

**Evaluation of the landscape architecture programme
offered by the Department of Landscape Architecture
and Spatial Planning (ILP)
at the
Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB)**

March 25th 2009

Table of Contents:

1	Introduction.....	4
2	Structure of the report.....	4
3	The Response of the Evaluation Committee to the ILP Self Evaluation Report (SER)	5
4	Discussion	12
	Appendix One Members of the Evaluation Committee	19
	Appendix Two: Site Visit Programme.....	20

Executive Summary

The landscape architect programme at ILP is a successful one in terms of its ability to attract in high calibre students, and in the quality of the graduates it produces. It is facing new challenges and opportunities in terms of changing social and educational issues and in existing and proposed changes in the provision of post graduate landscape architecture education Norway. The Evaluation Committee's review of the evaluation issues identified in the Terms of Reference supplied by the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB) identify the following issues as one of particular note; the programme structure, the learning environment, the Research basis and some issues to do with the broader labour market. The Evaluation Committee believe that the landscape architecture programme at UMB has an excellent opportunity to maximise its strengths in terms of its position in a University of Life Sciences and promote itself as an international leader in terms of green landscape architecture.

1 Introduction

The Terms of Reference (ToR) used in the evaluation process were supplied by the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB) Department of Academic Affairs. The evaluation process commenced in autumn 2008 with the site visit taking place February 2nd – 6th 2009. The Evaluation Committee members (EC) are listed in appendix one, with the Site Visit Programme outlined in appendix two.

1.1 Methodology and Sources Used

The main sources used by the EC in the review and preparation of the report comprised the following:

- The Department of Landscape Architecture and Spatial Planning (ILP) Self Evaluation Report;
- The folder of UMB information, supplied by UMB Department of Academic Affairs;
- Additional UMB material supplied in the committee room (Yellow Room) during the evaluation week;
- The UMB web page;
- The views and comments provided by groups and individuals interviewed by the EC (See Appendix 2);
- The collective impressions gained from the tour of the Departmental teaching and research facilities;
- A brief campus visit, including design studios and the virtual reality laboratory;
- Examples of studio work as supplied by academic staff.

2 Structure of the report

The EC have, in the first instant, followed the headings of the Terms of Reference (ToR) as supplied by the UMB Department of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Self Evaluation Report (SER) provided by the Head of the Landscape Architecture section in co-operation with the programme advisory board (Programrådet). As required, the EC have addressed all the evaluation issues identified in Section 7 of the ToR. At the end of the report, in Section 4, the EC bring together the different key issues that emerge from the individual points under the ToR, emphasising the matters that they found most significant in the process.

3 The Response of the Evaluation Committee to the ILP Self Evaluation Report (SER)

The ToR identifies the evaluation issues that are to guide the evaluation process. The ILP landscape architecture programme followed the structure of the evaluation headings in their Self Evaluation Report. In several places they specifically requested a response from the EC. This report makes reference to these requests in Section 3.2.

3.1 Learning Goals (7.1)¹

Relevance

Benchmarking and recommendations for improvement

Relevance: The EC notes that the landscape programme at UMB is a vocational programme aimed at preparing graduates to work in the profession of landscape architecture. The learning goals as identified in the Studiehåndboka² identify goals that are appropriate to landscape architectural objectives at a national and international level. UMB graduates work in the landscape architectural profession. The relevance of this programme is demonstrated in the role graduates take on when entering the work place. UMB landscape graduates are very successful in gaining employment. The SER identifies the professional focus of their objectives but note the potential lack of critical thinking and scholarly reflection. The EC return to this point in Section 4.

Benchmarking and recommendations for improvement international

benchmarks: Regarding international benchmarks, the EC note that the programme offered by UMB exceeds both the European Foundation for Landscape Architecture (EFLA)³, and the International Federation of Landscape Architecture (IFLA) minimum requirements for landscape architectural education. EFLA requires a minimum of 240 ECTS, while IFLA requires a minimum of four years full-time study. The landscape architectural programme at UMB is 300 ECTS/5 years full-time study.

