

Judson University
School of Art, Design and Architecture

Visiting Team Report

M. Arch
(Preprofessional Bachelor of Arts in Architecture + 42 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
6 March 2013

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

Table of Contents

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

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The School of Art, Design and Architecture (SOADA) at Judson University is seen as a flagship program for the institution. In addition, the iconic facility housing the SOADA is the newest on campus and is placed in a location giving strong presence to the program near the campus entry. While the faith-based foundation of Judson provides its identity as an institution of higher education, the Architecture Program is seen as a very strong element contributing to the unique and differentiating identity of Judson University internally by administration as well as externally by those seeking a Christian education in architecture.

The architecture program at Judson University is still a new program, with its vision as an accredited program, of less than a decade, still emerging. While its foundation has begun to be established, its ultimate form and strength will continue to be shaped in decades yet to come.

There are financial challenges that have placed the university and the architecture program under significant stress that will take time from which to rebound.

2. Conditions Not Met

SPC A.4	Technical Documentation
SPC B.4	Site Design
SPC B.6	Comprehensive Design
SPC B.7	Financial Considerations

3. Causes of Concern

- A. Financial Resources are identified as a cause of concern. Although the team considers this Condition met, a complex mix of factors – listed below – contributes to ongoing financial strain for the institution. This stress results in the potential for continuation of observed degradation within the architecture program.
- As an institution that relies on tuition for over 90% of its financial resources, the fiscal strength of the program is predominantly a function of enrollment. Enrollment at the university in general and to a lesser extent in the architecture program has significantly declined in recent years resulting in financial strain for the institution and for the program.
 - Efforts to increase enrollment have, anecdotally, resulted in a lowering of entry standards, resulting in a greater challenge to the pursuit of excellence for architectural education.
 - The architecture program, seen by the university as one of its flagship programs, has experienced a reduction in the percentage of university financial resources allocated to it.
 - Architecture faculty salaries are considerably below those for peer programs. The desire by the university and the department to increase compensation levels is thwarted by the lack of financial resources.
 - Tuition is relatively high when compared to many architectural programs, resulting in little ability by the university to increase tuition further if it is to remain competitive. To supplement tuition, student program fees were introduced and then had to be modestly discounted to reach a sustainable level.
 - Below-average compensation and benefits, diminished support services in a number of areas, and minimal resources for faculty development, all contribute to impediments to faculty retention and recruitment.

- Because of financial strain, this year the university has delayed all tenure applications and has denied all sabbatical requests further eroding faculty development.
- In response to the financial crisis, the university's Board of Trustees has a larger role in university administration, and with it there is a corresponding perception of reduced faculty governance.
- A new university president has been hired and will start in his position this spring (2013). One of the important criteria used in that selection was ability to secure outside funding for the institution. The result of this strategic move by the university is, of course, yet to be seen.

The combination of reduced enrollment and reduced financial allocations to the architecture program creates the potential for a 'perfect storm' for the program. These conditions could be an alarming predictor of greater financial challenge as well as continued program quality degradation for architecture in the near future.

A downward spiral of reduced enrollment drives reduced financial resources and the lowering of entrance standards in an attempt to raise enrollment numbers. Reduced resources drives cost containment and reduction measures that potentially includes further erosion of already below-average faculty salaries, reductions in support staff, reductions in part-time positions and either lack of or excessive reliance on adjunct faculty positions. The perceived need for the university administration to act aggressively to reduce faculty, staff and programs university-wide has been paralleled with a perceived reduction in faculty governance and participation in strategic planning.

Lack of resources and self-governance contributes to retention challenges with existing high performing faculty and likely increases the difficulty in recruiting qualified faculty in the future. Reductions in faculty qualifications and reduced student performance significantly risks future accreditation of the program.

These factors cumulatively drive down the attractiveness of the program to potential student applicants, thus leading to an even further weakening of the fiscal and academic strength of the institution. The ultimate consequences of such a downward spiral may not be evidenced for several years.

There is evidence that all factors described above exist currently. Whether they come together to create a downward spiral in the architecture program is uncertain. The potential however creates a significant cause of concern for the visiting team.

