

**University of Maryland
School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation**

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture

Track I: (pre-professional degree + 60 graduate credit hours)

Track II: (degree + 109 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
2 March 2011

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

- **Summarize team's findings overall and identify the state of the program as the visiting team finds it.** The 2011 The National Architectural Accrediting Board Visiting Team's review of the University of Maryland Master of Architecture Program within the School of Architecture Planning and Preservation finds the program to be one of enduring excellence. Since its first full accreditation in 1972, the program has garnered a national reputation in sustainability and commitment to preparing students for the practice of architecture. Practicing architects make up the majority of faculty. Faculty membership and participation in the professional associations is high and well-publicized. Although the role of the architect within the profession, academic community and public realm has expanded to include international markets and global networks, the University of Maryland's program in architecture has adroitly adapted to incorporate these complex associations. The ability to effectively manage the transitions can be traced to an overall willingness to openly communicate and collaborate. The Visiting Team witnessed the strong and positive relationships between alumni, faculty and students, students and staff, and the new administration.
- **Identify any areas beyond the program's control that may have affected the visit (budget cuts, construction illness or unavailability of personnel).** The University of Maryland's program in architecture has faced major obstacles since the previous visit in 2005. Administrative changes, an economic downturn, and loss of senior faculty have created unforeseen challenges. Yet, the visit and quality of the program did not appear to have been adversely affected. During the year and a half prior to the 2011 visit, the administrative leadership changed at every level. President Loh took office January, 2011. The Provost was so new--that the team visited her one day before she officially held the position and Dean Cronrath was appointed in the fall of 2010.
- **Efforts made by program to host program.** The program was prepared for the 2011 Visiting Team. The Team found the team room to be exceptionally well organized. A full range of projects, which included high and low pass, were readily accessible and clearly labeled. Notebooks were complete and well-marked. The faculty and staff were very accommodating and available to assist at only a moments' notice.

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

- **Summation of visit overall and consider the results of the assessment as a whole.** The 2011 Visiting Team characterizes the past six years since the program in architecture's last accreditation visit as one of change and loss. The program has dealt with the consequences of a complete administrative turnover, global economic downturn and the death and illness of revered colleagues. In spite of these profound challenges, the program quickly, effectively and openly dealt with each situation in remarkably resilient ways. The success can be directly attributed to the program's strong relationships with the professional and academic communities, along with supportive students and staff. Since its last accreditation visit in 2005, the faculty tapped into its network of diverse and multidisciplinary resources to craft a strong program. The 2011 Visiting Team's review of conditions and student performance criteria revealed only one criterion which was not met. This was in the area of technical specifications imbedded in the A.4 Technical Documentation requirement. The team identified only one area of concern under the category of Financial Resources. Six years ago, eight areas of concern were highlighted. The 2011 Visiting Team found all of these areas of concern to have been successfully addressed. In addition to these findings, there were five areas of distinction. Of special note is the positive vision and supportive communication between the new administrators and the program in architecture. Newly appointed President Loh already sees the School as instrumental in helping to forge improved alliances and to develop infrastructure plans with the community. The Provost is

looking at promoting research opportunities and connections and the Dean is making visible strides in effectively advocating on behalf of preservation, planning and architecture programs.

- **Efforts by program to prepare for visit or difficulties during visit.** The administration, faculty, students and staff were well-prepared for the visit. The visit went smoothly. There were no difficulties during the visit.

2. **Condition Not Met**
II.1.A.4 Technical Documentation

3. **Cause of Concern**

A. Financial Resources (Condition I.2.4): Current financial resources are adequate; however, meetings with administrators revealed that the global economic downturn will generate university-wide budget reductions. A substantially reduced budget could adversely impact faculty and staff hires and the caliber of program offerings.

4. **Progress since the Previous Site Visit (Year)**

The 2005 team found no conditions to be "Not Met."

Title of Cause for Concern: Diversity
Condition 4

2005 Condition 4, Social Equity: *The program must provide all faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with equitable access to a caring and supportive educational environment in which to learn, teach, and work.*

Previous Team Report (2005): While the make-up of the University is reasonably reflective of that of the state of Maryland, the composition of both the student body and faculty of the Architecture Program falls short of that model.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of diversity is no longer a cause for concern. The team finds that the Architecture Program has successfully addressed both faculty and student diversity issues. New faculty hires, both at the level of assistant professor and lecturer, have expanded the demographic composition of the faculty.

In addition, students have noted that there has been an increase in the number of minority faculty and fellow students. This shift is also reflected by the demographic evidence presented in the APR. The shifts are the result of several actions taken by the administration, faculty and students. A Diversity Task Force was formed and led by an African-American educator-practitioner and co-chaired by an African-American graduate student. The task force produced a Diversity Plan—which has been published and is currently available on the UMD Architecture Program's website. A second successful diversity activity was accomplished with the assistance of students enrolled in the graduate architecture program—including minority architecture students. These students actively recruited minority high school students attending a University of Maryland summer architecture course.

Thirdly, the graduate students participated in the hiring process for new faculty. They were invited to attend lectures and submit feedback on lectures given by candidates.

Title Cause for Concern: Compensation

Conditions 5 and 6

2005 Condition 5, Human Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.*

2005 Condition 6, Human Resource Development: *Programs must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth within and outside the program.*

Previous Team Report (2005): Consideration must be given to adequate and equitable overall compensation, with particular emphasis currently placed on associate professors and administrative staff, and equitable rebalancing of the academic staff as retirement of senior faculty is experienced in the future.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of compensation is no longer a cause for concern. In the current APR, the program provided a chart listing minimum, average and maximum salaries for Assistant, Associate and Full Professors for FY05, FY09 and FY10 in their Architecture program and provided data from the NAAB 2009 Report on Accreditation in Architecture Education. The minimum, average and maximum salaries of all the ranks are now higher than the FY09 ACSA Northeast Region and the combined ACSA schools. While staff salaries vary in the school, all but one is above the low range across the university in each category.

With respect to the equitable rebalancing of the academic staff, the current number of tenured/tenure-track faculty members in the Architecture program remains at 16, due to retirements, a death and new hires. The balance in the professorial rank now is 2 fewer full professors and 2 additional assistant professors. The current faculty stands at 6 full professors (including the new dean, six associate professors and 4 assistant professors). There no longer is a cause for concern.

Title Cause for Concern: Faculty Retirement

Conditions 5 and 6

2005 Condition 5, Human Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.*

2005 Condition 6, Human Resource Development: *Programs must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth within and outside the program.*

Previous Team Report (2005): The near term retirement of six to eight senior faculty members will require specific attention in sequential timing to prevent any erosion of the highly regarded academic instructional capacity, faculty culture, or overall collegiality.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of faculty retirement in terms of sequential timing is no longer a cause for concern. Faculty members have made a concerted effort to revitalize their faculty culture and collegiality by incorporating activities such as all-school assemblies, faculty meetings, faculty retreats and faculty/student retrospectives. Given the vision of the new dean, faculty are coming to grips with the economic reality of how new initiatives are funded.

Title Cause for Concern: New Initiatives

Condition 5

2005 Condition 5, Human Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.*

Previous Team Report (2005): While new programmatic initiatives (such as historic preservation, IT management, associate dean for students, and others) are noteworthy, care must be exercised to not unduly erode designated faculty lines in order to staff those positions.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of new initiatives is no longer a cause for concern. Although the entire upper administration has changed at every level in just a one and a half year span of time, the architecture program seems to have maintained its integrity. Since the last visit and since the submittal of this APR, the program a new dean arrived fall 2010, a new President took office January 2011 and an acting Provost had her first day during the NAAB's March 2011 visit. Interviews with all three administrators suggested that their respective visions for the university and the school are more supportive and integrative compared to the previous administrators. In spite of this extreme state of turnover and recent global economic challenges, the quality of the curricular offerings has remained high and do not appear to be compromised.

Title Cause of Concern: Physical Plant

Condition 7

2005 Condition 7, Physical Plant: *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.*

Previous Team Report (2005): The facility and its fixtures, furnishings, and equipment have generally reached an age where the near-term application of funds will be required to preserve the underlying value of the facility.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of physical plant is no longer a cause for concern. The team reviewed the physical plant and finds that improvements to the physical plant have been made since the last visit, including: 1) Renovation of the Architecture Library; 2) Addition to the Visual Resources Collection; 3) Creation of Digital Fabrication Lab out of a ground floor office space; 4) Renovation of the computer labs and continuing replacements of computer equipment; 5) Addition of the Digital Output Center (DOC); 6) Replacement of the elevator; 7) Addition of accessible door openers, and, 8) Construction of a translucent roof over courtyard. During the team's visit, the

building's skylights were in the process of being replaced. The studio spaces were recently repainted (a planned improvement). Furnishings throughout the building are somewhat shabby and existing drafting tables in the studio do not readily accommodate the multi-media, however the team understands that there is an intent to raise funds to replace the furnishings.

Title Cause of Concern: Library Relocation

Condition 8

2005 Condition 8, 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, evaluative, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

Previous Team Report (2005): The anticipated library development and relocation, potentially in conjunction with the College of Arts and Humanities, needs to be executed in such a way to preserve the library's all-weather connection and proximity to the Architecture Program student and faculty constituency.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of library relocation is no longer a cause for concern. The school has abandoned the idea of relocating to another library facility. The existing library was renovated.

Title Cause of Concern: Graphic Communication

Criterion 12.2

2005 Criterion 12.2, Graphic Skills: *Ability to employ appropriate representational media, including computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process*

Previous Team Report (2005): As the continued development of digital technology is undertaken, care should be exercised to maintain the longstanding superior capabilities the program exhibits in hand generated presentation skills.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of graphic communication is no longer a cause for concern. The team finds the level of hand-generated graphics to be high quality. Students demonstrate the ability to communicate graphically in a range of media in both Track I and Track II studio courses. There are high and low pass examples of student work which include sketches on tracing paper, hand drawings, rendered computer models, as well as physical models.

