More emphasis on urban design ........................................................................ 3.8%
- More emphasis on global issues/international practice ........................................ 34.6%
- More emphasis on professional practice ............................................................ 26.9%
- More emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration and integrated practice ................. 73.1%
- More technology integration ............................................................................. 34.6%
- More integrative projects .................................................................................... 34.6%
- More community engagement ........................................................................... 23.1%
- Upgrades in technology (hardware or software) .................................................. 53.8%
- Study abroad opportunities ................................................................................ 26.9%
- Retention of quality teaching staff ..................................................................... 34.6%
- Other .................................................................................................................. 23.1%

The design professions’ biggest concerns (Multiple responses)

- Aging of the population .................................................................................... 28.9%
- Globalization ..................................................................................................... 50%
- Integrated design ............................................................................................... 47.4%
- Licensing issues ................................................................................................ 10.5%
- Maintaining design quality ............................................................................... 36.8%
- Retaining quality staff in design practices ......................................................... 13.2%
- Safety/security ................................................................................................... 0%
- Speed of technological change .......................................................................... 47.4%
- Sustainability/climate change .......................................................................... 60.5%
- Urbanization ...................................................................................................... 0%
- Other .................................................................................................................. 28.9%
A SAMPLING FROM THE DESIGN LEADERSHIP INDEX AT GREENWAY GROUP

A brief list of leaders in award-winning firms and their institutional affiliations shows diversity of education backgrounds.

ADRIAN SMITH + GORDON GILL
ARCHITECTURE
Gordon Gill, Partner
B.S., Architecture ........................................ Ryerson University
M. Architecture ........................................ University of Texas at Arlington
M. Architecture ........................................ Harvard University

ALLIED WORKS
Brad Cloepfil, Founding Principal
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Oregon
M. Architecture ........................................ Columbia University

BERGMeyer ASSOCIATES, INC.
David Tubridy, President
M. Architecture ........................................ Harvard University
B. Architecture ........................................ Pratt Institute

BKL ARCHITECTURE LLC
Thomas Kerwin, Principal
MBA ..................................................... Northwestern University
B. Architecture ........................................ Ball State University

BRUNER/COTT & ASSOCIATES
Simeon Bruner, Founding Principal
A.B., Biology ........................................... Brandeis University
M. Architecture ........................................ Yale University

CANNON DESIGN
Mark Mendell, Co-chairman and President
B.S., Architecture ...................................... Rhode Island School of Design

CO ARCHITECTS
Scott P. Kelsey, Managing Principal
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Oregon

DILLER SCOFIDIO + RENFRO
Elizabeth Diller, Principal
B. Architecture ........................................... Cooper Union

DLR GROUP
Griff Davenport, Managing Principal
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Nebraska

ELKS MANFREDI ARCHITECTS
David Manfredi, Founding Principal
B.A., English ............................................. University of Notre Dame
M.A., English ............................................. Columbia University
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Notre Dame

FOX ARCHITECTS
Sabret A. Flocos, Managing Principal, Virginia Office
B.S., Housing and Interior Environment .... Colorado St. University

GBBN ARCHITECTS, INC.
Matthew Schottelkotte, CEO
BS Architecture ........................................ University of Cincinnati

HANBURY EVANS WRIGHT VLATTAS + CO.
Jane Cady Wright, CEO and President
B. Architecture ........................................... Virginia Tech

HGA ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS
Daniel Avchen, CEO
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Minnesota

HKS, INC.
Dan Noble, Design Partner
BA Architecture ......................................... North Dakota State University
BS Architecture ......................................... North Dakota State University

HOLZMAN MOSS BOTTINO
ARCHITECTURE
Nestor Bottino, Partner
Bachelor of Environmental Design......... Texas A&M University
M. Architecture ......................................... University of Texas at Austin

JBHM ARCHITECT
Richard McNeel, President
B. Architecture ........................................... Mississippi State University

KODET ARCHITECTURAL GROUP, LTD.
Edward J. Kodet, President, Principal-in-Charge
M. Architecture ........................................ University of Minnesota
B. Architecture ........................................ University of Nebraska
Kohn Pedersen Fox Associates
A. Eugene Kohn, Chairman
B. Architecture University of Pennsylvania
M. Architecture University of Pennsylvania

Lord, Aeck & Sargent
Antonin (Tony) Aeck, Chairman of the Board
Bachelor of Arts & Architecture Rice University

Machado and Silvetti Associates
Rodolfo Machado, Principal
M. Architecture University of California at Berkeley
Cert. de Chercheur Centre de Recherche d’Urbanisme Diploma in Architecture University of Buenos Aires

Mack Scogin Merrill Elam
Mack Scogin, Partner
B. Architecture Georgia Institute of Technology

Meyer Scherer & Rockcastle
Jeffrey Scherer, Principal
B. Architecture University of Arkansas

NBBJ
R. Steven McConnell, Managing Partner, Design
B.A., Architecture Southern California Institute of Architecture

Olson Kundig
Tom Kundig, Principal and Owner
B. Architecture University of Washington

Payette
James H. Collins, President
B. Science Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
MBA Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
B. Architecture Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

Pei Cobb Freed & Partners
George H. Miller, Partner
B. Architecture Pennsylvania State University

Perkowitz+Ruth Architects
Simon Perkowitz, President and CEO
BS Architectural Engineering Calif. Poly. Univ. San Luis Obispo

Pickard Chilton
William D. Chilton, Principal
M. Architecture University of Minnesota
BA Architecture Iowa State University

Rdg Planning & Design
John R. Birge, CEO and Principal
B. Architecture Iowa State University

Richard Meier & Partners
Richard Meier, Managing Partner
B. Architecture Cornell University

RNL
H. Joshua Gould, CEO, Chairman of the Board, Principal
Bachelor of Art Rutgers University
M. Architecture University of Colorado
MBA University of Colorado

Rtkl Associates Inc.
Lance K. Josal, President and CEO
B.A North Dakota State University
B. Architecture North Dakota State University

Skidmore, Owings, and Merrill, LLP
Gary Haney, Partner
M. Architecture Harvard University
B. Environmental Design Miami University of Ohio

Smallwood, Reynolds, Stewart, Stewart & Associates, Inc.
Howard H. Stewart, President
B. Architecture Georgia Institute of Technology

Thomas Phifer + Partners
Thomas Phifer, Partner
B. Architecture Clemson University
M. Architecture Clemson University

Thompson, Ventulett, Stainback & Associates, Inc.
Roger L. Neuenschwander, President
M. Business University of Pennsylvania
B. Architecture Ball State University

Tod Williams Billie Tsien
Billie Tsien, Partner
Bachelor of Fine Arts Yale University
M. Architecture University of California, Los Angeles
The Case for General Education

Accrediting Board study shows that architecture students benefit from liberal arts studies on the job and in higher learning.

—By Andrea S. Rutledge

In 2013, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) will undertake the next review of The Conditions for Accreditation. As part of the preparation, the NAAB commissioned a study of accredited architectural education in order to set a baseline for analyzing and synthesizing the positions and recommendations expected to come from other organizations in architecture and related professional groups.

The study was designed to identify the educational needs of architecture students, to test the utility of the NAAB’s conditions on infrastructure (e.g., financial, human, physical, and information resources) and to probe whether the existing commitment to and requirement for general studies remains valid.

Eighty-eight percent of respondents agreed that architecture students benefit from general or liberal arts studies (NAAB Study of Accredited Architectural Education, 2012). When asked what skills and knowledge were developed in liberal arts education (also referred to as general education or liberal education), respondents noted the following benefits:

- Critical thinking.
- Learning to learn.
- Synthesis of multiple subjects.
- Understanding other cultures.
- Collaborative teamwork with other professionals.

The respondents are not alone in this belief. Others outside the profession have spent a great deal of time and effort in the last 10 years considering the role and purpose of liberal learning in 21st century higher education. Here are a few:

In her February 2009 TED Talk, Liz Coleman, president of Bennington College, said to the audience in Long Beach, Calif., that “there is no such thing as a viable democracy made up of experts, zealots, politicians and spectators.” Coleman was expressing her dismay that as colleges and universities encouraged students to learn “more and more about less and less,” the “expert had dethroned the educated generalist to become the sole model of intellectual accomplishment.” In Coleman’s eye, the elevation of increasingly specific technical expertise over critical thinking and social responsibility had placed “civic-mindedness outside the realm of serious thinking and adult purposes.”

In their 2007 report, College Learning for the New Global Century, The Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Na-
tional Leadership Council for their Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) initiative noted that as post-secondary learning becomes more important for individual success, the policy arena has turned to matters of access, costs and student success. All of these are, according to AAC&U, generally measured by enrollment, persistence (retention) and degree attainment. In other words, the pressure today is to produce graduates who finish in four years’ time with a skill set that makes them immediately employable or prepared for advanced study.

The skills identified by the respondents to the NAAB study as being the outcomes of general or liberal education are aligned with those identified by AAC&U/LEAP and by Coleman:

**AAC&U/LEAP**

- Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world through studies in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages and the arts.
- Intellectual and practice skills, including inquiry and analysis, critical and creative thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative literacy, information literacy, and team work and problem solving.
- Personal and social responsibilities including civic knowledge and engagement – local and global, intercultural knowledge and competence, ethical reasoning and action, and foundations and skills for lifelong learning.
- Integrative learning including synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies.

**COLEMAN**

- Rhetoric: The art of organizing the world of words to maximum effect.
- Design: The art of organizing the world of things.
- Mediation and improvisation.
- Quantitative reasoning.
- The capacity to discriminate between what is at the core and what is at the periphery.

