NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

2023 Visiting Team Report

University of Detroit Mercy
School of Architecture and
Community Development

M.Arch.

Continuing Accreditation Visit
March 20-22, 2023

Contents

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank the University of Detroit Mercy School of Architecture and Community Development for facilitating a meaningful visit for the NAAB visiting team. The program provided the team with thorough and very well-organized documentation. Special thanks go to Dean Dan Pitera and Associate Dean Noah Resnick for their hard work on the logistics of the visit. They ensured that the team had everything needed for the review and responded quickly to requests for additional information. The team would also like to thank the students, faculty, and staff who shared and engaged in dialog, which was critical to gaining an understanding of the programs within the school and the institution as a whole. The visiting team was made to feel welcome throughout the visit.

The University of Detroit Mercy is unique among architecture schools in that it is the only accredited program at any of the Jesuit or Mercy institutions in the United States. The educational heritage that "celebrates a diversity of faith traditions, even those without a faith tradition, and is centered on social justice and the dignity of every person" is apparent throughout the institution and the architecture program. This core value permeates the culture within the School of Architecture and Community Development – not just with the clear sense of caring that the faculty and students have for one another but also with the nature of the curriculum and studio projects.

Studio culture is strong within the school, and multiple student organizations host a broad range of activities outside of the classroom to foster a sense of community and prepare students for their future careers. This is especially notable given the impact that the recent pandemic has had on all programs - particularly in the design fields where the studio setting is such a critical component of the overall educational experience.

The program is exemplary for its engagement with the community. The connection between the studios and the Detroit Community Design Center (DCDC) serves as a model for training the next generation of practitioners in responding to real world, critical issues, and provides valuable experiential learning opportunities for the students in collaboration and leadership, and of course, community engagement.

The team was impressed by how well the program has embraced new assessment processes and is using the results of newly developed tools to inform and improve the overall curriculum. Students and faculty alike felt that the assessments were fair and helpful.

The program has adapted to their aging building, with modifications over time as instructional needs have changed, including a recent $10 million renovation. Instructional spaces are generally accommodating the studios and lecture courses. Students noted that the numerous gathering spaces have helped foster a sense of community and provide a place to connect or relax between classes. The building continues to have some significant issues, however, with limited spaces for larger gatherings of combined studio sections; a lack of spaces for private and confidential faculty/student meetings; spaces lacking proper HVAC systems; and inadequate shop space and 'maker spaces' for students and faculty. The current shop space has limited hours and equipment, and IT support has been a challenge. Program leadership has indicated that they are exploring options, but these issues are impacting the program and will be an impediment to the planned growth. As noted, all faculty are currently adapting to the limitations with instructional and office spaces, and overall educational quality remains high. The burden of adapting to these conditions has

impacted faculty, forcing situations like advising meetings to take place outdoors and research and class prep to happen at home.

  b. Conditions with a Team Recommendation to the Board as Not Achieved *(list number and title)*

  - 5.6 Physical Resources

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2014 Conditions Not Met

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.

Previous Team Report (2014): The SPC matrix points to PYC 2650 Environmental Psychology as the primary course for this content. (This understanding is NOT listed among the course objectives.) However, this course outcomes focus on understanding Environmental Psychology and human behavior in and responses to the built environment. While gender and cultural differences are mentioned as factors affecting response and behavior in readings and lectures, student work demonstrates understanding and/or practice of normative theory. The college's plan to expand the very well-organized study abroad programs holds potential for addressing this criterion in the future.

2020 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Detroit Mercy, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report.

2023 Team Analysis: As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

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.

Previous Team Report (2014): ARCH 5190 and 5290—the Professional Practice courses—cover a broad spectrum of practice issues, including the architect's and the client's role and contractual responsibilities in the bidding phase and in managing construction costs. No evidence was found supporting an understanding required by the SPC, especially as related to project financing/funding and post-occupancy costs (i.e., operations, life-cycle).

2020 IPR Board Review: After reviewing the 5-year Interim Progress Report (IPR) submitted by University of Detroit Mercy, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has concluded that the program has demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the 2-Year Interim Progress Report.

2023 Team Analysis: As of the Board of Director's 2020 review of the program's 5-year Interim report, the program demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies previously identified.

III.   Program Changes

If the Accreditation Conditions have changed since the previous visit, a brief description of changes made to the program because of changes in the Conditions is required.

2023 Team Analysis:
Although not related to the change in Conditions, a significant change occurred in the Fall 2021 when the University Board of Trustees approved renaming the school from School of Architecture to School of Architecture and Community Development (SACD). This transition concentrated on amplifying the mission-driven and student-centered approach and uplifting Community Development agenda. Concurrent with this rebranding, faculty and administrators within SACD agreed that the new NAAB Conditions provided an opportunity for the program to amplify the aspects that make it unique and to illustrate how those aspects meet both the Program Criteria and Student Criteria.

The program thus took the following steps:
- Identified those which were most relevant to recent program changes include the criteria.
- Developed and began to implement an entirely new and rigorous assessment policy, mechanism, and culture.
- Made significant changes, not only to the overall five-year curriculum, but also to nearly all of the courses used to meet the new NAAB Student and Program criteria. In addition, the student learning objectives and outcomes for every course in the architecture curriculum were modified or re-written to better align with both the updated Core Values as well as the new 2020 Conditions for Accreditation. More specifically:
    - The upper-level studios were reorganized away from combined, or "vertical," third and fourth-year studios to a new studio experience.
    - The overall curriculum plan is slightly more choreographed.
    - The Building Technology sequence was completely revised; new faculty were hired; delivery methods were implemented to facilitate more connections to the rest of the curriculum and increase the use of hands-on and applied learning; and content was updated.
    - The Visual Communications Sequence was redesigned to give students a higher level of skill in representational production in studio and in preparation for practice. Faculty, delivery methods, and content were all revised.

