**Philadelphia University
School of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

B. Arch (166-68 credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
4 April 2012

Table of Contents

I.   **Summary of Team Findings**

1.   **Team Comments & Visit Summary**

The team would like to thank the faculty, students and staff for the courtesies extended to it during the visit. The program was well-prepared and responsive in providing the team information needed to make a thorough review.

Founded in 1884 as the Philadelphia Textile School, Philadelphia University is steeped in a rich tradition of teaching and research in design-arts and professions. In July 2011, the University reorganized into three Colleges: the College of Design Engineering and Commerce, the College of Architecture and the Built Environment, and the College of Science, Health, and the Liberal Arts.

The campus dates from the late 18th century in an established, upper-middle class neighborhood. It is charming and, weather permitting, an appropriately scaled pedestrian campus. The campus is linear, creating walking distances of 10–15 minutes from end to end (approximately ½ mile). The architecture program is currently housed in multiple buildings, former residences, and in a sublevel of the student dining hall.

The university's reorganization, coupled with relatively new programs in Sustainable Design, Historic Preservation and Visual Studies, Graphic Design Communication, Industrial Design, Digital Design, Landscape Architecture, and Construction Management creates an ideal milieu for a multidisciplinary education in architecture, the arts, and construction.

This reorganization also responds to dynamic growth and change occurring in the profession of architecture. The team is confident the program is appropriately positioned for the future enabled by a more efficient curriculum delivery.

The program has attracted outstanding faculty over the years, a healthy mix of experience and youth. There is a clear focus on the mission of preparing a well-rounded student, equipped to rise in the professional world.

The team felt the program met a Condition for Accreditation and several Student Performance Criteria with distinction.

> PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM
> Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms & Student Performance Criteria

>> II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria:
>> Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

>> **A.6 Fundamental Design Skills**
>> **A.7 Use of Precedents**
>> **A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture**

>> Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:

>> **B.1 Pre-Design**

The university is in the final stages of selecting a new executive dean for the College of Architecture and the Built Environment. The program is also in the third year of a major curriculum revision. The impact of these factors, while viewed with optimism, is unknown.

2.   Conditions Not Met

1.2.3 Physical Resources (This condition has not been met over multiple visits and remains unmet.)
B.2 Accessibility
B.5 Life Safety
B.6 Comprehensive Design
II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

3.   Causes of Concern

A.   **Impact of Cumulative Change** – Over the past several years both the university and the College of Architecture have driven positive change from within. The university has reorganized its academic programs, grouping them into three colleges and altering the relationship between faculty, students, and administration. The impact these administrative changes will have on the College of Architecture is unknown.

In addition, fundamental curriculum changes are underway at the College of Architecture. The team noted the pace of change is rapid, and managing all aspects concurrently will be a challenge for the College of Architecture in the near term.

4.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)

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 (2006): The required information is published in the university catalog but is not published on the school's web site.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of public information was found on the internet **http://www.philau.edu/arch/prog_arch_NAAB.html and in the 2008-9 Undergraduate Catalog Philadelphia University, Page 30, under Professional Accreditation.** This condition is now met.

2004 Condition 6, Human Resources: Ability *The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty*

members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

Previous Team Report (2006): Philadelphia University has assembled a team of outstanding faculty members. Numerous adjunct faculty members complement a corps of about 10 full-time faculty. The balance between full-time and part-time faculty has appeared to reach a breaking point. In addition to full teaching and research/practice loads, the full-time faculty is responsible for advising almost 400 majors in the architecture programs, coordinating curricular areas. Inconsistent instruction in some courses indicates inadequate mentoring of the adjuncts by the core faculty and administration. Furthermore, the pay scale for adjuncts is much lower than peer schools, leading to rapid turnover in part time faculty.

The dean also serves as director of the architecture program, causing an unbalanced relationship between architecture, interior design, and landscape architecture.

FE Review (2009): The concerns in the 2006 VTR appear to have been met by several actions taken by the school. The appointment of Vini Nathan as dean and David Buege as director of the architectural program was accomplished in July 2008. Furthermore, there is also an associate dean for the school of architecture. There have been three full-time faculty appointments. The shop supervisor is now full-time rather than part-time. These steps address the issues of teaching/advising roles as well as the relationship between the architecture, interior design, and landscape architecture programs.