Title Cause of Concern: Course-Criteria Density

Criteria 12.31, 12.32, 12.33, 12.34, 12.35, and 12.37

Previous Team Report (2005): The NAAB requirements for as many as six student performance criteria are solely met by one required course, Professional Practice (ARCH 770), which represents less than 1 percent of the total classroom and studio time a student may devote to a 6- to 7-year academic career. This places an exceptional burden on the "success" of this course,

whether measured in terms of student attendance, comprehensive syllabus, or faculty experience, and the Architecture Program should take care to devote ongoing attention to this course, its “delivered/received” content, and the broadening of coverage of these criteria in related required courses.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The issue of course-criteria density is no longer a cause for concern. The school responded to the 2005 VTR cause for concern in two distinct ways. First, the school hired an experienced faculty member at the rank of Associate Professor to strengthen the Professional Practice curriculum. The second measure taken to alleviate this cause for concern regarding student performance criteria in the realm of Leadership and Practice was to spread it more broadly throughout the curriculum. Criteria were integrated throughout the design curriculum. The team was able to verify that only two student performance criteria, C.4 Project Management and C.5 Practice Management, are met solely by the Professional Practice course.

FINAL DRAFT

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: *The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.*

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

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

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The UMD APR for the 2011 NAAB visit outlines information in detail. The narrative describes the history and activities within the framework of distinctive courses, initiatives and pilot projects. In addition to the APR documentation, commentary by administrators, faculty, staff and students confirms that the written document accurately describes the program's history and mission.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The Academic/Studio Culture Policy is online and mentioned in course syllabi. Students indicated awareness of the policy. Students and faculty found the document to be useful for conflict resolution. Additional faculty and student discussions are offered via a faculty retrospective and a student/faculty retrospective at the end of each semester. However, the staff expressed that they feel underappreciated by the faculty and that their talents have been underutilized.

The Graduate Student Handbook is available online and contains policies and procedures for harassment and discrimination as well as procedures for resolving issues of academic equity. The University also has a Code of Academic Integrity, and the college's Diversity Plan is posted on their website. It was written by a Diversity Task Force in 2007, and adopted in 2008. The team finds that students and faculty have been treated equitably. The staff would like to strengthen its relationship with the faculty. This issue was not seen as a diversity driven issue, but partially the result of administrative and faculty transitions.

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

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The Architecture Program recognizes that its unique position in the university is shifting. The program is practice oriented delivering a high quality professional Masters degree with the faculty and professional community. The University of Maryland's past President had a mission to become one of the top 20 research universities in the country pushing excellence with an emphasis on PhD programs and funded research. This presented significant challenges for a program whose central purpose is professional education rather than research. More recently, in recognition of the need to be more integrated into the strategic plans of the university, the Architecture program has started plans to: 1) offer interdisciplinary courses to other schools/colleges; 2) participate more vigorously in the school's interdisciplinary PhD program; 3) expand the undergraduate general education program; and, 4) highlight faculty roles in architectural and planning issues facing the University. The program plans to retain the high quality of the professional program and areas of excellence such as the Solar Decathlon. Under the guidance of the new dean, the architecture program faculty is discussing how it can work with other programs in the school.

- 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.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The mission statement included in the strategic plan of the college demonstrates a commitment to diversity and equal opportunity among its students as well as the program's learning goals. An example of global emphasis is seen in their diverse study abroad programs, which are highly promoted and financially supported by the college. Students have opportunities to collaborate with other students outside of the school and have opportunities to participate in dual-degree programs. In addition, students have many opportunities to get involved through student groups including AIAS, NOMAS, USGBC Students or the all-school association. Students can participate in community outreach by teaching summer school to high school or middle school students.

- 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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Review of the required courses, including site analysis and design, the thesis proseminar, and Professional Practice, demonstrates that the program provides a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments. Further, the high percentage of licensed architects within the UMD faculty contributes to an understanding of the role of the registration board for Maryland. The relationship of the Architecture Program with the professional community allows students who are seeking summer internships or full-time employment opportunities to fulfill that objective. Other ways the school facilitates the transition to internship and licensure is by hiring practicing architects to teach design studios, inviting local architects to project reviews, and collaborating with local professionals. Students have access to a faculty IDP Educator Coordinator and are required to attend an annual mandatory IDP workshop where they are given information to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP) prior to the earliest point of eligibility.

- 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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Architectural Education and the Profession is the hallmark of the University of Maryland's program in architecture. The synergistic relationship between the members of the academic community and the profession is characterized by an actively engaged alumni, faculty, and student body. Some of the highlights of these connections include the award-winning multidisciplinary approach to sustainable design via projects developed for the solar decathlon competition; the study abroad programs which align students and faculty with professionals on over four continents; and, the noteworthy lecture series, including "Sustainable Tuesdays." In addition, a pilot program, led by Dean Cronrath, partners the school's faculty and students with professionals to produce feasibility studies for a \$600 million dollar campus biotech laboratory. Furthermore, the faculty has a majority level of professional membership and

licensure. The faculty commitment to the profession is fostered by a distinctive level of service to the program by alumni and members of the profession who mentor programs, student organizations and architecture activities. In fact, the chapter house for the American Institute of Architects (AIA) is located in the university's solar decathlon house. The AIA fellowship status of the University of Maryland faculty and alumni is also high.

- 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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The School's view of the relationship between architectural education and society is undeniably shaped by the University of Maryland's rich institutional values of global awareness and technological innovation. This viewpoint emphasizes the relevancy and value of architectural design as both an intellectual and material practice that has the power to generate new information and ways of making which contribute to societal advancement. The multiple interdisciplinary initiatives found within the program both on campus and beyond, such as the Nascent Center for the Use of Sustainable Practices within the National Center for Smart Growth Research and Education, stand as examples of civic engagement. The architectural curriculum addresses the public good in multiple venues, including coursework, research and service by student organizations and faculty, study abroad programs that engage communities, lectures, and exhibits. For instance, all students learn about the history and contemporary challenges in the public realm, as well as ethics and professional judgment in Practice. The skills sets that students obtain prepare them to successfully operate as stakeholders who shape built environments worldwide.

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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The Architecture Program has a strategic plan adopted in fall 2005. The process and data sources that the APR describes are appropriate, especially that of seeking ongoing faculty and student input and faculty review.

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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The department has initiated several on-going continual self-assessment strategies such as the Student and Faculty Retrospectives each term to evaluate studio activities around curricular objectives and to address student concerns. Annual architecture faculty retreats focus on larger issues. Most recently these have been the SPCs. Annual school-wide retreats have recently reviewed on the criteria for promotion and tenure and the school's reorganization plan initiated by the new dean. These are still under discussion and review by the faculty. The APR listed action items that were results of self-assessment activities.

FINAL DRAFT

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Program faculty of all ranks and in all areas is highly productive and effective. Though faculty members typically carry a full teaching and service load along with their own research, they are very accessible to students outside class time and maintain a collegial atmosphere. The program has experienced several retirements, a death and a long-term illness since the last accreditation visit. Several new tenure-track hires have been made. There is an existing policy of providing incoming and junior faculty with mentors and information on school and university policies regarding tenure and promotion. Since the last accreditation visit two faculty members (both women) have been tenured and one Associate Professor was promoted to Full Professor. Program staff described a strong sense of community within the School of Architecture community and the commitment of staff and faculty to the students they serve. However, the staff did not comment that human resources are inadequate, but they did comment that they would welcome more opportunities for staff and faculty to work together more closely.

- *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

There is sufficient evidence of adequate human resources and development for students. The evidence regarding admissions policies and procedures for incoming freshman and transfer students can primarily

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.

be found on the program's website at: <http://www.arch.umd.edu/students/admissions/>. The program also has a ten-point diversity plan which is being implemented since its adoption in 2008. Some of the recommendations of the plan have already been put in place with positive results, such as the creation of a NOMAS chapter to support minority students. There is also evidence of a commitment to student achievement in and out of the classroom by the large number of student who participate in NOMAS, AIAS and USGBC--which are supported by the school. The academic/studio culture document is also a demonstration of the faculty's acknowledgement to promote a healthy work/life balance for students.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The Architecture Program is one of five academic programs (not departments) within the academic unit of the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation. The faculty are appointed by the Dean and assigned to individual programs. The budget is determined by the Dean. The Architecture Program Director administers the Architecture program while there are Associate Deans for Research, Academic Affairs and an Assistant Dean for Internal Affairs & Budget as well as other support staff. The structure is adequate. The new dean led a study regarding the restructuring of the school fall of 2010 and the first draft was sent to the faculty during the 2011 team visit.

- **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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There are standing committees on which the Architecture Program faculty sit and have input on curriculum, searches, tenure and promotion, etc. Faculty and staff are all represented by the School Assembly which meets once a month at a meeting chaired by the Dean to discuss issues. There are also a variety of ways that faculty, staff and students can provide input to the dean.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team feels that the facility is extremely pleasant and well designed for the architecture program and the building's openness enhances the learning environment. The "great space" is a multi-functional space and is the program's focal point. Infrastructure improvements, for example the elevator upgrade and the roof/skylight replacement project, have been steadily undertaken since the last accreditation visit. The dean and architecture program faculty are aware that the building furnishings are worn, and the drawing desks in the studios are deteriorated and do not accommodate the digital design paradigm. Efforts are being made to procure resources to upgrade the furnishings. The shop is suitable for a maximum of only 6 students working at once, however creative

expansion into the “great space” for model building functions has helped to accommodate more project work. Although there is limited office space for part-time faculty, faculty and students did not see this as a major detriment to providing service to the program.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is met with concern. In the past several years, the Provost and the Dean have both charged the program a 1% recapture of funds in order to implement their own initiatives. These funds were then reallocated based on competitive proposals from different units across campus and from within the School. The Architecture program did obtain funds but not to the extent of the 2% which was taken away. Since the last visit and since the submittal of this APR, the program has seen a new dean, a new President and a new Provost; all have a different and more inclusive vision for the university and the school from the previous administration. The national economic situation has impacted the university’s budget as well. The President of the university expressed his understanding that the process used in the past is not the best way to pull funds from the units to cover new initiatives given the future university-wide budget cuts. With the current budget situations, there is still concern over the program budget but the program faculty and director are more optimistic about program input and their ability to be more creative in solutions to which the upper administration may be amenable. The President does see the School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation as being strategically suited to work on some of the issues that he sees as critical to the university in partnership with others.

