

**State University of New York at Buffalo
School of Architecture and Planning**

Visiting Team Report

M. Arch

Track I (preprofessional degree plus 64 graduate credit hours)

Track II (undergraduate degree plus 112 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
28 March 2012

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Team Findings	
1. Team Comments	
2. Conditions Not Met	
3. Causes of Concern	
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	
III. Appendices:	
1. Program Information	
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	
3. Visiting Team	
IV. Report Signatures	
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	

I. Summary of Team Findings**1. Team Comments & Visit Summary**

- The 2012 National Architectural Accrediting Board visiting team's review of the State University of New York at Buffalo Master of Architecture program within the School of Architecture and Planning finds a program in transition but with considerable energy and optimism about the future. The administration and faculty have a vision of a school that carries forward the experimental qualities of its foundation. They conceive the School as having a core of professional education that prepares students for contemporary practice. This core is wrapped in the tradition of environmental research. These two layers interact with one another to advance both education and the profession. To this end the architecture program has defined for itself four clear research areas—material culture, inclusive design, sustainable natural and urban environments, and situated technologies.
- During the 2012 visiting team's visit major facilities were under construction, and the team assessed some of the operations of the program housed in temporary buildings. It is noteworthy that despite this relocation the faculty, students, and staff were energized and would not let the temporary inconvenience adversely impact the School's culture.
- The program was prepared for the 2012 visiting team. The dean, chair, faculty, students and staff were helpful and hospitable during our visit. The team wishes to point out that in every instance staff and faculty were responsive and helpful with requests for information. The team draws the program's attention to two items that they may want to consider for future accreditation visits: 1) the team found that the Student Performance Criteria and course matrix did not always indicate the appropriate course that effectively contained evidence of student performance; 2) future team rooms would make assessment easier and more thorough if examples of the student design process in addition to final products were provided. This information would give a team insight into decision-making, alternative explorations, and the critical thinking skills of students.

2. Conditions Not Met

Part I.1.4 Long Range Planning

Part II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria:

B.1 Pre-design

B.6 Comprehensive Design

Part II. 3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education

3. Causes of Concern

A. Site Design: The visiting team found a lack of diversity in studio site contexts presented as part of design problems. The overwhelming majority of sites were urban in nature with little topographic variety, grading design, parking lot layout, site circulation, or service access.

B. Comprehensive Design: This Student Performance Criteria remains a weak segment in the overall course of study, one that has been mentioned by two previous visiting team reports. The integrative nature of the comprehensive design requirement makes this continuing weakness a particular concern. Refer to II.1.1 for further elaboration.

C. Student Participation in Governance: The visiting team did not find any formal means for the administration to obtain feedback from students on governance and program issues. Students

expressed concern that they do not have an active role to play in areas such as curriculum development, faculty searches, and other important governance issues.

D. Advising: The visiting team heard concerns from students about the adequacy of career advising. Students said career advising was ad hoc in nature and not consistently available to all students. Given the professional aspirations of the program this is a cause of concern for the visiting team. Undergraduate academic advising is currently assigned to one assistant dean. Given the load, this individual is reactive, as opposed to being more proactive, to student needs. This arrangement appears to be a potential impediment to the program and School to meet desired retention, graduation rates, and opportunities for employment.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2009)

2004 Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment Procedures: *The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.*

Previous Team Report (2009): The program has a thoroughly organized, structured curriculum that is obviously the result of considerable collaborative effort. However, there does not appear to be communication on other important issues of the program that impact student learning in a reflective and integrated way. The self-assessment procedures do not appear to have a consistent method of implementation.