¹ Numbers in brackets refers to heading in the Terms of Reference

² See page 5 of SER

³ EFLA (www.efla.org) is the professional organisation for landscape architecture in Europe; membership is open to national associations in countries which are members of the Council of Europe. EFLA constitutes the European Region of the International Federation of Landscape Architects (IFLA, www.iflaonline.org).

The EC's recommendations for improvement will form part of the wider discussion at in Section 4 of this report.

3.2 Programme structure and delivery

Appropriateness for attaining learning goals

Evaluation and benchmarking

General: The SER contains extensive information on programme structure and delivery, highlighting the three specialisations offered in the landscape architecture programme at UMB:

- detailed landscape design;
- landscape planning;
- urban green space and landscape management.

The SER also establishes that, irrespective of the specialisation followed, the first two years of the programme are held in common.

The SER identify the following aspects of their existing programme for particular scrutiny by the EC:

- the small number of students following the Landscape Management option (p. 12 + 14);
- the challenge of offering courses in English (p. 12);
- the structure of the course as a 5 year masters, rather than divided into Bachelor and Masters (p. 14);
- the development of design skills between year 3 and 5 (p. 12);
- the harmonisation of the landscape architectural degree with the departments Spatial Planning programme (p. 11);
- the potential of linking with courses offered by other UMB departments (p. 12);
- the perceived loss of some landscape students to the Oslo School of Architecture (AHO) (p. 12).

Appropriateness for attaining learning goals: While the EC consider that the pedagogic framework of the landscape architecture programme is appropriate for attaining the learning goals, some of the interviews revealed strong negativity in some student groups. Pedagogy also involves the difficult work of motivating and enthusing students. The staff collective should aim to proactively assist such students.

Evaluation and benchmarking: programme structure. On initial review the EC observed three points of note:

- The two year common programme,;
- The loosely structured fourth year of the programme, and;
- The low numbers taking the urban green space and landscape management option;

These issues are addressed in Section 4.1

Evaluation and benchmarking: materials and learning methods: The curriculum covers the key subjects for a programme in landscape architecture as defined by EFLA and IFLA. It appears to have the correct balance between studio based modules and scientific and theoretical based components that are necessary in a design based programme. The essence of such a programme is based on problem-based learning. The EC note that the staff profile involved with the delivery of the landscape architecture programme has a combination of full-time and part-time positions. This allows key landscape practitioners to teach at UMB resulting in the beneficial exposure of students to contemporary professional practice.

During interviews the EC were made aware of some minor points of dissent, for example, the necessity of the 10 credit geology module in second year. The EC did not feel the necessity to respond specifically to this. Geology is an important part of understanding landscape, and this subject's position in the programme's Second year is appropriate. A reduction to 5 credits could be considered at a future date. A more significant issue arose about studio based pedagogy and the time demands on staff for this type of teaching. Studio is the core to design education, and comprises a balance of directed and self directed and problem based learning. The EC were informed of two related issues; that staff and a high contact time with students in studio, and that the students appeared to have an infinite capacity for demands on staff time. Concerns that the students were experiencing a high work load at certain periods were also expressed from various groups during the evaluation process.

Evaluation and benchmarking: assessment of student learning: The techniques used at ILP conform to normal practice in landscape architectural education as practice elsewhere in Europe. The SER raises the issue of the possibility of providing more written feedback on studio work. The EC recognise the dilemma of the subsequent increase in cost associated with this, and suggest that written specific feedback during the assessment process is a very valuable part of the learning

process and where possibly should be encouraged. The EC did not have a consensus on the merit of grading versus pass/fail, as individual members came from academic cultures where each types of assessment were practiced. However it is noted that the responsible application of grading offers the opportunity to indicate special quality, an aspect that can become very helpful for talented and ambitious students. The all-or-nothing principle of a pass/fail system often remunerates mediocre performance and ignores extraordinary work and personalities.

