



University of the District of Columbia
College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences
Department of Architecture and Community Planning

Initial Accreditation Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture

Track I [preprofessional degree + 49 graduate credit hours]

Track II [nonprofessional degree + 85 credit hours]

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
October 25, 2017

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

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

Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	1
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	2
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation	9
Part One (I): Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	9
Part Two (II): Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	19
Part Three (III): Annual and Interim Reports	32
IV. Appendices	33
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	33
2. Team SPC Matrix	34
3. The Visiting Team	35
V. Report Signatures	36

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank Dean Sabine O'Hara, Department Chair Susan Kliman, and the UDC faculty and staff for their hard work and attention to detail in preparation for the visit. The visit proceeded smoothly, with easy access to information and great support from the staff. The hospitality afforded to us by all was very much appreciated.

The university is committed to establishment of a professional degree program. The central administration (the dean of the College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences [CAUSES], in which the program is located, the provost, and the university president) expects this program to become a center of excellence. Land grant-based initiatives bring the architecture program's expertise and knowledge to bear on the wider CAUSES focus on urban agriculture, sustainability, and community health. It was apparent that the entire university community is energized and in full support of the establishment of a graduate level, accredited program in architecture.

The team found the architecture program at the University of the District of Columbia to be a small but lively environment devoted to the mission of the program and university. The mission regarding the architect's role in serving the community, with a focus on sustainability and the urban land grant, outreach, and the public resource role of the university, is well defined and is clearly articulated at all levels. The program collaborates with city and federal agencies to great advantage and strives to serve the local population.

The faculty is engaged and enthusiastic. The team was impressed by the faculty's dedication to the needs of the students. The mutual respect between the students and faculty was obvious. The university's recent renovation of the architecture program's spaces has provided the physical resources necessary for the program to thrive.

The students are studying in a commuter, after-work-hours situation (since many of them work and have other obligations stemming from being older than the average college student), and they have the energy and will to achieve this balancing act in their lives. Student organizations, including AIAS and NOMAS, are strong, and students understand quite clearly how their education will help their professional advancement. Student satisfaction seems high.

The administrative structure of the program is appropriate, with growth being evidenced in recent hires for full-time faculty and a program chair who best addresses the need for resources, curriculum, and student satisfaction.

The team recognizes the distinctive difference that this program's mission brings to our profession. This program is active in providing greater access to a career in architecture. Everyone involved in the program seems eager to strike a balance between the program's mission and professional standards, with good progress in this regard since the last visit.

Having an urban land-grant university in our nation's capital is unique. It succeeds with support from both the District municipality and the federal government. It attends closely to the needs of the local populace, while also enjoying a rich setting of international agencies and embassies, national civic debate, and a city that is growing and thriving.

Based on review of the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation, these attributes speak well to the potential of the program to progress to the next stage.

b. Conditions Not Achieved

Part II Student Performance Criteria (Total of 26)

SPC A.2 Design Thinking Skills (Ability)

SPC A.6 Use of Precedents (Ability)

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Previous Visiting Team Causes of Concern

a. Design Thinking

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The team finds that design skills and conceptual thinking, cited as weaknesses in the last visit, continue to be a concern. The cogent presentation and graphic and written representation of ideas used to determine a design direction are so central to the basic skills of an architect. We understand that there has been additional emphasis on design skills in the Basic Design and Communication courses; however, that effort has not yet been realized in subsequent courses/studios.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This cause of concern is now an SPC and the team has determined it to be **Not Met**. There has been increased emphasis on development of these skills in the curriculum, and students have made progress in addressing issues of verbal and graphic communications skills, but there is still a lack of critical inquiry. See SPC A.2 Design Thinking Skills.

b. Diversity

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: While the programs have been housed in a Historically Black University, the global and cultural diversity criteria in the SPC are not sufficiently introduced. The advantage of being in the nation's capital brings added richness to the programs through the city's abundance of embassies.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: Global and cultural diversity have been addressed in the History and Theory course, in the new Critical Issues course, and in the selection of thesis topics the students pursued.

c. Range of "High Pass" to "Low Pass"

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The distinction between "high pass" and "low pass" was often difficult to discern. The team felt that the faculty should review its criteria for determining these designations.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: Some of the classes offered at the graduate level had very few students, so there previously may been insufficient examples to choose from to create a distinction between high-pass and low-pass work. The examples provided to

this visiting team continue to be limited based on current enrollment in the program. However, examples were distinct enough to provide an adequate separation between high- and low-pass work.

d. Integrated Building Practices

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The programs have placed emphasis on the acquisition of technical skills to provide students with the means and opportunity to apply their knowledge in the marketplace. The team was concerned that, while the students were introduced to the principles of and criteria for integrated building practices, there was decidedly less ability for them to translate that knowledge into a design problem. Skills introduced at the lower levels did not find their way to the visual and graphic representation of projects at the upper levels. Inconsistent application of accessibility, site design and analysis, construction materials, spatial quality and organization, and basic information such as scale and orientation made them difficult to identify, or they were absent in the materials presented.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The programs continue to place emphasis on the acquisition of technical skills to provide students with the means and opportunity to apply their knowledge in the marketplace. The work presented under the new Realm C demonstrated that students are beginning to succeed in the translation of knowledge to their design problems. Skills introduced at the lower levels are being demonstrated at the upper levels, particularly in the visual and graphic representation of projects and the integration of various elements in design. The materials presented showed a better understanding of the application and integration of accessibility, site design, analysis, construction materials, and spatial quality and organization.