> **2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** University-wide administrative changes creating three colleges have redefined and separated the dean's and program director's roles and responsibilities, which has alleviated previous concerns. This condition is now met.

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 (2006): Physical resources continue to be lacking although some progress has been made since the previous visit.

Size issues noted by the previous team have been resolved through the expansion of the existing area into adjacent spaces. The facility itself, however, continues to be remote to upper level studios and even further from the school's new Manayunk (in town) campus where several third year studios are located.

The team is concerned about the continued use of "hot-desks" in the first and second year design studios although as "foundation studios" the team questions whether these are truly in the "professional track" which would make the exclusive desk a requirement. The school has attempted to improve conditions by providing project storage and locker areas within those studios so that students may leave project materials such as site models but the large item storage shelves are not secured. Whatever the applicability of the exclusive desk requirement, the team feels that if hot desks are to remain in use, the school should focus on providing better, secure storage so that each student may have access to such space. The facility also fails to provide acoustically adequate facilities. The team witnessed actual critiques in progress where ambient noise made for a non-workable learning environment.

Faculty office space remains a problem. Full-time faculty is forced to share limited and tight space with no opportunity for confidential discussions without leaving the area to seek such

accommodations. No designated office facilities (shared or otherwise) are available for adjunct faculty.

The lower level studio spaces in the A+D Center were extremely crowded and in certain areas, student work areas are on raised platforms (along exterior walls). The areas are at least 18 inches higher than adjacent floor areas without any edge or railing protection. Some tables are situated directly in front of the steps to and from these platforms raising additional safety issues. The heights of makeshift enclosures in the area leading toward one stairway are too high and block visibility of the Exit signs directing users to the stairs.

The lack of "review" space and limited availability of computer workstations were noted as problems by faculty and students.

In general, studio spaces lack sufficient power outlets for students' laptop computers and other devices. This was mentioned as a particular issue in the A&D center. More and more students are making use of laptops as a way of resolving access to computers; therefore the lack of power outlets has become worse.

Several comments were made concerning the limited hours of operations at both the Search building computer labs and the Manayunk campus spaces. In the case of Manayunk, an additional concern about the frequency and lack of availability of university-provided shuttle transportation to and from the area is a concern. We heard on several occasions that late night transportation is limited and sometimes not provided, leaving students to find alternative means of returning to the main campus

FE Review (2009): The focused evaluation report did not address the issues raised in the 2006 VTR; however, in email and telephone communication with Dean Vini Nathan, much additional information was received. The Smith House has undergone a major renovation and houses faculty offices and lecture space. It is a short walk from the architecture & design building, which houses dedicated architecture studios.

There are no longer any B. Arch programs on Manayunk, which address the transportation concerns.

Upper-level architecture studios and interior design studios have alternated by semester in sending several sections to other buildings, currently the newly renovated SEED Center.

Capital projects over the last two summers have increased electrical supply and power strips for student laptops in studio and lecture.

> **2012 Visiting Team Assessment:** Many concerns listed in the previous team's report regarding physical resources remain and are concerns of this team. This condition is not met.

2004 Criterion 13.34, Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of *the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice*

Previous Team Report (2006): Given the amount of material covered by both professional practice courses, one might assume that issues of ethics and professional judgment must certainly be covered in sufficient detail during the two semesters. However, no evidence of this was found in the materials provided for this course or in the material for any other course.

We did find papers on ethics in one of the professional writing courses; however, this appears to be a singular "assignment," not a topic of discussion, and the assignment was not common to all sections. Notwithstanding this finding, the team feels that this criterion is of sufficient importance that it should be handled within professional curriculum and not peripherally.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in course Arch 505. This condition is now met.

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

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The architecture program exemplifies outcome-based learning embodied in the Nexus learning model, documented in the publication, *The Theory and Practice of Teaching at Philadelphia University*. As it relates to architecture education, it encourages a holistic, practical and liberal arts-based delivery through available offerings outside the architecture program.