- B. Erosion of quality in the architecture program is identified as a cause of concern. The prior NAAB visiting teams identified all conditions as being met. This creates an unusually high benchmark for any program. The 2013 NAAB visiting team has identified a weakening within the general realm of integrated building design practices. While the design work was strong among the high pass examples, there were few that were truly outstanding samples of exceptional integrated design efforts even among this group. This quality erosion is exacerbated by a number of the financial factors described previously.
- C. Erosion of Shared Governance at the University is identified as a cause of concern. As the university is reacting to financial pressures, long-range planning with faculty involvement has been reduced. The team is concerned that the future of the university is not embracing faculty abilities, interests, knowledge and commitments within the planning and governance processes.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)

Since all conditions were met by the previous team progress since last visit is not applicable.

Previous Team Report (2007): All conditions were found to be met.

FINAL DRAFT

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The APR includes an articulate and comprehensive description of the history and mission of the program and university.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

- *Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.*

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The university requires an admission of faith of all faculty and staff, adhering to the Christian mission. The faculty provide a diverse network and resource for the students. Faculty represent a variety of races and professional backgrounds. The program utilizes additional adjunct faculty who provide even broader diversity to the faculty. Students are not required to profess their faith, and a variety of races, cultures, countries, religions, and lifestyles are represented within the student body.

The underlying Christian mission provides a sustainable culture for the students and faculty with regard to mutual respect and understanding as well as a healthy lifestyle. The APR describes the university goal of “balanced wholeness” creating an educational environment that integrates mind, body, and spirit, and that balanced wholeness is clearly evident.

Unique to Judson’s architectural program is the restricted building hours that discourages “all-nighters” and encourages thoughtful time management.

The physical and financial resources are distributed irrespective of demographics.

There do not appear to be architecture scholarships, but there are tuition discounts.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives: *Programs must demonstrate through narrative and artifacts, how they respond to the following perspectives on architecture education. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently within the context of its history, mission, and culture and to further identify as part of its long-range planning activities how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.*

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The goal of the University is to provide a “balanced wholeness” to the student, focused on Christian faith. During meetings with students, faculty, and administration, the team noted this commitment. The faculty and their research allow students the opportunity to research adjacent to or under the faculty. Students and faculty describe how these close relationships allow for mentorship and teaching in students’ lives and professional development.

For retention, promotion and tenure, faculty are evaluated on four categories: Christian living, modeling and nurturing; teaching; scholarly activity; and service to the campus, community and beyond. According to the faculty handbook, Christian living is considered by the university to be the most important for faculty evaluation. Second is excellence in teaching. Faculty are then asked to be strong in either service or scholarly activities.

Development of new knowledge at Judson is in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarly activity and is in support of the program’s mission statement. The faculty engages in national and international mission work with the students, architectural outreach projects, and service at the intersection of Christianity and architecture. Judson has held symposiums each semester and hosts lecturers (in architecture and allied arts) that support the program and university’s missions. Evidence of this work has been found in the APR, faculty meetings, discussions with students, faculty exhibits, and supporting materials.

A small faculty development allowance (\$1000) and discretionary dean’s fund has been available to the faculty in the past. With the financial difficulty of the program and the university, those monies are eroding and faculty are often using their own funds to support their development of knowledge. Coupled with chronically low salaries, the financial limitations impact research opportunities for the faculty may be problematic for the program’s success in the future.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

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

2013 Team Assessment: In meetings with faculty and students the mutual respect they have for one another became apparent. The draw of the Christian mission is unique to the program and university and permeates architectural teachings, mainly seen in the charge of sustainability and becoming good stewards of the earth. The team questioned if “niceness” creates a great sense of community over pushing innovative individual project development. Students clearly help each other but the team wondered if that mutual support sometimes worked to the potential detriment of a challenging environment that can foster creativity.

The preceptorship program is further evidence of professionals’ respect for Judson graduates, their work ethic, and general collaborative character. Multiple firms in a variety of architectural niches continue to hire new Judson students and graduates.