Based on the results of the NAAB study and the growing body of literature supporting the role of liberal learning, let us agree that further and deeper learning of these subjects or skills is cru-
cial to the success of emerging professionals in the 21st century. The question then emerges of when and where should architecture students learn these subjects and skills: in architecture school or in their preparatory or preprofessional education? Who would be responsible for ensuring their competence?

The AAC&U/LEAP report argues that these learning outcomes should be emphasized across every field of college study from architecture to zoology and including professional fields such as accounting, engineering, nursing and physical therapy. “General education plays a role, but it is not possible to squeeze all these important aims into the general education program alone. The majors must address them as well.”

“Architects are problem-solvers and community builders who direct the vision of a building project from concept to reality.”

Some will argue that The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation are already too prescriptive, and after having been reduced over the last 15 years to the current 32, the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) should not be expanded. Some have already suggested that the NAAB abandon the criteria for general education, communication skills, collaboration skills, cultural literacy, ethics and time management as “already addressed by the regional accreditors.”

The NAAB appreciates the grinding pressure on faculty, departments and schools to produce more graduates in less time, to attract larger research grants, and to raise significant sums for operations. Yet in order to sustain a system of accreditation “that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs” (NAAB Mission, Vision, and Values, October 2011), we must also listen carefully to what is going on in the world: Employers are calling for graduates who have a “working appreciation of the historical, cultural, ethical and global environments that surround the application of skilled work” (College Learning for the New Global Century, p. 16). College presidents and campus leaders like Coleman are anxious to redefine the learning they must deliver if our democracy is to succeed.

According to the early results of The American Institute of Architects’ repositioning project, its members agree that “architects are problem-solvers and community builders who direct the vision of a building project from concept to reality.” This role within a community calls not only for individuals trained in the unique — some say “dangerous” — knowledge required to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public, but also prepared to think critically, analyze choices, synthesize information, organize the world of words and differentiate between the critical and the distracting.

The natural next questions are “how should these skills be assessed?” and “are NAAB teams
prepared to look for the ‘right’ types of evidence of student achievement of these skills?” The conversations within the NAAB relative to the next review of The Conditions have already begun to focus on the importance of new assessment strategies. But where to begin?

In 2001, I read Italo Calvino’s book Six Memos for the Next Millennium as I was preparing a paper for the Oxford Roundtable on Higher Education and found embedded there clues for evaluating institutional success. Recently I reread that 2001 paper and began to consider whether within Calvino’s six qualities of literature there might be ideas for assessing student learning. Briefly, the six memos are:

**Lightness** – the ability to move into a different space in order to “change my approach, look at the work from a different perspective, with a different logic” (Calvino, 7). The ability to connect microcosm and macrocosm and explore the space between.

**Quickness** – the ability to think with “agility, mobility, and ease” (Calvino, 46). Finding that a rush of simultaneous ideas “sets the mind afloat on such an abundance of thoughts or images … that either it cannot embrace them all, or it has no time to be idle.” (Calvino, 42).

**Exactitude** – leadership that express priorities and objectives with “(1) a well-defined and well-calculated plan for the work in question. (2) an evocation of clear, incisive, memorable visual images: … and (3) a language as precise as possible” (Calvino, 56).

**Visibility** – giving image to words and words to image. Finding in verbal and written form the most concise and fulfilling expression of the intangible images and ideas that form the core of a project’s purpose.

**Multiplicity** – understanding and pressing the “network of connections between the events, the people and the things of the world” (Calvino, 105).

**Consistency** – the last memo was never completed by Calvino.

If these were used to identify the types of learning architecture students need in order to begin and complete professional studies, how would teams know? Imagine this:

**Lightness** – Do students demonstrate the ability to identify, explain and incorporate the needs
of users/occupants according to the distinct cultural norms of any and all user groups? Do students demonstrate the ability to use multiple forms of graphic representation to explain their concepts and ideas? Do students demonstrate the ability to connect the larger needs of society (macrocosm) with the specific needs of the client (microcosm)?

Quickness – Do students demonstrate that they have explored multiple precedents, ideas, images, scientific information, and related disciplines in the search for a solution to the design problem as presented? Do they demonstrate the use of an “abundance of thoughts or images” rather than pursuing the most expedient or obvious solution?

Exactitude – Can students plan their work in such a way as to convince others of their ability to integrate all the required elements of a comprehensive design?

Visibility — Do students demonstrate the ability to think, draw, write and speak concisely and to fully express their ideas, objectives and outcomes for a particular project?

Multiplicity – Do students demonstrate their understanding of what it means to be a member of a democratic society and to act responsibly and with a view toward understanding the “network of connections between the events, the people and the things of the world?”

This is a set of ideas offered as a place to begin the discussion, not a set of final conclusions.

That said, based on the outcomes of *The Study of Accredited Architectural Education* and other analysis, the NAAB has already come to realize that educating the 21st century emerging professional calls not for fewer SPC related to leadership, collaboration, communication and critical thinking, but instead for improved definitions, better guidelines on how these SPC are manifested in student work, and new or different types of assessment strategies for teams.

To that end, I hope everyone will take advantage of the opportunity to contribute to the NAAB’s deliberations in 2013. The deadline for all submissions — white papers, letters, messages, reports, recommended reading or shared research — is Jan. 31, 2013. You can send them to forum@naab.org.

Andrea S. Rutledge, CAE, has been the executive director of The National Architectural Accrediting Board since 2007.
For several decades now, architecture and interior design have struggled with how and where they intersect as professions and as academic disciplines. To the extent that this struggle continues to be defined by two opposing and irreconcilable points of view, it promises to continue into the foreseeable future with little meaningful change.

As the professional world becomes increasingly connected and interdisciplinary, however, and as more colleges and universities align these academic majors, the topic has seen renewed interest. A recent series of faculty exchanges labeled “Inside/Out — Architecture and Interior Design Curricula” endorsed by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) and the Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC), as well as recent efforts from an ACSA subcommittee to rethink accreditation standards, suggest that this disciplinary relationship remains, to some extent, in flux, and that we should continue to look to define a working relationship that will support the disciplinary distinction of both groups as well as their inherent connection. I suggest herein such a possible definition of how these disciplines might intersect, and — by extension — how a reconceived and more broadly defined profession might better engage the array of allied design disciplines in academic and professional settings.

**CONTEXT**

The commercial interiors industry has evolved largely since the middle of the last century for a variety of reasons. Historically, architects have held responsibility for completing the architectural interior of buildings, although artisans, craftsmen, furniture makers and — more recently — interior decorators have played a role. Beginning in the mid-1900s, the idea of the speculative building and a shift from corporate ownership to leasing began to separate the design of the building from the design of its interior. Urban cores have aged, prompting the need for interior renovation of still viable building shells. More importantly, an increasing complexity associated with the building interior — in workplace, healthcare, institutional and other types of environments — required an increased expertise and an increased level of specialization in professional services. This trend toward specialization continues, as evidenced by such things as LEED-certification and similar credentialing, which continue to fragment expertise across the range of architectural and design services.

The immergence of a commercial interiors market has brought with it an extensive support structure of professional organizations (IIDA, ASID, IDC, IFI), academic accreditors (CIDA),
and regulatory agencies (NCIDQ) — along with some success in the licensing arena — which have helped to professionalize the discipline. Academic programs previously focused on home economics and the design of the residential interior began to adjust to accommodate this new commercial interiors market. Architectural education, it’s worth noting, did not, likely given its longer history and somewhat more entrenched position.

What this debate is not about is the viability of the interiors industry, which includes about 70,000 businesses in the U.S. with combined annual revenue of $11 billion. Although a significant segment of this market includes sole practitioners engaged in smaller- or residential-scale work, it is the burgeoning commercial interiors market (much of it composed of architects) that is up for grabs. But this industry is here to stay. The debate is also not about who will do the work. The marketplace insures that those who possess both the skills and the interest in working at the interior scale will do so. This is apparent in any multidisciplinary commercial practice where work assignments are made mostly on the basis of interest and ability, rather than academic background or professional credentials.

So it is not the existence of the commercial interior design profession but rather its ownership that is being challenged. Which academic programs, accreditors and regulators should have jurisdiction? How should this group of emerging professionals be licensed, and what should they be called? The market share at stake insures that both legal and ideological battles will continue. Unfortunately, these battles fail to advance the dialogue or to suggest new models for collaborative practice that can advance the collective profession. So where do we go from here?

**OPPOSING PERSPECTIVES**

Architects continue to argue that the design of interior space falls under their jurisdiction; that the architect is qualified by education and experience to design the interior; and that they’ve always had this responsibility. So this doesn’t need to change. But things have changed. Increased complexity in the design of interior environments has demanded a more focused expertise and skill set related to sustainable interior materials, ergonomics, design for multiple populations, ADA compliance, workplace design, facilities management, interior lighting and other aspects of the built environment focused at the interior scale. This is clearly evidenced by the growth of the separate, parallel career track in interior design. Architectural education, given its inherent breadth, has failed to provide the focused experience at the interior scale needed to support an evolving and high level interior design practice. Thus, many talented college-bound students have chosen to pursue an interior design education more directly aligned with their passions and interests, even if this might ultimately place them at a disadvantage in the professional and licensing arenas.

