Mission Statement
Interior architecture critically engages design as a progressive craft of form making which transforms the individual and social ways we inhabit space. Design creatively orchestrates conflicting constraints creating meaningful solutions that fit into larger social and cultural contexts. Through the stories of our students, faculty and envisioned characters, the ephemeral and structured qualities of interior environments illuminate the human condition and its culturally rich spatial narratives. Students explore real and imagined geographies to critically produce space that researches technique and effect in order to develop new ways of seeing, building, and designing.

Goals
Program Goals
1. Provide nationally recognized curriculum in interior architecture
2. Engender the curriculum with critical insight into the technical, social and experiential aspects of space
3. Utilize the Los Angeles region as a laboratory for developing and solving design problems

Student Goals
1. Provide learning necessary to develop as professional design leaders
2. Provide students’ design and critical thinking skills through a transformational process that engages their specific individual and community voices
3. Provide learning experiences that encourage students to engage in multidisciplinary experiences

Faculty Goals
1. Provide both professional and cultural faculty diversity
2. Provide a structure for faculty to develop professional work that is integrated into the critical questions explored in the curriculum
3. Develop faculty that critically questions their own educational and professional experiences to become better teachers

Learning Objectives
1. Develop comprehensive critical thinking skills necessary for multidisciplinary approaches to problem solving issues dealing with interior environments
2. Provide students with learning experiences that incorporate professional values, professional practices and business procedures
3. Develop design skills as a way of researching and solving problems
4. Develop a comprehensive set of skills that focus on design problems that deal with the human inhabitation of interior spaces
5. Develop comprehensive visual, verbal, oral and quantifiable communication skills necessary to express research, analysis and expression of design solutions
6. Develop skills necessary for understanding and representing the technical art and regulations of building and designing interior spaces
Supporting SWOT Material
How do you define Interior architecture?

There were several ideas brought out in this discussion, some of them have affinities with one another others may be oppositional:

1. The discipline expands the idea of the material effect found in interior design to include the definition of space and form found in architecture
2. Includes a strong reliance on historical and theoretical frameworks found in art criticism and architectural theory
3. The discipline focuses on the social structure of space and inhabitation, in which the definition of space that doesn’t specifically rely on the use of physically tangible or permanent materials but instead relies on more ephemeral materials such as organization of people, light, color and moveable objects.
4. The discipline is a more specialized focus of architecture and therefore expands upon on the elements of the interior elements.
5. The discipline is an intentional marriage between space and its effects and the human body. This reinforces the desire of the curriculum to address with the one to one relationship between design and finished product.
6. The discipline can be defined as architecture with color which was expanded to explain that the notion of color (and other mediums of the interior environment such as social interaction, cultural signification, light and absence or volume of a container) complicates the expression of architectural form making.
7. The discipline, unencumbered by certain concerns of architecture allows for the exploration of space similar to the explorations found in installation art.
8. The discipline can embrace new genres of art form making and deal with the notion of hybridization of form making, social-relations enabling, and cultural signification as it applies to interior space.

What potential does Woodbury’s Interior Architecture have to become a nationally recognized program?

1. Relationship with the school of business holds possible synergies.
2. Liberal admissions policy brings in students that have a unique perspective to influence the program
3. The discipline allows for the integration of other disciplines
4. We are situated to increase integration of technology and design
5. There is a strong sense of cultural identity and community built into our student demographics
6. With the dematerialization occurring in many of the art and design disciplines, interior architecture is positioned to capitalize on an issue that is inherent to the discipline
7. The strong studio culture and design process allows taking a “laboratory” approach to the program. We should further exploit this strength by occupying spaces throughout campus for installation.
8. Inclusion of MFA and MArch grads for faculty help bridge the theoretical framework for interiors by understanding, critiquing and synthesizing these discourses into a discourse specific to interiors.