e. Digital and Three-Dimensional Representation

2015 Visiting Assessment: The programs are restricted in their ability to represent their work through the construction of three-dimensional models. The lack of modeling capabilities has limited the students' ability to explore site conditions, design alternatives, structural typologies, and project representation. Without shop equipment, laser cutters, or the possibility of using CNC applications, the students are forced to work with cardboard, balsa wood, and foam core models, with little variation in scale and without the option of producing multiple site, structural, or formal studies. The widespread exploration of parametric design has introduced the potential for "mass-produced" architectural elements, 3-D printed plug-ins, and the use of robotics in the construction industry. The inability to introduce students to the ramifications of these technologies leaves a gap in their knowledge base.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The department has increased its emphasis on producing models and has purchased additional equipment to produce 3D models. Equipment includes a 3-D printer, four MakerBot 3D printers, and 2 laser cutters, as well as increased access to the university shop by all students. Students regularly use two- and three-dimensional computer programs to develop presentation documents.

f. Expectation of Scholarship

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The lack of engagement of the faculty in scholarship and research and/or reflective practice was mentioned in the 2013 VTR. While new faculty have been added to the program since then, there is no evidence that the activity level of the faculty has changed or evolved in this regard. It is acknowledged that the faculty members are dedicated and that they have devoted themselves to teaching.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: There is increased focus on faculty scholarship by both the dean and department chair. Faculty hired since the last visit has begun to engage in scholarly research, especially in collaboration with the agriculture faculty and in conjunction with the school's sustainability initiative. At the time of this visit, the department chair is conducting a research project, a new assistant professor is about to have a book published, and a senior Associate professor regularly presents papers at professional conferences, among several other examples.

g. Institutional Support

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The students and the faculty noted the impact of operational weaknesses within the university. Financial aid, admissions, and information technology are areas that have created difficulties for the programs. It is noted that the new president and the newly appointed executive vice president have acknowledged these deficiencies in institutional support.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found evidence of full institutional support from all levels of the school's and the university's leadership.

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

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: Students know how to communicate verbally. Digital production is not strong enough, and the program has devoted new faculty talent toward addressing this. Writing skills are not strong, and they are not in evidence throughout the curriculum.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that criterion "Communication Skills" (Ability) has been **Met**.

i. 2009 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.

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: Design thinking was barely adequate in student work and was not strong enough (see Causes of Concern above). There was no evidence of programming or pre-design/design process work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that criterion "Design Thinking Skills" (Ability) remains **Unmet**.

- j. **2009 Criterion 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.**

2015 Team Assessment: While precedents were introduced in some courses, there was little evidence of this criterion in the design work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that this criterion “Use of Precedents” remains **Unmet**.

- k. **2009 Criterion A.9., Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including X 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**

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: As noted in Causes of Concern, there was little attention paid to global culture, and awareness of historical traditions seemed thin.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that this criterion “Historical Traditions and Global Culture” has been **Met**.

- l. **2009 Criterion 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**

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The graduate degree-path students, the Track II students, were of a more diverse population and had studio work to support an awareness of cultural diversity; however, the undergraduate Track I students remained primarily focused on their immediate context/population, and, given the mission of the university, scant opportunity was provided through coursework or projects to reinforce this criterion. The program is not drawing enough on its proximity to embassies and international NGOs to strengthen this learning.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found that this criterion “Cultural Diversity” has been **Met**.

- m. **2009 Criterion 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**

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found no evidence of programming ability in the student work. In discussions with the faculty, it appeared that this might be an oversight in preparation of the team room, as the faculty members say that this criterion is covered in the Professional Ethics and Practice course and in the Materials and Methods course. However, the team would expect to see evidence of it in the studio projects.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: There was sufficient evidence in the work product provided to show that students have developed the ability to both prepare a program and interpret it. The team found that this criterion “Pre-Design” has been **Met**.

- n. **2009 Criterion 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.**

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: The student work showed that a focus on accessibility was lacking. Accessibility is considered in ARCP-201/ARAC-602, but the ability to design for accessibility is incomplete. Bathrooms shown are not fully accessible, nor is any consideration of site issues and level changes demonstrated. Evidence of solutions incorporating accessibility is lacking throughout the studio work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This ability criterion has been combined into a more general “Codes and Regulations” SPC as B.3. We found evidence in the work product that this criterion “Accessibility” had been **Met**. However, it should be noted that accessibility, as we have come to understand the definition of that word in the built environment world, is not acknowledged or addressed as fully in the thesis projects (ARCP 502 and ARCP 550) as it would be in practice.

- o. **2009 Criterion B.4., Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.**

2015 Visiting Team Assessment: There was little evidence of site plans in the design work, and the courses did not address this ability, based on what was in the course notebooks. The ability to conduct site analysis was well demonstrated, particularly in ARCP-506 and 502. The ability to manipulate a site and respond to issues such as soils, building orientation, topography, and site drainage was inadequately demonstrated.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: In the 2014 Conditions, this criterion is now B.2. Examples were found in the student work where site design was adequately addressed, including discussions of site analysis, constraints analysis, and topography considerations. The team found that the “Site Design” criterion has been **Met**.