A different argument posited by architects suggests that even if one acknowledges the need for
a more focused interior scale education, those interior design programs that currently exist lack the conceptual and technical rigor, and theoretical base, needed to adequately prepare future professionals. This argument, I suggest, fails as well, because it only critiques the status quo at a point in time. What if interior design education met all quality benchmarks that one might construct? Would it then be justified? Further, the quality of interior design education has improved significantly as the accreditation process has evolved and as more programs have aligned with architecture and other allied design disciplines and bolstered the level of academic and theoretical rigor.

The most compelling argument for why the career tracks in architecture and interior design need to remain connected is actually a simple one: it is impossible to separate the design of a building from the design of its interior. The interior evolves directly from the formal and conceptual ideas of the building, and the building is (or should be) directly impacted by programmatic and human behavioral constraints of the interior. This connection is particularly obvious in the curricula of aligned academic programs. Foundational courses addressing beginning design principles, history, theory, graphic communication or building technology are fundamentally the same for the beginning student in architecture or in interior design. As the knowledge base diverges, and the student develops more specialized knowledge, so too do the academic tracks diverge. Students must increasingly rely on each others’ expertise. In practice, complex projects are designed by teams of specialists. Team members contribute specific talents and abilities that relate to the scale at which they work, but they continue to share common knowledge. The connection between building and interior remains critical. Thus, the study of architecture and the study of the architectural interior in the academic setting need to appropriately model the collaborative and integrated way of working that graduates will encounter in the professional setting.

**THE MEDICAL MODEL**

If one acknowledges both the distinction of an emergent interior design profession — with its own unique knowledge base — and its integral and important connection with architecture, we can arrive at a more nuanced understanding of how these disciplines might intersect. Arguably, architecture and interior design are both distinct and connected.

Current discourse argues for both breadth (shared knowledge) and depth (specialized knowledge) in the educational curriculum. This is exemplified in the medical profession, where a core education precedes a focus in one or more sub-specialties. Students complete a medical degree (and ultimately become licensed physicians) but subsequently earn certification in a specialty area. A pediatrician and brain surgeon possess very different types of knowledge, but both are doctors. The medical profession can serve as a model for how we might rethink the relationship between architecture and interior design.
Although the intent here is not to propose a specific model, one might envision a 3+2+1 educational track that delivers a three-year shared undergraduate core of liberal and foundational design education, a two-year shared accredited professional core leading to licensure, and a one-year specialization in interior design — or in *any of a variety* of sub-specializations under the broader umbrella of the built environment. Just as we should support specialization in interior design, a more expansive model could support specialization in sustainable environments, digital practices, construction management, material science, structural systems, or any of a number of focus areas that would position our graduates for meaningful practice. Such a model would allow existing four-year programs to remain viable as feeder schools while recognizing the current trend to reduce time-to-graduation at the undergraduate level. Such a model would also need to incorporate a “leveling component” (as occurs now) to insure that students who begin their education in another field are adequately equipped for graduate study.

At six years of total study, a 3+2+1 educational track would more than replicate current NAAB and CIDA requirements for time to degree. The only challenge would be to align those educational standards that are shared (core) and to separate those that are specialized. Initially, such an accreditation model would be driven by the need to support aligned academic programs and to recognize their integrated pedagogy. This model could be developed jointly by NAAB and CIDA and might need to exist for some period of time in test mode, not replacing but paralleling current standards. Testing and licensing requirements would follow suit, as deemed appropriate. Over time, the marketplace would prove (or disprove) the wisdom of such an aligned academic model.

**HOW TO GET THERE**

Many educators and practitioners in both disciplinary camps support the argument for an integrated professional track. The more challenging problem, however, may be to actually make this happen given that the existing relationship between disciplines is more combative and protectionist than it is collaborative. To some extent, an integrated model is already being explored in the schools, where architecture and interior design programs are administratively aligned and share core curricula, or where single “hybrid” programs, accredited by NAAB but focusing on interiors, straddle the boundaries of each discipline. And yet, currently, the schools must make the decision to conform (or not) to the guidelines of the accrediting organizations. NAAB and CIDA allow little latitude for a more shared or expansive practice. So where programs are administratively aligned, the accreditation process remains distinct. And any hybrid program must choose to align with one accreditor or the other (or neither one), ultimately compromising the educational program.

The professional organizations are least likely to take the lead in promoting a more integrated professional track. By definition, professional
organizations promote and preserve the status quo and are unlikely to propose any changes that would threaten their livelihood. It is likely, then, that the accrediting organizations along with educators, may be best suited to explore new relationships with the sister discipline. Although both NAAB and CIDA serve at the pleasure of the professions and the schools, they are also smaller and more flexible, and engage continually in the process of examining and revising academic standards.

A more expansive and inclusive architectural profession that recognizes disciplinary specialty as a complement to core knowledge will not evolve overnight. It will require significant dialogue and time. Most certainly, this idea will challenge the inclusion of those interior design practitioners who focus exclusively on the furnishing or decoration of interior space rather than the design of its architecture, or who have minimal involvement with issues of health, safety and welfare. But again, just as with the medical profession, this subset of the profession would pursue educational and examination levels consistent with the work being performed. Nurses, technicians and others are important contributors in the medical system, but they are credentialed at levels appropriate to the work. There is flexibility in the system.

A more integrated professional model would also challenge the fact that, currently, the time to degree in architecture required for accreditation and licensure (five to six years) differs from that required in interior design (four years). This poses a very real impediment to alignment within a single academic model. If interior design accreditation were to shift to the graduate level (a position currently being advocated by several design educators), this would place both disciplines on an even playing field and facilitate the dialogue. While such a shift, on the surface, threatens existing four-year degree programs, these programs would continue to exist and to make valuable contributions to the education of future design practitioners. They would only need to rethink their mission.

Similarly, a more integrated professional model would challenge the various collateral organizations in each profession to rethink their mission and affiliations. And yet this does not necessarily need to threaten their existence; it would only redefine how they work and with whom they work. Interior design professionals matriculating through a more integrated educational, testing and licensing system would still need to be educated, tested and licensed by those with expertise in interior design, and they would continue to demand organizational support defined by a common interest and expertise in interior design.

How this plays out may ultimately be dictated by the marketplace. The newly created hybrid programs (NAAB-accredited but with an interiors focus) will ultimately succeed or fail. To succeed, I believe that the focus on an interiors education cannot be token. It will need to be real and meaningful. And this will only occur if NAAB recognizes the need to broaden standards
to allow for flexibility and specialization tied to a core competency. If these hybrid programs do succeed, though, it is logical to think that other interior design degree programs would follow — especially those aligned with NAAB-accredited programs in architecture. The efficiencies and economic advantages of working with a single accreditor would be compelling.

If one believes that a more aligned and collaborative practice is in our future, then the process for getting there can either be unilateral or collaborative. As the older and more established profession, architecture may need to lead this dialogue or at least publicly endorse it. Should architecture (and its collateral organizations) choose to expand its professional definition to accommodate and legally recognize interior design (a unilateral approach), then interior design programs and practitioners could realign with this more inclusively defined profession. Such a strategy, although potentially efficient initially, could be slowed by a lengthy and divisive battle over the longer term. Such a unilateral action by the architectural profession would pit programs, accreditors, and associations against each other, likely delaying any meaningful development of a new model and continuing to confuse the public. To the extent that it’s possible, it may be more productive in the long run to promote a dialogue between the two professions in pursuit of a new collaborative model that does a better job of supporting disciplinary specialty. The end goal would be the same, but both parties would come to the table to hammer out the details.

On the heels of the Inside-Out conferences, it is time for the architecture and interior design establishment to make this a priority. It is time to give serious attention to the idea of an expanded and inclusive educational model more closely aligned with the medical profession, a model that allows for both shared and distinct knowledge reflective of contemporary practice. Many of the best academic programs in the country are asking for it. In the end, a more inclusive, diverse and unified profession is a win for all involved. One can only imagine how such a re-envisioned profession might impact our collective potential and influence in the world.

John Weigand is a professor and chair for the Department of Architecture and Interior Design at Miami University. Weigand earned architectural degrees at Miami and at the University of Illinois, and he worked professionally in Chicago from 1980 to 1991 prior to teaching. At Miami, Weigand developed the B.F.A. in interior design (1995) and directed the B.F.A. program until 2006. In 2001, he was awarded the NCARB Prize for creative integration of practice and education in the academy, for his work with collaborative, Internet-based design.

1 http://www.ibisworld.com/industry/default.aspx?indid=1410
The Need for a National Academy of Environmental Design

Architects, planners, constructors and others join together to tackle today’s urgent environmental challenges.

—By Kim Tanzer

Sustainability is today’s sputnik.” This frequently made assertion captures the importance and urgency of creating sustainable human environments. While today’s challenges are global, not just national, the need to act quickly — with expert knowledge and alert to unexpected consequences — is as present today as it was half a century ago.

For this reason, environmental designers around the country — architects, landscape architects, interior designers, planners, constructors and others — have joined together to form the National Academy of Environmental Design.

Highlighting this sense of urgency, the academy’s mission statement and purpose reads, in part: “Pressing and catastrophic challenges face the United States and the world, including precipitous climate change, species extinction, and a wide range of epidemics and toxins affecting human health. The factors that cause these problems are complex and often poorly understood even when recognized, but many such problems involve the communities, landscapes, buildings and products people occupy and use. The National Academy of Environmental Design has been created to address these problems through the diverse knowledge and practical expertise of the environmental design and related disciplines.”