Individually, a number of faculty expressed to the team their concern about the decision-making process, their lack of involvement in that process and a lack of clear structure for discussions on how the program is fulfilling the mission and accomplishing the NAAB perspectives. A clear and comprehensive process of self-assessment that involves all constituencies is not evident.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of decision-making and faculty involvement in the direction of the program and its fulfillment of mission and accomplishing NAAB perspectives is no longer a concern. The faculty at its meeting with the visiting team agreed that the new leadership has brought a sense of "justice and clarity" as well as "democratic processes" to decision-making. Since the last team visit, faculty members have worked hard to develop both formal and informal methods to assess progress and institute curricular change. The Self-Assessment Procedures condition is now met.

2004 Condition 3, Public Information: *To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.*

Previous Team Report (2009): The exact wording of the required NAAB text was not found in the catalogue.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The exact wording is found in print and electronic documents. This condition is met.

2004 Condition 7, Human Resource Development: *Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.*

Previous Team Report (2009): Faculty lacks basic support in terms of travel and conferences and research financial support. Research development for all the centers has no centralized support and does not seem to be a priority of the school. The majority of overhead from significant sponsored program income remains with the university and only 12% of that returns to the school. The proposal to split the latter between school, department and principal investigator, while an important first step, remains inadequate.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This concern from the previous team is no longer an issue. The architecture program has managed its enrollment and thereby balanced facility, faculty and financial resources. The result of this change in concert with changes in tuition disbursement has improved opportunities for faculty development. Research support has improved through the transfer of the UB Regional Institute to the school. See team report Part I.2.1 and I.2.4 for details.

2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: *The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.*

Previous Team Report (2009): The shop and the computer output facilities are superior. The present facilities are not in compliance with ADA and applicable building codes. The 2003 team noted these same concerns. Assurances of immediate action were promised to the 2003 team but did not occur. While some smaller renovations have occurred they have not addressed the serious life safety issues. This team was again assured by the administration that the funding was now in place.

While there is adequate square footage allotted to the program, that space isn't configured appropriately for use as design studios or jury spaces. The freshman studios are too crowded and in another separate and remote building; studio levels are in small rooms; the lecture and seminar spaces have acoustical problems; and the mechanical systems are antiquated and noisy.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Given the extent of the construction effort and the pride of both the faculty and administration over this project we do not believe this is a future cause for concern. Progress is being made on the \$50.5 million renovation of Hayes and Crosby Halls. The visiting team reviewed the drawings for the renovation and believes the finished space will be more than adequate for the program and its needs. During the multiyear construction effort the program has made good use of temporary space.

2004 Condition 10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2009): Current national economy and state budgets concern faculty and students; this is being exacerbated by a perceived lack of transparency regarding the finances of the school and the department. The Compact process of negotiation between the school and the university leads to clear and forward thinking strategies. However there is not transparency in that process for the faculty and students. Only part of this information is reaching the chair, and very little reaches the faculty and students. Clearly discussion within the school on visioning and consequent budgeting would be an effective way of advancing the program.

The department is struggling with chronic underfunding. Since the UB Compact process uses historic funding levels as its starting point, the department remains and apparently will remain underfunded. However, the Compact process does promise the potential of resources based on research initiatives aligned with university priorities. It is not clear that commitments and potential resources are communicated to or understood by the centers or the faculty.

Considering the substantial underfunding, the school has a small target (\$30,000) for development funding.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Developed since the previous team visit, the current fiscal plan set in place by the School of Architecture and Planning has resulted in a 28% increase in general per-student dollars within the architecture department, as compared to fiscal resources at the time of the previous visit. Much of this has been accomplished due to a shift to a differential tuition revenue model for the college, complemented by a reduction in the size of the student body, allowing for greater concentration of fiscal resources per student. This issue has therefore been met.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility: *Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities*

Previous Team Report (2009): Although written course work shows accessibility knowledge, this information is not synthesized consistently in studio projects.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This is no longer a concern. Evidence of this was found for Track I in ARC 302: Design Studio 6: Models, Organizations + Environments and ARC 362: Architectural Programming. Evidence of this condition as being met in Track II was found in ARC 503: Architectural Design Studio 3: Integration of Technology and ARC 562: Architectural Programming.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design: *Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability*

Previous Team Report (2009): Although portions of this criterion are introduced early in the program in ARC 302, many of these elements are not integrated consistently by the completion of the required studio sequence. In the coursework provided in the team room, the level presented

did not demonstrate an understanding of structural and environmental systems. Comprehensive life safety provision was not presented consistently.