Multiple opportunities exist in architectural and non-architecture-related extracurriculars for personal growth and leadership building. The breadth of theological teaching required by the university combined with the community outreach opportunities in the architecture school creates community-minded individuals.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The transition from internship to licensure is met through several opportunities and resources available to students. The preceptorship program, required for graduation, gives students “real world” experience allowing them to complete about a third of their IDP requirements. Early on students are introduced to their Educator Coordinator and informed of the process of obtaining registration through completion of the NAAB degree, completion of experience (IDP) and passing of the ARE for licensure and NCARB certification. Their professional practice courses, such as ARC 556 along with the preceptorship experience amply prepare students for the profession and their responsibilities. The program fully supports the Educator Coordinator in all of his duties, including attendance at IDP Coordinator meetings and training.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: Judson University is responsive to this perspective. The preceptorship plays an important role in linking the students’ architectural education to the profession. Many firms that offer preceptorships are located locally in Illinois and also across the country, in states such as Maine, Texas, Arizona, and California. One student (2011) had a preceptorship in India. Graduates of Judson University are also working in the field with firms nationally and globally, with practitioners in the US, Canada and China.

There are potential opportunities provided by the school's mission that could translate into greater distinctiveness in student (and faculty) work.

There are 11 full time faculty members: 3 full professors, 4 associate professors, and 4 assistant professors. Among these faculty members, 4 are licensed practitioners in the US. A number of the faculty are active in practice--either as a practitioner or consultant. There are an additional 8 adjunct faculty members.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: As a religious based institution, Judson's mission prioritizes community service. This passion is demonstrated in multiple venues and activities throughout the program including coursework such as ARC 575, Community Outreach Studio, where social and environmental justice across the world is a desired and demonstrated outcome.

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The process to develop a long-range plan seems to be continually ongoing within the School. This is evidenced by the SOADA's strategic planning efforts documented in the APR and meetings with the dean, chair, and faculty. As part of this process, the programs break out during these planning meetings to brainstorm on their specific concerns. Notes from the architecture program meetings are documented in the APR. The financial stability concerns of the university, school, and program were not reflected in the long-range planning documents or discussions with the faculty regarding long-range plans.

In the APR the 2006 long-range plan is included, as well as progress made toward goals and improvements listed in the plan and assessment of the current value of those goals and improvements. There is no clarity on the length of time for which the 2006 long-range plan is in effect.

Both the faculty and the dean have reported the faculty and student's involvement in the process for long-range planning. The long-range planning goals and objectives are organized around the mission of the university.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: *The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:*

- *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
- *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*

- *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
- *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
 - *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
 - *Individual course evaluations.*
 - *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
 - *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: Through faculty and administration meetings we have found anecdotal self-assessments of the program through reviews, public viewings, departmental meetings, scheduled meetings with students, informal interactions with students, and course evaluations. Assessment of the faculty and feedback on their professional development plan is inconsistent by the chair.

Assessment of the administration by the faculty has recently taken place, however faculty's assessment was not confidential and so a number of faculty did not participate. The university's process for self-assessment of administrators is clearly outlined in the APR.

It was not clear how either the program's or the university's assessment results impacted the long-range planning of the university, school, or program.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: Judson University has appropriate human resources to support learning and achievement in the student body. Currently, faculty to student ratios are 1:15 and in 6th year 1:10.

It is clear that the faculty is committed to the school beyond the typical role of a teacher. Mentorship plays an important role in the student/faculty relationship. The university does not make clear that administration is sensitive to workloads of faculty and staff or able to provide support for faculty and staff for professional development. Both workload and support issues have the potential for negatively impacting the program's strength.

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: At the university level there is little merit-based scholarship to offset the high tuition. No scholarships exist for architecture students, especially to offset architecture program fees built into the tuition. Funds are however available for students in teaching assistantship positions.

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

Graduation requires 1,600 hours of experience, provided in the required preceptorship. Spring of the third year is designated time for possible study abroad in an international architecture program. Students are highly encouraged but few choose to not participate. There are also numerous faculty-led community aid programs unrelated to the college. About one-half of all students take advantage of these mission trips. These programs offer students unique opportunities to pursue work and study in their desired fields.

