Howard University
Department of Architecture

2018 Visiting Team Report

B. Arch. [171 undergraduate credit hours]

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
March 31 – April 4, 2018

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Contents

Section	Page
I. Summary of Visit	1
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	1
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation	
Part One (I): Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	6
Part Two (II): Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	12
Part Three (III): Annual and Interim Reports	23
IV. Appendices	
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	24
2. Team SPC Matrix	25
3. The Visiting Team	26
V. Report Signatures	27

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The Team's initial questions and concerns were whether the program had addressed the conditions NOT MET and Causes of Concern identified in the 2012 VTR. At that time, there were issues with Long-Range Planning, Self-Assessment Procedures, Statistical Reports, Student Communication Skills, and Student Collaboration. We found that the deficiencies identified in 2012 are now MET.

The Team found that the current Conditions for Accreditation were MET. A review of the program, in relation to the current procedures, indicates multiple program strengths. The architecture program should be recognized for how closely it is aligned with the University's priorities, its diversity, and its commitment to community engagement. The program does not operate as a silo and is appreciated by the Dean and President. The program is uniquely suited to continue its legacy of social change and its unique contribution to the discipline.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

B.10 Financial Considerations

D.2 Project Management

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2009 Condition I.1.4, Long-Range Planning:
An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

Previous Team Report (2012): At the time of our visit, the team did not find documents and policies indicating that NAAB's standards for this condition were met. This also is a cause of concern for the team. While there is evidence at the university level of long-range planning with the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal (PCAR), the team found no documents and policies indicating a similar strategic plan at the department and school level. In addition, the university is in the midst of implementing a phased retirement plan, that will impact 5 out of the 7 tenured faculty positions, but no decision has been made on how many professors will accept the offer and how many tenured positions the school and department will retain. At the college, school and department levels there was discussion about increasing enrollment, growing the Architecture School from one department, expanding the program offerings, and the program's direction and focus, but no written plan for how to accomplish these objectives. There is evidence committees are in place to address the day-to-day issues and there is a proposal to change the degree nomenclature from B Arch to M Arch, but they are no substitute for long-range strategic planning to increase enrollment, expand program offerings, and provide a framework for how to transition between long-serving tenured faculty and attracting and retaining young and talented new professors to replace them.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition is **MET**. The Dean and the President provided a clear description of the planning process within Howard University, the expectations of the President, the expectations of the Dean and the role of the Annual Report. Even though the Dean did not require a Strategic Plan from the architecture program, the program developed the "Howard University Architectural Program Strategic Plan" in 2014. The 2014 plan was organized around the following themes: Strategic Issues, Tactical Realities,

Foundations, Major Steps, Graduate Education, Existing Underutilized Resources, Physical Facilities and Summation. The document identified multiyear objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission. In 2014, the College also completed a SWOT Analysis at a CEACS Retreat. Since then, the architecture program's Annual Report has served as the primary formal document used by the college.

2009 Condition I.1.5, Self-Assessment Procedures: *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
  - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
  - *Individual course evaluations.*
  - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
  - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

Previous Team Report (2012): The team did not find sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the program regularly conducts self-assessment and how that self-assessment is used to change and adjust the program. Although the faculty indicates that they are in agreement about the direction of the program based on a proposed change to the nomenclature of the degree, there are no written policies to indicate how assessment tools should be used, nor a timeline for implementing the plan or objectives. Some evidence of self-assessment such as course evaluations was provided, but there was no indication of how that information was used to improve the program and promote student success.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition is **MET**. Faculty and students focus on the design, technical, digital, and social aspects of the curriculum through formal and informal methods. The Chair provided documentation of End of Year Design Studio Reviews, Faculty Meetings, Faculty Dialogue Sessions, Architecture Forum with Students, Committee Meetings and Alumni Sessions. In 2016, the Department introduced End of Year Design Studio Reviews to evaluate the direction of design studios. This included faculty and alumni as well as local practitioners. Formally, the College and the program submit data for the Annual Report, which clarifies how the program is progressing toward its mission. In addition, information gathered from the faculty evaluations and HU IDEA Course Evaluations are supplemented by a series of standing committees. These include the Executive Committee, the Technology Committee and the Curriculum Committee. As a result, curriculum revisions were made in 2014 and 2017.