Evaluation and benchmarking: total learning environment: The learning environment of the campus in Ås is very good. The potential disadvantage of a rural setting for a design programme that embraces urbanism and social/cultural studies can be balanced by active travel efforts to international urban destinations. The EC support the SER (p 20 and 21) and particularly endorse necessity for all aspects of the landscape architecture programme to be located in one place(that is, administration, academic staff offices and design studios).

3.3 Competence and research basis for the programme

Competence basis of the teaching staff

Research basis

Competence basis of the teaching staff: The EC was generally impressed by the range of full and part time staff engaged in teaching on the landscape architecture programme. Interviews with students and the profession did not identify any specific shortcomings in this area. It is noted that the University's terms of reference state that all teachers should take a course in University Pedagogy. The EC recommends that this is enforced for all full time staff. Landscape architect education embraces a wide skill base, and also builds heavily on the input of practitioners who are outside the main academic framework. The landscape architecture programme at UMB appears well served by practitioners who teach.

Research basis: The University's International Strategy states that all teaching is research based. The SER highlights the University's concern about the requirement to increase research activity and the need to increase teaching efficiencies. The EC recognise that this is a common dilemma for design schools in many European countries. This point is returned to in the Section 4.3.

3.4 Future labour market

Relevance of the programme

Broader labour market

Relevance of the programme: The landscape architecture programme at UMB appears well placed to service the needs of the labour market. Until recently it has been the only place in Norway to study landscape architecture. Its graduates have a good reputation among employers (anecdotal evidence and interviews with the profession). The SER reports that the Norwegian employment office states that unemployment among landscape architects in Norway as nonexistent in the period Dec 07 – Oct 08 (p. 27). Additionally it has been reported to the EC that many landscape planning jobs have remained unfilled in recent years. While the economic climate has undoubtedly changed since autumn 2008 and future employment trends are difficult to predict it is noted that landscape architectural graduates are less subject to the vacillations in the development and construction industry than some other design professionals as their input occurs across a wider period of time. It is also noted that many of the UMB landscape graduates are employed in the public sector (SER p. 27).

The SER is pessimistic about the proportion of students who start on the landscape architecture programme at UMB, but complete their studies elsewhere, most notably AHO. The EC (and some of the staff interviewed) are not as concerned about this development.

Broader labour market: The EC consider that UMB landscape graduates are well placed to work in the broader labour market for the following reasons;

- Problem based learning is at the core of design education. These skills can be transferred to other areas outside mainstream landscape architecture.
- The 5 year landscape architecture programme exceeds the European minimum for landscape architectural education as defined by EFLA. This makes UMB graduates well educated when compared to the European norm.

3.5 Resource Use and Recruitment

Competitiveness

Admission requirements:

Recruitment

Economic sustainability

Competitiveness: The landscape architecture programme at UMB is highly successful in this area attracting increasing numbers of academically strong students (SER p. 30).

Admission requirements: Students are predominantly admitted based on their grades from secondary school. The SER identify the need to consider other options. The EC respond to this point in Section 4.

Recruitment: This is not an issue of significant concern as the landscape architecture programme at UMB is very attractive. The EC consider that there is potential to further increase the attractiveness of this programme to international students and issue this is addressed in Section 4.1. The one aspect of recruitment that the landscape section should consider addressing is to establish the motivation of those UMB landscape students who transfer to AHO. Such information may be instructive.