IV.   Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission *(Guidelines, p. 5)*
To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program's mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program's role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits–and benefits from–its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.
- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
SACD is the only architecture school in the city limits of Detroit, and the program embraces its urban setting. For more than fifty years it has garnered a respected and honored reputation for its knowledge and work in Detroit. This specific and unique perspective and research has been acknowledged to be applicable at the national and international scales, making the school not merely an expert on Detroit-based urban architecture, but a distinctive expert on urban architecture based on its engaged work in Detroit. The program notes that "it is clear, Detroit has been of interest—both positive and negative—to the world for decades. As eyes continue to focus on Detroit from every angle, SACD has been one of the key institutions at this nexus. However, to focus on the city context alone, simplifies the multivalent aspect of what underpins SACD. The school is also grounded in specific and notable university and national contexts. This context provides a foundation for SACD's mission and vision, our approach to pedagogy, and their specific academic and research programs."

SACD is located in a university where the founders are the Religious Sisters of Mercy and the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits). It is the only accredited school of architecture at any of the forty-five Jesuit or Mercy universities in the United States. Both the Sisters of Mercy and Jesuits have an educational heritage that celebrates a diversity of faith traditions, even those without a faith tradition, and is centered on social justice and the dignity of every person. University's Mercy and Jesuit Values from a recent Mission Self-Study: Education of the whole person; Service that leads to justice; and Recognition of the sacred in all. Within this framework, the SACD Core Values are a commitment to the following:
- Educating students who will adapt to and lead in the changing disciplines of architecture, urban design, and community development.
- Advancing social and environmental justice in our neighborhoods, cities, and planet.
- Cultivating equity in education and the profession by providing pipelines of access and support for underrepresented people.
- Nurturing engaged global citizens who can think broadly and act locally.
- Emphasizing a progressive and rigorous approach to design and community development education.
- Fostering a mosaic of students who reflect the diversity of people that make up our communities.

Meetings during the visit with the provost, program administrators, faculty, and students confirmed the program's mission and context, and significant role within the community. The program is one of the university's exemplary programs in engaging students with the community and providing experiential learning opportunities as part of the curriculum. Multiple extracurricular opportunities within the school and the larger institution round out the educational experience for students.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession (*Guidelines*, p. 6)
The program must report on how it responds to the following values, all of which affect the education and development of architects. The response to each value must also identify how the program will continue to address these values as part of its long-range planning. These values are foundational, not exhaustive.

Design: Architects design better, safer, more equitable, resilient, and sustainable built environments. Design thinking and integrated design solutions are hallmarks of architecture education, the discipline, and the profession. (p.7)

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: Architects are responsible for the impact of their work on the natural world and on public health, safety, and welfare. As professionals and designers of the built environment, we embrace these responsibilities and act ethically to accomplish them. (p.7)

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Architects commit to equity and inclusion in the environments we design, the policies we adopt, the words we speak, the actions we take, and the respectful learning, teaching, and working environments we create. Architects seek fairness, diversity, and social justice in the profession and in society and support a range of pathways for students seeking access to an architecture education. (p.7)

Knowledge and Innovation: Architects create and disseminate knowledge focused on design and the built environment in response to ever-changing conditions. New knowledge advances architecture as a cultural force, drives innovation, and prompts the continuous improvement of the discipline. (p.8)

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: Architects practice design as a collaborative, inclusive, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work. (p.8)

Lifelong Learning: Architects value educational breadth and depth, including a thorough understanding of the discipline's body of knowledge, histories and theories, and architecture's role in cultural, social, environmental, economic, and built contexts. The practice of architecture demands lifelong learning, which is a shared responsibility between academic and practice settings. (p.8)

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
Design: Curriculum and co-curricular opportunities have been developed around core principles of collaborative design within real-world context. The program's emphasis on the understanding of place and its impact on design is evidenced through the DCDC and multiple semester-long study abroad studios that provide an understanding of place in diverse social, environmental, and cultural conditions. Curriculum and co-curricular opportunities have been developed around core principles of collaborative design for diverse publics. The program has described several examples of its commitment to a diversifying and more socially engaged discipline through its pipeline programs, community-engaged work through the DCDC, and participation in the Design Future Student Leadership Forum. During the visit the team confirmed that a significant percentage of students have participated in past pipeline programs and are aware of their potential to participate.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: There is evidence that the program has been committed to teaching the importance of climate change, and what architects need to know to practice responsibly for quite some time, but they have reaffirmed that commitment through more rigorous course work. The statement of the SACD core vision is to create "just, ecological, and inspiring environments." Many courses pertaining to environmental subjects are listed–from the Introduction to Architecture in Year 1, through two Building Environment courses in the second year, Technical Analysis and Building Environment III in year 3, and Integrated Studio, PID Studio in year four, and more in year five. The course objectives for the Integrated Studio are to teach waste reduction, carbon reduction, and resilience principles. Student work exhibited an understanding of the technical aspects of carbon offsets, EUI ratings, and other relevant environmental tools used in architectural design. The stated emphasis on environmental justice, with studios, community design center, even the program's newly changed name to include Community Design also confirms their commitment to this value. The visiting team observed this strong commitment in the documents provided, and through multiple meetings during the visit. How this value is continuously addressed in long range planning is addressed under Condition 5.2 below.

Equity Diversity and Inclusion: The program has provided evidence on a broad range of efforts to embed values in the curricula and coursework; student groups and extra-curricular activities; and recruiting and retention efforts. SCAD has clearly identified core values and strategic priorities. Notable aspects of the program that promote these values include the mandatory Public Interest Design Studio, and the DCDC, which serves as the program's applied research arm and engages students with

community groups and projects. Faculty reported a strong commitment within the program administration and "well-versed" in DEI issues.

