IFLA ASIA-PACIFIC
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

DRAFT 2.1

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS
IFLA ASIA PACIFIC REGION

Accreditation Report: IPB Bachelor of Science in Landscape Architecture

24 May 2018

1. Introduction

The Montreal IFLA World Council meeting in November 2017 approved a proposal for the IFLA APR to conduct a Pilot Accreditation Review of the landscape programme at Institut Pertanian Bogor (IPB) in Indonesia. The pilot review was to test a new regional approach to assessing landscape programmes against a global benchmark standard. The IFLA APR formulated this regional approach by developing an Education Policy and Standards document, and Accreditation Procedure, to be followed by a three-person panel appointed by the IFLA APR Education Committee.

This report outlines the work of the IFLA APR Accreditation Panel at IPB on 9-10 April 2018, notes the panel's observations during the review process, and summarises the panel's findings with a recommendation on the standing of the landscape programme at IPB. Conditions attached to the recommendation are outlined later in the report. The report was prepared by the panel (Assoc. Prof. Mike Barthelmeh, Dr Budi Faisal, Dr Rustam Hakim Manan) reporting on the Pilot Review of the landscape architecture programme at IPB Indonesia for the Education Committee of the IFLA APR.

2. Recommendation

THAT the B. Sc. in Landscape Architecture offered by IPB is granted PROVISIONAL ACCREDITATION in accordance with the IFLA APR Accreditation Procedures 2017, for a five year period from 2018, subject to satisfactory self-evaluation through the annual IFLA APR reporting process.

(Note that this Provisional status may be considered for an upgrade to full accreditation status during the five year period subject to the achievement of, or substantial and satisfactory progress towards meeting, the conditions listed in section 7 of this report. There is <u>no expectation</u> that such a change to the status of the programme will be automatic or necessarily achieved early in the accreditation cycle; there <u>is an expectation</u> that the programme will be actively working towards achieving full accreditation status by the end of the current accreditation period and will keep its students informed as to progress in achieving this status. Progress reviews and a status reconsideration will normally only occur during an annual report period.)

3. The review process

An introduction to the programme was provided by Dr Makalew, Head of the Department of Landscape Architecture, after a welcome from the IPB Rector and the Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture. The panel then reviewed student work displayed in an exhibition room as well as work provided in drawings, plans, competition entries and written form. Further student work was readily provided on request, and supporting information such as subject outlines was readily available.

The panel met independently with senior staff, all permanent staff teaching into the programme, current undergraduate students, and with recent graduates of the programme. The panel was impressed with the open responses from all groups in regard to particular strengths of the programme, areas for improvement, and the ways in which facilities could better support the goals of the programme.

There was adequate time for the panel to hold these meetings as well as to visit the library, teaching and computer rooms, and the faculty glasshouses.

4. Observations following the 2018 review

Programme content

- We note that the programme has a strong focus on tropical landscape environments with a robust foundation in environmental sciences. The emphasis on plant material is commended and combination creates a strong point of difference for the programme. Particular strengths in research, inventory and analysis were also observed, although the panel notes that much work titled analysis was in fact simply landscape inventory; thus a more flexible approach to teaching design process explicitly distinguishing between inventory and analysis should be explored.

- However, while acknowledging the complexity and depth of landscape architecture and thus the competing pressure for content on landscape architecture programmes, there are opportunities within the current curriculum to substantially increase student learning in three key areas: design outcomes, design communication, and technical drawings. Landscape architecture is a design discipline but several examples of student work provided showed quite poor levels of spatial design resolution or well-resolved circulation systems. The foundations of Green Infrastructure as an underlying principle in designing with landscape systems appeared to be well understood as an intellectual principle, but not well understood when applied spatially to the landscape. Larger scale landscape planning work was generally of a higher standard than more detailed landscape design work.

- We were pleased to see an emphasis on hand drawing in the first year studio classes and were impressed with the quality of the work. This did not appear to be translated well into plan or perspective drawings or sections in more senior classes, where their skills appeared to be more rudimentary. The development of a technically appropriate more sophisticated graphic style (precise, or loose and more stylish, depending upon the drawing focus) to replicate or indeed lead what is currently seen in landscape practice is required.

- We note that technical planting plans were quite well done, although clearly there is always room for improvement in graphic clarity, while technical construction drawings were generally weak. There was no evidence provided of drawings which deal with levels, layout or earthworks and drainage components of a full landscape architecture curriculum. A greater level of explanatory information needs to be included on plans and drawings to enable them to work as stand-alone sheets when on display.