The university documents that a minimum GPA of 2.5 and ACT composite score of 23 is targeted for admission. The website states the minimum GPA but not the ACT requirement.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: The team finds that there is a defined administrative structure in place as evidenced by the University's organizational chart. The Board of Trustees advise the President (interim William C. Crothers) who oversees the Provost (Dr. Will Fiesen) who oversees the Dean of the School of Art, Design and Architecture (Dr. Curtis Sartor), who oversees the Chair of the Department of Architecture (Keelan Kaiser).

Curriculum decisions are generated within the Department of Architecture faculty and staff. It was not clear that students played a role in curriculum development.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: The faculty are involved in governance through faculty meetings. Because of the program's size and importance relative to the university, program faculty report much active participation on university committees. One of the architecture professors was on the search committee for the incoming president. Faculty, students, and administration report active student participation in university and program governance.

Faculty discussions and provided meeting minutes document that program faculty meetings are not held regularly. Instead the faculty are asked to convene as issues arise. The faculty are currently operating without bylaws. According to the APR, one faculty member is spearheading the development of bylaws.

With recent changes in the university administration, the interim president has requested that the Board of Trustees take a more active role in administration. Through meetings with faculty, and school and program administration, the team has learned that the board has implemented changes to the faculty handbook with little to no input from the faculty. The team is concerned that faculty governance is being eroded.

I.2.3 Physical Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:*

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: The new Harm A. Weber Academic Center (HAWAC) meets the physical resources required for a professional degree program. This new home of the SOADA with its in-house university library is well-suited for the program's students and faculty. The digital media lab is well-equipped and also conveniently located in the HAWAC.

The building itself is a teaching opportunity in that its design incorporates many green building features, such as an innovative ventilation system. Achieving LEED gold certification allows students to experience first-hand the benefits (and challenges) associated with green design techniques.

According to the APR the building can accommodate 350 students at full capacity. The program capacity is estimated at 250 based on the current number of faculty and staff. The number of students is currently lower than anticipated at around 160. There is also the utilization of another campus building (Volkman Hall) for the freshman studios.

I.2.4 Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.*

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: As an institution that relies to a very high degree on tuition-based financing, the fiscal strength of the program is to a large degree the product of enrollment. In recent years the enrollment at the university in general has declined. Specifically, in the architecture program at Judson enrollment has declined from nearly 200 to approximately 160, resulting in financial stress for the institution and the program. The architecture program is seen by the university as one of its flagship programs. Yet the percentage of university financial resources allocated to the architecture program appears to be significantly reducing in recent years from a prior operating budget of \$275,000 to an operating budget of \$104,000 in 2010. Tuition is relatively high as compared to many architectural programs resulting in little ability by the university to increase tuition further.

In the recent past student fees have been introduced to partially address fiscal challenges. These fees were perceived as being excessive and the response was to modestly reduce fees to a sustainable level. Due to inclusion of additional student program fees, the current operating budget is now approaching \$177,000. A new university president has been selected and will start in his position this spring (2013) and one of the important criteria used in that selection was ability to raise outside funds for the institution. The result of that strategic move by the university is of course yet to be seen.

While financial resources are met, they are a cause of concern. The combination of reduced enrollment and reduced percentage of university financial allocations could be an alarming predictor of greater financial challenge for the architecture program now and in the near future.

I.2.5 Information Resources: *The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: The university library is located in the same facility as the SOADA, giving the program a uniquely robust information resource. The architectural portion of the collection is high and participation among architecture students is higher than other university majors. The library users have access to database searches that go beyond the university's collection and the library has access to interlibrary loan books. There are periodicals, videos, slides, and digital images available to the architecture program. The architectural collection continues to grow; however, library acquisitions have slowed due to budget restrictions.

FINAL DRAFT

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports³. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- *Program student characteristics.*
 - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).*
 - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
 - *Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.*
 - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.*
 - *Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.*
 - *Time to graduation.*
 - *Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.*
 - *Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.*
- *Program faculty characteristics*
 - *Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.*
 - *Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.*
 - *Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.*
 - *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
 - *Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.*
 - *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
 - *Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.*
 - *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

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

2013 Team Assessment: Much of the statistical data has been adequately provided in the APR. One statistic missing was the demographic information of students of the program compared to the demographics of the university as a whole.