2009 Condition I.3.1, Statistical Reports: *Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.*

- *Program student characteristics.*
  - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).*

        - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
        - *Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.*
    - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.*
        - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.*
    - *Time to graduation.*
        - *Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.*
        - *Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.*

- *Program faculty characteristics*
    - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.*
        - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
        - *Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.*
    - *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
        - *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
    - *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
        - *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
    - *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

Previous Team Report (2012): The Howard University APR contained only some of the statistical information required to satisfy this criterion. During the site visit the team requested additional information. Following is a list of the materials that were not provided:

- Program Student Characteristics
- Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
- Demographics of students at the time of the previous visit were not provided.
- Demographics compared to those of the institution overall were provided for 2009 only.

- Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
- Qualifications of students at the time of the previous visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit were not provided.

- Time to graduation.
- Percentage that completed the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit was not found.

- Program Faculty Characteristics
- Demographics (race/ethnicity and gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
- Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit were not provided.
- Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall were not found.

- Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.

- Comparison to the number of faculty promoted each year across Howard during the same period was not found.

- Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
  - Comparison to the number of faculty receiving tenure at Howard during the same period was not provided, though the team became aware of one faculty member receiving tenure.

- Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit and where they are licensed, was found as a current list of registration locations provided in Section 1.3.3 – Faculty Credentials. The team also found a separate list of faculty categories with licenses in U.S. jurisdictions, but did not find a composite list.

> **2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team found that the condition is **MET**. The Chair provided copies of completed and accepted NAAB Statistical Reports for 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017. The reports provided the data missing from previous Statistical Reports.

2009 Student Performance Criterion A.1, Communication Skills: *Ability to* read, write, speak and listen effectively.

Previous Team Report (2012): Criterion of communication skills at the level of ability was not met. There is evidence of ability in reading, speaking and listening, but not in writing effectively. The grammar, vocabulary and structure of the written work did not meet the standards of effective communication. Evidence of this deficiency was found throughout the program, including the terminal written document, the thesis book for ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation. It was also evident in ARCH 301 and 302 – Architectural History I and II, despite efforts on the part of the faculty to provide a feedback loop for the students to improve on their skills by repeating the exercises in writing. In addition to the deficiency in basic writing skills, there was a lack of citations found throughout the thesis books produced for ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation including specific citations regarding sources for images, firm and project profiles, and incomplete notations for textual work. The ability to structure proper annotations is a part of effective communication and professional accuracy. The ability to listen and speak was met and was evident throughout the visit in studio observations, and interactions with the student body, both formal and informal. Reading skills were evident in ARCH 301 and 302 – Architectural History I and II, as well as many other courses that required reading assignments in order to complete work and tests required.

> **2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team found that the condition is **MET**. The Team was provided with multiple examples of student work from ARCH 891 Thesis Preparation. The documents' Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology and Outcome chapters reflected the appropriate writing skills. The documents also served to address the use of precedents and research skills. The students' ability to speak and listen was very well demonstrated in the student meetings and studio visits.

2009 Student Performance Criterion C.1, Collaboration: *Ability* to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

Previous Team Report (2012): While there is evidence in the design studios that the students have the ability to work in collaboration with each other during programming and pre-design, there was no evidence that the students met a level of ability collaborating with others outside the program in multi-disciplinary teams with other departments and schools in the university, such as engineering, computer science, art and interior design, to successfully complete design projects.

> **2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team found that the condition is **MET**. Collaboration with non-architecture students was found in the Disney Imagineering class, the Immersive Technology Research class, recent competitions and the Introduction to Sustainability course. The Chair

provided a class roster that demonstrated the enrollment of architecture, interior and engineering students in the classes.