Today’s environmental challenges are often described as “wicked problems” — problems caused by many factors acting simultaneously, requiring complex decision making in the face of sometimes unknowable outcomes. Traditional scientific thinking — often characterized by its reliance on linear deductive or inductive reasoning applied to questions neatly bounded to limit experimental variables and by the necessity of replicable results — cannot fully address today’s “wicked problems.” By contrast, design thinking — also known as abductive thinking, lateral thinking or creative thinking — focuses on finding patterns and similarities among complex sets of information.

A number of research methods developed by members of the environmental design disciplines are useful in understanding and acting on “wicked problems”: So-called natural experiments seek answers in real-world situations rather than within laboratory settings. Place-based knowledge, often held by local populations, provides evidence of change over long periods of time, especially change affecting natural systems. Case studies look comprehensively at similar circumstances — such as building or landscape typologies — for lessons to be applied in similar situations. Scenario planning is a method for strategically considering an array of potential futures without ar-
tificially limiting important variables. Each of these methods, well known to environmental designers, provides a rigorous means to evaluate a complex environmental situation, with the goal of recommending action toward a preferred future.

Because environmental designers have tended to focus on the future, we have spent less time sharing our knowledge of past successes and failures among our own disciplines and with the larger world. The National Academy of Environmental Design was established to create a forum for expert collaborative exchange.

**OTHER NATIONAL ACADEMIES**

Over the past 150 years the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering and the Institute of Medicine, along with their research partner the National Research Council, have been called upon by policy makers to provide expert, peer-reviewed recommendations on important societal challenges. Each was created during a time of crisis: The National Academy of Sciences was incorporated in Washington D.C. by President Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War in 1863; the National Research Council was convened in 1916 during World War I; the National Academy of Engineering began in 1964 against the backdrop of the Cold War and the space race; and the Institute of Medicine was established in 1970 at the start of what was called the “war on cancer.” Their collective mission, as outlined by President Lincoln in the original charter of the National Academy of Sciences, is to serve “whenever called upon by any department or agency of the government, to investigate, examine, experiment and report upon any subject of science or art.” Members of study groups are appointed by their peers because of their knowledge in particular scholarly disciplines.

But, as described in the 2007 resolution to create the National Academy of Environmental Design, “the existing national academies do not provide the breadth of multidisciplinary expertise necessary to effectively respond to these multiple and linked environmental challenges.” By contrast, the resolution continues, “the environmental design disciplines — involved in the design, construction and maintenance of cities, landscapes, buildings, interiors and products — do have the expertise to assist the citizens of the United States in addressing and mitigating the impacts of these multiple environmental challenges.”

**SUCCESSES TO DATE**

Recognizing the need for an integrated, proactive, interdisciplinary approach to sustainable planning and design, in 2007 a national group of academic leaders in the environmental design disciplines formally resolved to create the National Academy of Environmental Design during a meeting in Minneapolis of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. In the summer of 2008 a meeting of supporters was held at the National Building Museum in Washington D.C., during which a mission state-
ment was drafted and a governance process was initiated. Following a thoughtful and frank dialogue about the relationships of the disciplines, which would be reflected in a governing structure, bylaws were passed in 2009 and the first slate of officers and the executive council were elected and appointed respectively. It was and remains important to balance responsibility for the organization’s success equally among all the environmental design disciplines, as each plays an important role in creating a preferred, more sustainable future. During the organization’s formative years, the ACSA played a critical role in staffing the otherwise all-volunteer organization. The fourth annual membership meeting was held in October 2012 in Washington D.C., following meetings hosted by the U.S. Green Building Council, the American Society of Landscape Architects and the American Planning Association, each of which hosted the annual meetings in 2009, 2010 and 2011, respectively.

As the National Academy of Environmental Design’s governance process has been established, the important work of investigating and examining subjects of significance has developed in parallel. Our first national workshop, chaired by Dr. James Wescoat of MIT in 2010, was co-hosted by the Disaster Roundtable of the National Research Council. Titled “Disaster-Resilient Design,” it focused on the important role environmental design plays in preventing disasters through smart planning and mitigating them through effective short- and long-term responses. Our second national workshop, held in 2011 and co-chaired by Dean Tom Fisher of the University of Minnesota, Dr. Matt Trowbridge of the University of Virginia and Dr. Nisha Botchwey then of the University of Virginia and now of Georgia Tech, was titled “Green Health: Building Sustainable Schools for Healthy Kids.” It was co-sponsored by the National Collaborative on Childhood Obesity Research in partnership with the U.S. Green Building Council Center for Green Schools. The third workshop, held in October 2012, co-hosted by the National Building Museum and chaired by Susan Piedmont-Palladino of Virginia Tech and the National Building Museum, was titled “Designing Intelligent Environments: Social and Ethical Implications.”

These three national workshops established a pattern of partnership with significant national organizations, each of which will lead to new means of disseminating best environmental design knowledge to broad, high-level audiences. These followed a series of more focused workshops hosted by universities during the National Academy of Environmental Design’s first years. The University of Texas at Austin hosted a workshop on sustainable sites in 2008; the University of Minnesota hosted a 2009 workshop on sustainable materials; and the University of Florida hosted a 2009 workshop focused on water issues.

It is important to balance responsibility for the organization’s success equally among all the environmental design disciplines.
in the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee and Flint rivers basin. In each of the examples described above, environmental design experts and others from across the country came together to discuss a complex problem with the goal of sharing best practices through case studies, natural experiments, examples of local, place-based knowledge and the use of thoughtful scenario forecasting.

These workshops highlight a key element of the National Academy of Environmental Design’s approach to research. Complex problems must be addressed holistically by design experts across a range of professional disciplines. At the same time, expertise is necessary to provide recommendations based on experience and knowledge. The term “T-shaped thinking” refers to the horizontal, lateral, abductive thinking common to those of us trained in the design disciplines, which must be applied in combination with the vertical, deep research-informed knowledge of subject matter experts. A central premise of the National Academy of Environmental Design is the belief that design education provides the critical switching mechanism to allow these two elements to successfully combine.

THE FUTURE

The National Academy of Environmental Design is now poised to begin its next phase. With funding from Spotsylvania County, Virginia and the support and partnership of Luck Development Partners, the academy will hire an executive director and open an office in Ni Village, Va., in the coming months. This will allow the academy to take its next step, to become a “think-and-do tank” with a regional, place-based focus, as part of our larger national mission. Two further national workshops are in initial planning stages, one focused on urban water policies and practices and another on affordable, sustainable housing. As we continue to build the infrastructure necessary to join our disciplines in productive exchange, we will remain focused on advancing sustainable environmental design practices in public and governmental settings and on conducting and disseminating research in our fields. As our mission statement provides, we will “serve the public by promoting the flourishing of individuals, communities and the natural world through the sustainable design and stewardship of human and natural environments.”

For more information see www.naedonline.org.

Kim Tanzer, FAIA, is dean and Edward E. Elson professor at the University of Virginia School of Architecture. She served as the first president of the National Academy of Environmental Design from 2009-11.
Sustainability Takes Center Stage

How Lynn University improved the energy efficiency of its campus and increased its environmental stewardship.

—By Steven Baumgartner,

“We would not have been as well prepared to host a presidential debate without the guidance of our master plan, which will support a sustainable future for our campus long after the candidates have departed.”

— Dr. Kevin Ross, President, Lynn University

After hosting the last of three presidential debates on October 22, the campus of Lynn University can now get back to normal. But “normal” means something much different to Lynn than to most small American liberal arts schools.

The university has been staging its own debates on a nearly continuous basis to improve the energy efficiency of its campus and increase its environmental stewardship. These debates have paid off. In the four years since the previous presidential election the university has created a unique consensus-based approach called a Sustainability Management Tool, or SMT. This custom framework engaged the educational community and transformed Lynn’s campus into a model for sustainability.

It started with a typical master planning process spearheaded by engineers from Buro Happold and architects and planners from Gensler and was supported by a diverse expert team. What the school did not anticipate was a rich collaborative effort among students, faculty and administration, as well as municipal officials and third party consultants, to make unprecedented innovations in environmental stewardship.

Today, the university is expecting to reduce its annual utility bills by 32 percent for existing buildings. In the first year after construction of a new central energy plant and improvements to existing buildings, energy savings are expected to yield about $650,000 in cost reductions. The energy savings for new buildings will be 30 percent below ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2007.

How did this come about?

THE CHALLENGE

Lynn University has been located on a 123-acre campus in Boca Raton, Fla., since it was founded in 1962. Like many other universities, by 2008, the school had urgent needs that required immediate attention: an aging infrastructure, unsustainable energy and water consumption, and no clear environmental strategy.
In 2008, Lynn was using approximately 30 percent more energy per square foot than other comparable universities (according to the 2003 Commercial Building Energy Consumption Survey’s Weighted Mean Energy Use Intensities for its climate zone). It paid $1.43 million in annual utility costs, easily Lynn’s largest vendor. One of the school’s best assets is its lush landscaping, but its magnificent grounds are high maintenance and operationally intensive. About 70 percent of its water use alone went towards irrigation – 50 percent more than a typical campus.

**Lynn’s SMT is unique because it brings people and processes together to implement the sustainable objectives of the master plan.**

**THE PROCESS**

The university’s administration launched a master planning process in 2008 to set the course for a dynamic, growing campus along with a vision for sustainable development. The environmental objectives identified in the master plan by a rich collaboration of stakeholders, facilitated by Buro Happold, shed new light on sustainability, stimulating unprecedented enthusiasm for this goal. The university then retained Buro Happold to aid in the selection of an energy services company to specifically meet the energy and water targets stated in the plan.