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

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

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused

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

Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2013 Team Assessment: Annual reports to NAAB have been provided along with responses to prior NAAB visiting teams.

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The faculty is dedicated, well-qualified, and hardworking with a mixture of experience and youth. They are very much student centered and service oriented as they carry out the mission of the university, school, and program. Faculty resumes indicate that faculty who are teaching in the architecture program are well credentialed with terminal degrees in architecture, including three PhDs.

A number of faculty have had experience teaching at other institutions, but a limited number of faculty have come from critical design practices. Some junior faculty are graduates of Judson's Program or have held smaller, more local practices. This may lead to homogeneity of faculty in the future and appears to have resulted in a lack of faculty leadership in overall comprehensive design education in contrast to special design expertise which is evident in a number of faculty.

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

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: Studio culture policy is found in the SOADA Student Handbook provided in the team room. Self-assessment policies and student to faculty ratios were well documented in the APR. Square foot per student and faculty was not provided, but there is ample space for both. Policies on advising, integration of digital media, academic integrity, and library and information resources were described in the APR as well as the student handbook and employee handbook/manual.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to read and write is demonstrated in Architecture 441 Advanced Architectural Structures. Ability to speak and listen effectively is demonstrated in critiques for 452 Integrative Architectural Design Studies II. Based upon our meetings with students they demonstrated they are articulate and able to speak effectively.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability of most design thinking skills are demonstrated in 451 and 452 Integrative Architecture Design Studies I and II, respectively. Ability to test alternative outcomes is demonstrated in 351 Intermediate Architecture Design Studies.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to use visual communication skills is exhibited in 651 Advanced Architecture and Urbanism Studio and also evidenced by the body of work in the team room.

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

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to make technically clear drawings and prepare models illustrating components for building design is demonstrated in 452 Integrative Architecture Design Studies II and 322 Advanced Construction Tectonics and Assemblies. While the components were available to understand writing outline specifications, the team did not see ability to write and author outline specifications demonstrated.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability in investigative skills is demonstrated in 451 Integrative Architecture Design Studies I.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability in fundamental design skills is demonstrated in 351, Intermediate Architecture Design Studies.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to use precedents is demonstrated in 451 Integrative Architecture Design Studies I.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of ordering systems is demonstrated in Architecture 351 Intermediate Architecture Design Studies.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of historic traditions and global culture is demonstrated in Architecture 575, the Community Outreach Studio.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding cultural diversity is demonstrated in the sketchbooks from Arch 381, the Architecture Study Tour.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of applied research is found in Arch 651 Advanced Architecture and Urbanism.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found that most all of the eleven A-category criteria were met in the student coursework. Consistency of both ability and understanding greatly varied based between lecture and studio courses.

In terms of global and cultural diversity, the team finds a minimal understanding of non-Western traditions other than that found in the Arc 575 Community Outreach Studio.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability in pre-design was demonstrated in the final graduate studio ARC 651, taken following the preceptorship. The projects involve a great deal of student research and development.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to address issues regarding accessibility appeared to be evident in student projects for ARC 451, Integrative Design Studies studio.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability in sustainability design was demonstrated through drawings and individual project descriptions in the ARC 451 and 452 Integrative Design Studies studios. Emphasis was given across the board to the Living Building Challenge.