Previous Team Report (2012): Causes of Concern

A. Faculty Retirement and Succession and Staffing Plans: The team noted in its review of the materials for Conditions I.1.4 and I.2.1, Long-Range Planning, and Human Resources, respectively, and from meetings during the visit, that five out of the seven tenured faculty members are eligible for a 5-year phased retirement plan that is currently being offered throughout Howard University. Even though the university is implementing the phased retirement plan, it has not been determined who and how many in the architecture program will accept the offer and how many of the current tenured faculty lines will remain in the program. Since the university has indicated it does not intend to have a one-for-one replacement of faculty lines, the team is concerned that the program does not have a written plan in place indicating the number of faculty lines needed to be retained to sustain and grow the program, and how younger candidates will be retained and recruited to fill these vacancies and enhance the existing demographics of the faculty.

The recent budget cuts across the university have largely spared teaching positions in the School of Architecture, but at the expense of staff positions. Staff positions related to administrative support, financial aid, and recruitment have been eliminated. As the School attempts to grow its enrollment and course offerings, an evaluation and development of a staffing plan to support the program is needed.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition is **MET**. The Dean and the Chair provided the Team with an update on the faculty retirements. Since the last visit, four architecture faculty have retired. All of the vacant lines have been replaced with new architecture faculty. The new hires have increased the number of PhD faculty and the presence of women faculty in the program. The Dean has also been able to hire architecture faculty at salary rates that parallel the engineering faculty and provide support to improve the salary of the senior faculty.

B. Faculty Development: The team noted in its review of the information provided for Condition 1.2.1 Human Resource Development, that the school's faculty development opportunities rely heavily on the university-wide "Fund for Academic Excellence" program, which provides grant opportunities for faculty for special projects and original research. While half of the faculty benefited from this program up until 2009, they have not since then, due to university-wide cutbacks and questions from the school's faculty about the type of special projects and original research the fund would support. In addition there is also no evidence that consistent financial support for research exists at the school level; therefore, the acquisition of new knowledge for faculty members is primarily gained through professional practice. While acquiring new knowledge through professional practice should continue, with Howard University classified as a comprehensive research university, and research becoming an increasingly important component in the growth of design knowledge, it is important that support for faculty development be a priority in any accredited architecture program.

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition is **MET**. The Dean and the Chair indicated that Howard University has established several initiatives that benefit faculty development directly: 1) the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, and 2) the Office of Faculty Development. Both initiatives are housed within the Office of the Provost. Assistance is also available for research endeavors through the Office of Research Development. In addition, the new tenure-track hires for AY 2017–2018 received "Start-up Funds" that support attendance at conferences and other professional development activities.

III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT
This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

Part One (I): Section 1 – Identity and Self-Assessment

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. The description must include the program's benefits to the institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. The description must also include how the program as a unit develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the community.

[X] Described

2018 Analysis/Review: Howard University is a comprehensive research university, with a commitment to educating students for leadership and service to the nation and the global community. Howard values diversity, which can be observed in the administration, faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as well as in the wide range of academic programs, services, research and scholarly pursuits. Similarly, the architecture program has been a leading producer of African Americans with degrees in architecture. Currently, almost 20 percent of all African Americans receiving master's degrees at majority architecture programs had received their B. Arch. degree at Howard.

Howard has extended its public service function through expanded engagement with local, national, and international communities. This has been achieved through studio-based projects as well as collaboration with community groups and organizations as demonstrated by the Haiti Studio and the Community Design and Development Center (CDDC). The department's position within the College allows it to take advantage of the inherent synergies evident in the Immersive Technology Research and the Intro to Sustainability course. During the Administrative meeting, the Dean stated that "the President has made the architecture program a priority." In addition, the President highlighted a commitment to the architecture program and its commitment to community service.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments, both traditional and nontraditional.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy and a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Analysis/Review: The architecture program has adopted a written studio culture policy. The current document is an updated version of the 2011 Studio Culture Policy. The policy is disseminated through the school website and is posted in the design studios. The document will be assessed on a four-year basis and encourages learning inside and outside the classroom through the student organizations and field trips to "local architecture firms, related businesses, and construction sites." The policy addresses the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, professional conduct and more.