Economic sustainability: The SER expresses understandable concern about the current financial situation in the programme. The EC did not have the resources to develop a thorough understanding of the mechanism of the resourcing model used at UMB, so comments are confirmed to general observations. The facts are that this is a successful programme attracting increasing numbers of high calibre students. The EC were informed that baseline date for the basic funding was the year 2000 (SER p. 32) and can see that student numbers have increased. Table 2 of the SER (p. 19) gives the EC some indication of the increase in student numbers. Staff numbers have increased to reflect the growing landscape student population, but the basic funding allocation has not increased. Different academic disciplines have specific pedagogic requirements that can be resource demanding. For some subjects the resource requirements may be highly specific laboratories or field stations, while for design disciplines it is the interactive nature of studio education that is time consuming in terms of teaching resources.

3.6 Learning Results and Quality Assurance:

Attainment of stated goals:

Benchmarking of learning results:

Quality Assurance Practices:

Attainment of stated goals: The EC note the comments on the slightly lower than average internal evaluation in some of the course criteria, but note that the percentages of students responding to this survey were very small. It is also observed by the EC that design education encourages critical response.

Benchmarking of learning results: The EC consider that the learning results are in accordance with International standards.

Quality Assurance Practices: The EC consider that the Quality Assurance practices are in accordance with what they understand as best practice. Note the EC were not familiar with the Competence Reform introduced into Higher Education by the Norwegian Government in 2004, so could only assess by comparison with experience in their own countries.

3.7 Organisational Framework

Institutional support and framework factors:

Effective use of UMB and partner resources:

Institutional support and framework factors: It was observed during the interviews that lines of responsibility within the section appeared somewhat unclear. This should be addressed. To allow the landscape section to function more coherently the EC consider that the work load carried by the Head of the Landscape section of the Department of Landscape Architecture should be addressed, with a greater percentage of this post allocated to section management. Additionally in Section 4.3 the EC comment on the need for the landscape section to recruit a key person to act as a research manager, to support research and further promote a culture of research within the section.

Effective use of UMB and partner resources: The SER note the possibility to link the landscape programme with the revised Byreg programme. This possibility was raised at various times during the interviews. The EC did not have access to details of the core structure of the Byreg programme so cannot comment in detail on this point.

The EC strongly agree with the SER note on maximizing the opportunity to use the broad label of sustainability to brand the landscape architectural degree, and consider that one way of doing this would be to promote the potentially strong advantages that can arise from sharing a campus with Life Sciences.

4 Discussion

This part of the evaluation report brings together the comments made under the listed items in the ToR. The reason for this approach is that the EC see an inter-relationship between some of the challenges facing the ILP landscape architecture programme. The UMB's ToR contained 18 issues that the EC were asked to consider. These have been outlined above. Of these the following were identified as the most significant of the UMB's evaluation criteria in terms of the landscape architecture programme;

- Programme structure (7.2.2.1);
- Total learning environment (7.2.2.4.);
- Research basis (7.3.2);
- Broader labour market (7.4.2).

The main challenges that emerged as themes during the evaluation process were the economic viability of the programme as highlighted in pp 32 and 33 of the SER; the low research activity when considering the total staff base and the somewhat confused identity of the different specialisations. One further significant issue that arose during the interview process was the identification of a perceived lack of confidence in some graduates as to the strengths that their education gave them in terms of their graduate contribution to the landscape design and planning matters, and the promotion of the landscape profession in a multidisciplinary work environment on graduation.

The key issue highlighted in the evaluation process concerning the broader labour market was how to maximise the natural advantages inherent in the landscape architecture programme at UMB, and to secure this position in the future.

4.1 Programme structure

The EC fully support the notion of a 300 credit of 5 year full time programme in landscape architecture as is presently implemented at ILP. Currently the programme has two common years and then divides into one of three specialisations.

The EC suggest that ILP consider a three year common programme, with a subsequent two year specialisation where students elect to follow either detailed landscape design or landscape planning.

Rationale: the three common years plus a two year specialisation has a natural parallel with a general Bachelors and specialist Masters which is becoming the European 'Bologna' model. Restructuring the ILP course into this natural divide could, subject to institutional agreement, open up the final two years of the programme to students from many other landscape programmes across Europe. This strategy would have many advantages for UMB.