The studio work in the fourth year comprehensive design studio introduced many new issues to students such as high-rise construction, urban mixed use, and housing. Integrating this new knowledge appears to have limited the time for development of a comprehensive project.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This remains unmet. See II.1.1, B.6.

FINAL DRAFT

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

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 is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.*

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program's benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2012 Team Assessment: The 2011 Architecture Program Report provides a description of the history and mission of the institution. It outlines the eight cross-disciplinary areas of strength that define the university's strategic initiative UB 2020. The architecture program and the School contribute to four of these areas—artistic expression and the performing arts, civic engagement and public policy, information and computing technologies, and health and wellness across the life span. Each strategic emphasis finds expression in the program's graduate research groups—inclusive design, material culture, situated technologies, and sustainable urban and natural environments—and the relationship strengthens the tie between the larger institution and the program.

The State University of New York at Buffalo has a comprehensive general education curriculum that is incorporated into each major and degree program. The architecture program's undergraduate curriculum complies with this requirement. In addition, the architecture department provides courses that contribute to the university's broad educational requirement.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

- *Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of 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 non-traditional.*

Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able*

to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found the learning culture to be positive at all levels throughout the program. The Academic/Studio Culture Policy is online, and students indicated they are aware of the policy. The university has an Academic Integrity policy that is described on the program's website (http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/overview/pol_standards.asp).

Staff members were enthusiastic about the School and program and all felt they were contributing to the program's desire for excellence.

In the student and faculty meetings there was an expression of pride and support for diversity in the program. Students noted the international diversity of the faculty and the diversity of the student body. The program is aware of the special efforts required to encourage and support a diverse culture. They have initiated the founding of a NOMA chapter, started a women's group for faculty and students, and worked to create supportive relationships among the student body.

1.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: *Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.*

- A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community.** That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.¹ In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The university is fully accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and is in good standing. The architecture program website and interviews of faculty affirm that the program has built bridges with other disciplines within the university and enjoys joint degree programs with the Department of Media Study (March/MFA), the School of Management (MARCH/MBA), and the Department of Urban and Regional Planning (March/MUP). The faculty of the program have also worked with or shared courses with the Department of Urban and Regional Planning, the Department of Visual Studies, the Department of Industrial Engineering, the Department of Rehabilitation Services, and the Law School. A few faculty hold joint appointments with other departments. The faculty also participates in the thesis

¹ See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

committees for other disciplines, which further integrates the School's faculty into the intellectual life of the university.

- B. Architectural Education and Students.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to live and work in a global world where diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured and respected; to emerge as leaders in the academic setting and the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The students in the M. Arch program at the State University of New York at Buffalo receive an education with an emphasis on research and its application to architecture practice. Students enter the workforce understanding the value of working in cooperative groups and demonstrate the ability to do so by the abundance of collaborative projects by groups of students under the tutelage of faculty.

Through organizations such as the American Institute of Architecture Students, the Graduate Student Association, and Alpha Rho Chi, students are actively serving as leaders in their school and local community and are participating at conferences. There are several recent examples of students participating in national and international competitions, and winning recognition for their effort. This activity affirms their abilities match those of their peers and professionals alike.

- C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found the program is responsive to this perspective. Students learn the role of regulatory issues in ARC: 482 & ARC: 582 Professional Practice, and through licensed professionals on the faculty. Students are knowledgeable of IDP and have access to IDP materials and the IDP coordinator. At the student meeting 80% of the students were aware of the procedure and process to IDP, and when queried by the visiting team, answered questions about the program and were knowledgeable about it.