Recent reorganizations have turned the university's largest school, the School of Architecture, into the smallest college, the College of Architecture and the Built Environment; however, the architecture program remains the largest individual program on campus. The visiting team recognized the profound influence the architectural model of learning has had on the formation of curricula for other colleges. The team is hopeful the university will recognize this positive influence as future capital investment decisions are made.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The program instills a positive and respectful learning environment. Students actively seek community initiatives through involvement in community-based design projects; recently for seniors and the disadvantaged. In general a culture of sharing, respect, and optimism is promulgated within the university culture. The architecture program's studio culture policy is posted

throughout studios and classrooms. Students and faculty groups developed the document collaboratively. Student participation in campus organizations has raised an awareness of issues of diversity and social justice among students. Examples within the program include LEAD (Leadership Engagement Assessment Development), NOMA/S (National Organization of Minority Architects), and a fifth-year student project for the design of a charter high school for architecture and design (CHAD). Other examples of student participation in a positive learning culture and social equity include active chapters of the American Institute of Architecture Students and Freedom by Design.

I.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 Visiting Team Assessment: The faculty, students, and staff not only make positive contributions to the architectural educational offerings of the institution, but also through interdisciplinary initiatives create a unique opportunity for learning within the university and beyond. The architecture faculty is committed, competent, and collegial.

   The transition between the old and new curricula has created minor growing pains; however, when fully implemented, it promises to deliver a more holistic, practical, and comprehensive education for future architects.

   Professor Hermann oversees ePortfolio Implementation, Nexus Grants, and the SERVE-101 Learning Community. Professor Frosten is in charge of the Sustainable Station+ project and serves as a textile engineering student's thesis advisor. Professor Kratzer's students collaborated with industrial designers and occupational therapists on an adaptable hygiene station for universal use. These examples of collaborative models regularly engage faculty and students from multiple disciplines.

   Faculty is involved in pedagogical initiatives, practice, and scholarly research activities. They have received recognition in the form of the President's Award for Teaching Excellence and the Lindback Distinguished Teaching Award.

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.

---

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Students are being prepared for their future careers as demonstrated in the collaborative, interdisciplinary student work. Student-led initiatives and programs create opportunities for students to engage and apply their skill sets in university-wide and community activities. Adjunct faculty allow for professional opportunities within their educational experience. Current curriculum changes taking place are well received by the students and viewed to be more holistic and consolidated.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The university has a history of educating graduates to move into the professional world; students are well prepared. ARE pass rates are competitive with sister programs in the area. Students are aware of IDP and ARE protocols. Some are currently registered in the IDP process.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The program has been vocal about its mission of practice-based education balanced with strong design consciousness, an opinion supported by student feedback. This strategy is reinforced by the engagement of local adjunct professors, a relationship which has historically been a conduit for bringing workplace perspectives to the academy while offering opportunities for employment. During non-recession years, the school has had success with job placement. In addition, opportunities have been created for students to collaborate across disciplines within studios or to engage in projects that extend into the community. The school has followed changing digital methodologies by integrating newer technology and software into the curriculum, offering students a competitive advantage upon graduation. Parallel to these efforts, the school continues to recognize the importance of handcraft and the ability to design and create without digital tools.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found evidence that community outreach projects are a priority of the program. Community outreach is one of eight initiatives in the program's strategic plan and recent projects demonstrate this priority.

Specific examples include studio work in Arch 311, on urban food deserts, and in Arch 502, a design-build project to house the homeless, in working with a nonprofit client specializing in this field.

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.

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Long-range planning is outlined by the eight objectives stated in the "Architecture Program Strategic Plan 2009–14."

1. Updating the B. Arch curriculum
2. Improving and consolidating facilities
3. Developing, maintaining, and assessing a revised Studio Culture Document
4. Improving students' opportunities for interdisciplinary experiences
5. Increasing students' opportunities for community involvement.
6. Improving and integrating technology in teaching.
7. Increasing involvement of alumni and diversity of students.
8. Increasing interaction with other architecture programs

The program identifies three checkpoints used to verify continuous improvement: self-assessment, approval of changes, and implementation. The team assumes faculty are part of the planning process.

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.

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

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The program currently undergoes multiple internal and peer reviews including the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools periodic review, a 2006 self-study for the Middle States Decennial Review, and the Architecture Program Advisory Board's input. In addition, the program director and all full-time faculty members evaluate learning progress toward student outcomes. Evidence is found in the APR, pages 20 and 21.

The Architecture Program Assessment Plan 2010 for the Architecture Program was found on pages 22, 23, and 24 of the APR; recommendations are implemented through full-time faculty subcommittees.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:
▪ *Faculty & Staff:*
   o *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 descriptions[2].*
   o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
   o *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.*
   o *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.*
   o *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.*
   o *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 Visiting Team Assessment: Faculty and staff interviewed and reviewed are adequate for the program. Policies are documented in the Employee Handbook dated January 1, 2009, found in the team room.