The EC suggest that the urban green space and landscape management specialisation is removed as a specialisation, and instead fully incorporated into the core programme.

Rationale: The subject area of *urban green space and landscape management* is key to the profession of landscape architecture, both planning and design, and it therefore should be a core component of both specialisations and introduced right from the very start. The EC strongly encourage UMB to promote themselves as 'the green landscape architecture' programme and this subject area is at the core of such a strategy.

The current programme has a very 'open' fourth year. The reasons for this situation are to allow students the opportunity to travel and take courses abroad. UMB has a range of Educational institution with reciprocal arrangements. From the EC interviews with students it was apparent that while many student took the opportunity to travel, others stayed behind because of programmes they wished to take to further develop their landscape architectural skills.

The EC suggest that the fourth year becomes integral to the reconfigured five year programme and a full complement of course offered.

Rationale: The lack of structure in the current fourth year of the programme has been cited as one of the reasons that some UMB students 'drift' away to other universities to complete their landscape architectural education.

The UMB's Educational Strategy states that the study programmes "shall have a clear international perspective", and also aim to 'increase the number of exchange programmes'⁴

The EC suggest that consideration is given to making English the predominant language of delivery of the final two years of the 5 year programme

Rationale: (1) To further 'open up' the final two years of the programme to students from international landscape programme and to allow greater opportunities for international staff exchange.

Rationale (2) To better prepare graduates for the work place, i.e. the landscape profession noted the increasing internationalisation of landscape architectural practice and how many Norwegian practices were now either collaborating with overseas consultancies, or had been taken over by international consultancies. The language of communication in such cases is predominantly English.

The EC were initially cautious about making such a recommendation, and discussed this suggestion with a number of people. The discussion was very lively⁵. While the majority of those canvassed were strongly in favour, two very justifiable concerns emerged from this investigation;

1. That ILP graduates must have the capacity to communicate at professional level in the work place, particularly in the area of drafting planning policy and that this may be compromised by being taught in English in the last two years of their education,
2. That the Norwegian landscape and the Norwegian language are intertwined and that the richness and nuances of expression could be lost or homogenised by the use of English.

The EC are sympathetic to these views, but believe that these challenges could be addressed by offering specific electives in Norwegian in the final two years. UMB offers support for teaching in English

⁴ International Strategy for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences 2005-2010

⁵ The EC are aware that many of those who elected to be interviewed may well be more comfortable with communicating in English than others who did not come forward to meet with the evaluation panel.

The EC was asked to look at the structure of the programme.

The EC suggest that the curriculum is restructured into larger courses, with some of the technical and artistic components incorporated into larger studio modules; e.g. of 10, 15 or 20 ECTS. These larger courses should be structured so that smaller sub-sections of the total course could be available to other students at UMB. The EC understand that this is happening already in the curriculum offered by the BYREG section of the department.

Rationale: Larger modules will allow for greater flexibility in the delivery of the programme. Combining some of the artistic and technical components with the design studio will create several advantages. This approach should be more rewarding for the staff as their expertise can feed into bigger design challenges. The students get a better understanding of why they follow certain courses. Having 'teams' of two to three staff delivering modules should create some efficiencies in delivery, and allow periods of greater and lesser intensity of teaching, which should, in turn, promote opportunities for research.

4.2 Total learning environment

The EC consider it imperative that the proposed amalgamation of the disparate components of the ILP landscape architecture programme into one physical location happen as soon as possible, and without any compromises.

Rationale: The EC believe that the ILP Landscape architecture programme is a significant asset to UMB, but that it lacks physical presence on the campus. Creating an identifiable space that is associated with Landscape Architecture will foster a stronger identity of this creative discipline within an institution which is not necessarily primarily associated with the creative Arts. Furthermore the proximity of students from different years would be beneficial to students from the earlier stages who can observe the work of the more senior stages. This can be of particular benefit to those students who are experiencing doubts about their own competencies or their commitment to a career in landscape architecture. Greater interaction with more experienced mature fellow students, many of whom will have had similar experiences, can promote better self-confidence and direction. The EC noted in discussions with students that the current structure meant that students knew few students in the other years of their degree.