- D. Architectural Education and the Profession.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: A number of programs and initiatives within the studio curricula of both Tracks I and II prepare the students for diverse clients and diverse user types, as well as the range of roles and responsibilities they will face upon entering the profession. Students interact with a wide range of socio-cultural user groups in their studio courses that engage local

communities, and they learn about the profession and its response to diverse client groups in history lectures and topical courses.

- E. Architectural Education and the Public Good.** That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The school has a tradition of working with communities in the Buffalo region. Students are frequently involved in studio projects and volunteer activities that require civic engagement as a central component of their course work. Both Track I and II studio projects involve students in projects with clients and end users where their design proposals address varied socio-economic concerns and/or environmental justice issues.

The environment in the program is supportive of extracurricular involvement in student organizations, collaborative events with the AIA, and other community volunteering and leadership opportunities such as participation in Habitat for Humanity. This activity contributes to students gaining an appreciation of the ethical dimension of architecture and its need to serve both clients and the public.

1.1.4 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.*

[X] The program's processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The APR did not provide a description of a long-range plan or the process the program has defined to develop a plan. There was no long-range planning document available in the team room for review.

The program did provide the visiting team with in-depth information about its current data gathering and information development program (see I.1.5) and how it utilizes this data to shape changes in learning objectives and course work (faculty meeting minutes dated Thursday, 19 May 2011). Faculty and staff did acknowledge in meetings and discussions that the data collection program is in its infancy (only a single year's data had been collected at the time of the visit) and is premature to determine trends. The new Dean has held a retreat with the faculty and has discussed future direction, but no long-range planning document was available in the team room.

1.1.5 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.

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The 2012 visiting team confirmed the self-assessment processes outlined in the APR through faculty meetings and interviews. The program has a formal survey tool that is used to solicit input from students, faculty, alumni and practitioners. Faculty meetings (an example of formal data collection was found in faculty meeting minutes dated Thursday, 19 May 2011) and discussions among studio instructors augment the information compiled from the survey. The combination of surveys and faculty discussions focused on student outcomes in coursework add richness to the information available to guide curricular improvement.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES**I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:**

- **Faculty & Staff:**
 - *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions².*
 - *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
 - *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

[X] Human Resources (Faculty & Staff) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of these resources in the APR, pages 26-37, promotion policies dated Feb 1987, EEO/AA materials from UB website, and verified through discussions with faculty. The team noted the faculty mentorship policies to be helpful, encouraging and egalitarian.

- **Students:**
 - *An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.*

[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of admission policies on the department website (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/admissions/>), and the program provides opportunities for students to engage in foreign study, volunteer with local non-profits, and participate in collective research projects.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions

² A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The architecture program is one of two programs in the School of Architecture and Planning. It is led by a chair who reports directly to the Dean of the School. The chair participates in the school-wide Dean's Council. The chair of the architecture program administers the architecture degree program and is supported by both Associate and Assistant Deans responsible for financial information, IT, academic affairs, undergraduate education and graduate education. The structure is adequate.

- **Governance:** The program must demonstrate that all faculty, staff, and students have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance.

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: In meetings with the faculty and staff, the visiting team heard that a system of committees and scheduled meetings exist for personnel to participate in the governance process. Meetings with students also affirmed the existence of an open and collegial atmosphere for students to participate in program governance, particularly through the AIAS and Alpha Rho Chi chapters, though this process is at present an informal one.

The visiting team did not find evidence of a formal governance document (bylaws) that makes the governance process transparent with clearly defined roles and responsibilities for each constituent.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*

- *Space to support and encourage studio-based learning*
- *Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.*
- *Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.*

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The university approved a \$50.1M upgrade to the School of Architecture and Planning facilities. The first phase, \$20M renovation of Hayes Hall, was underway during the visit. Students, faculty and staff displaced by the construction were in the Hayes Annexes, Diefendorf Hall and the Health Sciences Library. Once the renovation of Hayes Hall has been completed, Crosby Hall is scheduled for renovation, and students will be relocated to the vacated flex space.