Knowledge and Innovation: This shared value is related to both the core values and strategic priorities of SACD. The APR states that "In support of the advancement of the mission of the SACD, the faculty and students engage in an inclusive model of research that may include (1.) applied research by faculty, such as professional practice, research-based practice, or technical research, and (2.) long-established scholarly research such as the authoring of papers and journal articles, and (3.) the development of other creative activities such as installations or "un-built" and/or speculative work." Research at SACD is performed by both faculty and students. This work is disseminated in multiple venues, including lectures, panel discussions, attendance at symposia and conferences, and the student journal, Dichotomy. The DCDC is an integral component of SACD and is an important mechanism for student research and dissemination of their work. Both the APR and documentation provided to the team during the visit confirmed the strong commitment of SACD to this shared value.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: The program has developed a sustainable long-term financial model to fund its student-run journal Dichotomy which provides an opportunity to showcase contemporary social and environmental justice work that is easily accessible to all students. A "collaborative vision of leadership" through the DCDC provides students with multiple optional and mandatory opportunities for collaborative work and knowledge exchange between a variety of stakeholders. Student diversity is fostered and supported through optional NOMA and HipHop special topic studios and past events from the active student organization NOMAS support the program's professional development efforts and professional practice-focused educational model. Numerous documents and discussions during the visit confirmed the importance of and commitment to this shared value.

Lifelong Learning: The program addresses this value adroitly; it is part of SACD's Mission and Core Values and is a key performance indicator used in the university as a whole: "Lifelong learning: students will develop foundational skills for lifelong learning, including curiosity, transfer, independence, initiative, and reflection." Evidence of its commitment to lifelong learning is found in the Co-op program, which is required and one of the oldest co-op programs at a NAAB accredited school. Students are also provided exposure to licensed professionals on the faculty who have their own practices, visiting lecturers, and courses which address professional licensing and development. Information regarding opportunities for interdisciplinary study is also documented in the APR and was confirmed during the site visit.

3—Program and Student Criteria (*Guidelines*, p. 9)
These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC) (*Guidelines*, p. 9)
A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.

PC.1 Career Paths—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Review of multiple documents, and discussions with students, faculty, and staff during confirmed how this criterion is addressed. An overview of the professional path and AXP is covered in early lectures in ARCH 1190. They are revisited in depth in the preparation course for co-op (ARCH 3000). Objectives are clearly

stated in the syllabus, and course material covers this criterion well including AXP and alternative careers. ARCH 3000 benchmarks included pass/fail for review of portfolio, resume, job search, mock interview, networking exercise, and attendance at AXP lectures. All students are required to enroll in AXP by the end of their third year in the undergraduate program. The degree requirements include participation in the Co-op Program, consisting of a minimum of 300 hours of paid work within an architecture or similar firm. The program also holds a job fair and runs a job board. The team reviewed multiple documents,

The program assesses this criterion in several ways: In ARCH 5190: Profession of Architecture projects, students describe enrollment in the AXP program and awareness of professional path. Benchmarks and assessment based on quiz scores. All objectives were met. Lecture Series Assessment benchmarks were reported and included for coverage of topics related to criterion and evaluated by peer review. Two of four outcomes assessed as not met, with a corrective plan outlined (e.g. more historical architects, and non-traditional architects to be invited).

PC.2 Design—How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program notes that a component of their core values includes ". . . educating students who will adapt to and lead the changing disciplines of architecture, urban design and community development. . . and advancing social and environmental justice in our neighborhoods, cities and planet. . . who think globally and act locally. . . and who have a hands-on approach to design." The program includes eight semesters of mandatory undergraduate design studios, beginning with foundations and escalating to advanced integrated design and public interest studios. Assessed courses include:
- ARCH 4100: Integrated Design Studio
- ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio

A series of non-curricular activities also focus on Design. The program has established multiple metrics of success, with an expected rate of 80% success, and has an assessment plan in place. In the most current cycle these metrics were met. Documents were provided to and reviewed by the visiting team, including syllabi, assessment reports, exams, and handouts; a detailed discussion with studio faculty, and observation of ARCH 3100 confirmed the commitment to this criterion and process for assessing program effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Three main courses - ARCH 2190: Site Analysis and Design, ARCH 3650: Tech Analysis, and ARCH 4100/4650 all include peer assessment surveys and instructor self-assessments, specific 80% benchmarks for course and lab quizzes, assignments, and final exams. Plans to correct unmet benchmarks assessed in ARCH 2190 will be addressed through sample site plan problems in class and dedicated lectures on subject matter site grading and drainage. Additional feedback includes adding content on embodied carbon. Additional non-curricular opportunities for student awareness of ecological responsibility through Fabrication Lab material reuse. Modifications to the curriculum include new Integrated Technology A,B and C modules added to the Building Technology sequence with future plans to merge into a single course. The team affirmed this criterion through a review of multiple documents and class observations during the visit.

PC.4 History and Theory—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
There is considerable coursework required of students that covers this criterion, with the primary ones being ARCH 2220: Architectural History & Theory II and ARCH 2520: Architectural History & Theory III taught in 2nd and 3rd years. The team reviewed the narrative, which explains thorough coverage of this PC, and examination of the learning objectives of Architectural History and Theory II revealed very detailed and extensive objectives, that are ambitious and comprehensive. Meetings during the visit included specific discussions about this History/Theory sequence. As a result of their assessment processes, the program has recently created a History and Theory Sequence Coordinator faculty position, whose job it is to improve this sequence. The intent is to enhance the coverage of architectural precedence and provide a wider range of history beyond the traditional western, dominant standard. This position has just been filled, and results will be forthcoming.

Assessment tools have been developed and followed, leading to changes in teaching approaches, examinations, and other student assessment methods.

PC.5 Research and Innovation—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Courses ARCH 5110 and 5210 which supplement the final thesis studios contain lecture content, readings, and assignments related to research methods and considerations. Assessment benchmarks are based on course grades. Observations of the Public Interest Design studio confirmed participation in practice-based research. Additionally, the student-edited journal Dichotomy, which is offered as a credit-earning course, provides evidence of a portion of students' engagement with research. Students provided details of this course and resulting journals during the visit.