- We note that examples of student work provided had generally been assessed by the department as being good or excellent projects. The panel also needed to see work that had been assessed as being barely competent, as well as failing projects, to understand the competency standard applied by the department to student project work.

- We understand that a practical work component or internship is currently available to students as an optional part of their programme. We believe that aspects of a programme specifically targeted towards easing the transition from academia to professional practice are to be commended, and so while such an attachment is available to students, we believe that it should be compulsory so that it is taken by all students.

- We note that matrices were provided mapping programme outcomes against standards defined by KKNI and the curriculum content defined by the IFLA Charter (Tables IPB C15.1 and IPB C15.2). However, these standards and curricula are not as detailed as the competencies required by the IFLA APR and against which this review has been undertaken. A further matrix was later supplied by IPB which illustrated the IFLA APR competencies and the subjects in which each competency was met. (We note that the IFLA APR competencies incorporate all of the IFLA Charter curriculum components.)

Staffing

- We understand that there are approximately 320 students on the four-year undergraduate programme and so with 21 full-time staff this gives an average staff to student ratio of 1:16, within the guideline ratio specified in the accreditation document.

- It was not clear to the panel whether or not external contributors from landscape practice who delivered lectures also taught into the design studio part of the programme. We commend external input to the lecture programme but also expected to see clear evidence of external input into studio-based design projects. Such links to practice are essential components of a professional programme in landscape architecture and so we would expect to see evidence of this aspect of external contribution in the first annual report due in February 2019.

- Staff expertise and their research profiles appears to be closely related to the strong science foundation of the programme. This is to be commended as a key point of difference for the programme, distinguishing it from other undergraduate programme offerings in other Indonesian universities. However, it is important to retain a balance in staff areas of interest and expertise to reflect the nature of a design programme, and so we would expect to see further evidence of design expertise emerging from existing staff or in future plans to recruit new staff, in the annual reports due in February each year.

Facilities

- We confirm that studio-based learning is critical to the field of landscape architecture, allowing interactive exploration of design opportunities and design innovation. We note that studio spaces are available to students during timetabled periods, but must be shared with other classes such that students need to remove their work at the conclusion of each of their allocated class times. We note that a total of just 130 studio workstations spread over three rooms are available for almost 300 students, which is not adequate for design teaching in landscape architecture.

- We further note the rather sterile nature of the existing studios. Studio spaces should be inspiring, light and airy, stimulating and fostering the development of creativity in students of landscape architecture. Further, these spaces should be open to students for at least 12 hours every day, with dedicated space for each student from at least year two onwards to maximise their opportunities to examine and explore the widest possible range of design directions.

- We confirm the role of research as a fundamental foundation for design innovation, supported by adequate resources in both analogue and digital formats. We understand that students have good access to a range of material using digital platforms, but we found that the printed material available to students in the main library (and especially in the departmental library) is woefully inadequate in regard to both books, and design journals. We were informed that it was university policy for printed material to be centralised in the main library, but we strongly suggest that the departmental library should also have a good collection of resource material. Students must not rely on digital sources only since this limits what might be found depending upon specific search algorithms; rather, a rich source of ideas, inspiration and exemplars also requires good access to an excellent range of printed material including books, journals and design magazines.

- We note the reproduction equipment available to students to print their work appeared to be of good quality, although we understand that the printers are rarely used (and indeed may not always be working). Much of the student graphic work presented to the panel was hand-drawn, and we commend the emphasis on hand techniques as part of design exploration, but technical and plan drawings sometimes need the precision afforded by digital platforms and this was not as strongly represented as we would have expected. Hand techniques can be

technically precise, but this was not in evidence in the material available to the panel during the review.

- We note that a range of software was available for students to use, although we understand that not all of this software, particularly in the graphics area, was as current as might be expected in a professional programme. It was noted that some of the hardware was dated and rather slow, thus being unable to support the most recent versions of software as well as higher specification components could. We suggest that 40 computers and GIS/CAD software licences may not be adequate for the number of students on the programme, and that better provision of graphics software needs to be investigated (e.g. Adobe Suite).

5. The Standards

The staff provided a comprehensive self-review of each of the competency standards required of an accredited programme of landscape architecture. Table 5.1 shows a summary of the standards with the panel's assessment of the level of compliance with each standard after considering the self-review commentary and information provided by staff, current students and recent graduates as well as the panel's own observations.