Classes take advantage of the Washington DC architectural and cultural experiences through field trips and regular lectures and crits from local and visiting architects. Students are active in the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), National Organization of Minority Architecture Students (NOMAS), Tau Sigma Delta, and Alpha Rho Chi. Faculty meet monthly and have worked together productively in the transition underway to a M. Arch. program. The visiting team observed some "growing pains" due to the recent changes in leadership and new enrollment numbers with plans underway to address these issues. The Department held a Town Hall in spring 2018. A student governing council is in the early stages of development, and an alumni advisory board is being formed. Due to the small size of classes and studios and close contact with faculty, the overall school climate is very supportive and "feels like a family," according to visits with students, faculty, and alumni.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students during the next two accreditation cycles as compared with the existing diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

[X] Described

2018 Analysis/Review: The program does not have an independent policy on diversity and inclusion, but follows the policies of the University—available on the university website. The University's Office of Human Resources provides a variety of services to University staff. They assist with situations that involve allegations of unfair treatment, sexual harassment, discrimination, and other issues that involve fairness, as well as disability accommodations. New hires attend an orientation through the HR Office and faculty attend "Unconscious Bias Training." During the Administrative meeting, the Dean clearly indicated his pride in the gender balance among the architecture faculty. The meeting with faculty confirmed the role of licensed architects, faculty with PhDs, full-time women, and people of color.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that affect the education and development of professional architects. The response to each perspective must further identify how these perspectives will continue to be addressed as part of the program's long-range planning activities.

[X] Described

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles.

2018 Analysis/Review: The program's culture builds on its long history of developing faculty and students as leaders in the surrounding community, the discipline and the nation. The curriculum prepares

students for such roles in studio and lecture courses as well as through experiential learning and community service activities. This is most evident in their thesis work, collaboration with non-architecture students through the Disney Imagineering class, the Immersive Technology Research class and the Introduction to Sustainability course. Students can also develop their skills through participation in the AIAS, NOMAS, Tau Sigma Delta, and Alpha Rho Chi in addition to College and university-wide organizations.

B. Design. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value.

2018 Analysis/Review: The program develops graduates by introducing design as a multidimensional process and continually introducing students to design thinking processes and the role of precedents. It is continually reinforced from the first year through the fifth year. Throughout the program, students demonstrated a multidimensional process which became fully evident in ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture.

C. Professional Opportunity. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.

2018 Analysis/Review: The program educates students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths by taking full advantage of its location in Washington, D.C. This became most evident in the Professional Practice class guest speakers and ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture. It was also found in the Internship class.

D. Stewardship of the Environment. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources.

2018 Analysis/Review: The program develops graduates who are prepared to understand and take responsibility for environmental stewardship as part of its overall mission toward community responsibility. Students demonstrate an understanding and responsibility in lecture courses and design studios: ARCH 521 and 522 (Environmental Systems I and II), ARCH 302, 891, 206 (Architectural History II, Thesis Preparation, Design VIII). This included research into vernacular architecture, passive design solutions, renewable energy systems, sustainable building rating systems, and embodied energy in materials. The team observed several student thesis projects that addressed net zero solutions, innovative sustainable systems, and food insecurity.

E. Community and Social Responsibility. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.

2018 Analysis/Review: Producing graduates dedicated to community and social responsibility is deeply ingrained in the overall Howard University mission and specifically in the Department of Architecture. This commitment was reinforced in discussions with the President, Dean and Chair. Evidence is seen throughout the design studios, required and elective courses. Most projects are based on real sites and have some community-based focus from early design through final thesis studio. The ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture course includes an understanding of community organizations and decision-making processes and emphasizes the leadership role of the architect as part of the public process. The students experienced direct engagement with key stakeholders by participating in town hall meetings and documented their findings.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies multiyear objectives within the context of the institutional mission and culture.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition was MET. The Dean and the President provided a clear description of the planning process within Howard University, the expectations of the President, the expectations of the Dean and the role of the Annual Report. Even though the Dean did not require a Strategic Plan from the architecture program, the program developed the "Howard University Architectural Program Strategic Plan" in 2014. The 2014 plan was organized around several themes: Strategic Issues, Tactical Realities, Foundations, Major Steps, Graduate Education, Existing Underutilized Resources, Physical Facilities and Summation. The document identified multiyear objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission. In 2014, the College also completed a SWOT Analysis at a CEACS Retreat. Since then, the architecture program's Annual Report has served as the primary formal document used by the college.