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program emphasizes an experiential learning approach to leadership and practice through the ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio and ARCH 3010/5020: Professional Experience I and II Co-Ops. A combination of faculty peer assessment and self-assessment is included in this course. Student achievement on Student and Employer Evaluation Forms and Assignments exceeded 80% benchmarks. Additionally, ARCH 5190: Profession of Architecture provides a faculty-led understanding of the profession and diverse professional scenarios. During the PID studio visit, student leadership as well as student-community member engagement was observed to be of an exceptional level. Since the previous visit in 2014, a new Professions Coordinator has taken over all 3 courses and modifications to address assessment findings and an unmet benchmark related to Objective 2 Outcome C (diverse management styles and strategies required to lead a practice) have been described.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program is small, and contained within one building, which fosters a sense of community within SACD. Extracurricular activities that encourage student and faculty camaraderie are cited, and in fact meetings with students and faculty confirmed their communal closeness and acceptance. Evidence was found in the syllabus for ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design studio and other courses that students are expected to participate in a positive and respectful manner, and are encouraged to work together, listen, and be respectful of diverse backgrounds, expressions, and thoughts. The culture in the studios also appears to be collaborative, open, crossing & mixing a diversity of students and their differing points of view and experience. Faculty were less positive about the mixing and interactivity in their building, with a few mentioning that privacy and quiet, uninterrupted workspace is difficult to find. This issue seems to be one related to facilities more than overall culture. Students expressed satisfaction with the level of departmental and institutional support for underrepresented students and/or students with limited resources.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities. (p.9)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Documentation provided and observations/meetings during the visit indicated multiple points where this criterion is addressed by the program:
- The co-requisite ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio and ARCH 3190: Building Code/Zoning Analysis courses allow students to engage directly with community organizations, frequently including underserved populations. The team observed student presentations to their community clients, which illustrated a thoughtful methodology for integrating equitable design practices.
- PYC 2650: Environmental Psychology syllabus indicated wide-ranging exploration of differences among people of various social and cultural identities, with a social-science perspective on equity in architecture. Benchmarks for learning objectives identified passing grades on quizzes and class assignments, with all identified as met.
- Lecture Series materials were offered for review and included an assessment of a variety of benchmarks. Improvements for objectives deemed not met were described (more diverse speakers; connection to Building Code/Zoning Analysis).
- The NOMAS student group has an active role in organizing activities and forging connections across campus between different identity groups. Their recent Black History exhibition was highlighted on the University website and attracted visitors to the architecture building.

Assessment occurs in several courses and program evaluations. As noted previously, the Assessment of the History sequence has led the program to propose upcoming revisions to be more inclusive of diverse perspectives.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes (*Guidelines*, p. 10)
A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The visiting team reviewed multiple documents, observed classes, and held discussions in several meetings to affirm this criterion. The program assesses ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio with included supplemental course material. The student 80% benchmark "well-met;" however, the co-requisite course ARCH 3190: Building Code / Zoning Analysis will correct inconsistencies in meeting SC.1. The assessment plan includes an 80% benchmark for ARCH 3190 writing assignment #2 found in SC.5. Technical workbooks demonstrate regulatory, accessibility, and egress requirements, and building code and zoning analysis. Additionally, ARCH 3650: Technical Analysis demonstrates an urban, large building scale analysis of human and environmental health.

SC.2 Professional Practice—How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team reviewed multiple documents in addition to the APR. The project-based assignment in the ARCH 5190: Profession of Architecture course asks students to develop a detailed proposal for firm structure that meets the student's personal career objectives and values. ARCH 5590: Architecture and Construction Law also covers a number of legal issues surrounding practice and the regulatory environment, such as professional liability and firm structure, land use, and includes a dedicated lecture on ethics and copyright. For ARCH 5590: Architecture and Construction Law, the assessment is based on final exam and assignment grades. All objectives were met. For ARCH 5190: Profession of Architecture learning objective benchmarks and assessment are based on quiz scores. All objectives were met. The practical experience within architecture firms as part of the required co-op, including the preparatory course, supplements this coursework with lived experience.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
In the APR (pp.64-65), the narrative documents provided by the program address this SC in a thorough and expected manner, and course descriptions and evaluations endorse the narrative. There is an assessment plan in place. The program has recently improved the delivery of this set of criteria by adding a course dedicated to regulatory topics, thus demonstrating that there is a system in place for continuous improvement. The team met with the professor who teaches this new course ARCH 3190: Building Code / Zoning Analysis.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects. (p.10)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Evidence was found in the APR (pp.66-70), and affirmed during the visit through a review of course materials for ARCH 4640/60/80: Integrated Tech A/B/C, respectively. Through lectures and a robust series of course assignments, which are tied to the ARCH 4100: Integrated Studio, the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

The assessment plan includes several metrics for success:
As noted in the APR (p.70) "ARCH 4100: Integrated Design Studio is considered one of the two capstone studios for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture (B.S.Arch.) degree. As such, it is expected (but not required) that all students should pass this studio with a grade of B or higher in order to ensure a successful application to the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) program. In addition, all students who transfer into the SACD B.S. Arch program or into the 2+ year M.Arch. track must take ARCH 4100 as part of their required curriculum plan."

SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions. (p. 12)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR (pp.70-71) describes the approach to this criterion. Review of course materials, student work, and meetings during the visit affirmed this information. ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio is the primary studio wherein students demonstrate their understanding of regulatory requirements, with the co-requisite course ARCH 3190: Building Code Analysis. Student work was reviewed for documentation of understanding and synthesis of the multiple strands of factors influencing design outcomes, including structures. The team found that the projects were strong on code analysis/building and site, comprehensive user requirements, clear documentation of site, accessible design (within the building), and environmental issues. In the studio, these projects are completed in teams, but the co-requisite ARCH 3190: Building Code/Zoning Analysis requires individual assignments with assessments that ensure that students get a detailed understanding of regulatory requirements and are able to apply them to their projects.