To address the overcrowding mentioned by the previous team, the school has placed a limit on the enrollment for freshman studios housed in Parker Hall. The school's Materials and Methods Shop for wood, metal and plastics is also located in Parker Hall, and is both spacious and well-equipped.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Despite fiscal hardships caused by current national economic conditions and state funding shortfalls, the fiscal plan set in place by the Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning has resulted in a 28% increase in general per-student dollars in the Architecture Department since the previous accreditation visit. Much of this has been accomplished due to a shift to a differential tuition revenue model for the college, as well as a reduction in the size of the student body for the architecture department, which has allowed a greater concentration of revenues to a conversely smaller student body. The 2011 differential tuition model has proven successful, with expectation of another 3% improvement in per-student funding over the next two years. Other promising signs include a significant projected increase in scholarship funding above base existing endowments, which are expected to result in an 83% increase in annual funding as compared to current values over the next two years.

This change in policy and process essentially ends the “Compact Process,” which was noted in the previous VTR as being an underlying cause to ongoing chronic shortfalls in departmental funding.

To complement the department’s already strong commitment to research, the architecture department has committed up to \$2,500 annually to non-tenured faculty for use in architectural research activities to serve as incubators for future departmental research growth above and beyond existing activities.

1.2.5 Information Resources: *The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found this condition met. Resources for students and faculty in both digital and hard copy form are readily accessible. The renovation of Hayes Hall has resulted in the temporary relocation of a portion of the library to the Health Science Library, which is very close to Crosby Hall and temporary faculty offices. The remaining portion of the collection is available through a patron request system. Students and faculty expressed satisfaction that materials are available. Once the renovation of Hayes Hall is complete, all volumes will return to a central location within the renovated building.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports³. 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.*

[X] Statistical reports were provided and provide the appropriate information

2012 Team Assessment: Statistical reports were provided in the APR and documents submitted by the Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Education. These sources provide the information required in Section I.3.1 of the 2009 Conditions.

I.3.2. Annual Reports: The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to 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.

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports

³ In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were provided and provide the appropriate information

2012 Team Assessment: Annual reports and NAAB Responses were provided in the team room and contained the appropriate information.

1.3.3 Faculty Credentials: *The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.*

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit⁴ that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

[X] Faculty credentials were provided and demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2012 Team Assessment: The team found the faculty credentials satisfactory, with a range of experience and expertise in all subject matter. Approximately 40% of the current design studio faculty members are registered architects.

⁴ The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: The team found the materials readily available and included in Appendix 3.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in coursework in ARC 231/531: Architectural History 1 & 234/534: Architectural History 2 (both Track I and II), as well as student discussion/observation during studio class tours.

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

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 231/531: Architectural History 1 and ARC 234/534: Architectural History 2 for Track I and II.

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: *Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 101: Design Studio 1 Communications and Critical Processes (Track I) and in ARC 511: Architectural Communications 1 and ARC 512 Architectural Communications 2 (Track II). In both degree programs students are introduced to traditional drafting, digital representation, and three-dimensional model making.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found for Track I in ARC 442: Construction Technology and ARC 404: Technical Documents Practicum, and for Track II in ARC 542: Construction Technology.

A.5. Investigative Skills: *Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 231 & 234 (Track 1) and ARC 531 & 534 (Track 2): Architectural History 1 and 2.

A. 6. Fundamental Design Skills: *Ability to effectively use basic architectural and environmental principles in design.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is well met. For Track I evidence was found in ARC 102: Design Studio 2 -- Process + Materiality. For Track II evidence of this ability was found in ARC 501: Architectural Design Studio 1 -- Principles of Design.