The APR provided the requested information which indicates appropriate financial resources to support the curricular program. The architecture program spends \$397/credit hour and \$9,635/student compared to \$257/ credit hour and \$5,092/student for Civil Engineering and \$368/credit hour and \$4,945/student for the College of Information Studies.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence of the student, faculty and staff access to information resources. The library hours are adequate, as is the availability of trained professional librarians. A renovation of the library has been completed since the last visit. It increases the visibility of the Library Director, who is also available to students by email. The Subject Librarian also teaches classes in the school—promoting higher visibility for the library and its resources. She works closely with online resources such as JSTOR (journal storage) to increase the digital resources available for architecture students online and outside of regular library hours. It is acknowledged that there is a small mezzanine in the library which is not ADA accessible, but reasonable accommodation has been made in the training of staff to retrieve books for individuals who are unable to access the area. The architecture program also has a separate, large architectural slide and video library that is run by staff, and is available for students, faculty and staff to use. Conversion of the slides to digital format is underway.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: All of the reports were provided except a “Time to graduation” report, because the University of Maryland’s Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (IRPA) does not track this data for the Architecture Program’s Master of Architecture degree programs.

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

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

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

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Annual reports were successfully accessed via the internet.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: *The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.*

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty 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.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Faculty resumes demonstrated the necessary range of knowledge and experience. The team specifically noted the large percentage of licensed architects with many years of professional practice experience. The program faculty is engaged in diverse modes of research that include scholarly, applied, design and creative research.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: All required policy documents were provided in a well organized manner in the team room.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence in essay exams submitted for both ARCH 226 History of World Architecture II and ARCH 227 History of World Architecture III. Track I students are achieving at the level of ability in communication skills. Response papers submitted by Track II students both for ARCH 426 Fundamentals of Architecture and ARCH 427 Theories of Architecture, as well as research papers written for ARCH 427 demonstrate student ability to communicate 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Students in both Track I and II clearly demonstrate the ability to employ design thinking skills in both the ARCH 601 Topical Design Studio and ARCH 799 Thesis Research.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. There is a large quantity of work displayed in the team room which showcases the representational abilities of the students throughout the entire undergraduate and graduate studio sequence. Digital technology is integrated slowly in the undergraduate studios, and is used more consistently in graduate school. Traditional hand drawings with a variety of drawing media are abundant and well met. An abundance of physical models is showcased which have been made both manually and using digital fabrication techniques.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has not been met. The team found a lack of evidence of student ability meeting the outline specification writing portion of this criterion. Evidence meeting the remainder of this performance criterion was found in Tracks I and II in the required courses ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio, ARCH 601 Topical Studio, and Arch 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence that Track I students are achieving at the level of ability in investigative skills as demonstrated by work in both ARCH 227 History of World Architecture III and ARCH 797 Thesis Proseminar. Track II student work in ARCH 797 Thesis Proseminar, as well as research papers in ARCH 427 Theories of Architecture clearly display student ability in investigative skills.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Evidence shows the abilities of the students to use basic architectural and environmental principles in design. The work in studios 402 and 403 focus on basic principles, and clearly build upon each other in technicality over time.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been well met in every level. Track I students demonstrated the ability to use precedents ranging from individual buildings to gardens and urban plans in both the ARCH 403 Architecture Studio IV and the ARCH 700 Advanced Urban Design Studio VII. Track II students demonstrated the ability to use architectural and urban precedents in their sketchbooks from ARCH 445 Visual Analysis and in the ARCH 407 Graduate Architecture Design Studio IV.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Students in Tracks I and II demonstrated an understanding of both natural and formal Ordering System Skills in their ARCH 460 Site Analysis and Design projects. Students in Track I also demonstrated this understanding in their ARCH 403 Architecture Studio IV work and Track II students in their ARCH 406 Graduate Architecture Design Studio III.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Strong evidence was found showing understanding from students in Track I in historical traditions and global culture in courses ARCH 225 and ARCH 226. There is also evidence of Track II students meeting this criterion in ARCH 426 and ARCH 427 in combination with ARCH 654.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. ARCH 225 and 226 show work of Track I students identifying the cultural reasons behind design decisions in both western and non-western societies in their exams. There is adequate evidence of Track II students meeting this criterion through courses ARCH 426, 427, and 654.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The various syllabi for Arch 601 Topical Studio required precedent studies, case-study investigations, analytical frameworks, and /or technology research. The student drawings in the "Great Space" for ARCH 601 show a wide range of precedent studies.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The 2011 Visiting Team finds that students demonstrate a thorough background and competent skill level in Critical Thinking and Representation. Use of precedents is of particularly high caliber and found within many of the design project studies. In the area of technical documentation, however, examples of outline specifications could not be found and were not provided.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II primarily in the documents produced for required courses ARCH 797 Thesis Pro-seminar and Arch 799 Master's Thesis Research.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II primarily in the drawings produced for required courses ARCH 460 Site Analysis and Design and ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been well met. The team found evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in a number of required courses including Arch 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar and particularly as evidenced in the documents produced for the ARCH 601 Topical Design Studio Solar Decathlon Project.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in the drawings produced for required courses ARCH 406 Graduate Architecture Design Studio III, ARCH 460 Site Analysis and Design, and ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student ability meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II primarily in the drawings and models produced for required courses ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio and Arch 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been well met. The team found strong evidence that both Track I and II students are achieving at the level of ability in Comprehensive Design in work produced for the concurrent ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio and ARCH 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar. The University of Maryland's focus on integrated, innovative design is clearly stated in fall 2008 and 2009 joint syllabi for ARCH600/611: "The intent of the course ARCH 600abc/611 is to recognize the unity of design and technology by concentrating on the impact of material and technique on architectural form in a studio setting." The student work fulfilled the stated intentions of the course. The fall 2010 version of these courses took the same approach and focused on the development of the University of Maryland's 2011 entry to the Solar Decathlon competition--WaterShed.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Architecture 770 Professional Practice introduces students to the fundamentals of financial considerations via lecture topics, case studies, and handouts on financial statements, budgets and cost estimating.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The criterion has been met. There is evidence of the student understanding of the principles of environmental systems' design. This is very clear in the technological classes, 413 and 611 for both Tracks.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The criterion has been met. Student work includes bridge modeling projects in 412, as well as exams with both calculations and graphic components in both 411 and 412.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The criterion has been well met. Comprehensive projects in 600/611 showed a high level of student understanding of building envelope systems. Evidence included detailed drawings of the building envelope systems for student projects and large scale models.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The criterion has been met. ARCH 413 is required for both Path A and Path B students. It is the only course which is indicated to fully cover this criterion. Sufficient evidence exists through the course exams which, among other things, require the students to sketch various mechanical systems.

- B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products,**

components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence that Track I and II students are achieving at the level of understanding in Building Materials and Assemblies Integration. Student examinations from ARCH 410 Technology I and design work from the integrated ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio and ARCH 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar demonstrate this understanding.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The 2011 Visiting Team finds that Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge is an area of strength in the program. Three of the four areas of distinction are in Realm B. Of particular note is the level of integration and involvement between students, faculty, professionals and the community to produce practical solutions to design problems. Sustainability, Comprehensive Design and Building Envelope are well developed and strong evidence of competence is demonstrated via drawings, models and multi-media format.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence that Track I and Track II students are achieving at the level of ability in collaboration in several courses. For instance, Track I and Track II students collaborate in ARCH 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar. The team also found evidence in project booklets collaboratively created in the ARCH 700 Advanced Urban Design Studio VII by Track I students. Track II students in ARCH 407 Graduate Architecture Design Studio IV collaborated in several phases of the design process, including site and program analysis, the creation of physical and digital site models, and the collaborative design of a master plan (in teams of three) within which individual building designs were sited.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The syllabus, paper assignments and exams for Arch 654 covered the topics in this criterion. Samples of student exams demonstrate that the material was covered.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student understanding meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in required courses ARCH 700 Urban Design Studio, ARCH 770 Professional Practice, and ARCH 799 Thesis Research.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student understanding meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in required course ARCH 770 Professional Practice.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student understanding meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in required course ARCH 770 Professional Practice.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. Sufficient evidence exists in course 770 of the understanding of the leadership techniques and skills of architects in collaborative work. The course includes response papers which allow students to demonstrate their understanding of complex situations which involve a combination of environmental, social, and aesthetic issues.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student understanding meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in required course ARCH 770 Professional Practice and ARCH 797 Thesis Proseminar.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence of student understanding meeting this performance criterion in both tracks I and II in required course ARCH 770 Professional Practice and ARCH 797 Thesis Proseminar.

- 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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has been met. The team found evidence that Track I and II students are achieving at the level of understanding in Community and Social Responsibility. This understanding is evident in student essay exams from ARCH 654 Urban Development and Design Theory. This understanding is also manifest in Track I student work from the ARCH 407 Graduate Architecture Design Studio IV and Track II student work produced in the ARCH 700 Advanced Urban Design Studio VII.

<p>Realm C. General Team Commentary: The 2011 Visiting Team finds that students meet the criteria for Leadership and Practice. Both lecture courses and studio programs provide exposure to the competencies for this realm. Evidence was found in response papers, exams and digital format.</p>
--

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The APR contains a copy of the letter dated June 29, 2007 from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education stating that the Commission voted to reaffirm accreditation for the University of Maryland, College Park and that the next Periodic Review Report is due June 1, 2012.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The APR supplied the information requested in this section that was necessary to determine curricular requirements. The programs curricular requirements meet or exceed the minimums for professional studies for the M.Arch degrees. Both M.Arch tracks require a baccalaureate degree for admission. General studies information for University of Maryland BS Architecture students was found on the school website listed under 'curricular summaries' and lists more than the 45 minimum general education credits required for that degree. It is assumed that these requirements are met in the undergraduate degrees of candidates being admitted into the programs from outside of the University of Maryland. Prerequisites for all University of Maryland courses were found in the Course Descriptions provided in Part Four: Supplemental Information of the APR.

The off-campus programs are primarily summer study abroad programs of 3 or 6 weeks in Paris, Rome and Stabiae. The programs offer one or two 3-credit elective courses depending on the length of time. The city is the classroom as they sketch or learn history of the area. Every spring semester 12 students can spend the semester at Kiplin Hall in Great Britain--a study center leased by the university. Classrooms and housing for the students and faculty are provided on the Hall grounds. Course requirements met are ARCH 407 Studio IV, ARCH 413 Technology IV, ARCH 460 Site Analysis and Design, ARCH XXX Architectural History Elective.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The University of Maryland has responded to changes in the NAAB conditions and has described the process by which their Track I and II programs are evaluated and modified in Section I.1.5 Program Self Assessment. The regular Faculty Retreats and end of semester

Retrospectives between students and faculty are examples of reflection, evaluation and development of the curriculum. Of particular note is that tenured and tenure-track faculty, many of whom are licensed architects, are very integrally involved in the curriculum review and development process.