There is a detailed assessment plan that includes an alternating cycle of reviews. Relevant learning outcomes are identified, along with metrics for success. As noted in the APR (p.71), "ARCH 3100: Public Interest Design Studio is considered one of the two capstone studios for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture (B.S.Arch.) degree. As such, it is expected (but not required) that all students should pass this studio with a grade of B or higher in order to ensure a successful application to the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) program. In addition, all students who transfer into the SACD B.S.Arch program or into the 2+ year M.Arch. track must take ARCH 3100 as part of their required curriculum plan."

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance. (p. 12)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR narrative (p.71) for this criterion covers structures in depth, and student work shows structural elements and details reflecting relevant technical knowledge in their drawings and specifications. Evidence in student work indicates coverage of structural systems. Environmental systems are

13

approached in a comprehensive manner, including solar, thermal, and wind. Thorough understanding of the impact of solar heat gain on interior space planning and facade design is evident in studio ARCH 4100 and ARCH 4680 student work. Projects demonstrate systems analysis and selection, building analysis for climate, overall systems knowledge, technical details, precedent analysis on facade systems, and energy analysis software used to inform building design. An understanding of a project's geographic location's impact on selected environmental strategies is evidenced through thorough climate analysis and subsequently identified climate-responsive design strategies. Digital analysis tools are consistently used across all work samples. These studio projects are completed in teams, but the co-requisite course ARCH 4640/60/80: Integrated Tech A/B/C, respectively, requires that students complete a series of robust individual assignments that facilitate a thorough understanding of building systems and assemblies and ensures that students are able to apply these systems and principles to their projects.

There is a detailed assessment plan that includes an alternating cycle of reviews. Relevant learning outcomes are identified, along with metrics for success. As noted in the APR (p.70), "ARCH 4100: Integrated Design Studio is considered one of the two capstone studios for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture (B.S. Arch.) degree. As such, it is expected (but not required) that all students should pass this studio with a grade of B or higher in order to ensure a successful application to the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.) program. In addition, all students who transfer into the SACD B.S. Architecture program or into the 2+ year M.Arch. track must take ARCH 4100 as part of their required curriculum plan." Recent curricular changes to create the co-requisite courses are a result of this assessment plan and demonstrate a process of continuous improvement.

4—Curricular Framework (*Guidelines*, p. 13)
This condition addresses the institution's regional accreditation and the program's degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

4.1 Institutional Accreditation (*Guidelines*, p. 13)
For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE)
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
The most recent letter from the Higher Learning Commission, dated December 16, 2016, was included in the APR. That letter indicated a continued accreditation with interim monitoring in the form of an interim report and the next reaffirmation of accreditation scheduled for 2026-2027. A copy of this letter is located on the university website at the following link:
https://www.hlcommission.org/component/directory/?Action=ShowBasic&Itemid=&instid=1367&lang=en

Additional information on institutional accreditation and program specific accreditations is available on the University website at the following links:

https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/academic-affairs/research/inst-accred.php
https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/academic-affairs/research/compliance.php

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum *(Guidelines,* p. 13)
The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

   4.2.1   **Professional Studies**. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students. (p.13)

   4.2.2   **General Studies**. An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge.
   In most cases**,** the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution. (p.14)

   4.2.3   **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors. (p.14)

NAAB-accredited professional degree programs have the exclusive right to use the B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. titles, which are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore may not be used by non-accredited programs.

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution's regional accreditor.

   4.2.4   **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

   4.2.5   **Master of Architecture**. The M.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.

   4.2.6   **Doctor of Architecture**. The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D.Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135

quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Mandatory professional courses and non-curricular activities satisfying PC and SC are listed in the APR (pp.75-76). The general education credits required exceed the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools minimum requirement. Accredited M.Arch, pre-professional, and non-accredited post-professional degrees are listed (pp.76-80). Minimum course credit requirements shown for each concentration and for all professional, degrees, and optional courses were confirmed to meet or exceed NAAB minimum credit requirements. Transfer criteria and evaluation details were listed and confirmed in a meeting with the program director. Several optional electives, concentrations including IPAL, minors, and thesis focus declarations described are in detail (pp.81-87).

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education (*Guidelines*, p. 16)
The NAAB recognizes that students transferring to an undergraduate accredited program or entering a graduate accredited program come from different types of programs and have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this condition, a program must demonstrate that it utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate incoming students and that it documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs.
- 4.3.1   A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2   In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3   A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Entry into the SACD's professional accredited Master of Architecture program can occur at multiple levels. The majority of students enter the 4+1 degree track, starting as freshmen in the four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture program, before gaining admission to the one-year Master of Architecture Program. The program has a number of students who have transferred into the 4+1 track. This transfer typically occurs in the second year. The program has relationships with several community colleges from which it recruits these transfer students. For a small number of applicants who already possess a bachelor's degree, the program will admit them as "post-degree undergraduate transfer" students with direct matriculation to the Master of Architecture degree on either a 2+year track, for a student with an architectural degree; or a 3+year track, for students with a degree in anything other than architecture. The program typically only admits 3-5 "post-degree undergraduate transfer" students per year. Students entering the SACD in their fourth year via the VABE program are not considered transfer students, as the curriculum plans for both the SACD and the University of Windsor have been pre-arranged and collaboratively developed.

Admissions requirements and procedures are clear and according to NAAB requirements. Transfer processes are described in detail in the APR (pp.87-90), and are handled with an individual review of transcripts, credits, and a tailored degree plan. The team met with the program director to confirm the admissions/transfer process and review individual applications. All degree candidates – regardless of their specific admissions process - are required to complete certain undergraduate courses that contain relevant Student Criteria.

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance (*Guidelines*, p. 18)
The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

> 5.1.1 **Administrative Structure**: Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.
> 5.1.2 **Governance**: Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

☒ **Described**

2023 Team Analysis:
Administrative Structure: Administrative leadership at the college level is provided by Dean Dan Pitera, FAIA and Associate Dean Noah Resnick, AIA, both of whom are tenured full professors. The dean reports directly to the Provost/VP Academic Affairs and has support from multiple staff members ranging from IT, to development, to business office staff. The department has 14 full-time and 35 part-time faculty. Detailed information, including organizational charts and distributions of responsibility for the faculty, staff, and administration were provided in the APR (pp.91-93) and confirmed during the visit with meetings of all constituents.