- p. **2009 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
A.4 Technical Documentation
A.5 Investigative Skills
A.8 Ordering Systems
A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
B.2 Accessibility
B.3 Sustainability
B.4 Site Design

B.5 Life Safety

B.7. Environmental Systems

B.9. Structural Systems

2015 Team Assessment: The studio designs lacked design thinking skills, an awareness of and the use of precedents, a broad global focus, and an ability to assess and design the sites of the projects. In addition, there was no evidence of the ability to use universal design. There was no evidence of integrated building systems and environmental systems in the designs.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: 2009 Criterion B.6 Comprehensive Design has been eliminated. This material is included in the 2014 Conditions as part of Realm C, which includes three SPC (C.1, C.2, and C.3). The team found that the three Realm C SPC have been **Met**.

- q. **2009 Criterion 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.**

2015 Team Assessment: This understanding was not shown either in the coursework or the studio designs. An introduction to environmental systems in buildings was evident in ARCP-246/ARAC-646. However, student work in this area was mostly missing, making it difficult to assess student understanding. Environmental systems appeared to be studied at the city-wide level, resulting in a clearer understanding of the impact of building activity on the city. Unfortunately, the impact of these systems on building design was not reflected in the studio work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This understanding SPC has been changed to SPC B6. There was enough evidence in the work product provided to show that the SPC was being **Met** at the building level. However, the level of understanding evidenced in the work was only basic.

- r. **2009 Criterion 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**

2015 Team Assessment: There was little evidence of an understanding of building service systems integration in the studio work and in the relevant courses that introduce this emphasis. Some introduction to building systems and their integration was evident in ARCP-246/ARAC-646. However, the amount of work presented was inadequate to evaluate student learning. Little understanding of the appropriate integration of these systems and their potential impact on the design of a building was evident in the studio work.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: This understanding SPC has been changed to SPC B.9 Building Service Systems. There was sufficient evidence in the work product provided to see that building systems integration has been fully considered in the project examples.

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 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.

2015 Team Assessment: This does not yet apply to the program, as it needs to be accredited before its students can pursue licensure.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment: No change. The program is not yet accredited.

III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution and its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

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

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

Described

Not Described

2017 Analysis/Review:

Originally founded in 1851 as a school for African American girls and after undergoing numerous changes and consolidations, the University of the District of Columbia was officially designated by the U.S. Department of Education in 1999 as one of the nation’s Historically Black Colleges and Universities. UDC is a congressionally-mandated land-grant university, and is unique in being the only urban land-grant university in the country.

In 1989, efforts were made to expand the two-year AET program into a full-fledged architecture program seeking NAAB accreditation, concurrent with founding the Architectural Research Institute (ARI), a research and professional practice clinic to the aspiring architecture program. While initial candidacy was originally granted in 1992, due to the budgetary crisis (the “control board” years), the UDC candidacy expired. In 2010 the existing architecture program was reorganized into a four-year BS of Architecture. UDC sought candidacy for its first professional degree Master of Architecture program and admitted its initial class of M. Arch. students. NAAB granted candidacy status to UDC’s M. Arch. program in 2013.

In 2012, the Department of Architecture and Urban Sustainability was relocated from the School of Engineering to the newly formed College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences. CAUSES also provides a home for the land-grant centers that are closely aligned with the academic programs.

Architecture Program and the Institutional Setting

The goals and objectives of the architecture program are well aligned with those of the college and the larger university. One of the central elements of the UDC mission is to provide cutting- edge technology and other relevant infrastructural support to the District of Columbia. The architecture program, as part of the CAUSES, is strategically placed to make a significant impact. Noteworthy are collaborative opportunities with the CAUSES Center for Urban Agriculture, the CAUSES Center for Sustainable Development and the Water Resources Research Institute. These land-grant centers and research institutes invite collaboration with the architecture program to address critical issues and growing concerns about food security, food safety, and sustainable resource management. Students in the

program are learning the problem-solving skills necessary to respond to the physical and cultural challenges of the 21st century, while engaging in experiential learning.

The Program

The hallmark of the architecture programs at UDC is the strong preparation to enter the workforce and the preparation for licensure to practice architecture. The studios enjoy low student/faculty ratios and provide both a social and curricular framework for students. Studios, and the supporting courses, focus on the technical aspects of architecture: building technology, structural systems, materials, and construction assemblies. These technical courses are supplemented by courses in history, theory, preservation, sustainability, and ethical and profession principles of architecture practice. Representational skills, including drawing, model making, and computer modeling are spread throughout the program, with an emphasis early in the program on construction documents to best position the students to obtain internships. Under Dr. Kliman's guidance there has been stronger alignment between the program's mission/vision and goals and the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

The program clearly understands, embraces, and supports its mission.

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Analysis/Review:

The studio culture policy is a living document in the department of architecture that is meant to serve as a guide for both students and staff and is presented at the fall meeting. It is distributed each fall in the program's student handbook. Although there have not been any changes in recent years, it is reviewed on a yearly basis by the AIAS chapter, the Student Advisory Board, and the faculty. Although faculty noted how they have worked to address their students' need to work full-time by moving the times of required courses to work around their schedules, the policy does not explicitly address time management. The document also states that students are expected to be in attendance for studio and attend extracurricular field trips and events in the DC Metro area that are associated with their program and course work. However, with talking with staff explained that they do make exceptions based on a students' personal lives and finances. Students said that all faculty have an open-door policy and are freely allowed to discuss any issues and concerns they may have about their course work or the program, and adjustments are made in due time.