A. 7. Use of Precedents: *Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 201: Design Studio 3 -- Integration of History – Ancient, ARC 202 Design Studio 4 -- Integration of History – Modern and ARC 403: Design Studio 7 -- Comprehensive Project for Track I students. Evidence of compliance for Track II students was found in ARC 502: Architectural Design Studio 2 -- Integration of History and ARC 504: Architectural Design Studio 4 -- Comprehensive Project.

A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: *Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence of this criteria being met by Track I students was found in ARC 201: Integration of History – Ancient and ARC 202: Integration of History – Modern. Evidence of this criterion being met by Track II students was found in ARC 501: Architectural Design Studio 1-- Principles of Design, and ARC 502: Architectural Design Studio 2 -- Integration of History.

- A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: *Understanding* of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in exams and quizzes that are part of the course work in ARC 231/531: Architecture History 1 and ARC 234/534: Architecture History 2 for both Track I and II students.

- A. 10. Cultural Diversity: *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 231 & 234 (Track 1) and ARC 531 & 534 (Track 2): Architectural History 1 and 2.

- A.11. Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in Design Studios ARC 605, ARC 606, & ARC 607 (Tracks 1 & 2).

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The 2012 visiting team finds that students demonstrate a thorough background and competent skill level in Critical Thinking and Representation. Use of precedents and their integration into studio projects is particularly noteworthy for both track 1 and track 2 students. Also the program's development of technical drawing, digital representation and three-dimensional constructions is a strength of the program. The students learn how to represent ideas and forms in multiple media—drawing, digital, castings, constructions, etc.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Incorporating life safety systems.
- Integrating accessibility.
- Applying principles of sustainable design.

- B. 1. Pre-Design: *Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.***

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team did not see evidence of ability to develop a comprehensive inventory for a building program, showing quantitative and qualitative characteristics of user requirements for a project. Ability to develop and apply site selection and design assessment criteria was not evident.

- B. 2. Accessibility: *Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.***

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence of compliance was found for Track I in ARC 302: Design Studio 6 -- Models, Organizations + Environments and ARC 362: Architectural Programming. Evidence for Track II students was found in ARC 503: Architectural Design Studio 3 -- Integration of Technology and ARC 562: Architectural Programming.

- B. 3. Sustainability: *Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.***

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC:241/541 – Introduction to Building Technology (Track I and II), and in ARC: 403 (Track I) and ARC 504 (Track II) – Comprehensive Design.

- B. 4. Site Design: *Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.***

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. The team found evidence of the use and manipulation of topographical features, consideration of soil types, and site development issues in course ARC 241/541: Introduction to Building Technology for both Track I and II.

B. 5. Life Safety: *Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion was met. Evidence was found for Track I students in ARC 301: Design Studio 5 -- Systems + Subjectivity and ARC 403: Design Studio 7 -- Comprehensive Project. For Track II students the criterion was met in ARC 503: Architectural Design Studio 3 -- Integration of Technology and ARC 504: Architectural Design Studio 4 -- Comprehensive Project

B. 6. Comprehensive Design: *Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:*

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

B.2. Accessibility

A.4. Technical Documentation

B.3. Sustainability

A.5. Investigative Skills

B.4. Site Design

A.8. Ordering Systems

B.8. Environmental Systems

A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture

B.9. Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: For Track I students the visiting team found ARC 403: Design Studio 7-- Comprehensive Project deficit in meeting the requirements for technical documentation and environmental systems integration. For Track II students taking ARC 504: Design Studio 4 -- Comprehensive Project the visiting team found deficiencies for technical documentation, environmental systems, and structural systems.

B. 7 Financial Considerations: *Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 362: Architectural Programming for Track I and ARC 562: Architectural Programming for Track II.

- B. 8. Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. The team found evidence in ARC 241/541: Introduction to Building Technology and ARC 473/573: Environmental Controls 1 and ARC 475/575: Environmental Controls 2 for both Track I and II.

- B. 9. Structural Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 352/552, ARC 353/553 and ARC 354/554: Structures 1, 2 and 3 (Track 1 & 2).