Governance: The APR (pp.94-98) describes a process by which the SACD's faculty fully participates in the governance of the program. The school's small size facilitates a direct connection between the administrator and the faculty - and the current administrators also teach. This structure means that shared governance has been an inherent part of the SACD's normal operations. The current faculty and administrators have made a commitment to developing "a more deliberate shared governance system that works to 'flatten' the power structure by celebrating the partnership between faculty, staff, administrators, students, alumni and community partners." The Faculty Council is composed of the faculty as a whole and meets on a bi-weekly basis. Although the dean and associate dean attend all meetings as non-voting guests, the APR notes that they do typically contribute to the meeting agendas. The visiting team was provided with copies of meeting agendas and minutes, which clearly document shared governance. The APR describes multiple collaborative knowledge sharing and decision-making tactics, the communications and feedback loop, and places identified for improvement.

At the university-level, the institution as a whole operates under a shared governance system. Multiple committees related to the overall operations of the institution include faculty, college administrators, and students. Within the McNichols Campus, there is a faculty assembly, which includes SACD. The faculty at the McNichols Campus are unionized. SACD Dean Pitera was part of the most recent negotiations for the current 5-year contract.

5.2 Planning and Assessment (*Guidelines*, p. 18)
The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

> 5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
> 5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.

5.2.3   How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
5.2.4   Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
5.2.5   Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

The program must also demonstrate that it regularly uses the results of self-assessments to advise and encourage changes and adjustments that promote student and faculty success.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The program's planning and assessment process are described in detail in the APR (pp. 97-111) and affirmed through a review of additional documents provided to the team and meetings with multiple constituents during the visit. The Strategic Priorities were generated from long-term analysis and conversations with the entire SCAD community. Detailed sub strategies, criteria for decision making, broad performance indicators, and progress milestones, and potential interdepartmental and intercollegiate collaborations were identified following a thorough SWAT and STEEP analysis and building upon the university's broader assessment plans. A strength of the program continues to be its collaborative approach spearheaded by the program's administration and new assessment coordinator. The program has developed a robust assessment method with gradual course assessment rolled out on a three-year schedule.

5.3 Curricular Development (*Guidelines*, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:
5.3.1   The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
5.3.2   The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR (pp.111-114) reports on rigorous and thoughtful processes for curriculum development, in part to respond to the 2020 Conditions of Accreditation. Having made various adjustments across the board, including "rebuilding the Building Technology Sequence from the ground up" (details on p.110), the program has instituted a three-year course review process. Faculty, students, administrators, alumni, and outside jurors are involved in peer and self-assessments. Design studios have observers who are tasked with measuring whether stated learning objectives and outcomes are being met by student work, with more detailed assessment required for studios that are designed to meet the SC.5 and SC.6 criteria. The APR is very detailed in its reported processes for curricular development and addresses 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, which was confirmed during the visit through a review of supplemental materials and meetings with faculty members, the program director, and the dean.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development (*Guidelines*, p. 19)
The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:
5.4.1   Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
5.4.2   Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual

NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up-to-date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.

    5.4.3   Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

    5.4.4   Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The team reviewed several documents in addition to the APR and met with multiple constituencies during the visit.

- Workload expectations prescribed in APR (pp.114-115).
- The ALA is Dean Pitera, who attended the Licensing Advisor Summit, and shares information in the ARCH 1190 and 1290 Courses and the ARCH 3000: Professional Experience Preparation.
- Funding for all full-time faculty is included as a part of the union contract and funds up to $2,000 per faculty member (APR p.117). This amount is budgeted within the dean's discretionary fund or other un-committed fundraising and while. Requests are never denied, as the dean has found the funding for faculty who requested it. Funding for digital instruction during the COVID-19 pandemic was provided.
- Adjunct faculty can request conference funds from the dean's budget or join research by a primary faculty member.
- University resources were identified as the primary support for counseling, wellness, accessibility accommodations, and personal advising, with career guidance and internship assistance provided by faculty and program administration. Syllabi routinely include description of these resources, and students reported positive access.
- The required co-op program and preparatory coursework for professional experiences is robust. Faculty assist with locating job and co-op opportunities, and students described ample opportunities through program sponsored job fair and job board. Students organize portfolio review and firm tours through NOMAS.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (*Guidelines*, p. 20)
The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

    5.5.1   Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.

    5.5.2   Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

    5.5.3   Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.

    5.5.4   Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

    5.5.5   Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
In the APR (pp.119-126), and affirmed through meetings during the visit, the program describes multiple human, physical, and financial approaches to social equity, diversity, and inclusion. They include 'open door' practices for increasing interdisciplinary interaction in SACD spaces or with the SACD community which take advantage of the program's location and accessibility. Although limited in student participation due to its occurrence during summer breaks, student diversity is approached through pipeline program recruitment backed by long held partnerships, in addition to diversity-based scholarships and changes to the admissions process with tracked improvements since 2019 and potential for additional gains utilizing the same approaches. Investments in faculty recruiting through personal and professional outreach and university search policy documents have resulted in substantially improved gender, racial, and ethnic diversity. The program's faculty and staff demographics have further room to align with student demographics, as noted by the dean and program director. It is not described how the program plans to improve faculty and staff diversity during the next accreditation cycle without the large number of new retirees seen between 2014 and 2019. A core value of the University is that diversity of faith is also seen as an important metric of student diversity. This diversity was observed during the team visit as students described a number of activities that foster community. Financial resources to target commonly reported hidden costs including free access to plotting and digital resources were provided, although the team noted that the cost of fabrication and physical model-making materials remains an additional hidden cost. Links to university-wide student and faculty support services included and services were affirmed through various meetings during the team visit.