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

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

2017 Analysis/Review:

Although there is no specific plan on increasing diversity, the university plans to continue to build on the community that it has already established. The college is located within an HBCU and is made up of students from across the globe, making for one of the most diverse educational communities in the country. The student population is currently 60 percent African American, 10 percent international, and 10 percent other.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

- A. Collaboration and Leadership.** The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.
- B. Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.
- C. Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.
- D. Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.
- E. Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment

Described

Not Described

2017 Analysis/Review:

The focus of I.1.4 Defining Perspectives has changed with the 2014 Conditions of Accreditation. This program has addressed the five Defining Perspectives in the following ways:

Collaboration and Leadership: The department resides in the College of Agriculture, Urban Sustainability and Environmental Sciences, which is a land-grant institution. Within the school is the Architecture Research Institute. Both the college and the institute provide a ready source of collaboration and leadership opportunities for faculty and students within the department, the school, and the DC community at large. The team saw evidence of joint research projects between the academic faculty and the land-grant faculty (i.e., architecture and agriculture) that would produce valuable data for both disciplines. The land-grant activities provide opportunities to students to develop leadership in community outreach situations that have a direct correlation to future roles in assessing client needs.

Design: As unlikely as it first seems, the connection to the School of Agriculture provides a direct pathway to understanding sustainability issues and finding solutions to site-related problems through the act of design and the problem-solving techniques developed by an architecture education.

Professional Opportunity: The Architectural Research Institute, with its many projects tied to the DC Department of Housing, and the community engagement requirements of the AG Extension component of the land-grant program of the School of Architecture provide awareness of many more career opportunities available to architecture students than might otherwise be provided by a more traditional architecture program.

Stewardship of the Environment: The mission of the college is to provide leadership in sustainability in the urban environment, in part by learning and interacting with the botanical world on a very practical level. Students in the architecture department are encouraged to collaborate and study with colleagues in the agriculture department to find solutions to problems that affect both realms.

Community and Social Responsibility: One of the missions of the University of the District of Columbia is to serve those who live in the community without regard for ability to pay. The college and, by extension, the department of architecture, as part of its land-grant mission, is charged with responsibility for community outreach. The department takes that responsibility seriously and is regularly engaged in the local community through the ARI, through community outreach, and through other participatory opportunities.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Analysis/Review:

The overarching planning objective of the UDC architecture program is to achieve initial accreditation by 2017. Continuous assessment and adaptation are organized and implemented toward achievement of that goal. The program enjoys the support of the other academic programs in CAUSES as well as the support of the CAUSES operations unit. The program also has the full support of the administration of CAUSES and the university in this endeavor. Through its monthly meetings, the architecture faculty serves as a “committee of the whole” to discuss items related to the overall program, curriculum, and

accreditation. Additional meetings with the full-time program faculty are held on an as-needed basis. Individual faculty members are tasked with leading initiatives.

UDC's current long-range plan, Vision 2020, was completed in 2014 as a precursor to the hiring of the current president. With this higher-level effort taking place, colleges within UDC—and, by extension, individual units—were asked to put their own long-term strategic plans on hold, pending finalization of the university's new plan under the new president, which has just been completed.

The college had its own strategic planning retreat in early August 2014. Out of that planning retreat, and ongoing efforts since, CAUSES has developed a strategic plan, and the units within the college have developed unit-specific strategic plans. On the college level, CAUSES seeks to actively contribute to the strategic objectives of the university and has developed three long-term strategic goals to accomplish this:

- (1) To be a leader in urban agriculture
- (2) To be a leader in urban sustainability
- (3) To be a university-wide resource in experiential learning and relevant research

The specific mission/vision/goals of the Department of Architecture (described on APR page 8) were developed in early 2016 within the overall framework of those of the university and CAUSES, along with the overarching plan of becoming an accredited program. The program chair is working with faculty to develop a strategic plan to accomplish the additional goals that relate closely to its mission and vision.

I.1.6 Assessment:

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

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

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Analysis/Review:

Program Self-Assessment

The UDC Department of Architecture is constantly evaluating the performance of its faculty, staff, and students and self-assessing its progress in relation to previously set goals. In addition, the program

assesses progress in relation to the external environment within CAUSES, at the university, and in the larger profession. Long-term strategic planning and visioning will continue to grow out of this ongoing self-assessment process. In 2016 the Middle States Commission on Higher Education conducted an institutional accreditation visit at UDC. The architecture program was an integral part of this process. UDC received distinction in its response to several standards—including the institution-wide culture of assessment/assessment process—and the university received a reaffirmation of its accreditation.

Curricular Assessment and Development

UDC has long used a course evaluation system for students to evaluate the quality of courses, instructors, and the infrastructure of the university. Students complete electronic evaluations at the end of each semester. Results of this electronic survey are compiled by the university and distributed to the colleges, which then provide the relevant results to each academic unit. The program director shares these results with the entire architecture faculty, and they are discussed during regular meetings.

In 2015, the university implemented the TK20 management system as a means of retaining the assessments and making them available for long-term data analysis. The documentation for each course provides the program with additional data when evaluating its overall curriculum and success in delivering the program.

The entire faculty meets monthly to discuss issues relevant to the department, including curriculum and student performance. Each year the department chair hosts an all-faculty meeting to review and discuss the studio sequence and curriculum. Examples of student work are displayed, and feedback on each studio is solicited to determine how closely the student work fits with the faculty's expectations. As a direct result of these discussions, the curriculum has been altered to add or remove classes, or modify course content.

