

August 25, 2010

Jeffrey Hou, Ph.D., Chair and Associate Professor  
Department of Landscape Architecture  
University of Washington  
348 Gould Hall, Box 355734  
Seattle, WA 98195-5734

Dear Professor Hou:

The Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board at its August 6-7, 2010 meeting granted accreditation for a six (6) year period to the course of study leading to the first professional MLA degree at the University of Washington, subject to review of annual reports and maintenance of good standing.

Accreditation is awarded on a time-certain basis. The six-year period of accreditation ends June 30, 2016. Accordingly, the MLA program is next scheduled for a review during the spring of 2016.

In making its decision, the LAAB considered the program's self-evaluation report, the visiting team report, the institution's response to the team report, and discussions with team members and program faculty.

Enclosed is a copy of the final visiting team report and a list of recommendations affecting accreditation (to be responded to in annual reports) and suggestions for improvement. This list was developed by LAAB from the materials reviewed during the meeting.

On behalf of the visiting team, I would like to thank you for the hospitality extended to them by the faculty, staff, and students.

Sincerely,

Richard Hawks, FASLA  
LAAB Chair

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Douglas J. Wadden, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Planning

**University of Washington  
MLA Program  
LAAB Meeting  
August 6-7, 2010**

**Summary of Recommendations and Suggestions**

**Recommendations Affecting Accreditation**

1. Ensure course syllabi include clear statements of course learning objectives, expected student learning outcomes and assessment measures appropriate for each course in the curriculum (Standard 3).

**Suggestions for Improvements**

1. Revise the October 2007 plan ensuring it is competitive in the impending 2Y/2D reorganization initiative which responds to potential future budget cuts (Standard 1).
2. Strategically plan an aggressive fund raising effort to add discretionary funds to the department budget (Standard 2).
3. Closely track the teaching and service loads of the faculty to guard against reductions in scholarly work and overloads (Standard 4).
4. Explore ways to improve on the space available for the program (Standard 9).