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multiyear objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that the condition was MET. Faculty and students focus on the design, technical, digital, and social aspects of the curriculum through formal and informal methods. The Chair provided documentation of End of Year Design Studio Reviews, Faculty Meetings, Faculty Dialogue Sessions, Architecture Forum with Students, Committee Meetings and Alumni Sessions. In 2016, the Department introduced End of Year Design Studio Reviews to evaluate the direction of design studios. This included faculty and alumni as well as local practitioners. Formally, the College and the program submit data for the Annual Report that clarifies how the program is progressing toward its mission. In addition, information gathered from the faculty evaluations and HU IDEA Course Evaluations are supplemented by a series of standing committees. These include the Executive Committee, the Technology Committee, and the Curriculum Committee. As a result, curriculum revisions were made in 2014 and 2017.

Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The Faculty complete a Workload Agreement (in accordance with the university's workload policy) that is consistent with the workload at most architecture programs, and the small classes support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement. For development, faculty can apply for sabbatical—but none have requested or received sabbatical since the last visit.

Support Services for the students are not limited to academic and personal advising and career guidance but also includes internship or job placement. In addition to the university-level student services, the architecture program is supported by the CEA Office of Student Services (OSS). This includes support for a student's financial aid, internships and career placement, recruiting as well as tutoring, company visits and other related professional outreach. Professor Ronnie McGhee serves as the AXP Advisor (formerly IDP coordinator).

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, on-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The program has sufficient physical resources and has had significant investment in the last two years. The past enrollment decline has allowed for ample space in the existing studios. In addition, the studios are conveniently located near the printing and fabrication lab. While the fabrication lab is only partially operational, the equipment has been purchased and is in the eventual space. There are also various student lounge spaces throughout the building. The administration is aware of architecture student and faculty requests for increased access and utilization of all new equipment, computer labs, fabrication spaces, and renovated classrooms.

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The meeting with the Dean provided very clear information about the program budget. He was adamant and proud that he and the President are committed to financially supporting the program. He also indicated that the budget was not significantly impacted by the reduced enrollment and that the architecture program has had "more investment than any other department in the college." While the Department of Architecture did not control its budget due to University-mandated policy, the investment was evident in the fabrication lab, the plotters, the advanced graphics lab and the team room renovation.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals who provide information services that teach and develop the research, evaluative, and critical-thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: Students, faculty and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information in both print and digital resources on campus. The Architecture Library, formerly located within the School of Architecture Mackey Building, has recently undergone a major renovation to support new makerspace labs and classrooms; the majority of the collection was archived offsite, and some resources were relocated on campus at Founders Library. The architecture program has dedicated personnel located at Founders Library with extensive knowledge and history of the collection to assist architecture students, faculty and staff as needed. While the collection on site is very limited, the students and faculty now have access to an expanded shared library database via the WRLC (Washington Resource Library Consortium), which provides students with access to a much deeper database to request books, journals and information within 24-48 hours. They also have access to the Avery Architectural index. General library literacy information and training is provided to all students during first-year orientation, with coordination between the Architecture Library liaison and faculty through scheduled meetings and monthly interactions with the faculty library liaison.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

• **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and school, college, and institution.

• **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Demonstrated

2018 Team Assessment: The meeting with the Dean, architecture faculty and staff confirmed the materials that were provided in the APR and provided during the visit. The documents provided very clear information about the administrative structure and identified key personnel. The Dean was adamant and proud that he and the President support the administration and key personnel. The meeting with the architecture faculty, students and staff confirmed the governance materials that were provided in the APR and during the visit.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms and Student Performance Criteria

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between each criterion.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the study and and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. Graduates must also be able to use a diverse range of skills to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigating, speaking, drawing, and modeling.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Assessing evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use representational media appropriate for both within the profession and with the public.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation) and ARCH 203 (Design V). Additional examples of writing skills were found in ARCH 301 (Architectural History I) and ARCH 302 (Architectural II).

A.2 Design Thinking Skills: *Ability* to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 201 (Design III), ARCH 202 (Design IV) and ARCH 203 (Design V).

A.3 Investigative Skills: *Ability* to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation), ARCH 204 (Design VI) and ARCH 206 (Design VIII).