In spring 2015, the chair formed an Architecture Student Advisory Board composed of representatives from the programs in the department. Faculty members nominate students to serve on the aAdvisory board. Periodic meetings with the chair occur throughout the academic year to discuss issues of concern to students, including feedback on instructors, courses, facilities, and other academic and nonacademic opportunities. The chair is also in the process of establishing a UDC Architecture Department Advisory Board of alumni and local professionals who can serve as a resource for the department and provide valuable feedback. The program requests that all graduates in both the BSc and M. Arch. programs complete an exit survey.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

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

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

The team held separate meetings with faculty, staff, and students during the visit. Currently there are appropriate human resources to support student learning; there are five full-time faculty and six adjunct faculty. Two of the full-time faculty are tenured. The chair is an associate professor who currently does not hold tenure.

The workloads are balanced to support excellent opportunities for faculty to have meaningful supportive interaction with students promoting student achievement.

The program's Architect Licensing Advisor is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP). The ALA regularly communicates with students, fulfills the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs. When queried at the student meeting, the majority of students in attendance were aware of the person who holds this position.

Economic challenges at UDC have affected resources for professional development opportunities over the past few years. Professional development of faculty members is largely accomplished through their full-time practices and continuing education. In the past two years, the chair has assisted faculty by providing travel resources to attend professional development meetings.

As part of Causes and UCD, opportunities abound for faculty to secure funding for research projects, and some successes have materialized for faculty to participate. This is a windfall for faculty that should be pursued.

All students in the programs are advised by architecture faculty. One faculty member is responsible for graduate students, and undergraduate students are assigned to three other full-time faculty. The chair handles the overflow of students at all levels.

The architecture department has three active chapters of AIAS, NOMAS, and CSI. Many students are members of more than one organization. The department administration supports travel to national conferences.

Many students have participated in faculty/staff research projects within CAUSES, gaining important learning opportunities as well as financial support.

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

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

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

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

Described

Not Described

2017 Team Assessment:

The university has made significant advances in renovating and updating the spaces for the architecture program since the last visit. The renovated studio space allows for a collaborative learning environment for students and staff alike. The new model shop offers students access to free 3-D printers, laser cutters, and plotters that will help strengthen the students' explorations. Students now have access to a campus woodshop. With the forthcoming renovations of the faculty offices and the Architectural Resource Institute, the faculty prep space will be greatly enhanced. The university library system includes access to digital information resources as well as a department computer laboratory that has all the necessary programs for students to complete their work.

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

Demonstrated

Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

The program has the appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement, as reported by students, faculty, and administrators at all levels. Both the university president and the dean of the school have committed to provide the support necessary to allow the program to thrive. In discussions with the team the dean described her plan to handle the expected program growth after accreditation is achieved.

After the 2015 visit, the department upgraded equipment in its model shop, and the school reorganized and expanded the space available to the program, with the final phase of that to occur by the end of this school year. The Architectural Research Institute, which essentially operates as an architectural office within the department, is an important source of funding for the university, indirectly benefitting the department. The ARI operates primarily through an annually negotiated MOU with the DC Department of

Housing and Community Development to provide architectural resources for smaller projects. It also provides an important outlet for paid internships for students.

As noted in the 2015 report, the program does not currently have its own formal fundraising and outreach system to enhance its programming.

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

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

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

There was sufficient evidence that students, faculty, and staff have ample access to library resources on the UDC campus, especially with the recent hire of a library support staff member for CAUSES. Students have access to over 4,000 books and reference materials that relate to CAUSES. They also have access to shared resources with nine other local institutions within the Washington Research Library Consortium, including Howard University and Catholic University of America.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.
- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

[] Not Described

2017 Team Assessment:

The administrative structure was described in the APR identifying key personnel within the context of the program, the college, and the institution. The team met with various individuals of the administration at the university, college and department levels and all were very supportive of the architecture department and its contribution to CAUSES and the university.

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE.** This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this section. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work.
- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK.** This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education, and access to optional studies.
- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION.** The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.
- **PUBLIC INFORMATION.** The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to “describe, document, or demonstrate.”
- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.
- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.
- A review of websites, links, and other materials.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

Instructions to the team:

1. *When an SPC is MET, the team is required to identify the course or courses where evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found.*
2. *If an SPC is NOT MET, the team must include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team's assessment.*
3. *After completing the VTR, the team must prepare an SPC matrix (using a blank matrix provided by the program) that identifies the courses in which the team found the evidence of student achievement. The team's matrix is to be appended to the VTR as Appendix 2.*

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**.

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.*

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The work presented, although it demonstrated ability in other aspects of Realm A, does not effectively demonstrate Design Thinking Skills and critical thinking. There is a lack of sense of inquiry utilizing many aspects learned from other areas such as investigation, and precedents. and in the conceptual and design development of projects. This is particularly evident in low-pass projects presented as evidence in the many design studios.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII, ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I** and **ARCP 507 - Graduate Thesis Seminar.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII, ARCP 505 - Sustainable Design I, ARAC 604 – Design Studio IV, and ARCP 550 – Thesis Studio II.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARAC 603 - Design Studio III.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of students using precedents to inform their design process was not found. In most instances, precedents were used for visual intrigue and there was insufficient effort made in dissecting the projects to find their strengths and weaknesses.