In 2010, Buro Happold collaborated with Siemens via their Guaranteed Performance Contract (GPC), which helped further the university’s sustainability goals. This arrangement guaranteed energy and water use reductions and used these savings to partially offset facility and infrastructure renewal projects. As a result, the savings are helping to fund the construction of a new central energy plant, which is urgently needed. Through an innovative financial arrangement, the GPC also subsidized Lynn’s ongoing sustainability initiatives.

Buro Happold used a bespoke Sustainability Management Tool — a structure, process, and document — that moved the master plan from thought into action. While many universities have implemented similar strategies (using tools like the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education’s Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System, or STARS) Lynn’s SMT is unique because it brings people and processes together to implement the sustainable objectives of the master plan. It also puts all of the university’s sustainability initiatives in one comprehensive document with measurable and obtainable performance indicators that define the university’s path toward a more sustainable future.
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SMT

Over the past three years, the SMT has resulted in action at all scales — from student events on campus to infrastructure upgrades and policy changes by Boca Raton. The success of the SMT yields four drivers that are applicable to any school that is undertaking an ambitious sustainability initiative:

1. Establish a Strong Organizational Structure

As part of the SMT, Lynn established a community-wide sustainability committee in 2010 to promote cross-pollination among students, faculty, administrators and staff, as well as strategic stakeholders from the community and city. Thomas Heffernan, the university’s dean of administration, chaired the committee, demonstrating a top level buy-in from the start. The committee is divided into the five disciplines identified in the master plan: energy, water, landscape/ ecology, materials/waste and community/education. Each discipline group sets an agenda and action plan for the upcoming academic year.

All groups include at least one third-party consultant or city official who advises the groups on technical matters, such as civil engineering, ecological wildlife, city codes and waste laws. The SMT’s success relies upon the involvement of everyone within the Lynn community, as well as tight collaboration with outside parties. The diverse perspectives of the group members are critical to its success.

2. Eliminate Boundaries and Think Broadly

Boundaries dictate everything from areas of study to election districts. However, Buro Happold has a saying: “boundaries are fictional.” This is particularly true of campuses, which have constant flows of people, energy, water, materials, transport and data. In this same spirit, the SMT broke down boundaries by working across scales, departments and disciplines in order to provoke intelligent design, assess the impacts of decisions on various scales of the campus and achieve the greatest benefit for all stakeholders.

For example, by dissolving traditional “town/gown” boundaries, Lynn came up with an innovative solution to save water at the university, as well as in South Florida. Top university administrators, with support of the water subcommittee of the SMT, partnered with Boca Raton to use its In-City Reclamation Irrigation System (IRIS) water for irrigation, reusing a scarce resource and conserving energy. Lynn was the first school in South Florida to connect to IRIS.

The SMT’s success relies upon the involvement of everyone within the Lynn community, as well as tight collaboration with outside parties.
which mutually benefitted the university and
the city.

The university is also getting approval from the
municipality to use IRIS for non-potable water
in its new School of Business (currently in de-
sign), as well as make-up water to the cooling
towers in the new central energy plant. When
finished, these will be the first applications in
South Florida to connect to the IRIS system for
uses other than irrigation.

3. Embrace Partnerships

Two of the major goals of the SMT are better
energy efficiency and control of existing build-
ings and improved energy and water infrastruc-
ture. Since Lynn’s central energy plant and most
of building systems dated from the early 1960s,
building and infrastructure upgrades were badly
needed. They also required the greatest financial
investment.

The Siemens-Buro Happold team collaborated
with the university to meet the master plan’s ag-
gressive energy and water reduction targets. In
addition, the innovative financing structure of
the GPC even funded additional energy stra-
tegies, such as signage, surveys, educational
awareness and joint campus/community events.
The SMT framework was funded through the
GPC, at Buro Happold’s recommendation – the
first time that Siemens had ever used this type
of arrangement.

Under the GPC, Buro Happold defined energy
and carbon benchmarks for the existing fa-
cilities, a full-campus energy model, and a life-
cycle cost assessment for a new central energy
plant. Ultimately, the team created a solution for
chilled water generation that included an inno-
vative hybrid heat rejection system that aligned
seamlessly with the university’s economic, sus-
tainable and operational objectives.

Funding sources became more transparent,
partnerships were easier and networks were leveraged to create innovative funding streams.

4. Expand Discussions

The success of a broad-based sustainability
initiative depends upon a university’s ability
to expand the discussion beyond the campus.
The SMT did exactly that, by creating a con-
duit for greater dialogue between the univer-
sity and the local community. It also shifted
the conversation from individual needs to a
discussion of shared responsibility and mutual
assistance. As a result, funding sources became
more transparent, partnerships were easier
and networks were leveraged to create innova-
tive funding streams.
For example, the Lynn campus is dotted with lakes that are an iconic element of the campus and a big part of its stormwater management system. The master plan identified a more passive and sustainable operational strategy that drastically reduced operational and maintenance costs. In order to implement this plan, the university initiated high-level discussions with Boca Raton, the Department of Environmental Protection and the South Florida Water Management District. These conversations allowed the parties to create a more sustainable lake management plan that benefitted the campus and, ultimately, helped all of the parties involved.

CONCLUSION

The SMT is a useful tool for a campus-wide sustainability initiative because it does everything from enabling the organization and prioritization of sustainable initiatives to establishing measurable targets and short-term actions. It also integrates sustainable initiatives into all levels of activity including daily operations, student life and awareness, the design of future buildings and even the educational curriculum.

Ultimately, this process enables significant change by aligning stakeholders and building consensus so that all groups feel they are reaping the benefits of sustainable actions. The changes adopted by Lynn — the natural lake system, the new energy plant, sustainable building design and the use of non-potable water — are as good for the local community as they are for the campus. Even more, they demonstrate how creative thinking can set up a domino effect where strategic sustainable changes extend past the boundaries of a campus to towns, cities, regions and far beyond.

Steven Baumgartner, PE, CEM, HBDP, LEED AP, is an energy engineer with Buro Happold. He creates strategic energy solutions for properties and campuses for clients throughout the world that bridge multiple scales and make the business case for sustainability. He teaches at Columbia University and is president of ASHRAE New York.

The master plan identified a more passive and sustainable operational strategy that drastically reduced operational and maintenance costs.
Entrepreneurship In Design

A promising prototype for architectural education.

— By Kathryn H. Anthony

What can designers learn from successful entrepreneurs? What can entrepreneurs learn from successful designers? How does design spark creativity at Google?

These are key questions that my students, colleagues and I have been asking in recent years. Given today’s challenging economic conditions, these are questions that all students and faculty in schools of architecture should be asking. The answers provide promising opportunities for a brighter future.

Successful entrepreneurs in design have broken out of the box, carving out new areas of practice. Several have blurred the boundaries of the architectural profession, redefined traditional roles of architects and impacted the public in ways we could never have imagined.

My course, “Entrepreneurship in Design, Diversity, Environment and Behavior,” serves as a prototype for other schools to follow. It began with a fellowship from the Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. One of the goals of the Academy, founded in 2004 with a $4.5 million grant from the Kauffman Foundation, is to infuse disciplines across the university with the entrepreneurial spirit by transforming ideas, accelerating innovation and creating value.

According to the academy, “entrepreneurship is the process of opportunity recognition and resource acquisition that leads to the creation of something new.” The academy provides multiple opportunities for educating the academic community in entrepreneurship, such as workshops, competitions, symposia, business plan competitions, discussions and lectures. Each fall faculty members from across campus are invited to submit proposals to develop new or revise existing courses in their own discipline while adding entrepreneurial principles and pedagogies. Up to 10 fellowships are awarded annually through a highly competitive process. I was fortunate to be awarded this fellowship.

The course will empower students to understand the value of entrepreneurship in the design professions.

My first round teaching this course put me well out of my comfort zone. I sought the assistance of colleagues in the academy to identify appropriate resources, spent several months reviewing the literature, developing student assignments and contacting numerous individuals to seek their participation as case studies, guest speakers or field trip hosts. Although I was excited by the prospect of teaching in unfamiliar
territory, I sometimes feared that I was in over my head. In retrospect, it was an eye-opening experience, almost like going back to school and starting all over again. Yet that is the challenge of a faculty member striving to keep up to date with changing times.

Since 2009, I have taught three iterations of this course as an elective graduate seminar to a total of about 40 students. Course objectives are to empower students to:

- Understand the value of entrepreneurship in architecture and the design professions to society.
- Identify and critically analyze major issues in entrepreneurship.
- Become familiar with some of the leading figures in entrepreneurship at the Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership at the University of Illinois; social entrepreneurs whose work has impacted the built environment worldwide; environment and behavior design consultants; and diverse designers in nearby metropolitan areas.
- Understand how these individuals have benefited from entrepreneurial knowledge and skills.
- See how their future career can be enhanced by acquiring some basic entrepreneurial knowledge and skills.
- Gain some hands-on experience proposing future ventures for creative entrepreneurship and for non-profit organizations.
- Present prospective ventures in a way that communicates effectively for future prospective clients.

MATERIALS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Michael Gelb and Sarah Miller Caldicott’s Innovate Like Edison, a book first introduced to me by Tony Mendes, former Director of the Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership, analyzes Thomas Edison’s five basic competencies: 1) solution-centered mindset, 2) kaleidoscopic thinking, 3) full-spectrum engagement, 4) mastermind collaboration, and 5) super-value creation. Learning about Edison’s way of working inspires our design students. Jack Kaplan and Anthony Warren’s Patterns of Entrepreneurship Management, a classic text used in entrepreneurship courses around the country, and Jim Horan’s The One Page Business Plan, stimulate students to consider developing innovative ventures of their own. Architecture for Humanity’s Design Like You Give a Damn and
Walter Isaacson’s *Steve Jobs* show students how one or two individuals can lead a design movement that can change the world.5

### Course assignments include:

1. Seminar presentation on a design entrepreneur: Students identify and interview a design entrepreneur and present information about him/her to class using innovative technology.