The program has a dedicated faculty and staff, and a competent director, Dr. David Breiner, who is highly regarded and respected by his peers. The associate dean, Craig Griffin, is a long-term contract full-time faculty member.

The core faculty teaching load is 12 units per semester and typically includes 3-4 instructional courses in addition to advising/coordinator duties and research or practice, including faculty development, which is considered heavy.

There is currently an interim dean for the college, and announcement of the new dean is expected soon.

Core faculty includes the following:
• two tenured faculty (including the director)
• one long-term (seven year) renewable contract
• one long-term (five year) renewable contract
• two tenure track (probationary) faculty
• four faculty (probationary) with renewable contracts
• one visiting contract faculty

---

[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.

The current program head splits time equally between administrative duties and teaching. There is a diverse and competent pool of 65 adjunct faculty; half of the adjunct faculty are registered architects. Eight full-time faculty members are licensed architects; one is in the process.
Five faculty committees support university academic and instructional objectives: academic standards, undergraduate curriculum, personnel, tenure and promotion, and faculty affairs and development, as well as three advocates: Nexus Learning, academic advising, and assessment.

The administrative staff of six, including shop manager, is dedicated and content with their work environment; however, the team's consensus is that they are overworked.

- *Students:*
  - o *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.*
  - o *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 Visiting Team Assessment: Transfer students are satisfied with the placement they receive at the institution; however, there is no documented rubric for placement of transfer students from outside the university.

Students experience inconsistent advising from their respective assigned faculty members. The team noted that the faculty has made an effort to create an advising system that supports students from year to year, allowing for an advisor to change advisees on a routine basis over the student's academic career. Based on student comments, additional effort to ensure consistent communication may be necessary for student advising to be optimally effective.

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 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 Visiting Team Assessment: A new dean will soon be named to replace the interim who currently leads the College of Architecture and the Built Environment.

The current administrative structure consists of eleven full-time faculty, including the program director who is a tenured associate professor. See I.2.1 for a list of the contract status of the faculty.

Even considering possible changes, the program currently contains sufficient administrative structure and conforms to the conditions for accreditation. It is assumed this structure is expected to continue and become more robust when the new dean arrives.

- **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 Visiting Team Assessment: Faculty, staff, and students have opportunities to serve in program and university-level governance. Faculty serve on various standing committees (see I.2.1), participate in the faculty senate and in the development of the program curriculum. Full-time faculty are expected to attend monthly faculty meetings and to serve on program and university standing committees.

A new manager of academic operations allows the program more time to focus on curriculum development and assessment, and opportunities for students.

Both students and faculty serve on the Studio Culture Policy task force. They report at monthly faculty meetings and students participate in the university-wide student government association. The team noted students do not have equal opportunities in the governance of the program from lack of proportional representation seen in curriculum development committees and in student advising.

I.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 inadequate for the program

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Previous teams have reported deficiencies in physical resources, which, for the most part, remain unaddressed. (Descriptions are found in the 2000 and 2006 VTRs.)

Although all programs are now housed on campus (previously some were off campus), physical resources continue to be lacking due to the programs being delivered in five separate campus locations over a ¾ mile distance. Faculty and staff offices are in multiple locations, making program collaboration and coordination, even with technologies like email and the Internet, difficult.

The team discussed "hot versus cold" desks at length. The program still uses hot desks at the first and second year levels. For second year professional track students, hot desks are inconsistent with accepted practice for students in a professional curriculum (2006 VTR). Similarly, acoustics remain an issue due to turnover of space, space turnover noise and marginal pin-up areas.

Full-time faculty office space remains a problem and is unavailable for adjunct faculty.

Weber Hall (shop) is deficient due to insufficient ventilation, roof leaks, and inoperable windows (ventilation). Students requested appropriate areas to spray (paint, glue, and weld).

In summary, it is clear facility issues such as location, quality, and adjacency are chronic deficiencies (2006 and 2000 VTRs) affecting the efficacy of investments made in resources to deliver the curriculum.

Enrollment is slightly down from the last visit, which may be attributable to the national economic downturn or possibly factors like those observed herein. The team feels potential within the program is likely being compromised due to the lack of appropriate facilities.