5.6 Physical Resources (*Guidelines*, p. 21)
The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program's pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

   5.6.1   Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
   5.6.2   Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.
   5.6.3   Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
   5.6.4   Resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, off-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

☒ **Not Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The Department benefits from and is very proud of its "home" in a historic, recently renovated Loranger Building. SACD has a clear and defined presence in that substantial, well-built classroom structure. The team was well introduced to their physical resources by an excellent video of the Loranger Building, with annotated plans provided in the APR (pp.127-129). The APR reports that the studio space, other teaching and learning spaces, and interactive areas are adequate and functional. However, the faculty referred to those spaces as being "full," which is corroborated by the section in the APR on p.105 which assesses the Operational and Building Strengths and Weaknesses, indicating "we are approaching our building's spatial limit." The APR mentions that the faculty office space is at capacity, and faculty confirmed that in the visit. They reported that finding acoustically private spaces to discuss confidential matters with students was difficult, especially for adjunct faculty. Attempts are being made to utilize other spaces, such as their off-campus headquarters for the DCDC center, and consideration is being given to moving other uses out of the main building to free up additional course and office space. The wood shop is not adequate, and the amount of equipment is limited and overused. This inadequacy is reported on p.105-106: "during the 2014 accreditation visit, the lack of effective shop equipment and shop supervision was listed as a concern. These items have been addressed, which now makes more apparent the limitation of

the current two shop spaces." It was reported in staff interviews that while improvements were addressed, there is also a serious need for greater staff support of the shop spaces. Students noted limited hours impacted project production. Increased technical support staff, both in hardware and software, is also needed to provide technical assistance for network and architectural software. Fabrication and digital printing are such a critical aspect of the architectural learning environment today that it is as important as the bricks and mortar issues. The current shop space is located in the basement, with inadequate ventilation, and out of the way in terms of proximity to studios. The building needs further upgrades including HVAC renovations and window restorations. Overall, the faculty, administration, and students are proud of their learning environment and the sense of "home" created there, but key improvements are needed.

5.7 Financial Resources (*Guidelines*, p. 21)
The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
Financial information on the program budget is included in the APR on p.136 and includes a description of the budget organization. This information was affirmed during the visit through several meetings with different constituencies. SACD's budget is divided into four sections:
- **Unrestricted** (Allocated University Funds)
  - Deans' Office (Administrative and School Operations)
  - Architecture Instruction (Primarily Faculty Salaries)
  - Community Development Instruction (Primarily Faculty Salaries with some Operations)
- **Restricted** (Funds received through fees and fundraising)
  - Detroit Collaborative Design Center (Approximately 50% Fund Development and 50% Project Fees)
- Programs and events such as: Dichotomy, Graduate Recognition Dinner, Lecture Series, and Study Abroad Programs, are funded through student fees and fundraising.
- A certain amount of flexibility is provided by discretionary funding within the dean's control but the amounts not dedicated to salaries and union-mandated travel reimbursement is very limited.

The funding level appears appropriate to support learning and achievement, although financial challenges with reduced enrollment during the pandemic were noted by the program administrators. This information was also accompanied by specific plans for recruiting to boost revenue.

The University does have a development office tasked with fundraising, and a staff member assigned specifically to SCAD. Challenges reported a lack of wealth and related philanthropy among alumni, except for those who followed development and construction careers.

The program reported that salaries were competitive with similar positions elsewhere. Further evidence that resources were adequate that the team found during the site visit was confirmed by conversations with faculty that travel opportunities were funded, appropriate faculty to student ratios in classes, and availability of scholarships to students in need.

5.8 Information Resources (*Guidelines*, p. 22)
The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals who provide discipline-relevant information services that support teaching and research.

☒ **Demonstrated**

2023 Team Analysis:
The APR (pp.137-139) provides details regarding the program's Informational Resources. The main library is situated next door to the Loranger Architecture building. The team observed the dedicated Architecture section, which was displayed in the video tour. This section includes books, bound journals and DVDs, along with tables for group student and review of materials. The library supports student and faculty learning through both physical resources as well as instruction. Information on access to librarian assistance and digital resources was included in APR. Students reported having training on library and digital resources, and very accessible digital library materials in addition to the physical library section.

6—Public Information
The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public about accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information about accredited and non-accredited architecture programs. The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the public. As a result, all NAAB-accredited programs are required to ensure that the following information is posted online and is easily available to the public.

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program's website.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Access to the Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees is provided on the program's website at the following link:
https://architecture.udmercy.edu/accreditation/index.php
and in the university catalog at the following link:
https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/catalog/undergraduate2022-2023/colleges/arch/index.php

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:
   a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
   b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2014, depending on the date of the last visit)
   c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
   d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2012 or 2015, depending on the date of the last visit)

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Access to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures is provided on the program's website at the following link: *https://architecture.udmercy.edu/accreditation/index.php*

6.3 Access to Career Development Information (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Student access to career development information is provided in multiple ways. Students have access to the Center for Career & Professional Development: https://www.udmercy.edu/current-students/cec/. The Department also hosts career/recruiting events. Students in the program participate in a co-op as part of the curriculum, providing them with experience in an office setting. As part of the co-op prep course, the instructor provides information on alternative careers and employer guidelines.

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents (*Guidelines*, p. 23)
To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:
- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Public access to the Accreditation Reports and Related Documents is provided at the following link: *https://architecture.udmercy.edu/accreditation/index.php*

Public access to information regarding learning and teaching culture is provided in the 'Studio Culture' video on the school website at the following link:
https://architecture.udmercy.edu/index.php
The current policy is posted throughout the studios. It is noted that this document is currently undergoing revision and has been temporarily removed from the school website (which was recently re-designed). Once the new policy has been finalized it will be posted on the updated website.