FINAL DRAFT

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Seven of the SPCs for the M.Arch Track 1 rely on coursework in the pre-professional educational experience. The SPC matrix indicates that A.1, A.3, A.6, A.9, A.10, B.9, B.11 are solely or primarily demonstrated by student undergraduate work.

The Architecture Program has developed a procedure for evaluating the preparatory/pre-professional education of students admitted to the accredited program with Advanced Standing (i.e. M.Arch Track 1). As part of the admissions process, the Admissions Committee reviews transcripts to confirm that required courses (corresponding to requirements of the University of Maryland B.S. in Architecture) have been completed successfully. The committee also reviews portfolios to confirm that student work demonstrates preparedness to undertake the Comprehensive Studio. If these two factors are satisfied (along with a BS in Architecture or equivalent, minimum 3.0 GPA, personal statement, references, GRE, TOEFL for international students), then the student is offered advanced standing and placed in the 2-year Master of Architecture Advanced Standing (pre-professional degree + 60 credit) program. In a small number of cases, students are awarded one year of advanced standing and placed in the second year of the 3 1/2 year Master of Architecture (degree + 109 credit) program. These students may have a B.S. in Architecture degree, but require additional studio education to prepare them for the Comprehensive Studio or they may have a B.A. in Architecture degree that includes a minimum of two semesters of studio and two semesters of technology.

Students with undergraduate degrees from institutions other than University of Maryland's Architecture Program who are admitted with Advanced Standing are advised that, prior to receiving authorization to register for courses, they must have their pre-professional preparation evaluated and approved. Students are asked to present course materials including syllabus, documentation of all coursework assigned, and examples of their work on every project, paper, exam, essay, or other course assignment for faculty and advisor review. The evaluation and approval is documented on a rubric and saved in the student file containing the admissions and advising records.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the program's website, the on-line graduate catalog of courses, and the university's promotional materials, and found the Statement on NAAB-Accredited degrees reproduced in the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5, as required.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the program's website, and found available and functioning downloadable editions of *The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* and *The 2010 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (the edition currently in effect)*, as required.

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.aiaa.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the program's website, and found available and functioning links to all documents listed in this item, as required.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the program's website, and found available and functioning links to of all documents listed in this item, as required.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team reviewed the program's website, and found the links were both available and functioning, as required.

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

University of Maryland's Transformation

During the past twelve years, the University of Maryland has transformed its academic stature and impact. Twenty years ago, Maryland was a good university, but considered a safety school for the highest achieving students. Today, it enrolls many of the State's top high school graduates and competes for outstanding students from around the nation and the world. Faculty members are pre-eminent in nearly all fields of research and scholarship. The University's faculty includes three Nobel laureates, seven Pulitzer Prize recipients, and more than 40 members of prestigious national academies. By 2008, competitively awarded research grants topped \$400 million, nearly double the amount in 1997. In the most recent ranking, U.S. News & World Report placed University of Maryland 18th among public institutions in the nation, up from 30th twelve years ago. The Academic Ranking of World Universities issued by Shanghai Jiao Tong University placed the University of Maryland 37th in the world, up from 75th seven years ago. The physical campus has grown by over 20% in the past twelve years. The University leadership is committed to continuing this upward trajectory.

In its Strategic Plan, aptly titled Transforming Maryland: Higher Expectations, the University defines its role as the State's flagship institution as follows:

The University of Maryland's role is to preserve and transmit the knowledge of the past, to illuminate the challenges of the present and contribute to their solution, and to shape the future. As the flagship, our task is to attract the most brilliant minds, advance the frontiers of knowledge, stimulate innovation and creativity, and educate those who will be leaders in all areas, including civic life, business, culture, and education. As the flagship, we have a special responsibility in Maryland to educate engaged and thoughtful citizens for life in a complex, vibrant, democratic society...In crafting its strategic plan to build upon world-class rank, the University of Maryland set out to exploit its distinctive strengths and advantages: its location just miles from the world's most powerful political capital and an unmatched array of federal laboratories and cultural institutions, embassies, libraries, artistic, and non-profit service organizations; its location in a state with tremendous resources and opportunities, a highly educated population, and a strong knowledge-based economy; its academic strength and breadth; its diverse community of students, faculty, and staff; and its momentum. This university places a premium on excellence in everything it does, on innovation and creativity, and on entrepreneurial initiative. It is determined to be preeminent, to serve our state through local and national engagement and world impact.

A new President has just been appointed to lead the University of Maryland. In his initial speech, he pledged to spur the upward trajectory of the University. In his talk, he stressed his new role as a citizen of College Park, committing himself to fostering a vibrant community surrounding the University. This presents a great opportunity for the Architecture Program and School to demonstrate our value to the University and local community by offering our considerable expertise and leadership in these efforts.

University of Maryland: History and Founding Principles

The State of Maryland established its first two colleges at Chestertown and Annapolis just after the American Revolution. By the 1850's at least thirty small colleges had sprung up around the state. Many institutions received state support, however a considerable number disappeared within a few years. In 1859 a different kind of institution appeared at College Park – the Maryland Agricultural College. This was the third such college in the world, created mainly for farmers' sons. The college was established by a descendant of the Lords Baltimore the founder-proprietors of Maryland. The founder built a handsome

Gothic style dormitory-classroom structure located in a grove of trees near the present Morrill Hall, and he divided the land down to the Baltimore-Washington Turnpike (today U.S. Route 1) into small plots where each of the approximately 50 students experimented with a different agricultural crop.

After the Civil War the institution became a land-grant college, with small appropriations from Washington. During this period, the college expanded its offerings into engineering, business and the liberal arts. In 1912 the old Gothic building burned, and the state provided new structures. Women were admitted to the campus and graduate studies were begun. In 1920 the college combined with the long-established professional schools of Baltimore and changed its name to the University of Maryland.

Ambitious university leaders from the mid 1930s through the 1950s resulted in the development of scores of new programs and dramatic expansion of the College Park campus. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., Charles W. Eliot, III, and Jens Frederick Larson, were among the legendary landscape architects, planners, and architects consulted during this period on the development of College Park's beaux-arts campus plan. Ambitious leaders built the institution on New Deal funding and by seeking out state and federal agencies that would benefit from an academic and research institution in College Park. Despite the progress during this time period, the University of Maryland was a segregated institution and it wasn't until the 1960's that the institution became fully integrated.

Following World War II the university maintained the rapid growth, and College Park became one of the largest campuses in the nation. New university leadership began the process of transforming the institution's public image into one of academic integrity. Emphasis was placed on basic subjects and strict academic standards. By 1964, eighty-two percent of freshmen came from the top half of their high school classes, and Phi Beta Kappa, which turned down Maryland twice before, established a chapter.

In the 1970's and 1980's, the University's graduate and research programs flourished. In 1988, the General Assembly of Maryland combined six state colleges with the five campuses of the University of Maryland to create the University System of Maryland (USM). The University of Maryland is the flagship institution in this system. USM is Maryland's system of public higher education and its members include all public colleges and universities in the State, with the exception of Morgan State University and St. Mary's College.

The twelfth-largest university system in the nation, USM administers system-wide programs of Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, and Advancement. The Office of Academic Affairs oversees academic planning and accountability, academic policy, articulation, faculty affairs, federal relations, and institutional research. The Office of Administration and Finance provides staff support to the Regents and the Chancellor in the exercise of their responsibility for resource management of the University System. It works with the presidents and their chief administrative and fiscal officers', the Office

coordinates and monitors the allocation and use of resources throughout the System. It is the principal interface between the System and those state departments and agencies concerned with the allocation and management of resources. State allocations are directed first to USM, then to UMD. The Office of Advancement oversees all Development and fund-raising on campus. In the late 1980's, the General Assembly also made significant efforts to increase funding of the University, which were, however, curtailed because of economic conditions.

In 1998, the College Park campus was given special status within the system by designating it "The University of Maryland." The nomenclature of other campuses in the system utilizes qualifiers such as "University of Maryland, Baltimore." In 1998, discussions in an economically favorable climate were directed at increased support for the University of Maryland, as the State recognized the benefits of high quality higher education.

These positive directions have been challenged by sustained State budget deficits and persistent cuts to higher education. Current budget cuts by the State of Maryland are reflective of national trends, and have had an impact on the University in terms of significantly higher tuition fees, increased teaching loads, and a variety of austerity measures. The University, however, remains committed to the quality of its programs, and to the enhancement of its national and international recognition. The University of Maryland's Strategic Plan, *Higher Expectations*, asserts the University's determination, despite the unfavorable economic conditions, to take its place among the very top public universities in the nation and the world. We see the impact of this commitment in the University's aggressive allocation of resources to reward and foster excellence and to promote efficiency.

The University of Maryland currently has a budget in excess of \$1.1 billion, making it one of Maryland's largest enterprises. Major efforts at private fund-raising were initiated in the 1990's and continue to the present day. A new presidential leadership will be joining University of Maryland in fall 2010. For its part, the University recognizes its special responsibility as the flagship and largest of the institutions in the state system to lead the quest for excellence. To this end, the University offers broad coverage in the traditional arts and sciences, as well as in a wide range of professional and pre-professional programs. 32 programs rank among the top ten and 86 programs among the top 25 in the nation. Approximately 65 departments and programs rank among the best in the nation. The University is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and is a member of the Association of American Universities. In the fall of 2009, 26,542 undergraduate and 10,653 graduate students were registered. The University is located on a 1309-acre campus in College Park, Maryland, about forty miles from Baltimore and fourteen miles from Washington, DC. Its location offers unusual access to a broad spectrum of cultural, political and economic institutions and a wide range of social and environmental settings, constituting excellent resources for study and intellectual enrichment.

University of Maryland: Vision

During the next decade, the University of Maryland will enhance its standing as a world-class, preeminent institution of higher education. The University will achieve this goal through an unwavering commitment to excellence in all that it undertakes. The University will attract a diverse student body that possesses the ability and passion for learning. Innovative and relevant programs, whether within or built upon traditional disciplines in the arts and sciences, will prepare students to be engaged and self-realized citizens and leaders in a complex, democratic society. The University will foster research, scholarship, and arts programs noted for their quality, creativity, and impact, and provide affordable access. As befits its proximity to the nation's capital, the University will expand its

international influence and address great and challenging problems of our time. Taking maximum advantage of its special location, the University will be a world center for creation and refinement of knowledge; advancement in science and technology, humanities, and social sciences; global leadership; and innovative production in the creative and performing arts.