I.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 Visiting Team Assessment: Financial resources are sufficient to conduct the program. Salaries are in line with comparable programs on campus as discussed in a meeting with Ms. Lynda Irwin, manager of academic operations, and Mr. James Hartman, chief financial officer of the university.

I.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 Visiting Team Assessment: The 21-year-old Paul J. Gutman Library contains approximately 148,000 volumes and provides the program and other integrated disciplines a broad array of resources. Located immediately adjacent to the A+D Center (architecture and design center – the former campus library) and campus core, it provides convenient access for upper level architecture students. Ms. Brynne Norton, the library's liaison to the School of Architecture, handles faculty and student requests on a case-by-case basis. Reasonable requests for additions to the collection are rarely denied. The Gutman staff provides numerous student instructional sessions, teaching resources for the architecture curriculum, and faculty support. Freshmen are trained in resource access and retrieval. The team felt students are pleased with library resources and they are sufficient for the program's, the student's, and the faculty's needs.

PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports[3]. *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.*

---

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

- o *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
  - ▪ *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
- o *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
  - ▪ *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
- o *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 Visiting Team Assessment: Reports were supplied in the APR and more detailed information was provided in the Team room. Gender diversity is reasonably well addressed. Cultural and ethnic diversity could be better.

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 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 Visiting Team Assessment: Annual reports were provided in the APR and in the team room and were adequate.

I.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 exhibit[4] 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 Visiting Team Assessment: Faculty is well qualified to deliver the curriculum; most are licensed and engaged in research and outreach. Two faculty members have their PhD.

The faculty exhibit was delivered digitally on a laptop in the team room. Many have active practices.

---

[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 Visiting Team Assessment: Documentation of course work was provided in the team room in course notebooks, College of Architecture reports and policy documents, university documents and student work. Student work reviewed clearly indicated high and low pass and was organized under clearly labeled course headings.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE
                CRITERIA

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in work produced in writing Arch-505 & Arch-506. In absence of a rubric, it was not clear how the papers are scored with respect to high and low pass; however, evidence of students' writings found in the AHIST-305 and 306 verify compliance with the criterion.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Compliance with this criterion was evident in student work produced in course ARCH 302, which clearly shows evidence of process thinking in design development.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in ARCH 302 and ARCHDSN 208. Student work demonstrates an ability to analyze a specific site, client needs, time and place, conceive a developed concept, and document such in an effective integration of media and models. Documentation found in ARCHDSN 208 reveals compliance with the criterion and the ability to communicate formal elements of the design process.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of illustrating and identifying materials assemblies was found in Arch 211 Building Technology, which was retired in fall of 2010.

In the new curriculum, evidence of developing wall sections in response to environmental factors is found in Arch 212 Technology 2 - Passive Systems and Building Enclosure - assignment 1a, Site Design.

Evidence of training in technical documentation is found in Arch 408 Visualization II, placing an emphasis on BIM and Revit. Assignment #3 covers assembling outline specifications.

The replacement course for Arch 408 Visualization II is Arch 416 and has no completed work available for review.

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

[X] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Although the team found little evidence of teaching methods for data gathering in development of investigative skills, evidence of this ability was found in Arch-301, Arch-501, and Arch-311.

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

[X] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is met with distinction. Evidence was found in studios ARCH 201 and 202, where students explore the natural environment, the site, and context to form their designs. Many first and second year design projects demonstrate an ability to work at a range of scales, using a variety of building types; including documentation in both 2-D and 3-D forms.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is met with distinction. Evidence was found in ARCH 202 and ARCH 501 and in several other courses. Projects showed thoughtful consideration and either complementary or divergent use of the documented precedents.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance was found in course work in ADFND 101 and ADFND 102.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is met with distinction. An understanding of a range of cultural dwelling concepts is found in Arch 202 studio work. An understanding of history and culture is found in both AHIST 205 and 206. The course work is exemplary in both written and graphic content and in the students' growth in ability over the duration of the course.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in AHIST 206 and AHIST 306. Students gain an understanding of cultural diversity through a series of structured investigations and subsequent critical analyses.