**What do you see as our obstacles to achieving this status?**

1. Liberal admissions policy brings in students that are under prepared for university studies
2. A lack of cohesion exist with in the IA faculty as it pertains to interest, attitudes and experience towards the significance of furnishings, color, material, scale of use.
3. There is not enough of an emphasis on technology.
4. Department relies to heavily on adjunct faculty
5. The size of the student enrollment
6. Lack of visual identity
7. Living in the shadow of architecture’s clout.
8. Lots of local competitors that compete with students
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Assumptions

1. Its all ladies
2. Architecture deals with form while IA deals with finishes
3. Interiors doesn’t require geometry or higher order math skills
4. Overall comprehensive program for interior student supported by dedicated faculty and chair that tries to achieve high academic standards that can compete with other schools.
5. There is no design rigor
6. Out students can excel and transform over a four year period
7. Program takes students with one idea of higher education and gives them another
8. Program is challenging
9. Program is isolated and avoids discourse and other design disciplines
10. Students will undoubtedly learn better time management skills
11. Studio course synthesize knowledge from support courses.
12. Student arte not taught to draw outside of studios
Aspirations
1. More engagement with architecture/interior communities outside of school
2. Develop some form of research as adept (faculty and students grants)
3. Find way to utilize skills of business school to create the first program to graduate students capable of both designing and running a design firm
4. Real-time problem solving/identification as related to contemporary technological issues, in professional practice/business
5. Reviews and studios to explore prevailing discourse in design theory production and technique.
6. Better understanding of role of furnishings and decorating plays in evolution of interior design and social implication and how present biases can be challenged to create a critical dialogue for faculty as well as students
7. Stronger sustainable focus
8. Exposure to other artistic programs cross disciplinary courses
9. Change reputation of interiors
10. Premier institute of interiors in country
11. More student engagement in the school between department competition
12. Concentration in furniture design
13. Concentration course in installation as an experimental form as a major studio
14. Program that focuses on lighting design
15. Development of incorporation of technology
16. Teach student to form social critique both inside of practice as well as outside of interior practices
17. Provide student opportunities to explore different tracks: project management, technology and history
18. Higher adjunct pay
19. All students study abroad
Concerns
1. Need to attract higher caliber of student
2. Department have a clearer established pedagogy
3. Non enough time with students
4. Administratively lost or marginalized with reorganization
5. Architecture department will leave IA in the dust
6. Marginalization will cause the loss of a critical voice and our ability to be featured within in the building community.
7. Too many architects teaching
8. Teachers that come out of ID programs have a limited critical voice
9. Low adjunct pay
10. Small number of full time faculty
11. Craftsmanship of student
12. Designs studios predominantly taught by men support courses taught predominantly by women which does not reflect student demographics
13. Accreditation process may cause dumbing down of program.
14. Specificity of program limits direction students will go when they graduate.
15. Student need to cross disciplinary boundaries when they graduate.
16. Myth of heroic individual interior design persists.
17. Not enough community or social projects
18. Structure of design studios is too similar.
Below are the items from last night’s meeting organized into the appropriate categories of Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses and threats. Though we didn’t explicitly go through each of our lists last night when collating the information it was evident that our discussion included all of the items that were listed out your individual analysis.

In order to redact the list down to 5 items for each category, I tried to find commonalities. The numbers to the right of the chart indicate how I categorized the overall comments. As is normal when a rich amount of data is redacted to fit into categories, some of the insightful nuances presented may have been lost. Please review the list and the corresponding categorization and let me know if you feel that the way I have categorized them can be viewed differently. Following this list you will see a matrix that organizes the redacted categories. See below for the next steps.

**Strengths**

1. Dedication of faculty to transforming the mindset of the students  
2. The cultural diversity of student body to create the curriculum  
3. The fact that the current curriculum has a defined path within which there is freedom for the instructor to develop projects that meet the goals  
4. Strong Faculty  
5. Critical Design Direction and pedagogy  
6. Faculty, staff, director commitment, and their resources, talents - equals strong work being produced  
7. Diversity of students, committed students  
8. Being part of a larger school of design  
9. Agile and talented faculty  
10. Rigorous program that allows for dedicated students to excel  
11. Well developed curricular structure allowing for integration of all professional components and versatility  

