I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity

Learning Culture
Studio Culture Policy
In 2004, the School of Architecture established a Studio Culture Committee that was comprised of School administrators, faculty, students and staff. As the committee and our studio culture policy was first being established, there were student representatives from each year of the program. In recent years, the student membership on the committee has consisted of one undergraduate and one graduate student in addition to faculty and staff representation. As part of our updated studio culture policy, representation will again be expanded to include students from each year of our program. Over the last two years, the Studio Culture Committee—renamed the Learning Culture Committee-has been charged with reviewing and updating the School's Studio Culture Policy. The new policy was adopted in May 2013 and can be accessed on the School's website at http://www.arch.montana.edu/pdf/StudioCulturePolicy.pdf

Studio Culture Survey-Assessment of Progress
During the time period of 2005-2007, Associate Professor Mike Everts worked with our AIAS organization to develop a Studio Culture Survey which all students would complete in order to gauge 'the pulse' of the school so that we could address any critical issues. The questions in the survey were reviewed by AIAS officers from schools throughout the United States as well as by faculty and AIAS students within MSU. This effort was undertaken in order to obtain the most effective and useful information from the survey. The survey was organized along four major categories. The first was to establish the background of the student—i.e. what year in the program, involvement in other activities, etc. The subsequent three categories were designed to evaluate the Pedagogy (what is being taught), the Methodology (how courses are taught) and the Environment (the environment in which their education takes place.

The benefit of having this survey completed by our students each year is that we have a benchmark set of data from 2007 and can compare data from 2007-2013. Because the Studio Culture Survey looks at issues of pedagogy, methods and environment in not only design studio courses/activities but also non-studio courses/activities it allows us to look at the broader learning culture of the school and identify strengths and areas that need improvement. The results of the survey—taken in Spring Semester each year—are used to measure the effectiveness of our efforts during the past year. The responses from the students are compared each year and areas that show a decline in favorable responses are brought up to the committee and the faculty for discussion and proposals and remedies. Results from 2013 survey when compared to the 2012 results show the following areas of improvement and the following areas that we need to evaluate and address. The complete results of the Studio Culture Survey and yearly comparisons will be located in the Team Room.

Areas of Improvements from 2012 to 2013
Student responses demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in favorable responses or 'a step up' on the majority of responses
- *Design Skills*
  - Written communication to supplement visual and graphic communication
  - Design decisions based on client and user values
  - Analyzing and understanding the ethical implications of design
  - Analyzing and understanding the social and political implications of design
  - Analyzing and understanding the economic implications of design
- *Pedagogy*
  - The opportunity for collaborative research/investigation with other professors is encouraged
  - Creative and innovative design processes are taught
  - Creative and innovative teaching approaches are used
  - Learning from the examples of other construction related professionals
  - Effectiveness of project critique process
    - Final critiques
    - Project critiques conducted within a group
- *Academic Environment*
  - Rate the degree to which you believe the following are valued in studio.
    - Leadership and accountability of architects within the building industry

- Student opinion matters within the School of Architecture
- Students have the latitude to develop personal approaches in higher level studios.
  Perspectives
- Students believe they are getting a quality education in the School of Architecture at MSU

Areas to Address 2012 to 2013
Student responses demonstrate a decrease of 10% or more in favorable responses or 'a step down' on the majority of responses
  Pedagogy
- The opportunity for collaborative research/investigation with students in other majors is promoted
- The opportunity for collaborative research/investigation with architectural and other professionals is encouraged
  Academic Environment
- Rate the degree to which you believe the following are valued in studio.
  - Community project and student service participation
  - Non-studio courses
  - Time spent on non-studio assignments
  - Personal non-studio activities (friends, family, own time)

There were a number of areas of improvement over the 2012-2013 survey from the perspective of students. It should be noted that 42.2% of the students responded that they "Strongly Agree" that they are "getting a quality education in the School of Architecture" and 50% responded that they "Agree" with this statement.