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: *Ability* to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 200 (Design II) and ARCH 202 (Design IV) with additional evidence found in ARCH 201 (Design III), ARCH 203 (Design V), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII) and ARCH 206 (Design VIII).

A.5 Ordering Systems: *Ability* to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 011 (Elements of Architecture), ARCH 200 (Design II), ARCH 201 (Design III) and ARCH 202 (Design IV).

A.6 Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices about the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found consistently throughout the student work prepared for ARCH 200 (Design II), ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII), ARCH 206 (Design VIII). There was also evidence of precedent research in ARCH 501 (Structures I), ARCH 502 (Structures II), ARCH 521 (Environment Systems I), ARCH 522 (Environmental Systems II).

A.7 History and Culture: *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, ecological, and technological factors.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 301 (Architectural History I) and ARCH 302 (Architectural History II).

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Strong evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found for social equity in student work prepared for ARCH 200 (Design II), ARCH 201 (Design III), ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 203 (Design V), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII), ARCH 206 (Design VIII) and ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation). Evidence found for cultural diversity was found in ARCH 301 (Architectural History I), ARCH 302 (Architectural History II) and ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation).

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The 2018 visiting team found the student work in Realm A was MET. Architectural Design Skills (A.4) was found to be strong and noted with distinction in ARCH 200 (Design II), ARCH 201 (Design III), ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 203 (Design V), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII), ARCH 206 (Design VIII). The Use of Precedents (A.6) was found

to be strong and noted with distinction. In general, student work was presented from many courses across the curriculum, and the level of ability to understand was clearly satisfied in specified courses.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills, and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. In addition, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

B.1 **Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project that includes an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 901 (Programming I) and ARCH 203 (Design III), ARCH 204 (Design VI) and ARCH 205 (Design VII).

B.2 **Site Design:** *Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation, in the development of a project design.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 201 (Design III) and ARCH 202 (Design IV).

B.3 **Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations, and include the principles of life-safety and accessibility standards.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 201 (Design III), with additional supportive documentation found in ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 522 (Environmental Systems II), and ARCH 401 (Materials & Methods). Supportive documentation on ADA accessibility was found in lecture class ARCH 003 (Environment and Architecture).

B.4 **Technical Documentation:** *Ability* to make technically clear drawings, prepare outline specifications, and construct models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 204 and 205 (Design Studios), with additional supportive documentation in ARCH 501 and 502 (Structures I & II), and ARCH 951 (Construction Documents). Limited Outline Specifications were found in ARCH 951 (Construction Documents).

B.5 **Structural Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravitational, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 501 (Structures I) and 502 (Structures II), with additional supportive documentation in ARCH 203 (Design V), ARCH 205 (Design VII) and ARCH 206 (Design VIII).

B.6 **Environmental Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems' design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 521 and 522 (Environmental Systems I and II). Additional supportive documentation was found in ARCH 302, 891, 206 (Architectural History II, Thesis Preparation, Design VIII).

B.7 **Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH, 401, 402, 521 (Materials and Methods I and II, Environmental Systems I). Additional supportive evidence was found in ARCH 205, 206, 891 (Design Studios VII, VIII, Thesis Preparation).

B.8 **Building Materials and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles used in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 401, 402, 521 (Materials and Methods I and II, Environmental Systems I). Additional supportive evidence was found in ARCH 205, 206, 891, 951 (Design Studios VII, VIII, Thesis Preparation, Construction Documents).

B.9 Building Service Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including lighting, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 401 (Materials & Methods), with additional supportive documentation in ARCH 522 (Environmental Systems II) and ARCH 951 (Construction Documents).

B.10 Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Not Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was NOT MET. ARCH 751 (Professional Practice) includes a few multiple choice questions defining terms but no evidence of financial spreadsheet exercises demonstrating an understanding of the financial aspects of project feasibility. ARCH 901 (Programming I) includes no reference to financial aspects of projects except for a single line item in instructor presentation indicating that "economic issues" are considered one of the "facts" to be considered in project programming. ARCH 752 (Business of Architecture) includes a complete project feasibility analysis and proforma, but this is an elective class.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Realm B. General Team Commentary: The 2018 visiting team finds that student achievement in all elements of Realm B was MET with the exception of B-10 (Financial Considerations).