4.3 Research basis

The EC notes that ILP landscape architecture programme is experiencing the challenge of a constant increase in student numbers⁶. This compromises staff opportunities for research and can result in a 'vicious circle' of stagnation and frustration. Restructuring the curriculum into larger courses will free up periods of time to allow staff to pursue research. It is noted that UMB expects staff to be research active and states that 'all teaching is research based'.⁷ The EC notes that this can be a challenge in a discipline that has many part-time staff, in order to allow student exposure to artists and practitioners that provide an essential part of the necessary pedagogy, but are not part of core University activity. It needs to be recognised that not all staff will become research active.

The EC supports a system that supports the requirement of research for all full time staff, and that promotes a transparent workload model that rewards research activity, and permits those who are not research active to substitute research activity with additional teaching or administration.

Rationale: As a discipline landscape architecture needs the support of research activity both to promote and revitalise itself in order to ensure its pertinence as a socially relevant endeavour. The potential lack of critical reflection and scholarly endeavour identified in the SER can be reduced by the creation of a strong research culture underpinning landscape architecture at UMB.

The challenge of promoting research activity in design disciplines is widely recognised. The United Kingdom's Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) which is aimed at providing a profile of research carried out in universities and colleges in the United Kingdom gives a definition of research activity for Architecture and the Built Environment. This includes activities such as

'papers, books, materials, images, devices, patents, artefacts, designs, design codes, buildings, prototypes and installations, products and

⁶ SER report p. 30.

⁷ Educational Strategy for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (UMB) 2005-2010

processes, time-based media, exhibits, software, and work published in non-print media'⁸

The EC suggest that UMB engage in the wider debate about measuring achievement in landscape architectural research by design. In parallel with architecture such staff activity is measured internationally by such metrics as success in design competitions, publication of critical reviews, awards and curating exhibitions.

Rationale: The promotion of research activity in a design discipline.

It is noted that to promote and give substance to the design teachers new positions based on artistic skills the Faculty of LTJ at Sveriges Lantbruksuniversitet (SLU) have put forward new guidelines for appointments that includes pedagogical experiences as well as artistic skills, experiences as participation in competitions and juries or taking part in the ongoing critical debate⁹

The EC suggests that some ILP positions should be remade into artistic ones.

Rationale: A definition of artistic skills in the titles/positions should give more substance and more pressure for the teachers to be more active in promoting themselves and a willingness to take in ground breaking activities in their respective areas.

The EC believe that the Landscape architecture programme at ILP is of considerable value to UMB in diversifying the degree options and research opportunities offered and that it requires active support to promote its emerging research profile. From the interviews held during the evaluation process there emerged from the staff a sense that, because their discipline falls outside the main remit of the UMB, their successes are not publicised as widely as they could be.

The EC endorse the appointment of a Departmental Research manager to co-ordinate and support Landscape staff in the preparation of bids, the management of research funding, the publicising of research activity at Institutional, National and International level.

⁸ RAE 2008 Panel Criteria and working methods 'Architecture and the Built Environment' p.

23

⁹ SLU Faculty of LTJ February 2008 Assessment criteria for appointments in artistic disciplines.

Rationale: the promotion of a research culture and raising the exposure of the landscape architectural discipline.

During the evaluation process the EC were made aware of an uncertainty of future direction of the focus of the landscape architecture section, both in terms of the educational programme and the research. This hesitancy may be a result of the self evaluation process, or the emergence of increased competition for both students and funding. The EC have no doubts about the many positive factors associated with the landscape architecture section at UMB.