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

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 512 - Critical Issues in Architecture**, **ARCP 520 - Architectural Design Theory**, and **ARAC 621 - History and Theory of Architecture**. Students in the M. Arch. – Track I curriculum have also taken **ARCH 321 - History & Theory of Architecture I** and **ARCH 322 - History & Theory of Architecture II** at UDC, or equivalent courses in another preprofessional program.

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

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 507- Graduate Thesis Seminar**, **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**, and **ARCP 550 - Thesis Studio II**, which also explore projects in international locations.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found that since the previous visit considerable progress has been made in satisfying many of the previously Not Met criteria. Students have demonstrated improvement in communication skills, both written and graphic, investigative skills, ordering systems, and cultural diversity and social equity. Projects in ARCP 501 and Thesis Studios I and II explore social issues such as the relationship of intergenerational citizens in America and cultural/social issues in international settings such as Burkina Faso. Two criteria—design thinking skills and use of precedents—are not met.

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

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

B.1 Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the

relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII**, **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**, and **ARCP 507 - Graduate Thesis Seminar**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems & Environment**, and for Track II in **ARAC 601 - Design Studio I**.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Track II in **ARAC 602 - Design Studio II**, and both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems and Environment**, and for Track II in **ARAC 602 - Design Studio II**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Track II students in **ARAC 633 - Theory of Structures, ARAC 632 - Design of Steel Structures,** and **ARAC 634 - Design of Concrete Structures.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 505 - Sustainable Design, ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems and Environment,** and for track II in **ARAC 602 - Design Studio II.** For candidates in track I, the Environmental Systems sequence is part of the undergraduate curriculum and the Environmental Systems SPC is satisfied at the undergraduate level prior to entry into the graduate program, **ARCP 244 and 246 - Environmental Systems I & II.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for Track II in **ARAC 615 - Materials and Methods** and for both tracks in **ARCP 505 - Sustainable Design I** and **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems & Environment.** For candidates in track I, the Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies sequence is part of the undergraduate curriculum, and this SPC is satisfied at the undergraduate level prior to entry into the graduate program through **ARCP 115 and 116 - Materials & Methods of Construction I & II.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for track II students in **ARAC 615 - Materials and Methods,** and for both tracks in **ARCP 505 - Sustainable Design I** and **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems & Environment.** For candidates in track I, the Building Materials & Assemblies sequence is part of the undergraduate curriculum, and this SPC is satisfied at the undergraduate level prior to entry into the graduate program by **ARCP 115 and ARCP116 - Materials & Methods I & II.**

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for track II students in **ARAC 602 - Design Studio II** and for both tracks in **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**. For candidates in track I, the Building Service Systems sequence is part of the undergraduate curriculum, and this SPC is satisfied at the undergraduate level prior to entry into the graduate program by **ARCP 115 and 116 - Environmental Systems I & II**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 501 Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARCP-514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, for tracks I and II.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The team found evidence that all the SPCs of Realm B were being addressed in both high pass and low pass work. Much of the work was not robust. The program is very young and very small, so in the case of some SPCs there was not a large body of evidence to review.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

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

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII**, **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**, **ARCP 550 - Thesis Studio II**, and **ARCP 507 - Graduate Thesis Seminar**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems & Environment**, as well as **ARCP 502 - Thesis Studio I**, and **ARCP 550 - Thesis Studio II**.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for both tracks in **ARCP 501 - Professional Studio Lab VII** and **ARCP 521 - Architectural Systems & Environment**.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team found evidence that all the SPCs of Realm C were being addressed in both high pass and low pass work, although much of the work was not demonstrative of deep scholarly critical inquiry. The program is very young and very small, so in the case of some SPCs there was not a large body of evidence to review. While there were not many projects for SPC C.3, the projects chosen, and the design solutions provided in the two connected courses (ARCP 501 and ARCP 521) were of a complex enough nature to show that all aspects of Integrated Design were acknowledged in the final project solution.

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

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to of those stakeholders.

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP-514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, tracks I and II, and high- and low-pass work.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, tracks I and II and in high- and low-pass work.

D.3 Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP 514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, tracks I and II and in high- and low-pass work.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP-514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, tracks I and II, and in high- and low-pass work.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for **ARCP-514 Professional Ethics and Practice**, tracks I and II, and in high- and low-pass work.

<p>Realm D. General Team Commentary: The team found that Realm D criteria were met primarily in ARCP 514 Professional Ethics and Practice, in high- and low-pass work. Evidence was included in course</p>

notes, case studies, scored exams, and in discussion boards. Though referenced, evidence was not found in - ARCP 412 Critical Issues in Architecture.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the Higher Learning Commission (formerly the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

UDC is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. The accreditation was reaffirmed June 23, 2016, as evidenced by the Statement of Accreditation Status, included in the APR and the supplemental information provided by the program. The next evaluation is scheduled for 2025-26.