University of Maryland: Mission

As a major asset to the State of Maryland, the University's mission is to foster the education, critical thinking, and intellectual growth of its students, the creation and application of new knowledge, the economic development of the State, and the effective engagement of its students, faculty, and staff with the surrounding world. Outstanding students from Maryland, the nation, and the world are provided with training, habits of thought, knowledge, and skills that will prepare them to be leaders in their careers and global citizens. To do this, the University offers a wide range of education programs, generates a rich array of special opportunities, and nurtures a diverse and stimulating campus community. Through its emphasis on the foundational disciplines that provide the basis for understanding current issues, it prepares students who can think critically about society, who have knowledge of the history and development of ideas concerning human experience and society, and who are scientifically literate, technologically proficient, and globally conscious. Through extensive programs in research, scholarship, and the performing and creative arts, the University plays a significant role in advancing the frontiers of knowledge. The University places a premium on social, scientific, and technological innovations. These initiatives contribute to economic development, help solve major societal challenges, and advance human welfare. The University shares its intellectual and artistic resources with the community for the benefit of all. It engages in collaborative ventures with a range of domestic and international institutions – educational, scientific, cultural, governmental, and commercial. These ventures serve a variety of ends. They benefit the development of the University's students and its scholarly endeavors. They provide support to the University's partners. And they advance the overall welfare of Maryland and the world beyond.

B. History and Mission of the Program

Architecture Program: Within the Context of the School, the University, and 21st Century Higher Education

Founded as the School of Architecture in 1977, the School today comprises several disciplines, and is growing into its identity as a place for interdisciplinary teaching, research, creative practice, and service to the local, regional, national, and global communities. In line with its motto, "Collaborative Education for a Sustainable Future," the School is adding dual degree programs and certificate programs offering opportunities for students to cross-disciplinary lines to prepare themselves for a future in which complex problems require interdisciplinary expertise. The School's programs are Architecture, Planning, Historic Preservation, and Real Estate Development. There is an interdisciplinary PhD program. The Architecture Program offers dual degrees with Planning and Historic Preservation. A dual Architecture/Real Estate Development degree is in the approval stages. Certificates exist in Urban Design, Historic Preservation, and Real Estate Development.

Our fifth Dean joined the School this summer, with a mandate from the Provost to bring the School into alignment with the University's strategic priorities. Poised for the start of the new academic year, we have high hopes that the new Dean an educator-architect, will both represent us well to the University administration and guide us through a period of transformative change in response to changing conditions in our university and in

higher education around the nation. Key challenges will be to advocate for a professional school in a university that privileges scientific research; to unite a School that has grown in programs without commensurate development of organizational integration; to compete for funding in a time of increasing privatization of public universities; to strive for excellence and to gain recognition for our accomplishments.

Architecture Program: History, and Founding Principles

In response to several years of lobbying by the Maryland architectural community, the University invited the American Institute of Architects to help it form a committee to advise it on the establishment of an architectural school. The blue-ribbon committee, chaired by a past national President of the American Institute of Architects, recommended in 1964 that the program be located at College Park, and outlined conditions that ensured that the sights of the University were aimed at excellence in professional architectural education.

In 1967, after a nation-wide search, the first Dean of the School of Architecture was appointed, and the School opened its doors to students in the fall of that year. Selective admissions procedures were established from the beginning, targeted to 300 undergraduate majors, a number selected to avoid the need to provide redundant drawing, history/theory, technology, and professional practice course sections. In the first decade of the school's experience, it was able to select students from an applicant pool about six times larger than each year's freshman class. The curriculum was organized as a five-year Bachelor of Architecture Degree program, with the intention that a graduate degree be initiated after the program was fully in place, and accredited.

The five-year format allowed the school to attract strong students and grow quickly in quality and breadth. The dean in those early years reported directly to the president of the university, and that situation, coupled with an atmosphere of strong emphasis on quality and adequate financial resources, contributed to the qualitative growth of the curriculum, faculty and supporting resources. From the beginning, the school was able to aim for excellence in its slide and library collections, and to attract outstanding leadership for those resources, as well as outstanding faculty.

In 1972, the School moved into its present building, and gained full accreditation. During the next few years, the School continued to develop its program and expand its areas of research and service. It intensified its efforts to recruit students from a wider geographic and social constituency, and to broaden the service and consultative roles of faculty and students. During this period, a number of useful and educational projects were undertaken in the service of the community that left a legacy of good will in diverse communities throughout the state.

In the 1970's, the University was reorganized in a divisional structure, removing the dean one step from the office of the campus executive, which had a somewhat inhibiting effect on the School's further realization of its initial ambitions. However, the changing mission of the university provided a context for the reorganization of the school's curriculum around a graduate professional degree program, and in the late '70's, the school began a study of the conversion of its program to a graduate model.

Campus administration was reorganized again, in the late 1980's, abandoning its "divisional" model and reverting to its earlier "college" model. The change has resulted in the School's dean reporting, once again, directly to the Office of the President of the College Park Campus, in the person of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The administrative change has led to improved communications between the School's leadership and the leadership of other schools and colleges on campus, and with the Office of the President.

After several years of work, a reorganized curriculum leading to a Master's Degree in Architecture was put forward, and in 1980 the revised program was approved. At the undergraduate level, selective admissions were maintained, with students admitted to the pre-professional program beginning in their junior collegiate years. Special exceptions were made for outstanding students, who were granted early admission to the program as freshmen. In 1991, the admissions procedures were revised in accordance with university policy, to facilitate provisional admission of students to the School from high school, with formal candidacy for the architecture undergraduate architecture major (leading to a B.S. in Architecture) dependent on performance in "gateway" courses (43-credit review) and on submission of a competitive portfolio.

The graduate professional degree program was fully accredited in 1985. The graduate program is a 3-1/2 year course of study for students with a prior undergraduate degree in a field other than architecture (Path B). Students with a B.S. Arch., or equivalent, enter the program with advanced standing and follow a two-year course of study (Path A). Admission to the graduate program is competitive and is based on academic achievement (GPA and GRE), recommendations and a portfolio. The program faculty approved revisions to the architecture curriculum in 2002 and 2004 in order to make better use of faculty and financial resources while simultaneously improving student outcomes.

In 1992, the program in Urban Studies and Planning was moved from the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences to the School of Architecture as a part of a campus-wide reallocation of resources. Urban Studies and Planning offers a Master of Community Planning degree, and in 1998 the school began offering a M.ARCH./M.C.P. dual degree program. In 2001 a Masters degree in Historic Preservation (M.H.P.) was initiated; the School continues to offer its long-standing Certificate in Historic Preservation, which has been awarded to a significant number of architecture students. In 2008, the school graduated its first student with a dual Master of Architecture and Master of Historic Preservation Degree.

The Architecture Program also benefits from contact with the National Center for Smart Growth Education and Research, which was established in 2001 as a cooperative venture of four schools: Architecture, Public Affairs, Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Engineering. Headquartered in the School, the Center's goal is to become the national leader in research-based knowledge and education for Maryland and the nation. The interests of the Center are clearly shared by the Architecture Program, and collaborative efforts are being implemented.

An important goal of the strategic plan of the School was the establishment of a doctoral program. In 2002, the School initiated a Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning and Design. Currently the program is stewarded by a faculty member from the Planning Program, however a faculty member from the Architecture Program participates in the admissions committee. As the program admits Ph.D. candidates with interests related to the field, Architecture Program faculty members are likely to serve as committee members. However, the Architecture faculty is concerned that a lack of resources will hamper full participation in the Ph.D. program. Currently the participation on a Ph.D. committee constitutes significant instructional overload for Architecture Program faculty members. It is hoped that new leadership within the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation will help to develop workload models that will encourage participation of Architecture faculty in this important program.

In 2006, the School created a new Masters in Real Estate Development Program (MRED). This new program has functioned as a catalyst for collaborative activity among the programs, with the Program Director's keen interest in teaching students how the

various disciplines fit into the development process. Interdisciplinary competitions are one important way in which the Real Estate Development Program fosters collaboration among students and faculty in the various programs. A number of Architecture Program students take courses in MRED, complete MRED certificates, and plan to complete the dual Architecture/MRED degree program (in the approval process).

In 1997 the Dean of the School appointed for the first time a Director of the Architecture program; prior to this time the Dean had acted as Director of Architecture. This change was necessitated by the addition of the Urban Studies and Planning Program to the School and (at the time) the likely expansion of Historic Preservation. In 1998, with the help of the Office of Institutional Advancement, the Dean appointed a full-time Director of Development for the first time in its history. Since his arrival, the School has exceeded fund-raising goals set by the university. In 2002, the School was renamed the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, and in 2003, renovation of the gallery space into two levels provided needed new office space. All faculty of the School, except for the faculty of the National Center for Smart Growth Research and Education, are now together in one building, facilitating improved communication.

Architecture Program: Vision and Mission

The Architecture Program envisions a community of students, scholars, and practitioners committed to life-long critical thinking focused on the built and natural environments; to advancing and integrating academic and professional knowledge about those environments; and to achieving utility, sustainability, beauty and meaningful expressions of culture in shaping those environments.

The mission of the Architecture Program at the University of Maryland is to engage in teaching and learning imbued with critical thinking; to foster critical inquiry through research, scholarship, and creative academic and professional activity; and to encourage leadership in community service that enhances the quality of built and natural environments.

Engagement in teaching and learning places value on critical analysis of architectural conventions and their evolution, encourages informed reasoning and appropriate form-making in giving shape to the built environment, whether crafting building details or composing landscapes or planning cities; and recognizes design excellence that embraces a humane, sustainable future.

Critical inquiry in a collegial setting preserves and refines existing knowledge while simultaneously developing new knowledge of the built and natural environments through research, scholarship, and creative academic and professional activities.

Leadership through service activity proclaims that architecture is the most public of arts, and that Architects are committed to environmental quality, to social justice, and to helping meet the needs of communities not only in the Chesapeake Bay region and throughout the State of Maryland, but also nationally and internationally.