The EC encourage the Landscape section to use this process to decide (and recognise) what you are good at.

Rationale: This is necessary in the contemporary competitive educational 'market'. ILP and UMB have their foundation in "the green landscape architect". If this is strongly put forward in marketing the programme and in the research Ås campus will be the place to turn to considering these issues.

4.4 Broader labour market and graduate confidence

The landscape architecture programme at UMB is regarded as being highly successful. It has a good international reputation as shown by the high number of international students it attracts both as part of an exchange and at PhD level.

The issue of engendering professional confidence in new graduates is one for detailed study by the ILP staff. The EC make the following suggestions:

Widen the selection criteria and use interview and portfolio as well as admission points.

Rationale: This will ensure a more diverse cohort of student entry and the ability to ensure that selected students demonstrate an initial design ability and understanding of the scope of landscape architecture.

The EC would encourage joint design studios' both at generalist and specialist stages of the curriculum with students from architectural, engineering and planning courses.

Rationale: Such joint studios foster understanding of the methodologies of cognate disciplines with which professional landscape architecture engage.

The EC suggest that the programme more clearly help students recognise the scope of landscape architecture by presenting them with challenging interdisciplinary tasks across the whole landscape scale directly from the start of their education, by constantly reminding them of their broad competencies and by giving them tools to argue and promote themselves and their work.

Rationale: Giving the students an insight into their complex future working conditions will allow them to develop an understanding as to why they need certain knowledge and skills and also help them identify the unique specialism they can bring to the challenge of addressing the complex issues concerning the debate about the future direction of landscape issues in the natural and built environment.

Appendix One

MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Name	Affiliation
Karen Foley (Head of evaluation team)	School of Architecture, Landscape and Civil Engineering, University College Dublin, Ireland
Jörg Rekitke	Department of Architecture, National University of Singapore
Martine Henriette Wilberg	MNLA; Arkitektskap AS, Oslo
Anna Peterson	Faculty of Landscape Planning, Horticulture and Agricultural Science, Alnarp, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU)
Elin Henricson	Student, Master of Science in Landscape planning, Faculty of Landscape Planning, Horticulture and Agricultural Science , SLU - Alnarp

Appendix 2 Site Visit Programme

Monday 2nd February

Welcome and interview with Rector Knut Hove

Interviews with Head of Department Eva Falleth, Head of Education Committee Einar A. Hegstad

Campus visit led by Prof Anne Katrine Geelmuyden

Interview with PhD students, author of the Self Evaluation Report; (Prof. Anne Katrine Geelmuyden) and ILP's Self-evaluation staff (Corinna Clewing and Karsten Jørgensen)

Tuesday 3rd February

Interviews with first, second and third year students; Student advisers: Monica Vestvik, Anne Svinddal, and Inger Lise Smebøl and fifth year landscape planning students and ILP (LA) scientific staff Karsten Jørgensen, Anne Grethe Dietze, Anne Katrine Geelmuyden)

Wednesday 4th February

Interviews with ILP (LA) scientific staff (Kine Halvorsen Thoren, Alf Haukeland, Corinna Clewing), Representatives from the LA Program Committee (Tove Næverdal, Ingrid Ødegård, Knut Wik, Anne Svinddal) and ILP (LA) scientific staff (Ola Bettum, Ramzi Hassan, Tore Edvard Bergaust)

Thursday 5th February

Visit to virtual reality laboratory led by Ramzi Hassan. Interview with fourth and fifth year landscape design students. Interview with representatives of the landscape profession in Norway: Anne Aude, (Riksantikvaren); Kari Bergo (Østengen og Bergo); Marit Brandsteg, (Vegvesenet); David Brasfield (Oslo commune); Marianne Hermansen (Rambøll); Janne Walker Ørka, (COWI,)

Friday

Evaluation Committee presentation of preliminary findings to Pro-rector Trine Hvoslef-Eide and staff from the landscape section ILP.