2. Seminar presentation based on Horan’s *One Page Business Plan for Non-Profit Organizations*: Students produce an innovative venture for a nonprofit organization or produce an innovative for-profit entrepreneurial effort based on what they learned from the course.

3. Google assignment: Based on what they learned from a class visit to Google, students design an office for their own entrepreneurial venture to spark the highest possible levels of creativity.

Students analyze the entrepreneurial qualities of award-winning high-tech firm, Google, which sparks unusually high degrees of creativity among its employees and meets the needs of an increasingly diverse, global workforce. Google’s meteoric rise in large part has been due to the innovative design of its physical and social work environment.

Students are required participate in a private Facebook group that provides an avenue for constant course communication. This has prov-
Cesar Pelli (Class of 1954) designed the Petronas Towers in Kuala Lumpur, the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Osaka, Japan, and the Business Instructional Facility on the University of Illinois campus. The American Institute of Architects named Pelli as one of the 10 most influential living American architects.

Carol Ross Barney (Class of 1971) designed the Oklahoma City Federal Building, the Chicago Riverwalk, the Champaign Public Library.

Ralph Johnson (Class of 1971) director of design at Perkins and Will, designed the Los Angeles Federal Courthouse, Shanghai Nature Museum, Chicago’s Skybridge and Peggy Notebaert Nature Museum, and Temple Hoyne Buell Hall at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Jack Travis (Class of 1978) served as architectural consultant to Spike Lee for his film *Jungle Fever*.

Jeanne Gang (Class of 1986) designed Chicago’s 82-story Aqua tower, the tallest building commissioned to a female architect. She is the fourth architect ever to receive a “genius” award from the MacArthur Foundation.

Dina Griffin (Class of 1986) collaborated with Renzo Piano on the design of the Modern Wing of Chicago’s Art Institute.

Anshuman Prasad (Class of 2003) used his architectural background to become a set designer on Hollywood blockbuster films like *The Hangover, The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo,* and *Total Recall.*

By instilling the entrepreneurial spirit in the current generation of aspiring architects at Illinois, it won’t be long before future alumni will join this list.
Nonprofit social entrepreneurs Jack Sim, president of World Toilet Organization, named one of Time magazine’s Heroes of the Environment; Bindheshwar Pathak of Sulabh International; Cameron Sinclair and Kate Stohr, founders of Architecture for Humanity; Jon Pounds of Chicago Public Art Group.

Environment-behavior researchers who apply their findings to design: Bill Lucas of Luma Institute; Nicholas Watkins, director of research at HOK and past chair of the Environmental Design Research Association; Sally Augustin, editor at Research Design Connections; John Zeisel, president and co-founder of the Hearthstone Alzheimer’s Family Foundation and Hearthstone Alzheimer Care; Elaine Ostroff, director of Access to Design Professions.

Co-founder of Chicago Apartment Finders Andrew Ahitow.

Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership colleagues with expertise in market research and guerilla marketing, Cindy Kehoe, Tony Mendes and Kimberly Sugden.

Google’s Jim Laumann, director of real estate, design and construction in the Americas and Andrea Cattarin, facilities manager.

IDEO engineer Tasos Karahalios.

CASE STUDIES AND FIELD TRIPS

Students learn the most from conducting case studies of award-winning individuals, firms and organizations, and from meeting with accomplished out-of-the-box entrepreneurs as field trip hosts or guest speakers. Students study their missions, objectives, strategies and business plans, bringing them into class via video-recorded or Skype interviews.

One student said about a case study of Sim: “Many people fail to recognize the basic human need for a toilet and don’t know how many people don’t have one. I think it brought awareness to us about our social responsibilities and was a nice segue into the social entrepreneurship portion of the course.”

“My view on jobs has expanded greatly to the point I think I can become my own entrepreneur.”

Our annual visit to Google Chicago and meeting with their real estate and workplace services provide a dramatic contrast from the atmosphere seen in most architectural offices. While the design of far too many architectural offices pays short shrift to common areas for employees, the design of Google offices gives top priority to informal meeting spaces, wellness areas, cafeterias and “micro-kitchen” snack bars serving healthy meals every day. Tremendous attention to design
By the end of the course, what did students learn about entrepreneurship? One student said, “entrepreneurship, especially in the design profession, was very foreign to me. No one personally close to me was an entrepreneur, or at least I did not realize they were until I took this class. … Now, I can see the wide array of creative opportunities a person can do with an architectural master’s degree. My view on jobs has expanded greatly to the point I think I can become my own entrepreneur.”

Kathryn H. Anthony, Ph.D., is an ACSA Distinguished Professor in the School of Architecture at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Teaching this course inspired some entrepreneurial ventures of her own: two apps for iOS, the Design Student Survival Guide and the Student Survival Guide; and the 20th anniversary edition of her award-winning book, Design Juries on Trial: The Renaissance of the Design Studio.

1 “Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership.” College of Business, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Available at: http://business.illinois.edu/ael/index.html (visited 10.1.12)

2 Two such course offerings are documented at “Arch 576 Entrepreneurship in Design, Diversity, Environment and Behavior.” Available at: http://www2.arch.uiuc.edu/kanthony/arch576KASP09/entrepreneurship/default.html (visited 10.1.12)


6 For more about my use of private Facebook groups in the classroom, see Campus Information Technologies and Educational Services, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “The Many Faces of Facebook: Enhancing the Academic Experience.” http://ensemble.atlas.uiuc.edu/app/sites/index.aspx?destinationID=lmQ4u4JRsUIpp8vy5X9jzg&contentId=TV5B-zAE502MHDx356YZw