The Architecture Program Benefits the University of Maryland through Discovery, Teaching, Engagement, and Service

The Architecture Program offers leadership in the design of the built environment at all scales. Activities such as the Solar Decathlon draw students from around campus into an active learning experience about

sustainable architecture. Lectures, exhibits, symposia, and conferences bring architecture into the intellectual life of the campus. Competition awards bring honor to the University. Outreach activities bring the University the good will of the community. General Education courses teach students from around campus about architecture. Some examples of the specific benefits that the Architecture Program brings to the University are as follows:

- Leadership in the Solar Decathlon, a collaborative research project involving students and faculty from around campus – the Architecture Program is currently leading the University of Maryland’s fourth entry into the Solar Decathlon competition
- AIA 150 Initiative the Greener Greenbelt Project – an interdisciplinary effort of the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation
- Consulting expertise on campus planning and design issues such as East Campus Re-Development, campus art, faculty member service on the University Facilities Council, multiple faculty member service on the Architectural Design Standards Board that ensures quality of design execution on campus.
- Kibel Gallery and Linear Gallery Exhibits
- Public Lecture Series
- Symposia including international symposium on School Design, Visions of Place Symposium, Thomas Schumacher Memorial Symposium, contributions to School-wide symposia on Housing and Sustainable Development, Laboratory Symposium
- Several Congress of the New Urbanism awards to students
- Competition successes, including ULI Hines Competition
- K-12 STEM Teaching, including Discovering Architecture Young Scholars Summer Program, Architecture in the Schools, summer high school program for National Federation for the Blind

The Institutional Setting of the University of Maryland Benefits the Architecture Program

The Architecture Program benefits from its setting in a multidisciplinary School within a top-tier research University. Some specific benefits of the School setting:

- Interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching, research, competitions
- Students have access to courses, certificates, and dual degree programs in multiple disciplines
- Information resources including a library with subject librarian specializing in architecture and a visual resource center
- Interdisciplinary PhD Program

Benefits of the University setting:

- Array of excellent departments and programs offers opportunities to form partnerships for teaching and research – examples: Solar Decathlon brings together students and faculty from Engineering and Agriculture with Architecture for courses and competition; collaborative proposal for NSF SEED grant with Engineering and Agriculture
- Research support
- Extensive Library system
- Shared governance – Senate
- Cultural activities

Architecture Program: Developing Young Professionals through Liberal Arts and Practicum Based Learning

Professional education in the graduate Architecture Program is grounded in previous undergraduate education giving students an extensive foundation in the liberal arts. Students in the 2 year Master of Architecture degree program prepare for graduate study with a BS in Architecture degree. Many students in the 2 year program are graduates of University of Maryland, with its CORE/General Education requirements, designed to “help students achieve the intellectual integration and awareness they need to meet challenges in their personal, social, political, and professional lives. General education courses introduce the great ideas and controversies in human thought and experience.”⁵

Students in the 3 ½ year program come with a wide variety of undergraduate degrees and sometimes prior careers, including visual arts, art history, psychology, neuroscience, computer science, physics, mechanical engineering, and a diversity of other majors. This intellectual diversity adds breadth to the peer teaching that takes place in studio.

The Architecture Program offers strong preparation in the areas of history, theory, urbanism, site analysis and design, technology, professional practice, and, for students in the 3 ½ year program, visual communication and visual analysis. Required electives, directed electives, and a seminar give students the opportunity for exploring in breadth or concentrating in depth. Study abroad experiences are highly valued by students and faculty alike. The program takes pride in providing scholarship funds to every student participating in study abroad experiences who applies to the Scholarship Committee. Integration of knowledge and skills takes place in the studio, where faculty, consultants, and guest critics reinforce the lessons learned in the various subject areas and tie in students’ experiences with sketching and analysis of places visited on study abroad programs.

The Comprehensive Studio coupled with the Advanced Technology course, pioneered at the University of Maryland, gives students a semester-long experience simulating architectural practice, with collaborative work, an array of consultants, and the detailed development of a building design, with exposure to the use of Building Information Modeling in the design process. Professional preparation culminates in the Master of Architecture thesis, a year-long endeavor in which students explore a set of ideas by initiating, siting, programming, and designing a project in regular consultation with a faculty committee. The thesis is where students generally integrate their prior education and experiences into their architectural educations and create a bridge to their future practice. For students both local and international, this may mean tackling a challenge in their home communities, launching them into practice in those locales. Or, it may mean defining an area of expertise, such as design for education that knits an earlier career in teaching to a future career designing schools.

The Architecture Program offers students a rich set of opportunities to participate in interdisciplinary competitions, where they develop collaborative teamwork skills and a firsthand understanding of the contributions of a constellation of participants in projects. Students gain perspective by viewing complex problems through the eyes of their teammates, faculty advisors, and mentors. The focus of the competitions on issues of sustainable buildings and communities prepares students to tackle critical issues in practice. The Program is currently undertaking the Solar Decathlon for the fourth time, with a team of over 100 students plus faculty from the Schools of Architecture, Engineering, and Agriculture and mentors from Architecture, Engineering, allied professions and trades. Architecture Program students team with participants from the School’s other disciplines in the ULI Hines Urban Design Competition, the REIDO Competition, and the Hillman Competition, working collaboratively on issues of planning, development, and design.

C. Long-Range Planning

A description of the process by which the program identifies its objectives for continuous improvement:

- University of Maryland's Strategic Plan, *Transforming Maryland: Higher Expectations* adopted in 2008.
- School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation Strategic Plan was created by a faculty process led by the Dean. The Plan was designed in response to the University's new Strategic Plan, adopted in 2008. Plan was adopted in 2008 http://www.arch.umd.edu/about_the_school/strategic_plan.cfm is accompanied by an action plan <http://www.arch.umd.edu/downloads/pdfs/ActionPlanCondensed.pdf>
- Architecture Program Strategic Plan adopted in Fall 2005 maps out a path towards continuous improvement. The Plan needs to be updated to bring it into alignment with the University's Strategic Plan. Goals and corresponding strategic initiatives are as follows:
 1. Nurture a collegial, diverse, inclusive, and inter-generational community of scholars and practitioners
 - 1.1 Embrace stewardship of a collegial environment
 - 1.2 Understand, affirm, and act on commitments to diversity
 - 1.3 Develop an academic/studio culture assessment
 - 1.4 Address the strategic and cyclical factors engaging the student body
 - 1.5 Advance a strategic posture for faculty growth, renewal, and change
 - 1.6 Enhance Architecture Program alumni relations
 - 1.7 Augment interaction with the architecture profession and allied disciplines
 - 1.8 Improve Architecture Program communications
 2. Sustain and enhance expertise in urban design and building craft by integrating historical, technical, conceptual, and scholarly knowledge focused on making "place" at diverse scales, in diverse cultures, and in diverse environmental conditions.
 - 2.1 Affirm long-standing commitments to comprehensive design, urban design, and professional education grounded in a balanced architectural discourse
 - 2.2 Revise the Path A (pre-professional degree + 60 credits) and Path B (degree + 109 credits) degree tracks to provide comparable educational experiences
 - 2.3 Expand a tradition of teaching effective visual communication skills
 - 2.4 Build upon the success of existing study abroad experiences
 - 2.5 Review commitments to post-professional education
 - 2.6 Provide annual review of accreditation status and compliance with all conditions and procedures
 3. Establish opportunities for critical exchange and collaboration between allied disciplines within and outside the university context.
 - 3.1 Seek opportunities for collaboration between disciplines within the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation
 - 3.2 Search for inter-disciplinary collaboration opportunities throughout the University
 - 3.3 Engage entrepreneurial opportunities that offer unique teaching-learning scenarios, service, and development of research, scholarship, and creative academic and professional activities

4. Embrace liberal education through the discipline of architecture.
 - 4.1 Investigate alternative paradigms for pre-professional education
 - 4.2 Develop new CORE offerings in Architecture
 - 4.3 Advocate design education as a progressive paradigm for integration of knowledge in all aspects of teaching, learning, research, scholarship, and service.

 5. Promote sustainability and stewardship of the physical environment.
 - 5.1 Develop faculty expertise in sustainability and environmental stewardship
 - 5.2 Integrate environmental stewardship and sustainability throughout curriculum
 - 5.3 Utilize the physical plant of the architecture program as a laboratory to demonstrate environmental stewardship and sustainability
- Annual (sometimes twice annual) retreats revisit strategic plan, evaluate progress, set priorities
 - Learning Outcomes Assessment process informs curricular planning
 - Monthly faculty meetings serve as forums for discussion.
 - Twice-annual Retrospective meetings. Faculty Retrospective focuses on curricular issues. Student/faculty Retrospective is more broad-ranging, including curricular issues, academic/studio culture, resources and facilities, extra-curricular opportunities.
 - The Architecture Program Curriculum Committee meets monthly and holds an annual planning charette open to all Architecture Program faculty. This is a work session in which faculty move forward towards the achievement of strategic objectives.

A description of the data and information sources used to inform the development of these objectives:

- University of Maryland Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA)
- Faculty, students, alumni, and professional colleagues input

A description of the role of long-range planning in other programmatic and institutional planning initiatives:

- Following upon the University of Maryland's Strategic Plan, a major initiative is underway to totally redesign General Education. A new course category, Scholarship in Practice, offers opportunities for the Architecture Program to assume a leading role in delivering General Education.

A description of the role the five perspectives play in long-range planning:

- Architectural Education and the Academic Context: This perspective guides our efforts in curricular planning and the development of policies in the area of academic/studio culture and diversity. Strategic goals and initiatives in this area include:

2. Sustain and enhance expertise in urban design and building craft by integrating historical, technical, conceptual, and scholarly knowledge focused on making “place” at diverse scales, in diverse cultures, and in diverse environmental conditions.

2.1 Affirm long-standing commitments to comprehensive design, urban design, and professional education grounded in a balanced architectural discourse

2.2 Revise the Path A (preprofessional degree + 60 credits) and Path B (degree + 109 credits) degree tracks to provide comparable educational experiences

2.3 Expand a tradition of teaching effective visual communication skills

2.4 Build upon the success of existing study abroad experiences

2.5 Review commitments to post-professional education

2.6 Provide annual review of accreditation status and compliance with all conditions and procedures

3. Establish opportunities for critical exchange and collaboration between allied disciplines within and outside the university context.

3.1 Seek opportunities for collaboration between disciplines within the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation

3.2 Search for inter-disciplinary collaboration opportunities throughout the University

3.3 Engage entrepreneurial opportunities that offer unique teaching-learning scenarios, service, and development of research, scholarship, and creative academic and professional activities

4. Embrace liberal education through the discipline of architecture.

4.1 Investigate alternative paradigms for pre-professional education

4.2 Develop new CORE offerings in Architecture

4.3 Advocate design education as a progressive paradigm for integration of knowledge in all aspects of teaching, learning, research, scholarship, and service.