Table 5.1: Competency standard compliance

IFLA APR competency	Attained each competency?			Action / observation
	Fully met	**Partially met**	**Not yet met**	
1	☑			
2	☑			
3	☑			
4	☑			
5		☑		Need to increase ISLA membership (only 10 ISLA members currently)
6	☑			
7	☑			Aim to increase the number of staff with design qualifications or design practice experience
8	☑			Aim to increase the number of staff with landscape architecture qualifications
9	☑			
10	☑			Note: the ratio must be lower in senior classes
11		☑		It is important to involve external staff in studio projects as well as to deliver lectures or seminars
12	☑			Note: CPD includes seminar and conference attendance; research should have an academic focus, leading to refereed publications
13	☑			
14	☑			Note: this should relate to C1, with a stronger emphasis on design
15		☑		Note: studio means applying theory and practice subjects in site-based design projects
16	☑			
17		☑		Note: that the value of practical experience means that internships should be compulsory for all students
18	☑			
19				Tables IPB C19-32 were superseded by new Tables
20				IPB 4.1 and IPB 4.2 sent on 18 April by email,

21				showing competencies by subject; section 6 of this report has a detailed response to these aspects of the self-review
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
29				
30				
31				
32				
33		☑		See Section 4 above
34		☑		See Section 4 above
35			☑	We did not observe any storage space for students
36	☑			
37			☑	See Section 4 above
38	☑			
39	☑			
40	☑			
41	NA			Note: first report is due in February 2019
42	☑			
43	☑			

6. Issues arising from the review

The panel notes that generally the competencies required to meet the IFLA APR Education Standards were being met by the programme, except as indicated in Tables 5.1 and 6.1.

New Tables IPB 4.1 and IPB 4.2 provided after the review visit cover competencies 19-32 as indicated in Table 5.1 above. The panel's observations which follow in Table 6.1 below only refer to competencies which are not considered to be fully met from information provided in those new tables; all other competencies in new Tables IPB 4.1 and IPB 4.2 are considered to have been met.

Table 6.1: Competency standard compliance demonstrated in New Tables 4.1 and 4.2

IFLA APR competency	Attained each competency?			Action / observation
	Fully met	**Partially met**	**Not yet met**	
22.2		☑		Delivered in 27, 42, 43; studio-based design projects need more emphasis in the programme
22.4		☑		Delivered in 42; issues of sustainability need more emphasis in the programme
24.1		☑		Delivered in 37; hard materials and landscape construction also need more emphasis
24.2			☑	Delivered in 42; design detailing and construction either need their own subject, or inclusion in other subjects as well as in 42
24.4		☑		Delivered in 50; it may make more sense to be delivered in subject 52
26.4			☑	Not delivered; should be included in 52

7. Conditions, prior to achieving full accreditation status

The panel notes that there are several areas where the Department needs to demonstrate the achievement of, or substantial and satisfactory progress towards meeting, the conditions noted below, before full accreditation can be considered for recommendation by the IFLA APR Education Committee.

- **Required changes** mean that a subsequent visit by the national representatives on the accreditation panel will find clear evidence presented that such changes have been made on a permanent basis as a formal and documented modification to the programme.
- **Strongly recommended changes** are those which the panel believes will strengthen the programme, but understands that resources may limit the extent to which changes are able to be made in the short term. There will be a demonstrated commitment from the Department however to ensure incremental change is able to be made such that any strongly recommended changes have a reasonable chance of implementation during the review period.
- **Optional programme enhancements** mean that as resources permit, the Department investigates the possibility of adding breadth or depth to the programme by considering these possible developments.

The conditions in this section of the report may include reference to facilities, staffing, or the curriculum.

7.1 Required programme changes

7.1.1 Site-based landscape design projects must be included in more of the programme subjects, from first year to final year, applying learning from theory and landscape practice subjects in the design studio. Subjects which include these site-based landscape design and planning studios are to comprise at least 50% of the programme. The panel understands that formal documented curriculum changes may not be able to occur immediately, but also believe that there is scope within existing subject requirements to allow a more design-based focus in project work.

7.1.2 Hand-drawn or digital graphic communication tuition and assessment must be included in more of the programme subjects, from first year to final year, enabling students to develop a broader range of graphic styles with greater technical proficiency to prepare for professional practice in Indonesia, regionally and globally.