The areas that need improvement have been discussed in the context of the new curriculum changes and our long-range strategic planning process. Discussions on utilizing a third year design studio for collaborative work and/or community based/inspired projects have been some proposals put forward. There has also been a series of meetings with Architecture and Engineering faculty on the development of a joint minor between our programs. The Building Energy Systems minor is currently in the planning phases with the goal of being submitted to the Board of Regents during the coming year. The written proposal is being led by Assistant Professor Kevin Amende in the College of Engineering in consultation with the School of Architecture.

Time Management
Time management is brought up in discussions with students and faculty on many occasions. On one hand the student response to the studio culture survey "Rate the degree to which you believe time management is valued in studio" received a Very Important response from 46.5% of the students and 34.7% responded that it was Important. But at the same time, student responses to other questions did not always appear to support a similar emphasis on non-studio courses and activities.

To address some of this, the School has instituted staggered review weeks with First year, Undergraduate and Graduate studio reviews taking place over the course of three weeks. In addition, the school establishes a common deadline date/time for each year. This deadline has at times been on a Friday or Saturday before a Monday review and in other cases has been on a Sunday afternoon to still allow students adequate preparation and rest time prior to a Monday review. The dates for studio deadline are discussed each year—often with changes from one year to the next. The school continues to look at ways to balance the aspirations and requirements of the design studio courses with the needs and demands of non-studio courses and non-school activities. The intent of the staggered review week is to allow First year students with the opportunity to attend upper level studios during subsequent weeks and to adequately prepare for the end of semester projects and final exams in their other non-studio courses. Similarly Undergraduate students present during their last week of classes in order to provide time for their non-studio courses and study time for final exams. Graduate students have much fewer final exams, which is why their final reviews occur during that week. This staggered review schedule has also allowed us to hold reviews that can span over two class sessions. Prior to using the staggered review schedule, some students might be allotted only 12-15 minutes for their project review. This did not seem to adequately provide them with feedback given the time they spent on the project during the semester. Our staggered review week has allowed us to expand the time that each student receives on their review to 15-20 minutes in first year, 20-40 minutes in the undergraduate reviews and 40-60 minutes per student in the graduate reviews. This has allowed for the reviews to take on greater discussions and to seem less rushed and hurried. This has been seen as a positive change.

As part of the survey, we added a series of questions related directly to our third year spring semester curriculum, which had been identified by faculty and students as a point in the curriculum where the number and intensity of courses may be having an adverse effect on the students' ability to produce high quality work in all of them. Based upon the responses to those specific questions, the School altered the curriculum in 2012 by shifting one course, ARCH 313 Professional Practice, to Fall semester fourth year. We are continuing to monitor the results of this switch.

A tragic event happened this past spring which impacted the students, faculty and staff in the School a great deal. One of our students committed suicide. The MSU Counseling and Psychological Services was contacted immediately-along with the Dean of Students and other upper administrators. Students were informed immediately by the School of this tragic event and were given contact information for the counseling office. In consultation with the counseling center, two walk-in counseling sessions were scheduled for students, staff and faculty. A number of students, staff and faculty in the school attended these sessions. Because this student's death took place toward the end of the semester, many students and faculty soon dispersed for the summer after these sessions. The counseling center has maintained contact with the School and offered to provide additional sessions as needed. With the startup of the School soon approaching, we will be continuing to monitor the needs of the students, staff and faculty and as needed we will continue to work with the counseling center. While there are limitations as to how much information can be shared due to FERPA regulations, the School administration and faculty have worked with all of our students to direct them to these services as well as to provide accommodations in class—such as additional time for completing assignments or tests. We have had multiple meetings with faculty or staff to help guide students through challenges they may be facing, or mentoring opportunities as was the case in this instance. Nevertheless, it was a very difficult time within the school and for the student's family and friends.