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

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: Introduction and teaching of site design is partially evident in the ARC 451/452 Integrative Design Studios. Ability in the integration of site design and its influence on the design evolution of a project is absent in the low pass work.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability to apply life safety principles is evident in both ARC 451 and ARC 452, Integrative Architectural Design Studios studios, with ARC 451 emphasizing egress and ARC 452 emphasizing sprinkler systems.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

B.2. Accessibility

A.4. Technical Documentation

B.3. Sustainability

A.5. Investigative Skills

B.4. Site Design

A.8. Ordering Systems

B.7. Environmental Systems

A.9. Historical Traditions and
Global Culture

B.9. Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team had difficulty detecting comprehensive design skills in ARC 451 where indicated by the program and instead focused our efforts in evaluating work from ARC 452 where there was more evidence. Sustainability, accessibility, and environmental systems were well integrated in the final project in ARC 452. Specifically in the low passes, the team noted weakness in integrating structural systems, historical conditions and site design into the designs. Although the team noted strong work in the structures courses (ARC 341/441 Theories and Advanced Architectural Structures) the team found little-to-no documentation was demonstrated of horizontal or lateral structural systems within the overall building design. Additionally, the team found little to no site design information such as surrounding buildings, topography, watershed or vegetation on the site plans, perspectives, building sections, or elevations. The team noted full design integration of structures and site design in the high passes was evident.

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

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: There is no evidence of introduction or application of financial considerations at either the concept or detail level with regard to the project. In 2006 it had been incorporated into the curriculum of ARC 580 Programming and Research Methods in Architecture.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Environmental Technologies classes ARC 421 and 422 introduce the concepts and issues of environmental systems. The ARC 452 Integrative Architecture Design Studies comprehensive studio addresses design integration of environmental systems and analysis of the active systems through appropriate software. Evidence of understanding environmental systems was demonstrated in student work for all of the above classes.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of principles of structural behavior is evidenced in design and research projects, quizzes and exams in ARC 341 Theories of Architectural Structures and ARC 441 Advanced Architectural Structures.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of building envelope systems is evidenced in drawings, quizzes and exams in ARC 322 Advanced Construction Tectonics & Assemblies.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of acoustics is evidenced in project drawings in ARC 421 Environmental Technology II. Understanding of natural and artificial lighting, acoustics, HVAC systems, fire protection and plumbing are evidenced in project drawings in ARC 422 Environmental Technology III. Although building security and vertical transportation are subtle issues ingrained in every program, there was no evidence of guided teaching in appropriate design decisions, such as proper core layout or programmatic separation of spaces.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of building materials and assemblies integration is evidenced in drawings, quizzes and exams in ARC 322 Advanced Construction Tectonics & Assemblies.

Realm B. General Team Commentary:

Many of the individual components of realm B (e.g. accessibility, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope) were met. Evidence supplied in the realms of site design and financial considerations was overwhelmingly weak or lacking. The team noted a lack of ability of the students to integrate those components within the design process. The team would like to note a sweeping observation of superficiality in design thinking, integration, and execution in the studio projects.

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Ability in collaboration is evidenced in team reports found in ARC 691 Christian Worldview and Architecture as well as in ARC 575 Community Outreach Studio through documentation of local projects that included project scheduling/timelines and delegation of responsibilities of team members.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment is demonstrated in ARC 351, Intermediate Architecture Design Studies studio through student explanations of design decisions and concept.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of the architect's responsibility in obtaining necessary information from the client/users is evidenced by the documentation shown through their Community Outreach Studio, ARC 575 where they experience direct interaction with real clients, such as conducting community surveys, participating in property owner meetings, and participation in community visioning sessions.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding various methods for assembling teams, recommending project delivery methods, and competing for commissions are evidenced through ARC 656 Architectural Practice, Law and Management, specifically through assignments such as development of a proposal for architectural services and various quizzes testing their understanding of delivery methods.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of practice management is evident through ARC 656 Architectural Practice, Law and Management through various learning exercises, such as creation of a business plan.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of leadership techniques and skills is evidenced in ARC 556, Architectural Practice, Leadership, and Ethics and ARC 661, Christian Worldview and Architecture.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of legal responsibilities of an architect is evidenced in ARC 656, Architectural Practice, Law and Management.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of ethical issues in professional practice is evidenced through ARC 691 Christian Worldview and Architecture.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Understanding of community and social responsibility is evidenced through ARC 691 Christian Worldview and Architecture and ARC 575 Community Outreach Studio, such as historic renovation projects in the local community.