- Architectural Education and Students: This perspective guides our efforts in developing student affairs policies and admissions policies. Students form a part of the long-range planning process through their participation on Architecture Program standing committees and the Dean’s Advisory Board. Through the Architecture Students Assembly (ASA), students engage in long-range planning. Strategic goals and initiatives in this area include:

1. Nurture a collegial, diverse, inclusive, and inter-generational community of scholars and practitioners

1.1 Embrace stewardship of a collegial environment

1.2 Understand, affirm, and act on commitments to diversity

1.3 Develop an academic/studio culture assessment

1.4 Address the strategic and cyclical factors engaging the student body

- Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment: This perspective guides us in planning for change in the regulatory context of practice and in planning ways to deliver up-to-date information to students. Strategic goals and initiatives in this area include:

2.6 Provide annual review of accreditation status and compliance with all conditions and procedures

- Architectural Education and the Profession: This perspective guides us in incorporating the professional community into the long-range planning process. Strategic goals and initiatives in this area include:

1. Nurture a collegial, diverse, inclusive, and inter-generational community of scholars and practitioners

1.6 Enhance Architecture Program alumni relations

1.7 Augment interaction with the architecture profession and allied disciplines

3. Establish opportunities for critical exchange and collaboration between allied disciplines within and outside the university context.

- Architectural Education and the Public Good: This perspective guides us in planning curricula that introduce students to the pressing problems of society. It guides us in planning extra-curricular offerings such as service opportunities. Strategic goals and initiatives in this area include:

5. Promote sustainability and stewardship of the physical environment.

5.1 Develop faculty expertise in sustainability and environmental stewardship

5.2 Integrate environmental stewardship and sustainability throughout curriculum

5.3 Utilize the physical plant of the architecture program as a laboratory to demonstrate environmental stewardship and sustainability

D. Self-Assessment

A description of the school's self-assessment process, specifically with regard to ongoing evaluation of the program's mission statement, its multi-year objectives and how it relates to the five perspectives

The Program recognizes that the APR, as well as the annual report, are opportunities for self-assessment and hence the entire faculty participates in the preparation of these documents. Program Assessment is a continuing process within the School in which faculty, students, and staff are active participants.

The Architecture Program recognizes the need to update the Strategic Plan in light of the University's new Strategic Plan; the School's growing multidisciplinary identity, changes in the composition of the faculty, changes in the professional context, and changes in the economic context of higher education.

- Architectural Education and the Academic Context
 - The School and Architecture Program each hold an annual Retreat in August prior to the opening of the academic year where administrative, fiscal, and academic activities of the previous year are assessed, plans and goals are established for the coming year. Some recent examples of these assessment activities are as follows:
 - The most recent Faculty Retreat focused on an assessment of how the required courses of the Program's Master of Architecture Curricula meet the Student Performance Criteria. The assessment resulted in the revision of the Program's SPC Matrix and Course Descriptions.
 - The most recent School Retreat focused upon the criteria for promotion and tenure and resulted in the generation of a list of faculty activities valued by the School's programs.
 - The most recent School Retreat included focused discussion of the School's Plan of Organization and resulted in the identification of areas where change is required.
 - Assessment takes place through focused discussion in monthly Faculty Meetings. Some recent examples of these assessment activities are as follows:
 - In Spring 2010, Faculty conducted a Learning Outcomes Assessment of the Master of Architecture Thesis.
 - In the following meeting, Faculty assessed the feasibility of the thesis process in light of number of thesis students and number of faculty available to serve on thesis committees.
 - A Faculty Retrospective at the end of each semester serves as a "post mortem" to evaluate studio activities as well as the integration of these activities with the history, technology, and professional aspects of the curriculum. All work of the design studios is publicly displayed after each design review, enabling faculty and students to be aware of what is being accomplished. The Faculty Retrospectives serve as venues for discussion and debate evaluating success in fulfilling curricular objectives.
- Architectural Education and Students
 - The Learning Outcomes Assessment Process measures the extent to which the content of the curriculum results in student learning in selected areas. The University is embarking upon a new 5 year cycle of Learning Outcomes Assessment. The Architecture Program is preparing input into the School's report, including the following:
 - A summary and review of achievements in the assessment of student learning during the past cycle, documenting the feedback loop to show how results inform planning
 - Report on plans for the next 4 year cycle
 - Reflection on past assessment and planning for future assessment
 - Schedule of learning outcomes assessments for the next 4 years, listing outcomes to be assessed and schedule for data collection and analysis
 - Plans for learning outcomes assessment during the upcoming year.

- A student/faculty Retrospective informs faculty, administration and staff of issues that students find important. Discussion in these meetings assists students, faculty, and administrators in evaluating the success of new initiatives and in setting agendas for change.
- Students complete course evaluations at the conclusion of each semester and term. Faculty members use the evaluations for self-assessment of teaching; the Dean uses the evaluations for discussion with faculty members about teaching activities and as information in the merit evaluation process.
- Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment
 - The IDP Coordinator brings information about changes in the regulatory environment of practice to Faculty for assessment of communications to students
 - NCARB Architectural Registration Exam
- Architectural Education and the Profession
 - A new Professional Advisory Board was formed in late Spring 2010. The board performed a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis of the Architecture Program. The board will meet with faculty in November for further engagement in the strategic planning and implementation process.
 - Evaluations by guests practitioners at design reviews are sought formally and informally.
 - Alumni offer significant feedback about the School. The School has an active local alumni chapter. Many alumni attend the public lecture series and gallery openings, which are also occasions for informal exchange. And, of course, alumni are in positions of responsibility in architectural firms, and they actively recruit students and graduates of the Program. Periodically, alumni/ae are surveyed to ascertain demographic information, career paths, and perceptions of their alma mater.
- Architectural Education and the Public Good
 - From the perspective of Architectural Education and the Public Good, the Architecture Program's Strategic Plan focuses on sustainability and stewardship of the physical environment and making "place" in diverse cultures and in diverse environmental conditions. The results of international and national competitions in these areas, particularly the Solar Decathlon and the ULI Hines Urban Design Competition, give the Program important feedback about success in addressing these significant issues in society,

A description of the results of faculty, students', and graduates' assessments of the accredited degree program's curriculum and learning context as outlined in the five perspectives.

- Architectural Education and the Academic Context: At the Fall 2010 School Retreat, faculty engaged in a new effort to define faculty roles and activities
 - The results of this process are a list of roles and activities that will be used in merit evaluation and will be incorporated into the revision of the School's Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure document

2. Sustain and enhance expertise in urban design and building craft by integrating historical, technical, conceptual, and scholarly knowledge focused on making “place” at diverse scales, in diverse cultures, and in diverse environmental conditions

- National design competitions offer assessment of success in this area. In 2009, the School ULI Hines Urban Design Competition team received honorable mention. Based upon that feedback, the team was able to improve its performance and finish in the top four in 2010.

2.2 Revise the Path A (pre-professional degree + 60 credits) and Path B (degree + 109 credits) degree tracks to provide comparable educational experiences – completed in a curriculum committee charette (see II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum)

2.3 Expand a tradition of teaching effective visual communication skills

- This was cited as a cause for concern in the past visit. This assessment resulted in the Architecture Program taking action to strengthen its traditions of excellence in hand methods of representation and building strength in digital representation, including hiring experienced adjunct faculty to deliver instruction in required (ARCH 443, ARCH 445) and elective (ARCH 343) manual drawing and visual analysis courses and hiring experienced adjunct faculty to deliver instruction in digital media in an elective course (ARCH 470) and in studios, sometimes teaming a faculty member with advanced digital expertise with a faculty member skilled in manual drawing. Funded research by faculty members has resulted in the acquisition of a 3D Printer and an ongoing study of the application of this technology in the beginning design studios.

2.4 Build upon the success of existing study abroad experiences

- based upon evidence of student learning in Study Abroad programs (sketchbooks, student achievement in coursework, student course evaluations), a broad array of new programs have taken students to diverse destinations including Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and Europe. Assessment at the Spring Architecture Program Retreat has resulted in an affirmation that the Program should continue the long-standing Study Abroad Programs in Rome and Paris and Stabiae. Furthermore, it was determined that the quantity of Study Abroad programs should be limited each Winter and Summer in order to concentrate student enrollment in a few high quality programs. This offers room for proposing one new Winter Study Abroad program and one new Summer Study Abroad program each year.

2.5 Review commitments to post-professional education

- The School participated in an assessment of the interdisciplinary PhD Program and results were published by the University in academic year 2009 – 2010. The School’s PhD Program was well-received. The University is in the process of making recommendations for right-sizing the student enrollment of this program.

2.6 Provide annual review of accreditation status and compliance with all conditions and procedures

- Fall Retreat 2010 focused on this initiative. This meeting will serve as a good model for process going forward. As a result of faculty assessment, the course descriptions have been updated to reflect current Student Performance Criteria.

3. Establish opportunities for critical exchange and collaboration between allied disciplines within and outside the university context
 - Based upon student demand and student enrollment in courses and certificate programs in the other disciplines in the School, the Architecture Program has created two additional dual Masters degree programs. The dual Master of Architecture/Master of Planning degree is now joined by the dual Master of Architecture/Master of Historic Preservation degree. The dual Master of Architecture/Master of Real Estate Development has been approved by the Architecture Program Curriculum Committee and is pending University approval.
- 3.1 Seek opportunities for collaboration between disciplines within the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation
 - Key results include an annual Interdisciplinary Study Tour to orient incoming graduate students to the way the various disciplines come together to address issues; several interdisciplinary competitions with top four finish in the ULI Hines Competition and finalist status in Solar Decathlon 2011. Also, see dual degrees above.
- 3.2 Search for inter-disciplinary collaboration opportunities throughout the University
 - Results include Solar Decathlon 2011 collaboration with Engineering and Agriculture; joint NSF SEED Grant submission with Engineering and Agriculture
- 3.3 Engage entrepreneurial opportunities that offer unique teaching-learning scenarios, service, and development of research, scholarship, and creative academic and professional activities
 - Results include Solar Decathlon 2010, with its suite of courses bringing Architecture, Engineering, and Agriculture students and faculty together with mentors from the professions and industry for unique-teaching-learning experiences with research and creative practice dimensions.
4. Embrace liberal education through the discipline of architecture.
 - 4.1 Investigate alternative paradigms for pre-professional education
 - Results include Provost's funding for investigation of BAED undergraduate environmental design program.
 - 4.2 Develop new CORE offerings in Architecture
 - Results include current collaborative initiative among all four academic disciplines, with funding from Provost for the development of two i-Series courses, part of the University's new General Education program.
 - 4.3 Advocate design education as a progressive paradigm for integration of knowledge in all aspects of teaching, learning, research, scholarship, and service
 - Results include Solar Decathlon suite of courses plus collaborative General Education initiative (see initiatives 3.3 and 4.2 above)
- Architectural Education and Students: The Architecture Program participates in a University-wide process of Learning Outcomes Assessment. The Program sets multi-year objectives for assessment, selecting particular outcomes for study and scheduling assessments. The University provides support to assist the University community in learning how to set, measure, and report outcomes and how to use the assessment process for continuous improvement. The University has just completed a multi-year cycle of assessments and is embarking upon a new 4-year cycle.