7.1.3 The library collection must be greatly improved (in the departmental library as well as in the main library) in terms of the numbers of books, journals and topics covered. An initial addition of several hundred volumes is needed to address key shortfalls in the collection, and this must be supplemented by an additional and substantial number of new books each year over the accreditation period and beyond. The library collection of landscape journals and design journals must also be enhanced with a wider range of subscriptions, in both print and digital formats.

7.1.4 An increased emphasis on landscape practice subjects needs to be made to enable graduates to be 'work-ready' at graduation time. Technical drawings for planting design appear to be a greater strength in the programme than technical drawings for landscape construction or working with hard materials.

7.1.5 Examples of student work from theory, practice and studio subjects needs to be available with any application to upgrade the status of the programme, demonstrating a full range of achievement including excellent (A), good (B), competent (C) and fail (D) projects.

7.2 Strongly recommended programme changes

7.2.1 Students in years 2, 3 and 4 of the programme should each have their own dedicated desk or drawing board space, to undertake studio project work whenever they do not have other timetabled classes to attend. First-year students are able to share desk space, but not at the expense of senior student access. Studio space should be freely available to students for at

least 12 hours each day, and enable inspirational exemplars to be readily displayed with good access to natural light.

7.2.2   Permanent gallery display space showing student work should be available, perhaps adjacent to the covered space outdoors where landscape students currently have some tables, so that the work is on display to other landscape students as well as to other students and staff in the Faculty to better publicise the interesting and relevant work that is undertaken by landscape students.

7.2.3   While it was good to see models being built to illustrate design ideas in 3D, a more technically precise and sophisticated style would lift the quality of student output to a more professional standard. We suggest that such an approach is explored in first to final year classes, supported by a workshop area.

7.2.4   The panel's expectation is that the majority of staff teaching into a landscape architecture programme will be members of ISLA, although in fact less than half of the staff members currently seem to be members. We believe that membership of the professional landscape architecture association should be the priority professional connection for most staff teaching into a landscape architecture programme, and suggest making this connection a priority for the Department's CPD programme and for any new staff appointments.

7.2.5   To strengthen this connection with landscape practice, the panel suggests that the department explore hosting regular collaborative events or seminars with ISLA.

7.2.6   Similarly, the panel suggests that staff with landscape practice experience should be encouraged to take a leading role in the delivery of landscape studio projects alongside visiting practitioners.

7.2.7   The panel notes that there appears to be an emphasis on rote learning of theory material in the programme, which can be useful, but theory needs to be explored further in site-based studio design and planning projects to both investigate the value of such theory to, and apply a range of theoretical ideas for, enhancing landscape practice.

7.2.8   Dedicated site design studios such as the 'Theme Park' subject should be compulsory for all students to improve site-based design and planning skills.

7.2.9   Practical work in the form of an internship is a valuable aspect of learning in landscape architecture and so all students should be encouraged if not required to complete a period of internship as part of their programme requirements.

7.3   Optional programme enhancements

7.3.1   The use of the glasshouses and associated space for plant association trials, or landscape management or maintenance practical experience, should be explored further. This is a great opportunity to enhance programme distinctiveness, as well as better preparing students for their professional careers. It will also reinforce learning from internship placements.

7.3.2   An area for practical experimentation with hard materials and construction methods would be a useful addition to the plant-based facilities available to the department.

7.3.3   The panel suggests that the Department explore further methods of bringing international exchange students into the programme to facilitate a wider exposure to different modes of learning and different approaches to design process

8. Additional matters

The IFLA APR Accreditation Panel wishes to thank the Department for taking all necessary steps to make our task easier and more enjoyable. The Department responded quickly to all requests for further information, and the only material not provided as expected was due to a misunderstanding about some of the competency terms rather than an inability to provide what was required. In particular, the efforts of Dr Afra Makalew and Ms Rezalini Anwar were greatly appreciated. All staff and students were friendly and approachable, willing to freely share their views about the department and the programme; their warm hospitality made our two days at IPB flow smoothly and effortlessly.

9. The IFLA APR Accreditation Panel

Assoc. Prof. Mike Barthelmeh   Chair of Panel
BHortSc; PGDipLA; MLA; FNZILA

Dr Ir Budi Faisal   Panel member
BArch; MAUD; MLA; PhD; IAI; IALI

Dr Ir Rustam Hakim Manan   Panel member
MTSP; PhD; FALI; APALI; IALI

Appendix: additional matrix for Standard 4 supplied by IPB