- B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence for Track I students was found in ARC 403: Design Studio 7 -- Comprehensive Project and ARC 442 Construction Technology. The criterion is met for Track II students through ARC 504: Architectural Design Studio 4 -- Comprehensive Project and ARC 542: Construction Technology.

- B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence for Track I students was found in ARC 473: Environmental Controls 1 and ARC 475: Environmental Controls 2. In addition, evidence of vertical transportation system and fire protection systems was found in ARC 403 : Design Studio 7 -- Comprehensive Project. Evidence of meeting this criterion for Track 2 students was found in ARC 573: Environmental Controls 1 and ARC 575: Environmental Controls 2. Evidence of understanding vertical transportation systems was found in ARC 504: Architectural Design Studio 4 -- Comprehensive Project.

- B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 301: Design Studio 5 (Track I) and ARC 504: Design Studio 4 (Track II).

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The 2012 visiting team found that the requirements for Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge were found in the individual course work for the technical courses, but this knowledge was not integrated into the comprehensive design studio. The team observed a disconnect between the small-scale material explorations that are a hallmark for the program and the translation of these projects into the larger-scale assemblies associated with architecture projects.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

C. 1. Collaboration: *Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.***[X] Met**

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. There is evidence of group work in ARCH 362/562: Architectural Programming for both Track I and II. Multi-disciplinary work does occur between architecture and planning students in one of the sections of ARCH 607/608: Research Studio/Thesis, as well as in several elective courses. In student meetings with the team, students explained that jurors representing other disciplines are frequently present at critiques as well as being challenged by “clients” for studio projects who reside in the surrounding community.

C. 2. Human Behavior: *Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.***[X] Met**

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is well met. The team found evidence in ARC 362/562: Architectural Programming for Track I and II. The team found the research component of this course to be distinctive in the way it integrated research methods, human factors and studio investigations.

C. 3 Client Role in Architecture: *Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.***[X] Met**

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 362/562: Architectural Programming and in ARC 482/582: Professional Practice for Track I and II students.

- C. 4. Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 482/582 – Professional Practice (Track I & 2).

- C. 5. Practice Management: *Understanding* of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 482/582 – Professional Practice (Track I & 2).

- C. 6. Leadership: *Understanding* of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in examinations and written papers for ARC 482/582 – Professional Practice (Track I & 2).

- C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in ARC 482/582 – Professional Practice (Track I & 2).

- C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. Evidence was found in examinations and written papers for ARC 482/582 – Professional Practice (Track I & 2).

- C. 9. **Community and Social Responsibility: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.**

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is met. The team found evidence of compliance for Track I and II students in ARC 362/562: Architectural Programming where students conduct research into the accommodation of diverse populations and sustainable practices. In addition, the team found projects in ARC 403: Design Studio 7 – Comprehensive Project that explored alternative lifestyles and sustainable urban agriculture.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The 2012 visiting team found a majority of the criteria in Leadership and Practice to be met in ARC 482/582: Professional Practice. The syllabi and student work products for this course were very thorough and comprehensive.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: *The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following 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); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The University at Buffalo (UB) has maintained continuous accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education since 1921. The university was last reaccredited through the Periodic Review Report in 2009 (<http://www.buffalo.edu/content/www/provost/acredit/middle-states.html>).

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: *The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: 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 electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.*

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program provides a clear statement that the B.S. in Architecture is not a NAAB-accredited program (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/degrees/bsarch.asp>). Undergraduates are referred to the accredited degree web pages to make degree nomenclature and accredited status explicit. In addition, a show of hands at the student meeting suggested widespread understanding of the difference between the accredited program and the non-accredited undergraduate degree program.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team was provided copies of faculty meeting minutes that provide evidence that the faculty undergo a process of formally identifying the strength and weakness of the curriculum from multiple sources, including practitioners, and use that information to make adjustments to the curriculum.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that 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. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student's progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student's admission and advising files.