Access to Information
In addition to the Studio Culture Policy being available on our website under the Student section of the Downloads page at http://www.arch.montana.edu/pdf/StudioCulturePolicy.pdf , the School holds an All-School meeting at the start of each semester. A variety of information is shared with students and faculty at these meetings. One area brought to the students' attention is the Studio Culture Policy as well as a discussion on the importance of time management as a means for them to achieve high quality work and develop the skills they will need as a professional to balance the many professional, personal and community demands on our time. A copy of this slide presentation will be made available in the Team Room but the main talking points related to studio culture and time management were:
- Professional conduct within the school
- Work Hard
- Play Hard
- Sleep Hard (as opposed to Sleep Hard-ly)
- Approach your education with passion
- Actively engage in the act of discovery, experimentation and innovation
- Engage in the concept of **civitas**

During a trip to another accredited program this past spring, the Interim Director of the School noticed that the studio culture policy was posted at the printing center at this School. It seemed that this would be an effective method for increasing the awareness of our policy and we will be investigating a similar posting practice at areas in the school that are frequented by the majority of our students during the course of the semester.

Social Equity
University policies and Procedures
Montana State University and the School of Architecture are committed to providing faculty, students and staff with a culturally rich, educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach and work. MSU combined existing administrative components to create the Office of Institutional Equity, www.montana.edu/equity/

- Montana State University's Statement on Diversity can be found at www.montana.edu/president/prescomm/diversity.html

- MSU's Affirmative Action Plan, which is currently being reviewed and updated, can be found at www.montana.edu/equity/AAPlan/MSU_2013DraftAffirmActionPlan.pdf

- The University has developed Nondiscrimination Policy and Discrimination Grievance Procedures that can be found at: www2.montana.edu/policy/affirmative_action/ . This policy and procedure includes sexual harassment and retaliation as well as disability discrimination.

- All faculty and staff at MSU are required to complete Discrimination & Harassment Training. Information on this can be found at: http://www.montana.edu/equity/training.html

The University has established policies for academic integrity which can be found in the MSU Student Conduct Code at http://www2.montana.edu/policy/student_conduct/ . Section 300 of the conduct code covers student responsibilities while Section 400 covers Academic Misconduct, Section 500 covers Academic Grievances and Section 600 covers the Student Conduct Code. The University has established recommended syllabus language regarding behavioral expectations, collaboration, plagiarism, academic misconduct, academic expectations, withdrawal deadlines, disability accommodations, email policy and student educational record policies. This language can be found at http://www.montana.edu/teachlearn/TLResources/SyllabusLanguage.html

Diversity—Status and Strategies: Faculty
The School has tried to be proactive in its efforts to increase the diversity of our faculty, but this past year has seen some setbacks in this area. Two tenure-track faculty members—both of whom increased the diversity of our faculty and were hired since the last accreditation visit—accepted positions at Kent State University and at Laurentian University in Canada. Along with a third tenure-track faculty member accepting a position at Kansas State University, the School was faced with filling these three tenure-track positions with non-tenure track (NTT) faculty during this coming academic year. These NTT faculty hires have led to an increase in diversity on our faculty. The School will conduct tenure-track searches in AY 2012-13 for all three faculty position with the intent of all three positions being filled beginning Fall 2014. The School will be aggressively using these tenure-track faculty searches to both hire the best available applicant and increase the diversity of our faculty.

To assist in these efforts, the University received an NSF grant to establish ADVANCE Project TRACS. More information on ADVANCE can be found at www.montana.edu/nsfadvance/ . Although, ADVANCE's primary goal is to transform Montana State University and broaden the participation of women faculty in STEM and underrepresented areas of Social and Behavioral Science (SBS), the faculty team at ADVANCE is committed to assisting non-STEM and non-SBS disciplines to increase the diversity of faculty ranks. Jessi Smith, Director of ADVANCE, has met with all program heads on campus, including Architecture, and reviewed the School's current status in this area. The School of Architecture, along with all programs on campus, is required to submit a progress report on number of faculty receiving tenure, promotion, awards, or grants each year in an effort to more fully report on the progress of all departments and faculty in each of these areas.