### Directory of Leading U.S. Architecture and Design Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Industrial Design</th>
<th>Interior Design</th>
<th>Landscape Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALABAMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>auburn.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samford University</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>samford.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuskegee University</td>
<td>Tuskegee</td>
<td>tuskegee.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa</td>
<td>ua.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia College in Birmingham</td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>vc.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARIZONA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Tempe</td>
<td>asu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Phoenix</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/phoenix</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>taliesin.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Community College</td>
<td>Mesa</td>
<td>mc.maricopa.edu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottsdale Community College</td>
<td>Scottsdale</td>
<td>scottsdalecc.edu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest University of Visual Arts</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>suva.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>arizona.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARKANSAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harding University</td>
<td>Searcy</td>
<td>harding.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>Fayetteville</td>
<td>uark.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>Conway</td>
<td>uca.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALIFORNIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy of Art University</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>academyart.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Center College of Design</td>
<td>Pasadena</td>
<td>artcenter.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of California-Los Angeles</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/losangeles</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of California-Orange County</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/orangecounty</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks College</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>brookscollege.edu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California College of the Arts</td>
<td>Oakland &amp; SF</td>
<td>cca.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Polytechnic State Univ., San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>calpoly.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Polytechnic University, Pomona</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>csupomona.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Fresno</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>csufresno.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Long Beach</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>csulb.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
<td>Northridge</td>
<td>csun.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Sacramento</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>csus.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Institute of San Diego</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>disd.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Designers Institute</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>idi.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewSchool of Architecture &amp; Design</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>newschoolarch.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>otis.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>sdsu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This listing does not include all new programs recently launched and/or non-accredited.
This listing does not include all design programs in the United States.
It does not include B.A., B.S., M.A., M.S., or Ph.D. programs in architecture.
Only B.Arch, M.Arch and D.Arch degrees are represented in architecture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Industrial Design</th>
<th>Interior Design</th>
<th>Landscape Architecture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>sfu.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>sjtu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Institute of Architecture</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>sciarc.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>stanford.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>berkeley.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley Extension</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>unex.berkeley.edu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>ucdavis.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>ucla.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>usc.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley College</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>westvalley.edu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury University</td>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>woodbury.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Colorado</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/denver</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
<td>colostate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan State College of Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>mscd.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>rmcad.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Denver/Boulder</td>
<td>Denver/Boulder</td>
<td>ucdenver.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bridgeport</td>
<td>Bridgeport</td>
<td>bridgeport.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Storrs</td>
<td>uconn.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hartford</td>
<td>West Hartford</td>
<td>hartford.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>yale.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>cua.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>gwu.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard University</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>howard.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/fortlauderdale</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>famu.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td>Fort Lauderdale</td>
<td>fau.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>fiu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Tallahassee</td>
<td>fsu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Academy of Design &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>academy.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami International University of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>aritinstitutes.edu/miami</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringling School of Art and Design</td>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>ringling.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>ufl.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>miami.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>usf.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEORGIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American InterContinental University</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>aiubuckhead.com</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Atlanta</td>
<td>Dunwoody</td>
<td>artninstitutes.edu/atlanta</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenau University</td>
<td>Gainesville</td>
<td>brenau.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>gatech.edu</td>
<td>M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td>georgiasouthern.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>scad.edu</td>
<td>M B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Polytechnic State University</td>
<td>Marietta</td>
<td>spsu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>uga.edu</td>
<td>B B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAWAII</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii at Manoa</td>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>hawaii.edu</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDAHO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University–Idaho</td>
<td>Rexburg</td>
<td>byui.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>uidaho.edu</td>
<td>M B B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILLINOIS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>colum.edu</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrington College of Design</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>interiordesign.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Art–Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>artninstitutes.edu/chicago</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Art–Schaumburg</td>
<td>Schaumburg</td>
<td>artninstitutes.edu/schaumburg</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>iit.edu</td>
<td>B M M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>ilst.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Academy of Design &amp; Technology–Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>iadtchicago.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judson University</td>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>judson.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Art Institute of Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>saic.edu</td>
<td>M B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University Carbondale</td>
<td>Carbondale</td>
<td>siu.edu</td>
<td>M B B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>uic.edu</td>
<td>M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign</td>
<td>Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td>illinois.edu</td>
<td>M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>bsu.edu</td>
<td>M B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State University</td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>indstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>indiana.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis</td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>iupui.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>purdue.edu</td>
<td>B M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>nd.edu</td>
<td>B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IOWA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>iastate.edu</td>
<td>B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KANSAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>k-state.edu</td>
<td>M B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>ku.edu</td>
<td>M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KENTUCKY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>uky.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>louisville.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOUISIANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>lsu.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Tech University</td>
<td>Ruston</td>
<td>latech.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University and A&amp;M College</td>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>subr.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>tulane.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisiana at Lafayette</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>louisiana.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARYLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>morgan.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>umd.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASSACHUSETTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Architectural College</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>the-bac.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott College</td>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>endicott.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>harvard.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>massart.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>mit.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ida College</td>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>mountida.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England School of Art &amp; Design at Suffolk U.</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>suffolk.edu/nesad</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>northeastern.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst</td>
<td>Amherst</td>
<td>umass.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>wit.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MICHIGAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews University</td>
<td>Berrien Springs</td>
<td>andrews.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>cel.cmich.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College for Creative Studies</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>collegeforcreativestudies.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranbrook Academy of Art</td>
<td>Bloomfield Hills</td>
<td>cranbrookart.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University</td>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
<td>emich.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int’l Academy of Design &amp; Technology, Detroit</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>iadtddetroit.com</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall College of Art and Design</td>
<td>Grand Rapids</td>
<td>kcad.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Technological University</td>
<td>Southfield</td>
<td>ltu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>East Lansing</td>
<td>msu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
<td>Marquette</td>
<td>nmu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit Mercy</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>udmercy.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
<td>umich.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>Kalamazoo</td>
<td>wmich.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINNESOTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota County Technical College</td>
<td>Rosemount</td>
<td>dctc.mnscu.edu</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Mpls./St. Paul</td>
<td>umn.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSISSIPPI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi College</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>mc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>msstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>usm.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSOURI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury University</td>
<td>Springfield</td>
<td>drury.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryville University</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>maryville.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri–Columbia</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>missouri.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>wustl.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MONTANA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State University</td>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>montana.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEBRASKA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska at Kearney</td>
<td>Kearney</td>
<td>unk.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska–Lincoln</td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>unl.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEVADA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Las Vegas</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/lasvegas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>unlv.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW JERSEY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kean University</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>kean.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>Upper Montclair</td>
<td>montclair.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>njit.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>princeton.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>rutgers.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW MEXICO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest University of Visual Arts</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>suva.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>unm.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW YORK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo State College, SUNY</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>buffalostate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College of New York, CUNY</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>cuny.cuny.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Environmental Science and Forestry, SUNY</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>esf.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>columbia.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Union</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>cooper.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>cornell.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion Institute of Technology, SUNY</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>fitnyc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>nyit.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York School of Interior Design</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>nysid.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons School of Design</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>parsons.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt Institute</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>pratt.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK-cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>Troy</td>
<td>rpi.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>rit.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Visual Arts</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>schoolofvisualarts.edu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>syr.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University at Buffalo, SUNY</td>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>buffalo.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>appstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carolina University</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>ecu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Point University</td>
<td>High Point</td>
<td>highpoint.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith College</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>meredith.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State University</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>ncat.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>ncsu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Charlotte</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>uncc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>uncg.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Carolina University</td>
<td>Cullowhee</td>
<td>wcu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH DAKOTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Fargo</td>
<td>ndsu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Institute of Art</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>cia.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>ccad.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>kent.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>muohio.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>osu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>ohio.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>uakron.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>uc.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Christian University</td>
<td>Oklahoma City</td>
<td>oc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>okstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>Edmund</td>
<td>uco.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>Norman</td>
<td>ou.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Portland</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/portland</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylhurst University</td>
<td>Marylhurst</td>
<td>marylhurst.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Corvallis</td>
<td>oregonstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>pdx.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>Eugene</td>
<td>uoregon.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Philadelphia</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/philadelphia</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/pittsburgh</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>cmu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PENNSYLVANIA-cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham University</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>chatham.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drexel University</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>drexel.edu</td>
<td>B B B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Roche College</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>laroche.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore College of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>moore.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>State College</td>
<td>psu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia University</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>philau.edu</td>
<td>B B M B B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>temple.edu</td>
<td>B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>upenn.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Arts</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>varts.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUERTO RICO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>pupr.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Rio Piedras</td>
<td>upr.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RHODE ISLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island School of Design</td>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>risd.edu</td>
<td>B M B M B M M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Williams University</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>rwu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>uri.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>clemson.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converse College</td>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>converse.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td>Rock Hill</td>
<td>winthrop.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH DAKOTA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota State University</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>sdstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TENNESSEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intl. Academy of Design &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>iadttnashville.com</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>Murfreesboro</td>
<td>mtsu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’More College of Design</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>omorecollege.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>memphis.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee at Chattanooga</td>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>utc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee–Knoxville</td>
<td>Knoxville</td>
<td>utk.edu</td>
<td>B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watkins College of Art, Design &amp; Film</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>watkins.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEXAS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilene Christian University</td>
<td>Abilene</td>
<td>acu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/dallas</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Houston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/houston</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>Waco</td>
<td>baylor.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro College</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>ecc.dcccd.edu</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Prairie View</td>
<td>pvamu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>rice.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>Nacogdoches</td>
<td>sfasu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>College Station</td>
<td>tamu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>tcu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University–San Marcos</td>
<td>San Marcos</td>
<td>txstate.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Web Address</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>Industrial Design</td>
<td>Interior Design</td>
<td>Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEXAS-cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Lubbock</td>
<td>ttu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>uh.edu</td>
<td>B M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Incarnate Word</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>uiv.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>unt.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Arlington</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>uta.edu</td>
<td>M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>utexas.edu</td>
<td>B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at San Antonio</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>utsa.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTAH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>Provo</td>
<td>byu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>utah.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>usu.edu</td>
<td>B B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber State University</td>
<td>Ogden</td>
<td>weber.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERMONT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich University</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>norwich.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Washington</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/arlington</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton University</td>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>hamptonu.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>Harrisonburg</td>
<td>jmu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marymount University</td>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>marymount.edu</td>
<td>B M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>Radford</td>
<td>radford.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>Charlottesville</td>
<td>virginia.edu</td>
<td>M M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>vcu.edu</td>
<td>B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State Univ.</td>
<td>Blacksburg</td>
<td>vt.edu</td>
<td>B M B B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASHINGTON</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Institute of Seattle</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>artinstitutes.edu/seattle</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue College</td>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>bellevuecollege.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>washington.edu</td>
<td>M B M B M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>Pullman and Spokane</td>
<td>wsu.edu</td>
<td>M B M B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td><a href="http://www.edu">www.edu</a></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WEST VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Morgantown</td>
<td>wvu.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISCONSIN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee Institute of Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>miad.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Mary College</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>mmary.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>wisc.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee</td>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>uwm.edu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Stevens Point</td>
<td>Stevens Point</td>
<td>uwsp.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin–Stout</td>
<td>Menomonie</td>
<td>uwestout.edu</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University of Sharjah</td>
<td>Sharjah, UAE</td>
<td>aus.edu</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DesignIntelligence 2013 Research Participants

Approximately 392 U.S. firms and organizations employing architecture, design, and landscape architecture professionals participated in this year's research. Many firms listed have branch offices in multiple locations.

2B Design, LLC
AECOM
Al Weisz Architecture
Allegro Interior Architecture
Alley, Williams, Carmen & King
Architectural Design Guild
Architectural Resources
Architecture is Fun
Arium ae
Aspen Medical Products
Atelier Ten

Balzer and Associates
Bauer Architects
Beck Group
Bennett, Benner Pettit Architects + Planners
Berger Partnership
Bernardon Haber Holloway Architects
Bestor Architecture
Biosips Inc.
BKA Architects
Blitch Knevel Architects
Bommarito Group
Brecon Land Design
Burger Landscape Architecture
Burns and McDonnell
Bury + Partners, Inc.
BWBR

C2 Studio Landscape Architects
Cama Inc.
Cannon Design
CBSA
CH2M Hill
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools
Chu + Gooding Architects
Cite Design
City of Round Rock Texas
CJS Group Architects
Code unlimited
Concensus Planning, LLC
Confluence
Cooper Carry
Cooper, Robertson and Partners
Copley Wolff Design Group Inc.
Cordogan, Clark & Associates
Cornerstone Studios

Creative Contours
Cunningham Group Architecture
Cutsogeorge Toolman & Allen Architects
Dana Brown & Associates, Inc.
David Linner Architects
David M. Schwarz Architects
Derci & Edson Associates
DesignTeam LLC
DesignWorkshop
Dewberry
DHM Design
DLM Architects
DLR Group
DTJ Design, Inc.
Dynerman Architects
Earth Works Baseline and Design
El Dorado Inc.
Elkus Manfredi
Ennead
Eskew Dumez Ripple
Estopinal Group Architects
Evolve Architecture
Exteriors by Chad Roberts
F36
Fentress Architects
Flad Architects
Foxlin Inc.
FXFowle Architects

Gastinger Walker Harden Architects
GBBN
GCLS Architects
Gensler
Goettsch Partners
Graham Landscape Architecture
Gray Design Group
Greg Lynn FORM
Griffin Enright Architects
GSBS Architects
Gund Partnership

Hammel, Green & Abrahamson
Hanbury Evans Wright Viattas + Company
Hansen Architects
HDR Architecture Inc.