ARCH 302- Design VI work is exemplary and included several Habitat for Humanity projects. Students show evidence of meeting the criterion in ARCH 311 Design 5, which included the Food Desert Project. These projects show students have a clear understanding of their role and responsibility as an architect.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in Arch-301, Arch-502, and Arch-511; however, the course pedagogy does not appear to include instruction of various research methodologies.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The students' work demonstrates ability in building abstract relationships and understanding the impact of ideas based on analysis of theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This knowledge is gained from a broad exposure to interdisciplinary opportunities. Students are inquisitive and seem to appreciate people, place, and context, as well as needs of the community and the society. They demonstrate the ability to communicate in a range of media including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

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] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is met with distinction. Studio projects illustrate contextual, environmental and regulatory investigations clearly and concisely. Evidence of space and inventory assessment and analysis of existing buildings was found in ARCH 202; site assessment ability was found in ARCH 212; analysis of relevant laws and standards was found in ARCH 501, programming in relation to client needs was found in ARCH 502. Evidence of application of zoning regulations was found in ARCH 505. The team felt work produced in these courses was exemplary.

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] Not Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence found was not consistent or sufficient to comply with this criterion.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance is found in student work in courses ARCH 212, ARCH 312 and ARCH 511.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in ARCH 301 (Studio V). In the new curriculum, site design issues are now handled in ARCH-201 Design 3. Exemplary work was found in ARCH 501's "Nicetown Center for Urban Renewal."

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

[X] Not Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence presented was not consistent or sufficient to comply with the requirement specified for this criterion.

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 **A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture**	**B.7. Environmental Systems** **B.9.Structural Systems**
B.5. Life Safety	

[X] Not Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Projects reviewed did not consistently indicate an ability to implement principles of life safety or compliance with the requirements of the ADA as specified in the detailed requirements of the Comprehensive Design criterion**.**

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance with this criterion was found in the ARCH 408.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of compliance was found in course work in ARCH 403 and 404.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of projects complying with this criterion was found in courses ARCH 303, 304, 309, 310, and 405.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of projects complying with this criterion was found in courses ARCH-211 Tech II (old curriculum), ARCH-212 Tech 2 (new curriculum), ARCH-402 Design VIII/Tectonics (old), ARCH-501 Design IX/Comprehensive (old), ARCHDSN-408 Vis II (old), and ARCH-511 Tech V/Tech capstone (old).

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found in ARCH511 where students comprehend and integrate building service systems into their projects. Review of the process books revealed students possess the required understanding of building service systems.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Students' understanding of materials and assemblies was found in ARCH 210 Technology 1: Materials and Methods. Evidence of an understanding of construction materials was found in ARCH 501 Design 9: Architecture Studio Brief #2 and in resultant studio work.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Student work demonstrated a comprehension of building systems and constructability. Designs demonstrate an integration of sustainable concepts. The team did not find consistent evidence to demonstrate the requisite ability to integrate life safety concepts or principles of accessibility in their designs.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Collaborative team works in studios ARCH-501 and ARCH-511 meet the requirement for ability in this criterion.

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

[X] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in student examinations in courses AHIST 205 – HISTORY 1 and AHIST 206 – HISTORY 2.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion was satisfied in courses ARCH 302, ARCH 502, 505 and 506. There is a clear understanding of user group needs, and public and community domains; however, an understanding of the interaction of the client role is not well established in targeted courses. Evidence of significant client interaction was seen in ARCH 402 but was inconsistent across the multiple courses offered.

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 Visiting Team Assessment:: Evidence was found in ARCH 505 and 506. Understanding is developed through a series of written papers and responses with a focus on application through the students' practice-oriented education experiences. A prevalence of interdisciplinary team projects demonstrates the students' understanding of this criterion.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in student work in Professional Management I and II (ARCH 505 and ARCH 506).

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in Arch-502, a sustainability design competition in ARCH-301 "Social Public Good." It was also found in collaborative projects like the "TD Module" in ARCH 402 – Design VIII.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is being met in courses ARCH 505 and 506, Professional Management I and II, offered by adjunct professor Hoffman.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Ethical concepts are being taught in ARCH 505 and 506 Professional Practice and Professional Management through course readings.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Student work in ARCH 302 satisfied this criterion. New curriculum course ARCH 311 is designed to fulfill the requirement moving forward.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The program satisfies this realm with a strong professional practice sequence, coupled with placing students in a series of settings with clients. Students collaborate in both course work and studio work; the quality of the projects suggests successful group efforts.

A client's role in the process is taught in professional practice and through real-life clients who visit the school including firemen, bank executives, and the homeless.