- One important result of the faculty's learning outcomes assessment process has been the creation of a data set to inform our evaluation of the changes in the delivery of the Master of Architecture thesis courses. The faculty assessed a set of student learning outcomes under the old system, when faculty committees worked with students during one semester. The faculty assessed the same learning outcomes under the new system, with faculty committees working with students for two semesters. As a result of the discussion based upon the learning outcomes assessment of the thesis, faculty have decided to continue with the new thesis process.

1. Nurture a collegial, diverse, inclusive, and inter-generational community of scholars and practitioners

1.1 Embrace stewardship of a collegial environment

- Evidence of progress towards this initiative is the growth of the Architecture Students Assembly's leadership and visibility in the Architecture Program. The organization has nearly completed the process of adopting a Plan of Organization. A process has been developed for electing representatives. Ombudspersons have been elected and have been active in conflict resolution. The ASA has taken leadership of the twice annual student/faculty Retrospectives, a joint assessment process undertaken by students and faculty.

1.2 Understand, affirm, and act on commitments to diversity

- Evidence of progress towards this initiative is the work of the joint faculty/student task force, that assessed the state of the Architecture Program with respect to diversity, then used that assessment to create a Diversity Plan to guide the Architecture Programs continuing efforts to create a more diverse environment (see I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity).

1.3 Develop an academic/studio culture assessment

- The Architecture Program fulfilled this initiative with the work of a joint faculty/student task force that assessed the current academic/studio culture, then drafted a policy (see I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity).

1.4 Address the strategic and cyclical factors engaging the student body

- Evidence of results is the strong participation of and faculty in assessment conducted twice annually in the student/faculty Retrospectives
- Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment: Input from the professional organizations suggests that students are not well-informed about the legal and regulatory context of architectural practice early in their preprofessional and professional education. Information about entry into the profession and regulation of practice was largely concentrated in the Professional Practice course, scheduled in the last semester of the Master of Architecture degree program. Discussion in AIA Potomac Valley meetings highlights the low numbers of interns who complete the registration process.
- A Curriculum Committee charette focused on this issue and resulted in distributing student performance criteria dealing with issues of practice into the studio courses.

The Architecture Program has incorporated education about the profession, including the architect's legal responsibilities and the registration process from professional education through internship, examination, registration, and continuing education into the annual All-Program meeting attended by all juniors, seniors, and graduate students on the first day of the Fall semester and into the Orientation meeting for incoming graduate students. The Architecture Program's IDP Coordinator presents information on IDP at the All-

Program meeting, all students are given a brochure and informed about the website and ongoing opportunities to meet with the IDP Coordinator. AIA Potomac Valley partners with the Architecture Program to offer a Speed-Mentoring event during Architecture Week, bringing practitioners at a variety of experience levels together with students for a highly interactive discussion of the process of becoming an architect. The IDP Coordinator gives an introductory talk at this event.

- Architectural Education and the Profession:

1. Nurture a collegial, diverse, inclusive, and inter-generational community of scholars and practitioners

1.6 Enhance Architecture Program alumni relations

- Based upon feedback from alumni who do not receive regular communications from the School, staff has been working on updating the alumni records and sending electronic newsletters to alumni on a regular basis. Alumni stay close to the School in a number of ways including teaching part time, serving as guest critics on reviews, attending lectures and gallery openings, attending AIA Potomac Valley events held at the School, attending and participating in symposia, inviting faculty to participate in a golf tournament, offering alumni association scholarships and awards to students, and through the firms, offering scholarship/internship opportunities to students.

1.7 Augment interaction with the architecture profession and allied disciplines

- Evidence of progress is the formation of a new Architecture Program Professional Advisory Board in 2010.

3. Establish opportunities for critical exchange and collaboration between allied disciplines within and outside the university context.

- Development of new dual degrees with Historic Preservation and Real Estate Development Programs (see above)
- Solar decathlon competition with partners in Schools of Engineering and Agriculture and partners in the professions and industry and opportunities for critical exchange with teams from around the world (see above)
- ULI Hines Urban Design Competition partnerships with the allied disciplines within the Schools and critical exchange with teams from around the country(see above)
- NSF SEED Grant Proposal-writing collaboration with University of Maryland Schools of Engineering and Agriculture leading to critical exchange with EPA officer about potential role of the Architecture Program in environmental research (also see above)

- Architectural Education and the Public Good: This perspective guides us in planning initiatives that address issues of pressing importance to the community, whether locally or globally. This includes participation in service-learning experiences such as competitions and studios focused on community issues.

5. Promote sustainability and stewardship of the physical environment.

5.1 Develop faculty expertise in sustainability and environmental stewardship

Evidence of results include success in first two stages of Solar Decathlon competition leading to funding for the project that brings two Architecture Program faculty together with a broad interdisciplinary team of students, faculty, and mentors from the professions and industry in the development of faculty expertise.

5.2 Integrate environmental stewardship and sustainability throughout curriculum

- Evidence of results includes:
- Development of new course, ARCH 418 Measuring Sustainability, resulting in the LEED-accreditation of students
- Development of multi-disciplinary suite of courses focused on active learning through the Solar Decathlon 2007 and 2011 competitions
- Teaming of design faculty and technology faculty in the foundations design studio ARCH 403 in Spring 2011 to highlight sustainability

5.3 Utilize the physical plant of the architecture program as a laboratory to demonstrate environmental stewardship and sustainability

- Evidence of results is the development of a student furnishings and equipment recycling program by the USGBC Student Organization in Spring 2010 and a talk at the Fall 2010 AIII-Program Meeting by the School's Building Maintenance man on how students can reduce energy consumption in the building

A description, if applicable, of institutional requirements for self-assessment: The University of Maryland requires learning outcomes assessment by all Schools and Colleges and their Programs and Departments. The University uses the results in the Middle States accreditation process. University of Maryland policies and procedures for Learning Outcomes Assessment are found on the web at <https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/LearningOutcomes/>

With the following introduction: *The assessment of student learning outcomes is the national standard for improving teaching and learning in higher education. Outcomes assessment is also prominent in the procedures used by all higher education accrediting agencies. At the University of Maryland, the Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment provides the leadership and organizational procedures for our engagement in such assessment.*

Student learning outcomes focus not on what the faculty member knows, but on what a student knows or can do after being involved in a course or program. The assessment of student learning outcomes provides information that puts student learning at the forefront of academic planning processes.

This website contains all aspects of the UM plan for establishing and maintaining a culture of learning outcomes assessment on our campus and exists primarily for the use of faculty, students, and administrators.

A description of the manner in which results from self-assessment activities are used to inform long-range planning, curriculum development, learning culture, and responses to external pressures or challenges to institutions (e.g., reduced funding for state support institutions or enrollment mandates).

Self-assessment informs long-range planning: Assessment of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT analysis) has been completed in a Faculty Retreat in Fall 2009 and a Professional Advisory Board Meeting in Spring 2010. Student input has not yet been solicited. These analyses will become input into a re-evaluation of the Architecture Program's Strategic Plan. The next step will be an assessment of the Plan's objectives and initiatives in light of the University's recent Strategic Plan. These assessments are evidence to be used by the faculty to inform a revision of the

- Architecture Program Strategic Plan.
- Self-assessment informs curriculum development: Learning Outcomes Assessments form the basis for discussion of curricular development. Curriculum Committee, formed of faculty and students, manages curricular continuity and change. Curriculum Committee charrette is vehicle for curriculum development. The upcoming Summary and Review Report on Learning Outcomes Assessment is an opportunity for the Architecture Program to strengthen its process for planning, conducting, learning from, and implementing results of future learning outcomes assessments.
- Self-assessment informs learning culture: the Academic/Studio Policy and the Diversity Plan resulted from the work of two joint faculty/student task forces that assessed the existing culture as the basis for the creation of sets of standards and procedures leading to cultural change.
- Self-assessment informs responses to external pressures/challenges to institutions: SWOT analyses at faculty retreats and subsequent discussions with Architecture Program and School faculty informed the interview process leading to the selection of the new Dean. SWOT analysis at the first Professional Advisory Board meeting laid the groundwork for further planning activities with that group.

2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**

The following conditions or student performance criteria are judged “well met.”

II.1.A.7 Use of Precedents

II.1.B.3 Sustainability

II.1.B.6 Comprehensive Design

II.1.B.10 Building Envelope

FINAL DRAFT

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Linda Kiisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP
624 Brown Street
Healdsburg, CA 95448
307 760 1625
ikiisk@hotmail.com

Representing the ACSA
Barbara A. Sestak, AIA, Dean
School of Fine and Performing Arts
Portland State University
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751
(503) 725-3340
(503) 725-3351 fax
sestakb@pdx.edu

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

Representing the NCARB
Jeanne Jackson, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP
Partner
VCBO Architecture
524 South 600 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102
(801) 575-8800
(801) 531-9850 fax
(801) 558-7440 mobile
jjackson@vcbo.com

Non-voting member
Phoebe Crisman
Associate Dean for Research
University of Virginia
Campbell Hall, PO Box 400122
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 924-1006
crisman@virginia.edu

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

**Linda Kiisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP
Team Chair**

Representing the AIA

**Barbara A. Sestak, AIA
Team member**

Representing the ACSA

**Michelle A. Morehead
Team member**

Representing the AIAS

**Jeanne Jackson, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP
Team member**

Representing the NCARB

**Phoebe Crisman
Non-voting member**