ADVANCE has a number of resources and strategies that are available to program heads and search committees that can assist with expanding the pool of qualified candidates. Some of these strategies have already been implemented as we prepare for our faculty searches. Advertisements for these three faculty positions have been expanded to include Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), Chronicle of Higher Education, and Women in Higher Education website and print publications. In addition, the School sent one of the search committee members to attend the Society of Architectural Historians national conference in order to generate interest in the Architectural History/Theory faculty position to a much broader audience. The Interim Director has sent letters and copies of the advertisements to all accredited architecture programs in the United States. In addition, as recommended by the ADVANCE team, one search committee will be conducting the search process for all three positions and the membership of the search committee will represent a balance of gender, teaching areas and time at MSU. A student representative will also be included on the Search Committee. The Search Committee has had an initial meeting with MSU's Affirmative Action Office and with Jessi Smith, Director of ADVANCE to assist the committee in attracting a highly qualified and diverse pool of applicants for all three of the positions.

Amongst non-tenure track (NTT) faculty positions, the School has a good level of diversity on its faculty. During the coming year, Elisa Renouard (Instructor), Xuemei Li (Assistant Teaching Professor) and Gretchen Miller (Instructor) will be joining the faculty as 1-year visiting full-time NTT faculty. In addition, a number of local and visiting practitioners will continue to teach or consult part-time in the School: Lindsay Schack (Instructor and Internship Coordinator), Sherrill Halbe (Instructor), and Jessica Jellison (Coordinator for Professional Practice of Architecture Graduate Certificate Program—and Instructor in prior years). Lori Ryker, a former tenured Associate

Professor in the School of Architecture, continues to offer a course through MSU Extended University which has been taken by some of our students as one of their fourth year studio options or as a graduate elective.

In addition, the School utilized its Fall 2007 and 2008 Visiting Scholars Studio (Arch 551) as a means to increase the diversity of the faculty by inviting Holly Porter and Monika Wittig to participate with Mark McInturff, Tom Porter and Shane Salisbury in these design studios. In 2011, the School shifted the visiting scholars' studio to the summer semester and Monika Wittig and Yong Ju Lee were brought to our campus to teach graduate studios and graduate electives. Over the last few years we have had women faculty members as NTT faculty teaching in the design studios:
> Sherrill Halbe (ARCH 525 2008-13)
> Jessica Jellison (ARCH 151, 152, 253, 261, 262, 363, 2008-2012)
> Mara-Gai Katz (Arch253, 355 450 and 456, 2011-12),
> Angie Keesee (multiple studios from 2007-2010)
> Laura Landon (Arch 414, Fall 2011),
> Tammy Minge (Arch 253, Fall 2009)
> Holly Porter (ARCH 551, Fall 2007)
> Lindsay Schack (Arch 152, 363, 498, 525, 2009-13)
> Jamie Slagel (Arch 414, Fall 2011),
> Monika Wittig (Arch 525, 551, Fall 2008, Summer 2011)

Following are the other part-time adjunct faculty the school has utilized since the last accreditation visit:
> Keith Anderson (Arch 254 and 564, 2010 and 2012)
> Robert Aydlett (Arch 313, 456, 552, 2009 and 2012)
> Brian Brush (Arch 525, 551 Summer 2011-12)
> Tyler Call (Arch 254, 355 and 340, 2009)
> Coleman Coker (Arch 551, Fall 2010)
> Scott Deitle (Arch 565, Fall 2012)
> Luis Ferrada (Arch 551, Fall 2008))
> Peter Jahnke (Arch 551, Fall 2009))
> Yong Ju Lee (Arch 525, 551, Summer 2011)
> Mike Patterson (Arch 551, Fall 2012)
> Shane Salisbury (Arch 525, 551 Fall 2008, Summer 2011)
> Ron Shvartsman (Arch 551, Summer 2012)
> Carson Smuts (Arch 525, 551, Summer 2012)
> Ken Vandewalle (Arch 551, Fall 2009))
> Josh Vernon (Arch 355 and 363, 2009)
> Lance Walter (Arch 551, Summer 2011)
> Dan Wise (Arch 525, Fall and Spring Semester 2004-2007)

Diversity—Status and strategies: Students
The State of Montana has the following demographic breakdown based upon 2010 US Census figures:

White	89.7%
Black or African American	0.6%
Native American and Alaska Native	6.5%
Asian	0.7%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	0.1%
Two or more Races	2.5%
Hispanic or Latino	3.1%

Comparisons of School, University and State demographics occur in Part One (I) Section 3.1 Statistical Reports

Montana State University has made increasing the diversity of its student body one of its objectives in the University's Strategic Plan. More information on this can be found at www.montana.edu/strategicplan/access2.html

Objective A.2 Diversity the student body
- *Metric A.2.:1* By 2019, the number of Native American students enrolled will increase to 800 (a 45% increase)
- *Metric A.2.2:* By 2019, the number of other under-represented minority students enrolled will increase to 1300 (a 40% increase)
- *Metric A.2.3:* By 2019, the number of international students enrolled will increase to 660 (a 20% increase)
- *Metric A.2.4:* By 2019, the number of nontraditional students enrolled in undergraduate and Gallatin College programs will increase to 3,200 9a 20% increase)

The School of architecture has identified a strategy in the School's Strategic Plan to develop transfer articulation agreements with targeted universities as a means for supporting the University's Objective A.1: Educate more students while maintaining the quality of programs.

To increase the School's diversity, the School has actively reached out to student populations in other parts of the country. The School of Architecture participates with the University at a series of events in which out-of-state high school counselors are brought to MSU in order to raise the profile of the University and various programs such as Architecture in the hopes of attracting a more diverse student population. This group of counselors includes representatives from distant states such as Hawaii, Florida, Arizona, New Mexico and California. In addition, the School has participated in the Wentworth Institute of Technology and the IIT Chicago Architecture career fair in order to recruit students from both the Northeast and Midwest portions of the United States. The school participates in the International Student Exchange and has hosted a number of international students since the last accreditation visit. In two cases, one student from central Russia and one student from Valencia, Spain completed their exchange year at MSU and decided to enroll as a degree seeking student. Both students received their undergraduate degree from us. One student went on to complete their Master of Architecture degree and the other student is planning on applying to our Master of Architecture degree program.

As part of the School's strategic planning process, one of the strategies identified as a high priority was to increase the number of international transfer articulation agreements. The School currently has agreements of cooperation with one university in China and another university in Kenya, however, these have not yet led to any exchange students. A transfer articulation agreement with Lethbridge College has also been established. The School will be looking at ways to expand these initial efforts.

In addition, as part of our strategic planning process, students and faculty strongly supported revisiting our scholarship criteria to identify more opportunities for need-base scholarships to assist more students in their efforts to complete their education. While the school currently has one scholarship targeted toward assisting international students, this additional strategy could allow us to assist more students from diverse backgrounds.

Over the course of the last 5 years, the School and University requirement efforts have provided a increase in the diversity of our student population. While the increase is modest, it has resulted in increased numbers of Asian, Native Hawaiian/pacific Islander and Hispanic/Latino students in our program. The percentage of white students in our program has dropped from 94.3% in the academic year prior to our last accreditation visit to 85.8% in our most recent year, AY 2012-13. In some student demographic areas we are at a higher percentage than the university as a whole. As mentioned elsewhere in the APR, we work with the Office of International Programs to accept exchange students on a semester or year-long basis. While these students do not always stay at MSU to complete their degree, they bring a cultural diversity to our program and students. In return, we believe that we provide those students with a good education and cultural experience with a rural setting in the United States. Many of them participate in our design studio field trips to other parts of the country. We will continue to support the policy of accepting exchange students throughout the various years of our program. Statistical data on student demographics can be found in Part One (I) Section 3.1 Statistical Data.

In terms of gender diversity amongst students, the percentage of female students has varied from a low of 26% to a high of 38% with the higher percentage being in the most recent year—and an average of 33% over the last six years. During the previous term of accreditation (2002-2008) the percentage of women in our program ranged from 28-32%. As such we are only slightly higher on average when compared to our previous accreditation visit. We know that increasing the diversity of our faculty can play a role in increasing the number of women in our program and is another reason we are

working with the ADVANCE team to assist us in this area. Additional data on the number of women in our program can be found at page 94.