**Opportunities**

1. Create fund raisers, mixers, socials, IA lecture series, competitions, etc. with the interiors community and larger LA scene. Create events throughout the year that promotes the Woodbury IA identity  
2. The dissemination of the program with a larger network of resources and cultures  
3. Affiliations with other IA programs nationally or internationally for student course, resource exchange  
4. Distinctly different departments (i.e. business) to work with  
5. A culturally rich city with many opportunities for alliances  
6. Opportunities for lectures, site visits, field trip to explore range of potential in Los Angeles Establish  
7. stronger internships wit local offices as part of the curriculum  
8. Tapping into background of students  
9. Technological advances in manufacturing technologies  
10. Strong faculty connections to outside interior design, architecture, and art practice fields  
11. the location in a world class art and design center is our greatest opportunity for education. I wish we were closer to LA to take more advantage of it. This also gives us a pool of excellent faculty to draw from.
### Weaknesses

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge by faculty of breadth and balance of curriculum and interior design field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Definition of what interior architecture is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of broad range of design studio structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shop resources and other technology resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>core classes, studios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of a visual and conceptual identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>facilities for research, materials lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>part time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>size of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>too many adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Design building offers minimal environment (pin-up space, etc) with in which to teach and learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Drawing skill set of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Weakness of department name with respect to professional practice -- students with IA can not practice interior architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Incoming students misconception of the difficulty and intricacies of the profession leading to increase introductory re-education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>dis-parity of critical voice from the interior design perspective/education on par with that of architecture and visual/fine arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Adjunct and junior level facility salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Narrow professional possibilities presented to the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The emphasis on contemporary architectural form in every studio over other the potential for other interior design exploration and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Threats

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The interior design profession's lack of identity and critical perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Narrow accreditation requirements slanted to vocational interests over interests of criticality and opportunities for inter (trans) disciplinarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Co-opting of interests, resources and identity from architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>many similarities with the architecture program, so identity and definition of interior architecture seems confusing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>other design school's strong sense of identity, style, financial and cultural resources to promote themselves, therefore overshadowing Woodbury in the Los Angeles and national community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Not having enough creative and financial support from the university to promote the IA program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Multitude of other institutions in area with similar curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>lack of respect for discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TV celebrity designers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Interior designers = pillow flufflers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>the reorganization of departments has me more worried than any other change I have seen here. It may turn out just fine, but I am concerned our program’s position within the university structure may be weakened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Enrollment is always a worry, but seems to stay about the same over a period of years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The below matrixes organize the strengths and opportunities into one chart and the weaknesses and threats into another. It is interesting to see that there are emerging themes that nicely correspond to the list generated above.

In the next step we will assign priorities to the matrix below based on the following recommendations from the MAP guide:

“The internal strengths and external opportunities are placed in a grid created by the intersection of the opportunities (rows) and strengths (columns). Working independently, each member of the group places a number in each cell of the grid to indicate the extent to which he or she thinks that each strength could take advantage of the intersecting opportunity: 5=greatest possibility of advantage; 4=strong possibility of advantage; 3=some possibility of advantage; 2=weak possibility of advantage; 1=least possibility of advantage; 0=no clear relationship of strength to opportunity”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities (External)</th>
<th>Strengths (Internal)</th>
<th>1. Cultural diversity of student</th>
<th>2. Commitment and talent of faculty</th>
<th>3. Critical curriculum</th>
<th>4. Programs ability to transform dedicated students</th>
<th>5. Rigorous yet flexible curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Educational opportunities of Los Angeles, culturally, professionally, artistically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural background of incoming students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distinctiveness of departments and &quot;schools&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Technological advances available in the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lecture series, site visits, fund raising, events to create stronger program identity to external &quot;world&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The same needs to be done for the Weaknesses and Threats:

**Working Document #5: Cross Impact Analysis**
The Institute planning group was asked to fill in a grid created by the intersection of weaknesses (rows) and threats (columns). Working independently, each member of the group placed a number in each cell of the grid to indicate the extent to which he or she thought that each weakness created greatest vulnerability to the threat: 5=very great; 4=great; 3=some; 2=slight; 1= little; 0=no clear relevance of disadvantage to threat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses (Internal)</th>
<th>Threats (External)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of program identity to incoming students in relation to program identity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and learning environments, shop, materials lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student's foundational skills: drawing, computer technology, conceptualization, analytical skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Size of enrollment part-time enrolment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Limited approach to design studies leading to limited professional and further academic futures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lack of identity