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

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

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

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

The curriculum for the M. Arch. I meets the NAAB requirement of a minimum of 168 hours, with a total of 169. It is composed of the Bachelor of Science in Architecture (120 credits) preprofessional degree plus an additional 49 credits of graduate course work. Professional course work required totals 39 credits, and the remaining 10 credits are optional graduate-level courses. The curriculum for the M. Arch II

degree meets the NAAB requirement of a minimum of 168 hours with a total of 85 credits beyond a bachelor's degree. Any student who hasn't taken the GRE and passed with a minimum grade must take an additional 3 credits in writing proficiency. The degree requirements are 75 credits of professional course work and 10 credits of optional studies at the graduate level.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

Once the university has deemed an applicant eligible for the program, the application is forwarded to the Department Admissions Committee (comprised of the graduate program coordinator and the department chair) for review. Students who have earned a B.Sc. Arch. from UDC with the minimum GPA are automatically accepted into the M. Arch. I program as the department knows that they have followed the program's SPC matrix and have fulfilled the SPC requirements that are expected to have been met in preparatory or preprofessional education.

For applicants who come from other pre-professional programs, a portfolio is required as part of the application. The Admissions Committee reviews the portfolio, as well as the undergraduate transcript. The Committee also reviews the SPC matrix for the program that granted the applicant degree. If an SPC matrix is unavailable, the Admissions Committee will review the transcript for the course curriculum, as well as copies of the syllabus and representative student work for each course necessary to satisfy the SPC. If the applicant lacks the necessary undergraduate credit hours or insufficient preparation (or documentation thereof), the applicant may be admitted with the stipulation that additional course work will be required to satisfy any deficiencies.

The M. Arch II track program is for those applicants without a preprofessional degree. These students generally have no advanced standing and must complete the 85-credit hour curriculum. In some instances, students will have some course work from their baccalaureate degree that applies to the M. Arch. degree program. In these instances, the applicant must submit a syllabus and representative assignments to the Admissions Committee for evaluation. If the work and earned grade are deemed acceptable to satisfy the SPC, then the course may be waived for the student.

The applicant meets with the program coordinator or the department chair and a path is created that ensures that all SPC will be addressed before graduation. Individual paths are then placed in the student's file. Any evidence of work that was used to establish advanced standing, including syllabi and samples of completed course assignments, are placed in the student's permanent file. Evidence of these

processes were described in the APR and validated by the student files made available in the team room.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

The accreditation terminology on the website does not meet the exact required language of the NAAB Conditions. In addition, the library subject profile pamphlet does not correctly state the candidacy terminology (resources binder). The student handbook does not comply with the NAAB guidelines.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

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

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

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

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

Evidence was found on the college's website under the Statement of Accreditation tab.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

The department has an identified Student Architect Licensing Advisor and a Faculty Architect Licensing Advisor. The university also has an Office of Student Success and a Career Placement Office whose roles are to provide resources to students who need assistance to remain in school and to provide career placement upon graduation. The department relies on chair and faculty contacts within the local architectural community, a job board that publishes vacancies, Career Services Department's two campuswide career fairs a year, and the Architectural Research Institute for career placement. This

system seems to work given the small student body and the frequent faculty contact and interaction with students, but nothing is institutionalized at the departmental level.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

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

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

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

Digital evidence was found on the Department of Architecture's webpage under the Statement of Accreditation tab. Print evidence was found in the Department of Architecture's office in the public files shelves.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

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

[] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

There has been no change since the 2015 review since students are not yet eligible to start taking exams because initial candidacy has not yet been granted.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

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

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding

remediation and advanced standing.

- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

Admissions to UDC are governed by the University Admissions Policies established by the Office of Recruitment and Admissions. See the following link.

<http://www.udc.edu/docs/admissions/Admissions%20Policies.pdf>

For students wishing to matriculate into the professional Graduate Program in Architecture, the following requirements apply:

- Track I: BS or BA in Architecture from an accredited post-secondary institution; Earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 at the undergraduate level.
- Track II: BS degree from an accredited post-secondary institution; Earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.5 at the undergraduate level.

Once the University has deemed an applicant eligible for the program, the application is forwarded to the Department Admissions Committee (composed of the graduate program coordinator or the department chair) for review. Students who have earned a Bachelor of Science in Architecture from UDC with the minimum GPA are automatically accepted into the M. Arch. program.

The first path for admission is for those applicants with a preprofessional degree. For applicants who have completed the UDC the Bachelor of Science in Architecture, the program knows that they have followed the program's SPC matrix and have fulfilled the requirements of the SPC that are expected to have been met in preparatory or preprofessional education.

The second path for admission is for those applicants without a preprofessional degree. These students generally have no advanced standing and must complete the track II curriculum. In some instances, a student will have some course work from their baccalaureate degree that applies to the M. Arch. degree program. In these instances, the applicant must submit a syllabus and representative assignments to the Admissions Committee for evaluation. If the work and earned grade are deemed acceptable to satisfy the SPC, then the course may be waived for the student.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

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

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

Evidence of the cost of education was found on the university website, although the cost of the textbooks and supplies was not found. The school does provide free printing, plotting and 3D model

making materials. Students also noted the ample amount of support they receive from the university's financial aid office. In addition, the university counsels graduating students on how to begin paying off their student loans.

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

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

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

The required reports were provided.

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

Met

Not Met

2017 Team Assessment:

The required reports were provided.