[X] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: The 2012 visiting team had the opportunity to review student folders to assess the specifics of the evaluation process for students entering the M. Arch program. The team focused specifically on those new students admitted to the 2-year Master program who did not graduate from the UB Bachelor of Science degree program. The team observed the assessment of this group of students was conducted in a more holistic and general manner. The files did not provide a detailed assessment of NAAB Student Performance Criteria that were required to be met for acceptance into the two-year M. Arch program. This observation was confirmed by student comments made at the all-school meeting.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION**II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees**

In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The required NAAB language is available on the program's website (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/degrees/naab.asp>) and (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/degrees/march.asp>), as well as printed in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: These documents are available to students, parents, and others through the program's website at (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/degrees/naab.asp>) and the architecture library.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional's Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aia.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Career development information is available through the program website (<http://www.ap.buffalo.edu/architecture/opportunities/careers.asp>).

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 available to the public:

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent APR

The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

These documents must be housed together and accessible to all. Programs are encouraged to make these documents available electronically from their websites.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: These documents are available to the public and students in the architecture library.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education.

Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This material is available in the architecture library.

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

[Taken from the *Architecture Program Report*, responses to Part One: Section 1 Identity and Self-Assessment]

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

Reference State University of New York at Buffalo, *APR*, pp 3-5.

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

Reference State University of New York at Buffalo, *APR*, pp. 5-8.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference State University of New York at Buffalo, *APR*, pp. 18-21.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference State University of New York at Buffalo, *APR*, pp. 21-26.

FINAL DRAFT

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A.6 Fundamental Design Skills – Students exhibited an exceptional ability to explore and present design ideas through multiple media types and multiple scales of form, including full-scale models. Students also expressed great enthusiasm for these design assignments, which begin at the very initial studio sequence ARC 201 and continue throughout their education at UB.

B.8 Environmental Systems – Students in both Tracks I and II complete a rigorous range of exercises in ARC 473/573: Environmental Controls 1 and ARC 474/574: Environmental Controls 2, as well as ARC 241/541: Introduction to Building Technology. Content in this suite of classes provides both a broad and in-depth range of understanding of environmental systems and their design.

C.2 Human Behavior – Students and faculty share a desire to explore, pursue, and research the relationship between human behavior and the design of the physical environment. In ARC 362/462: Architectural Programming the team found the research component of this course to be distinctive in the way it integrated research methods, human factors and studio investigations. The IDeA Center, part of the Inclusive Design research focus, extends this research into practice.

C.5 Practice Management – The visiting team found ARC 482/582: Professional Practice to provide an in-depth understanding of practice management. The reading assignments for the course cover a range of perspectives on many topics from the AIA, NCARB, and books written by practitioners. In the course students take multiple quizzes that clearly demonstrate a thorough understanding of content.

FINAL DRAFT

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
David Cronrath
Dean and Professor
School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation
University of Maryland
Campus Drive, Building 145, Room 1298
College Park, MD 20742-0001
(301) 405-8000
(301) 314-6784 fax
cronrath@umd.edu

Representing the AIA
Brian H. Griggs, AIA
Project Manager
Parkhill, Smith & Cooper, Inc.
1001 S Harrison, Suite A
Amarillo, TX 79101
(806) 376-8600
bgriggs@team-psc.com

Representing the AIAS
Michelle A. Morehead
105 N. 8th Street
Apt. 303
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402) 618-0479
michelleamorehead@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Paul G. May, AIA, LEED® AP
Miller Dunwiddie Architecture
123 North Third Street
Suite 104
Minneapolis, MN 55401
(612) 278-7712
(612) 337-0031 fax
pmay@millerdunwiddie.com

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

David Cronrath
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA

Brian H. Griggs, AIA
Team member

Representing the AIA

Michelle A. Morehead
Team member

Representing the AIAS

Paul G. May, AIA, LEED® AP
Team member

Representing the NCARB