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to demonstrate that they have the ability to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Comprehending the importance of research pursuits to inform the design process.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.
- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.

C.1 Research: *Understanding* of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 205 (Design VII) and ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation). Both classes included research methods that addressed cultural and community circumstances and analyzed environmental conditions. ARCH 205 includes finish selections based on material properties and intrinsic aesthetic and physical qualities.

C.2 **Integrated Evaluations and Decision-Making Design Process:** *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This demonstration includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 205 (Design VII) and 206 (Design VIII). This includes problem identification, programming and analyzing solutions.

C.3 **Integrative Design:** *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was addressed in student work prepared for ARCH 205 (Design VII) and 206 (Design VIII) but more thoroughly covered in ARCH 951 (Construction Documents). Specifically, environmental stewardship, structural systems and building envelope systems were found in ARCH 205 (Design VII) and 206 (Design VIII). Technical documentation, environmental systems and building assemblies were integrated in ARCH 951 (Construction Documents).

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The 2018 visiting team found the student work in Realm C was MET. Two classes: ARCH 205 (Design VII) and ARCH 891 (Thesis Preparation) demonstrated the ability to develop conceptual ideas, apply research methods and integrate evaluations in their decision-making process. Three classes: ARCH 205 (Design VII); ARCH 206 (Design VIII); and ARCH 951 (Construction Documents) were needed to address Integrative Design.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and the need to act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 **Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding* of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process—client, contractor, architect, user groups, local community—the architect's role to reconcile stakeholders needs.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture. The students experienced direct engagement with key stakeholders by participating in town hall meetings and documented their findings.

D.2 **Project Management:** *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Not Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was NOT MET. ARCH 751 Professional Practice was the only class referenced in the SPC Matrix. While the instructor's lecture materials address these subjects, there was no evidence of understanding in the student work - resume/portfolio preparation and multi-choice quizzes. While other courses were reviewed (i.e., ARCH 205, 206 891, 401, 402, and 951), the evidence was not found.

D.3 **Business Practices:** *Understanding* of the basic principles of a firm's business practices, including financial management and business planning, marketing, organization, and entrepreneurship.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in the 2014 version of ARCH 751 (Professional Practice). Students produced comprehensive business plans demonstrating an excellent understanding of a firm's business practices, including financial management and business planning.

D.4 **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in the 2014 version of ARCH 751 (Professional Practice). Student work demonstrated the architect's responsibility to the public and the client.

D.5 **Professional Ethics:** *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice and understanding the role of the NCARB Rules of Conduct and the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in the 2014 version of ARCH 751 (Professional Practice). Students demonstrated a solid understanding of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: The team found that the firsthand introduction to the Stakeholder Roles in Architecture (D.1), through ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture, was exemplary and provided students with a keen sense of awareness of the value that stakeholders bring to the design process. Project Management (D.2) was not met.

Part Two (II): Section 2 – Curricular Framework

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation
For a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
2. Institutions located outside the United States and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may pursue candidacy and accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture under the following circumstances:

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR on page 65 and confirmed during the visit.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs. The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore should not be used by non-accredited programs.

Therefore, any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch. for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. All accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements:

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR on pages 66-69 and confirmed during the visit.

Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education
The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process for evaluating the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic course work related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate before accepting the offer of admission. See also Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR on page 71 and confirmed during the visit.

Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Office of Career Service website.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.[1]
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of pre professional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence found on the Department of Architecture website.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Department of Architecture website.

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was provided by the Department of Architecture during the visit.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2015 Edition).

[X] Met

2018 Team Assessment: Evidence was provided by the Department of Architecture during the visit.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Strong evidence of ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design shown throughout courses ARCH 201(Design III), ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 203 (Design V), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII), ARCH 206 (Design VIII).

A.6 Use of Precedents: Strong evidence of ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices about the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects shown throughout courses ARCH 200 (Design II), ARCH 202 (Design IV), ARCH 204 (Design VI), ARCH 205 (Design VII), ARCH 206 (Design VIII). There was also evidence of precedent research in ARCH 501 (Structures I), ARCH 502 (Structures II), ARCH 521 (Environment Systems I), ARCH 522 (Environmental Systems II).