Project management concepts from industry are covered in professional practice classes; this knowledge is reinforced through adjunct faculty who bring lessons-learned into the studio.

Leadership opportunities are found in student organizations such as AIA/S, Freedom by Design and group site analysis opportunities found early in studio projects.

Students are interested in environmental and socioeconomic challenges; heard in their testimonials and seen in extramural work activities.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: A copy of the statement of accreditation status from the Middle States Commission of Higher Education is in the APR. The university is fully accredited.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The program follows NAAB-recommended degree terminology. The curriculum (old and new) is clearly described on charts found on pages114 and 115 of the APR by year, credit hours, course category, and title.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The architecture program received its first accreditation in 2000. Since that time, the curriculum is reviewed on a routine basis by the full- time faculty. All full-time faculty serve on the curriculum committee including special meetings with students for their input.

The ongoing NAAB accreditation process also stimulates curriculum review and improvement. Similarly, the Middle States regional accreditation process coupled with the decennial evaluation of 2006 serve as stimuli for curriculum review.

Internally, curriculum evolution occurs through the strategic planning process. The recent adoption of a new university strategic plan crafted under president Spinelli serves to sharpen the curriculum focus. Academic change has been driven by changes in university governance, starting with the provost whose position is designed to lead and support faculty in generating curricular change. At the upper levels of university administration, the position of executive dean of research and a director of teaching innovation and Nexus Learning havebeen created to directly support academic incentives in the strategic plan, and a director of institutional research ensures that decision making is data-driven.

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] Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: As stated in the APR, "Philadelphia University does not offer a preparatory or pre-professional program." In discussion with the program director, new students wishing to enroll in the accredited architecture program must meet university-established minimum academic requirements and must submit a design portfolio for review by a faculty committee.

Students already enrolled in another accredited 5-year B. Arch. curriculum who meet minimum academic requirements and are interested in transferring to the Philadelphia University's program are required to submit a portfolio to the program director for admission review.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The program includes the exact language of the Statement on NAAB Accredited Degrees both in the hard-copy catalogs and on the Philadelphia University Architecture web site.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation are available to all students, parents, and faculty through the Philadelphia University College of Architecture web site.

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.aias.org
    www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Not Met

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Listed links were not found on the Philadelphia University Career Services Center web site; however, Trish Shafer, director of the Career Services Center, confirmed that the links were not available because the web site was down during the visit. A recheck after the visit confirmed they are available.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Public access to APRs and VTRs is made available through email by contacting David Breiner, program director. The team notes it is preferable to provide these documents for public downloading via the college's web site.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: Pass rates for Philadelphia University students are available on the NCARB web site and are comparable to competitive institutions in the area.

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 Philadelphia University, *APR,* pp 1-2.

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

Reference Philadelphia University, APR, pp. 2-3.

C.   Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Philadelphia University, APR, pp. 16-20.

D.   Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Philadelphia University, APR, pp. 20-31.

2.   Conditions Met with Distinction

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM
Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms & Student
Performance Criteria

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria:
Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

A.6 Fundamental Design Skills
A.7 Use of Precedents
A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:

B.1 Pre-Design

3.   The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Marzette Fisher
ArchitectureWorks, LLC
PO Box 130991
Birmingham, AL 35213-0991
(205) 515-4882
marzettefisher@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
Leit Downing, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP BD+C
POB 40826
Portland, OR 97240
(907) 957-1316
leit.downing@gmail.com

Representing the AIAS
Nicholas J. Burger
120 Daniel Drive
Clemson, SC 29631
(540) 455-0368
nburger@clemson.edu

Representing the ACSA
Mitra Kanaani, Chair
Undergraduate Department
NewSchool of Architecture and Design
1249 F. Street
San Diego, CA 92101-6634
(619) 235-4100 ext. 109
(858) 663-2127 mobile
mitra621@aol.com

Non-voting member
Janice M. Woodcock, AIA, LEED®AP
Principal
Woodcock Design, Inc.
2047 Rittenhouse Square
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(267) 738-0956
wc2047@verizon.net

IV.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Marzette Fisher   **Representing the NCARB**
Team Chair

Leit Downing, AIA, NCARB, LEED®AP, BD+C   **Representing the AIA**
Team member

Nicholas J. Burger   **Representing the AIAS**
Team member

Mitra Kanaani   **Representing the ACSA**
Team member

Janice M. Woodcock, AIA, LEED®AP   **Non-voting member**