2. Institutional support

3. Accreditation requirements limit professional and academic potential of students

4. Resources

5. Competition from other institutions and architecture department

I will take a stab at it but at this point I would like Joshua Stein and Carolee to develop the conclusions for this exercise. We have relied on the adjunct faculty quite a bit for this process and I feel that the three of us have the necessary multiple perspective to develop the conclusion, mission, and learning objectives for the department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses (Internal)</th>
<th>1. Lack of program identity</th>
<th>2. Teaching and learning environments, shop, materials lab</th>
<th>3. Students' financial needs, skills, drawing, computer technology, perspective</th>
<th>4. Size of student, part time, full time enrollment</th>
<th>5. Student planning, part time employment</th>
<th>Threats (External)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accreditation requirements limit professional and academic potential of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competition from other institutions and architecture department</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions:

Strengths and Opportunities

1. Cultural diversity of the students can parallel the diversity of the city. This would be applicable to students who are local to Woodbury’s campus as well as students coming from diverse areas of the country and globally.

2. The department’s identity should revolve around the notion of form making as a vehicle for exploring the political and social representation of diverse cultures. The identity of the department would build on the student’s unique perspective of their material world while articulating (subverting) contemporary theories and forms of interior environments. Criticality will arise from undermining and enriching the normative practices of avant-garde design.

3. Relying on the flexibility of the curriculum we can develop projects that speak to the unique perspective of the students and faculty and question the types of projects that are explored and designed in the course work.

4. By maintaining the high standard and rigor of the current studio practice students incoming cultural and individual perspective becomes a foundation for integrating these diverse and often under-represented populations into a forward looking and transformational critique of interior design. The transformation experienced by students becomes a model for the transformational process of current design practices.

5. Technological experimentation conducted in the studio practice can continual to grow knowing that technology will be a tool for exploring the cultural understanding of form making – progressive craft.

Weakness and Threat

1. Entering students’ preconceptions of the profession are inherent. There is a desire to not only change the conceptions of the program but also the expectations that students have of interior design to transform perceptions of space and its impact on society.

2. The department is in dire need of resources. The ability to use technology as a tool for developing transformative spaces, the ability to convey to the outside world the strength of the department and the ability to use innovative learning spaces to challenge the learning process are all inhibited by the resources available to the department.

3. The faculty and chair must creatively understand the parameters of the guiding accreditation standards in order to develop projects and learning experiences that both foster the professional expectations while maintaining a critical voice in the projects students develop. Accreditation standards determine the identity of the program.

4. Enrollment size inhibits diversity of learning experiences and our identity.

5. Studio curriculum is hampered by a strict understanding of design parameters. By focusing solely on programmatic difference it undermines the value of other social, technical and cultural understanding of space.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths (Internal)</th>
<th>Opportunities (External)</th>
<th>Weaknesses (Internal)</th>
<th>Threats (External)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural diversity of student</td>
<td>1. Educational opportunities of Los Angeles, culturally, professionally, artistically</td>
<td>1. Lack of program identity to incoming students in relation to program identity and vision</td>
<td>1. Lack of identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Commitment and talent of faculty</td>
<td>2. Teaching and learning environments, shop, materials lab</td>
<td>2. Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Critical curriculum</td>
<td>3. Student’s foundational skills: drawing, computer technology, conceptualization, analytical skills</td>
<td>3. Accreditation requirements limit professional and academic potential of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Programs ability to transform dedicated students</td>
<td>4. Size of enrollment part time enrollment</td>
<td>4. Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Rigorous yet flexible curriculum</td>
<td>5. Limited approach to design studies leading to limited professional and academic futures</td>
<td>5. Competition from other institutions and architecture department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 2 4 3 2 2
2. 4 2 4 5 4
3. 1 4 4 4 5
4. 2 3 3 3 2
5. 3 4 5 5 4