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: The team found that the firsthand introduction to the Stakeholder Roles in Architecture (D.1), through ARCH 701 Public Issues & Architecture, was exemplary and provided students with a keen sense of awareness of the value that stakeholders bring to the design process.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work was found that demonstrated the program's compliance with Part II, Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and then added to the final VTR.

STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA MATRIX

NAAB 2014 CONDITIONS | Bachelor of Architecture Curriculum

			REALM A								REALM B										REALM C			REALM D				
TYPE	Number	Course name	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
			A	A	A	A	A	A	U	U	A	A	A	A	A	A	U	U	U	U	U	A	A	U	U	U	U	A
HISTORY/ THEORY	ARCH 003	Environment & Architecture											■															
	ARCH 011	Elements of Architecture					■																					
	ARCH 301	Architectural History I	■						■	■																		
	ARCH 302	Architectural History II	■						■	■						■												
FOUNDATION STUDIOS	ARCH 150	Design Communication I																										
	ARCH 151	Design Communication II																										
	ARCH 199	Design I																										
	ARCH 200	Design II				■	■	■		■																		
	ARCH 201	Design III		■		■	■			■		■	■															
	ARCH 202	Design IV		■		■	■	■		■		■	■															
PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE STUDIOS	ARCH 203	Design V	■	■		■				■	■				■													
	ARCH 204	Design VI			■	■		■		■	■			■														
	ARCH 205	Design VII				■		■		■	■			■	■		■	■			■	■	■						
THESIS	ARCH 891	Thesis Preparation	■		■					■						■	■	■			■							
	ARCH 206	Design VIII			■	■		■		■					■	■	■	■				■	■					
TECHNOLOGY SERIES	ARCH 401	Materials & Methods I											■				■	■	■									
	ARCH 402	Materials & Methods II															■	■										
	ARCH 501	Structures I						■						■	■													
	ARCH 502	Structures II						■						■	■													
	ARCH 511	Intro to Computer Applications in Arch																										
	ARCH 521	Environmental Systems I						■								■	■	■										
	ARCH 522	Environmental Systems II						■					■			■			■									
	ARCH 951	Construction Documents I												■				■	■				■					
OTHER REQUIRED ARCHITECTURE COURSES	ARCH 651	Principles of Urban Design																										
	ARCH 701	Public Issues & Architecture																						■				
	ARCH 751	Professional Practice																								■	■	■
	ARCH 901	Programming I									■																	

■ LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT MET: A= Ability or U=Understanding:

Ability—Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation.

Understanding—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain, and/or interpret information.

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Andrew Chin
Interim Dean
School of Architecture + Engineering Technology (SA+ET)
Florida A&M University (FAMU)
1938 South MLK Boulevard,
Tallahassee, FL 32307
850.412.7815
andrew.chin@famu.edu

Representing the AIA
Mary Ann Lazarus FAIA, LEED AP BD+C
Architect and Consultant
Cameron Macallister Group
St. Louis, MO
314.805.9332
lazarus@cameronmacallister.com

Representing the NCARB
Jon Alan Baker, FAIA, LEED AP
Baker Nowicki Design Studio
731 Ninth Ave., Suite A
San Diego, CA 92101
619-795-2450 (O)
858-449-0800 (M)
jbaker@bndesignstudio.com

Representing the AIAS
Kevin Leong, AIAS
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, MI
269-332 4466
kevinl@andrews.edu

Nonvoting Team Member
Jason Pugh, AIA, NOMA, LEED AP BD+C
3532 S. King Drive, Unit 2F
Chicago, IL 60653
202.669.4595
Jason_Pugh@gensler.com

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Andrew Chin
Team Chair

Mary Ann Lazarus, FAIA LEED AP BD+C
Team Member

Jon Alan Baker, FAIA LEED AP
Team Member

Kevin Leong, AIAS
Team Member

Jason Pugh, AIA, NOMA, LEED AP BD+C
Non-Voting Team Member