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

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

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

M. ARCH - TRACK I (PRE-PROFESSIONAL DEGREE + 49 GRADUATE CREDIT HOURS)

NAAB MATRIX		REALM A								REALM B										REALM C			REALM D					
		CRITICAL THINKING & REPRESENTATION								BLDG PRACTICES, TECH. SKILLS & KNOWLEDGE										I.A.S.			PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE					
		Professional Communication Skills	Design Thinking Skills	Investigative Skills	Architectural Design Skills	Ordering Systems	Use of Precedents	History and Global Culture	Cultural Diversity and Social Equity	Pre-Design	Site Design	Codes and Regulations	Technical Documentation	Structural Systems	Environmental Systems	Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies	Building Materials and Assemblies	Building Service Systems	Financial Considerations	Research	Integrated Eval. & Decision-Making Design Process	Integrative Design	Stakeholder Roles in Architecture	Project Management	Business Practices	Legal Responsibilities	Professional Conduct	
		A.1	A.2	A.3	A.4	A.5	A.6	A.7	A.8	B.1	B.2	B.3	B.4	B.5	B.6	B.7	B.8	B.9	B.10	C.1	C.2	C.3	D.1	D.2	D.3	D.4	D.5	
25-Jan-17		ABILITY						UND.	ABILITY						UNDERSTANDING				UND.	ABILITY		UNDERSTANDING						
PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION							X						X															
Design	ARCP-501	PROFESSIONAL STUDIO LAB VII																										
	ARCP-502	THESIS STUDIO I																										
	ARCP-550	THESIS STUDIO II																										
	ARCP-507	GRADUATE THESIS SEMINAR																										
Technology	ARCP-505	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN I																										
	ARCP-506	SUSTAINABLE DESIGN II																										
	ARCP-521	ARCHITECTURAL SYSTEMS & ENVIRONMENT																										
Hist-Th	ARCP-503	URBAN AND COMM. DESIGN I																										
	ARCP-520	ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN THEORY																										
Other	ARCP-512	CRITICAL ISSUES IN ARCHITECTURE																										
	ARCP-514	PROFESSIONAL ETHICS & PRACTICE																										

M. ARCH - TRACK II (NON-PRE-PROFESSIONAL DEGREE + 85 GRADUATE CREDIT HOURS)

NAAB MATRIX STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA		REALM A CRITICAL THINKING & REPRESENTATION								REALM B BLDG PRACTICES, TECH. SKILLS & KNOWLEDGE										REALM C I.A.S.			REALM D PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE				
		Professional Communication Skills	Design Thinking Skills	Investigative Skills	Architectural Design Skills	Ordering Systems	Use of Precedents	History and Global Culture	Cultural Diversity and Social Equity	Pre-Design	Site Design	Codes and Regulations	Technical Documentation	Structural Systems	Environmental Systems	Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies	Building Materials and Assemblies	Building Service Systems	Financial Considerations	Research	Integrated Eval. & Decision-Making Design Process	Integrative Design	Stakeholder Roles in Architecture	Project Management	Business Practices	Legal Responsibilities	Professional Conduct
		A.1	A.2	A.3	A.4	A.5	A.6	A.7	A.8	B.1	B.2	B.3	B.4	B.5	B.6	B.7	B.8	B.9	B.10	C.1	C.2	C.3	D.1	D.2	D.3	D.4	D.5
		ABILITY							UND.	ABILITY					UNDERSTANDING					UND.	ABILITY		UNDERSTANDING				
PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION																											
Design and Graphics	ARAC-601 DESIGN STUDIO I																										
	ARAC-602 DESIGN STUDIO II																										
	ARAC-603 DESIGN STUDIO III																										
	ARAC-604 DESIGN STUDIO IV																										
	ARCP-501 PROFESSIONAL STUDIO LAB VII																										
	ARCP-502 THESIS STUDIO I																										
	ARCP-550 THESIS STUDIO II																										
ARCP-507 GRADUATE THESIS SEMINAR																											
Technology	ARAC-615 MATERIALS & METHODS STUDIES																										
	ARAC-646 ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES																										
	ARCP-505 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN I																										
	ARCP-506 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN II																										
	ARCP-521 ARCHITECTURAL SYSTEMS & ENVIRONMENT																										
	ARAC-631 STATICS & STRUCTURAL DESIGN*																										
	ARAC-632 DESIGN OF STEEL STRUCTURES*																										
ARAC-633 THEORY OF STRUCTURES																											
ARAC-634 DESIGN OF CONCRETE STRUCTURES																											
Hist.-Theory	ARAC-621 HISTORY & THEORY OF ARCHITECTURE																										
	ARCP-503 URBAN AND COMM. DESIGN I																										
	ARCP-520 ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN THEORY																										
Other	ARCP-512 CRITICAL ISSUES IN ARCHITECTURE																										
	ARCP-514 PROFESSIONAL ETHICS & PRACTICE																										

* Effective fall 2017 these two courses will be combined

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, NCARB Representative

Cheryl Walker, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C
Principal
Bergmann Associates
500 North Tryon Street
Charlotte, NC 28202
704-907-7241
cwalker@bergmannpc.com

ACSA Representative

Michael Buono, FAIA
Professor/HSA Director Emeritus
Hammons School of Architecture
Drury University
900 North Benton Avenue
Springfield, Missouri 65802
417-873-7596 (office)
417-812-4151 (cell)
mbuono@drury.edu

AIA Representative

Mark McKechnie, AIA
Oregon Architecture
132 W. Main Street
Medford, OR
541.722.4372
mark@oregonarchitecture.biz

AIAS Representative

Clayton Daher
393 Commonwealth Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
m. 978.886.7399
cdaher064@g.rwu.edu

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



Cheryl Walker, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP BD+C
Team Chair



Michael Buono, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Team Member



Mark McKechnie, AIA NCARB,
Team Member



Clayton Daher, AIA
Team Member