Realm C. General Team Commentary:

All conditions regarding Leadership and Practice have been addressed at the understanding level of learning. The professional practice courses cover a wide array of realm C conditions along with the Community Outreach Studio and Christian Worldview and Architecture courses. All of these are taken after their Preceptorship experience, providing a good foundation and preparation for practice as a professional.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Regional Accreditation: *The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).*

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The APR provides copies of the university's accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: *The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.*

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The program uses the preferred NAAB nomenclature for its accredited degree program--BA to refer to its non-accredited Bachelors of Arts in architecture and MArch for its accredited Masters' degree. This is evidenced in both the APR and on the website.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The APR describes the process of curriculum review by the faculty, administration, with input by the students. Review has been at annual retreats, business meeting, and blitz-shops (part meeting part workshop). The faculty seemed committed to the current curriculum and pleased with how it fits with the mission of the program and the university. Because the program is the largest program within the university, Architecture has representation of its faculty on many university curriculum committees.

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

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

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student's progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student's admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Many SPC have been moved out of the first two years of the program's curriculum so that the program can more easily accept transfer students from community colleges. There seems to be a good system in place for evaluating the SPC requirements of incoming transfer students. The program chair currently reviews all applicants' syllabi, course work, and portfolios and evaluates the ability or understanding of the SPC as demonstrated by the student. A checklist is completed to record the evaluation. It appears that the burden of implementing the system relies on one person, which results in inconsistencies depending upon workload.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This has been found on the program's website: <http://arch.judsonu.edu/culture>

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: A link to NAAB's website can be found on the university's website: <http://www.judsonu.edu/Undergraduate/Architecture/NAAB/>

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional's Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aia.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: A link to all above information can be found on the university's website: <http://www.judsonu.edu/Undergraduate/Architecture/NAAB/>

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent APR

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: A link to ARPs and VTRs can be found on the University's website:
<http://www.judsonu.edu/Undergraduate/Architecture/NAAB/>

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: A link to ARE Pass Rate information can be found on the University's website:
<http://www.judsonu.edu/Undergraduate/Architecture/NAAB/>

FINAL DRAFT

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference Judson University, *APR*, pp. 5-13

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

Reference Judson University, *APR*, pp. 5-13

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Judson University, *APR*, pp. 21-28

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Judson University, *APR*, pp. 28-32

FINAL DRAFT

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

Perspective E - Architectural Education and the Public Good. We found that Judson students are passionately prepared to be active, engaged citizens who will be responsive to the needs of a changing world. This is exemplified in part through the ARC 575 Community Outreach Studio, as well as through faculty-led mission trips and disaster support efforts. These venues help support the mission of the program and to distinguish it from other schools nationwide.

FINAL DRAFT

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
NAC/Architecture
1203 West Riverside Avenue
Spokane, WA 99201-1107
(509) 838-8240
(509) 838-8261 fax
bblackmer@nacarchitecture.com

Representing the ACSA
Dana K. Gulling
Assistant Professor
North Carolina State University
College of Design
Campus Box 7701
Raleigh, North Carolina 27695
(919) 515-8362 office
(505) 948-8762 mobile
(919) 515-7330 fax
dana_gulling@ncsu.edu; danakgulling@yahoo.com

Representing the AIAS
Carrie L. Foster
220 N. West Street
Apt. 1
Stillwater, OK 74075
(972) 639-8327
carrie.foster@okstate.edu

Representing the NCARB
Michelle Kinasiewicz, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP^{BD+C}
Assistant Director / Education
NCARB
1801 K Street NW, Suite 700K
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 783 6500 main
(202) 461 3946 direct
(202) 579 2439 mobile
(202) 783 0290 fax
mkinasiewicz@ncarb.org

Non-voting member
Gary Wang, Principal
Wang Architects
1208 S. Church Street
Austin, TX
(512) 677-9610 office
(617) 610-9610 mobile
gary@wangarchitects.com

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

**Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
Team Chair**

Representing the AIA

**Dana K. Gulling
Team member**

Representing the ACSA

**Carrie L. Foster
Team member**

Representing the AIAS

**Michelle Kinasiewicz, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP^{BD+C}
Team member**

Representing the NCARB

Gary Wang

Non-voting member