Helix Architecture + Design
Henneberg Eddy Architect
Heyday Partnerships
Hill Studio
Historical Concepts, LLC
HKIT Architects
HKP Architects
HKS
HMC Architects
Hnedak Bobo Group
Hodgetts + Fung Design and Architecture
HOK
Holabird and Root
Hord Architects
House Walker Architecture
Hughes Litton Godwin
Huitz-Zollars, Inc.
Huntsman Architectural Group
Hutzler

ICON architecture/planning
Integration Design Studio
Jack Ball Architects
Jacobs/Wyper Architects
James Arthur Young Design
JCJ Architecture
Jeffrey Beers International
JMJ Architects and Planners
Johnson Studio
JRS Architect
JSDA Inc.

Keith LeBlanc Landscape Architecture
Kiku Obata & Co.
Kimley-Horn and Associates
Kimmey Unabia Architects
KlingStubbins
Klopfer Martin Design Group
Kono Designs

L & R Publications
Land Design Inc.
Land Elements
Law Kingdon Architecture
Lawrence Group
Lawson Willard Architecture
Leo A Daly

Note: Partial list
DesignIntelligence 2013 Deans Survey Research Participants

Deans and chairs from more than 100 academic programs in architecture, interior design, industrial design, and landscape architecture participated in this year’s research.

Academy of Art University
American Intercontinental University
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Ball State University
Boston Architectural College
Brenau University
Brigham Young University
California College of the Arts
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona
California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
California State University-Long Beach
Carnegie Mellon University
Central Michigan University
Chatham University
City College of New York
Clemson University
Cleveland Institute of Art
College for Creative Studies
College of Fine and Applied Arts
Colorado State University
Columbia College Chicago
Corcoran College of Art and Design
Cornell University
Cranbrook Academy of Art
Drexel University
Druy University
East Carolina University
Eastern Michigan University
Fashion Institute of Technology
Florida A & M University
Florida International University
Florida State University
George Washington University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Hampton University
Harrington College of Design
Harvard University
High Point University
Illinois Institute of Technology
Indiana State University
Indiana University
International Academy of Design and Technology-Detroit
Iowa State University
James Madison University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
La Roche College
Lawrence Technological University
Louisiana State University
Louisiana Tech University
Marylhurst University
Marymount University
Marywood University
Meredith College
Miami International University of Art & Design
Miami University
Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design
Mississippi State University
Montana State University
Morgan State University
Mount Mary College
New England School of Art & Design at Suffolk University
New Jersey Institute of Technology
New York School of Interior Design
NewSchool of Architecture and Design
North Carolina State University
North Dakota State University
NY School of Interior Design
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
O’More College of Design
Oregon State University
OTIS College of Art and Design
Parsons The New School for Design
Pennsylvania State University
Philadelphia University
Pratt Institute
Purdue University
Radford University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rhode Island School of Design
Rice University
Ringling College of Art and Design
Rochester Institute of Technology
Roger Williams University
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
Savannah College of Art and Design
School of the Art Institute of Chicago
School of Visual Arts
South Dakota State University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Southern Polytechnic State University
SUNY Buffalo
SUNY College of Technology at Alfred
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas A&M University
Texas Christian University
Texas State University
Texas Tech University
The Art Institute of California-Orange County
The Art Institute of Charleston
Tulane University
Universidad de Puerto Rico School of Architecture
University of Akron
University of Alabama
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of California-Berkeley
University of Charleston
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado Denver
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Hawaii
University of Houston
University of Illinois-Chicago
University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts-Amherst
University of Memphis
University of Miami
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska-Kearney
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina-Charlotte
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
University of North Texas
University of Notre Dame
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Southern California
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Tennessee
University of Texas-Arlington
University of Texas-Austin
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Kentucky
Valdosta State University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Washington State University
Washington University-St. Louis
 Wentworth Institute of Technology
Western Carolina University
Winthrop University
Woodbury University
Hosted at the historic La Valencia Hotel, this conference focuses on leading and implementing innovation using new collaborative technologies and fostering dynamic change to drive success in professional practices and organizations.

Examining Barriers to Innovation and Defining Strategies for Success

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Analyze the way leading organizations are creating and fostering design innovation.

Discover how new technologies are transforming professional practices.

Develop strategic and tactical leadership techniques that lead to clarity of vision and creative future invention.

Examine how leading organizations are developing innovation strategies in their practices to create original design opportunities and value propositions for clients.

Five Futurists

Master strategies for supporting innovation and spending capital wisely.

Network with top A/E/C thought leaders.

You are cordially invited to be a delegate at the

LEADERSHIP SUMMIT ON DESIGN INNOVATION & TECHNOLOGY - LA JOLLA

January 16-17, 2013 · La Valencia Hotel · La Jolla, CA

For more info, visit www.di.net
Providing Foresight and Insight

If you have ever witnessed a trend unfolding and said to yourself, I should have seen this coming, then you are beginning to understand the value of the services of the Greenway Group.

The Greenway Group is a management consulting and research firm serving as trusted advisors to the design, construction, and real estate sectors of the global economy.

Our singularity is the depth of understanding we bring to the task, an intensity of knowledge that is fueled by an intelligence network unparalleled in our industry.

♦ Strategic Planning
♦ Leadership Development and Coaching
♦ Ownership Transfer
♦ Vision and Strategic Retreats
♦ Management Consulting and Research
♦ Business Models and Growth Strategies
♦ Compensation and Executive Equity Plans

Greenway Group
Foresight for the Business of Design

(678) 879-0929 or www.greenway.us
DFC Professional Partners

AECOM
Arup
BCI Group
The Beck Group
Buro Happold
Cannon Design
CH2M Hill
Design Workshop
DLR Group
Fentress Architects
Gensler
Goettsch Partners
Hammel, Green & Abrahamson
Hardbury Evans Wright Vlattas
HDR Architecture, Inc.
HKS Inc.
HMC Architects
HOK
Kasian
KieranTimberlake
Leo A Daly
LS3P Associates Ltd.
NBBJ
Pickard Chilton
RNL Design
Sasaki Associates
Shepley Bulfinch
SHP Leading Design
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill LLP
Studios Architecture
Walter P Moore
ZGF Architects LLP

DFC Research Partners

Armstrong
Deltek
DuPont
Georgia-Pacific
Greenway Group
Kawneer
Oldcastle
Reed Construction Data
Steelcase
Tandus

DFC Institutional Affiliates

American Institute of Architects • American Institute of Architecture Students • American Society of Landscape Architects • Arizona State University Master of Real Estate Development Program • Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture • Auburn University College of Architecture, Design, and Construction • Boston Architectural College • Georgia Institute of Technology • Iowa State University • Kansas State University College of Architecture, Planning & Design • National Council of Architectural Registration Boards • New Jersey Institute of Technology • New York School of Interior Design • North Carolina State University College of Design • Pennsylvania State University • Philadelphia University School of Architecture • Rice University • Savannah College of Art and Design School of Building Arts • Texas A&M University College of Architecture • Texas Board of Architectural Examiners • Tulane School of Architecture • University of Arizona College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture • University of Arkansas School of Architecture • University of Cincinnati College of Design, Architecture, Art & Planning • University of New Mexico School of Architecture & Planning • University of Puerto Rico • University of Tennessee College of Architecture and Design • University of Washington College of Built Environments • University of Wisconsin Milwaukee School of Architecture and Urban Planning • Virginia Commonwealth University Department of Interior Design • Washington University in St. Louis

DFC Sustaining Patrons

Joslyn Institute for Sustainable Communities
Manning Architects
The Vinyl Institute
The Design Futures Council is an independent and interdisciplinary network of design, product, and construction leaders exploring global trends, challenges, and opportunities to advance innovation and shape the future of our industry and environment. The DFC integrates the latest research to benefit the built environment, to improve the way we design and build, and to strengthen member organizations. The DFC facilitates the networking of leaders and decision makers. The DFC challenges conventions and limiting beliefs, offering instead fresh intelligence, innovation, and strategic optimism to enable the design, product, and construction industry to improve the human condition.

AMERICA'S BEST ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN SCHOOLS 2013
A PROPOSAL TO IMPROVE DESIGN EDUCATION
30 MOST ADMIREDEDUCATORS OF 2013
ARCHITECTURE & LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE STUDENT SURVEYS
ARCHITECTURE DEGREE TUITION SUMMARY
ARCHITECTURE SCHOOL BRAND STRENGTHS
2013 LEADERSHIP INDEX
THE CASE FOR GENERAL EDUCATION
INTERIOR DESIGN & ARCHITECTURE
THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL ACADEMY OF ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN
SUSTAINABILITY TAKES CENTER STAGE
ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN DESIGN
DIRECTORY OF LEADING U.S. ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN PROGRAMS