1. 4 2 3 3 4
2. 3 5 4 3 4
3. 4 3 3 2 4
4. 2 5 4 4 4
5. 3 2 2 4 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths (Internal)</th>
<th>Opportunities (External)</th>
<th>Weaknesses (Internal)</th>
<th>Threats (External)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural diversity of student</td>
<td>1. Educational opportunities of Los Angeles, culturally, professionally, artistically</td>
<td>1. Lack of program identity to incoming students in relation to program identity and vision</td>
<td>1. Lack of identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commitment and talent of faculty</td>
<td>2. Cultural background of incoming students</td>
<td>2. Teaching and learning environments, shop, materials lab</td>
<td>2. Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Critical curriculum</td>
<td>3. Distinctiveness of departments and &quot;schools&quot;</td>
<td>3. Students foundational skills: drawing, computer technology, conceptualization</td>
<td>3. Accreditation requirements limit professional and academic potential of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programs ability to transform dedicated students</td>
<td>4. Technological advances available in the area</td>
<td>4. Size of enrollment part time enrollment</td>
<td>4. Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rigorous yet flexible curriculum</td>
<td>5. Lecture series, site visits, fund raising, events to create</td>
<td>5. Limited approach to design studios leading to limited professional and further academic futures</td>
<td>5. Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opportunities (External)**

1. Educational opportunities of Los Angeles, culturally, professionally, artistically: 5 2 2 2 2 diverse educational opps. Can relate nicely within the diverse student body.

2. Cultural background of incoming students: 5 1 1 3 3 I don't think the commitment of faculty and critical curriculum have any strong relationship to cultural background.

3. Distinctiveness of departments and "schools": 2 3 3 1 3 I think the students transformation arises from igniting their passion and dedication to IA.

4. Technological advances available in the area: 1 3 4 2 2 the products created by tech. Advances can benefit from more diverse authors.

5. Lecture series, site visits, fund raising, events to create: 4 3 5 4 5 I think this is very important, getting outside the campus, learning various ways.

**Weaknesses (Internal)**

1. Lack of program identity to incoming students in relation to program identity and vision: 5 3 3 2 3 students are surprised because they think the stereotype of what is interiors.

2. Teaching and learning environments, shop, materials lab: 3 5 5 3 2 I think it's essential to have institutional support both academically and financially to be able to execute.

3. Students foundational skills: drawing, computer technology, conceptualization: 2 3 3 2 4

4. Size of enrollment part time enrollment: 2 3 3 2 4

5. Limited approach to design studios leading to limited professional and further academic futures: 3 5 4 2 5 strong relationship between what resources we have and both #2 and 5.
Cross Impact Analysis Conclusions

Strengths and Opportunities
1. I believe there is a strong potential in lecture series, site visits and off campus events and critical discussion within the classroom. Many of the students have faith in the knowledge of outside experts. In this case, faculty become the interpreters or moderators rather than disseminators of knowledge.
2. This translates directly into our ability to transform dedicated students. One of the biggest opportunities we can offer these students is a connection to (and support in experimenting in) a larger world. Our best students are scared of, yet fascinated and invigorated by this larger world. I believe this is what the Barcelona Program has been about.
3. Distinctiveness of departments and schools as related to rigorous yet flexible curriculum: I am a firm believer of institutional branding. There is power in the naming of a program and even more in its distinctiveness. The ‘architecture’ in IA changes the way students view what they learn. MCD will have similar repercussions.
4. Cultural background in relationship to ability to transform dedicated students:

Weaknesses and Threats
1. Resources and institutional support in relationship to teaching and learning environments: this seems somewhat obvious but there is a direct relationship here. The clearest outcome is in facilities such as shop, and lab environments. Students will always complain about their access to resources, but they do feel when they are being supported by the school.
2. These issues indirectly affect foundational skills, certainly in the realm of technology, whether digital or craft-based.
3. The relationship between accreditation and identity is tricky, but not necessarily problematic. The program must not define itself through accreditation, but use it only as guidelines, and perhaps more importantly as an impetus for self-evaluation. I believe the program has been relatively successful in doing this so far.