Statement on Inclusion can be found at the following link:
https://architecture.udmercy.edu/commitment-to-inclusion.php

6.5 Admissions and Advising (*Guidelines*, p. 24)
The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:
- a) Application forms and instructions

b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees
d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships
e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Information Regarding admissions and advising is provided in the APR, and public access is provided on the program and university website at the following links:
https://www.udmercy.edu/admission/apply.php
https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/catalog/undergraduate2022-2023/admission/index.php
https://www.udmercy.edu/academics/catalog/undergraduate2022-2023/colleges/arch/index.php

6.6 Student Financial Information (*Guidelines*, p. 24)
6.6.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.
6.6.2 The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

☒ **Met**

2023 Team Analysis:
Public access to the Student Financial Information is provided on the university website at the following link:
https://www.udmercy.edu/admission/financial-aid/index.php
https://www.udmercy.edu/admission/financial-aid/index.php

V.   Appendices

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

- Condition 2. Shared Values – Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
- Condition 2. Shared Values - Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement
- PC. 6. Leadership and Collaboration
- PC. 8. Social Equity and Inclusion

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

NAAB Matrix

	Year 1 Fall			Year 1 Spring						Year 2 Fall							Year 2 Spring						Year 3 Fall							Year 3 Spring	Su	Year 4 Fall				Year 4 Spring				Su	Year 5 Fall			Year 5 Spring			Non-Curricular Activity						
	ARCH 1100 Architectural Design I	ARCH 1110 Visual Communication I	ARCH 1190 Introduction to Architecture I	ARCH 1200 Architectural Design II	ARCH 1211 Visual Communication II	ARCH 1290 Introduction to Architecture II	ARCH 1840 Structural Principles	ARCH 1860 Environmental Principles	ARCH 1880 Construction Principles	ARCH 1300 Architectural Design III	ARCH 2110 Visual Communication III	ARCH 2120 Architectural History & Theory I	ARCH 2640 Building Structures I	ARCH 2660 Building Environment I	ARCH 2680 Building Construction I	ARCH 2190 Site Analysis & Design	ARCH 1400 Architectural Design IV	ARCH 2211 Visual Communication IV	ARCH 2220 Architectural History & Theory II	ARCH 2840 Building Structures II	ARCH 2860 Building Environment II	ARCH 2880 Building Construction II	ARCH 2100 Special Topics Studio	ARCH 2520 Architectural History Theory III	ARCH 3000 Professional Experience Prep	ARCH 4840 Building Structures III	ARCH 3650 Technical Analysis	ARCH 3660 Building Environment III	ARCH 3680 Building Construction III	ARCH 2200 Special Topics Studio	ARCH 3010 COOP 1	ARCH 4100 Integrated Studio	ARCH 4640 Integrated Tech A	ARCH 4660 Integrated Tech B	ARCH 4680 Integrated Tech C	ARCH 3100 Public Interest Design Studio	ARCH 3190 Building Code Analysis	ARCH 4919 Thesis Prep	PYC 2650 Environmental Psychology	ARCH 5020 COOP 2	ARCH 5100 Masters Studio I	ARCH 5110 Masters Studio Supplement I	ARCH 5190 Profession of Architecture	ARCH 5200 Masters Studio II	ARCH 5210 Masters Studio Supplement II	ARCH 5590 Arch & Construction Law	Fabrication Lab Waste Reduction Program	Lecture Series	DCDC	Study Abroad + Exchange + VABE	Career Fair/Alumni Events	Portfolio Review	Dichotomy Student Journal

Shared Values

Criterion	Filled courses
Design	ARCH 4100; ARCH 3100; DCDC; Study Abroad + Exchange + VABE
Env. Stewardship & Professional Respon.	ARCH 1860; ARCH 2660; ARCH 2860; ARCH 3660; ARCH 4100; ARCH 3100; ARCH 3190; Lecture Series
Equity, Diversity & Inclusion	Fabrication Lab Waste Reduction Program; Lecture Series
Knowledge & Innovation	ARCH 3100; ARCH 5110; ARCH 5200; Lecture Series; Dichotomy Student Journal
Leadership, Collab. & Community Engmt.	ARCH 3100; DCDC
Lifelong Learning	ARCH 2520; ARCH 3010; Lecture Series; Study Abroad + Exchange + VABE

Program Criteria

Criterion	Filled courses
PC.1 Career Paths	ARCH 3000; ARCH 4100; ARCH 3100; ARCH 5110; Fabrication Lab Waste Reduction Program; Career Fair/Alumni Events
PC.2 Design	
PC.3 Ecological Know. & Respon.	ARCH 2660; ARCH 3650; ARCH 4100; ARCH 4660
PC.4 History & Theory	ARCH 2120; ARCH 2220
PC.5 Research & Innovation	ARCH 3100; ARCH 5100; ARCH 5110; ARCH 5200; Dichotomy Student Journal
PC.6 Leadership & Collaboration	ARCH 2200; ARCH 5020
PC.7 Learning & Teaching Culture	
PC.8 Social Equity & Inclusion	Fabrication Lab Waste Reduction Program

Student Criteria

Criterion	Filled courses
SC.1 HSW in the Built Environ.	ARCH 3000; ARCH 4100
SC.2 Professional Practice	ARCH 2520; ARCH 3190; ARCH 5100; ARCH 5590
SC.3 Regulatory Context	
SC.4 Technical Knowledge	ARCH 4100; ARCH 4640; ARCH 4660; ARCH 4680; ARCH 3100
SC.5 Design Synthesis	ARCH 4100; ARCH 3100
SC.6 Building Integration	ARCH 4100

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Perspective
Susan Schaefer Kliman, PhD, FAIA, NCARB
Chair & Professor / Department of Architecture
North Dakota State University
Fargo, ND
susan.kliman@ndsu.edu

Practitioner Perspective
Camille Sherrod, RA
School of Public Architecture
Michael Graves College
Kean University
Union, New Jersey
csherrod@kean.edu

Regulator Perspective
Margo Jones, FAIA, NCARB, LEED AP
Founding Principal
Jones Whitsett Architects
Greenfield, MA
mj@joneswhitsett.com

Student and Practitioner Perspective
Christine Malecki West, AIA
Principal
KITE Architects
Providence, RI
cw@kitearchitects.com

Observer
Mick Kennedy, AIA
University of Michigan
Taubman College
Department of Architecture
Ann Arbor, MI
mickk@umich.edu