

**University of Detroit Mercy
School of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture

(139 undergraduate credit hours+ 34 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
12 March 2014

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 a 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	1
2. Conditions Not Met	1
3. Causes of Concern	1
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	1
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	4
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	15
III. Appendices:	
1. Program Information	28
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	29
3. Visiting Team	30
IV. Report Signatures	31
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	32

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team enjoyed a warm welcome, in an open and comfortable environment, whether meeting with faculty, administration, students, staff, or alumni. Fresh new leadership energizes the school at every level—from the dean and staff of the architecture program, to the provost and president of the university. These changes bolster the esprit de corps of faculty, staff, and students, and accompany a renewed sense of optimism, as they celebrate the 50th anniversary of the School of Architecture (SOA) and the 20th anniversary of the Detroit Collaborative Design Center (DCDC).

The SOA is exemplary of the service and community-driven mission of the university; most (if not all) students and faculty are actively engaged in service to the communities of Detroit. It is in this work that the entrepreneurial spirit of the school (and the city) is most notably demonstrated. That spirit is both demonstrated and recognized in recent success in fundraising, through private gifts, grants, and contracts.

Collectively, these factors overcome the concerns from the previous visit, and convinced the team that the program and school are in good hands.

2. Conditions Not Met

- A.10 Cultural Diversity
- B.7 Financial Considerations

3. Causes of Concern

- A. Shop supervision—a junior faculty member manages; students supervise (still irregular)
- B. Shop conditions—aging equipment and safety concerns. Space for a new laser cutter seems inadequate, in terms of ventilation. Accessibility for persons w/disabilities is a general concern.
- C. Shop and computer lab open hours are not dependable.
- D. Ethnic and gender diversity among faculty and students has declined.
- E. Sustainability not consistently addressed or advanced; students feel that approaches and material presented are outdated.
- F. Faculty retirements seem imminent; succession could significantly impact school culture, if new hires come in clusters.
- G. Faculty workload and demand for university service obligations continue to be a concern (especially as the number of full-time faculty shrinks and programs grow).

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008)

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

Previous Team Report (2008): The 2002 Visiting Team Report found that both the Human Resources and Human Resource Development conditions were not adequately addressed by the school. In fact these Conditions have been an outstanding issue prior to the 2002 accreditation

visit. This team (2008) had expected to find these two Conditions addressed, at least to some degree, during this visit. However, the 2008 team finds conditions similar to what was found by the last team - faculty salaries are lower than university averages and regional peer institutions and the resources available for faculty development and professional growth are limited.

The visiting team views this problem as a concern not just for NAAB accreditation but also for the spirit and life of the School of Architecture. With this concern in mind, some immediate actions need to be forthcoming. Faculty salaries need to achieve parity with university averages and with the architecture faculty salaries of other regional institutions if the school is to remain competitive and achieve its potential. In addition, more resources are required for professional growth of the faculty.

These same concerns are expressed for the compensation of adjunct faculty. While adjunct faculty salaries are tied to the number of credit hours taught, the team notes that the number of student contact hours required per credit hour is considerably more in architecture studios than in other disciplines on campus. Considering the significant role adjunct faculty play in the advancement of the school, this is a very important issue. The team considers this issue comparable to the salary challenges faced by the full-time tenure and tenure leading faculty.

Technical support staff for the woodshop and computer labs is also a concern. The number of personnel is inadequate given the emphasis the school has placed on computing and hands-on experiences. This situation is likely to worsen as the school contemplates a mandatory student computer purchase program, advances the desire for more design-build studios, or responds to the request for an increase in student enrollment.

Finally, the office support staff is stretched thin by the growth in the number of programs offered within the School.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: While there are still some challenges, substantial progress has been made.

Model/wood shop: technical support staff for and safety in the model shop are still a concern. The shop is managed by a junior faculty member (who carries a full teaching load and directs the M. Arch program). Supervision is provided by work-study student attendants. Students must complete an orientation in order to use power tools. New laser cutter is scheduled for installation soon (conditions of the room don't seem adequate).

Computing, plotting and IT: IT manager established in Aug 2013, at 60% effort (MWF schedule), to support SOA computer labs and the DCDC. Supplemented by work-study student attendants to extend hours beyond these times (including evenings and weekends).

Office/school support staff: New staff started arriving in fall of 2011 (office manager) and now includes business manager, development officer (.66 FTE), and IT manager (.60 FTE). Hope/plan is that IT manager will move to full time once Dental School hires an IT manager (the search is underway). The latter three positions hired within the past year, so it's still too soon to see the impact. However, the dean expressed optimism about the leadership and support team he's been building.

2004 Condition 7, Human Resources Development: *Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.*

Previous Team Report (2008): See comments for Condition #6.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: These conditions have improved (see section 1.2.1): adjunct salaries have been raised, and full-time faculty salaries have been adjusted to address inequities and compaction, so they are now comparable with the rest of the university. However, adjunct faculty report perceived inequity among part-time studio assignments, where salary is determined by credit hours, but all demand the same number of contact hours (12-14) and effort. First- and second-year studios meet for 12 contact hours per week, and upper-level studios meet for 14 contact hours per week. Adjunct pay for these studios is adjusted proportionally based on this difference in contact time.

2004 Condition 10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous Team Report (2008): The financial resources do not appear to have substantially improved since the 2002 accreditation visit. The school's multiple challenges with support services, physical facilities, faculty development, and faculty salaries can all be attributed to a shortfall in resources. In addition, the Detroit Collaborative Design Center requires a stable source of funds if it is to achieve the school's aspirations for this innovative program.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: The team is satisfied that the school has sufficient financial resources to maintain and sustain program quality. The SOA budget has increased by an average of 4% since 2009, with the largest increase in 2011. According to the dean, the current budget will remain in place for 2014-15 (no cut; no increase). (See also Section 1.2.4) The budget is modestly improved by increases in tuition; significant increase in gifts and grants. The DCDC is supported by a multiyear grant from a foundation.

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (1): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The History and Mission of the UDM are very much aligned with the University Mission and Vision. This is documented in the APR and was consistently communicated to the team from multiple levels (President, Provost, Dean, Faculty and Students). All being founded in the Jesuit and Mercy traditions of quality education, service, and social justice.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found the learning culture of the school to be one of open collaboration, civic engagement, and service learning. The Jesuit and Mercy traditions have had a strong presence in the underlying esprit de corps of the school and the university as a whole. Students feel that the small, intimate environment of the school facilitates their development throughout the program, with an informal, entrepreneurial and inclusive mentality. Their Honor Code and Studio Culture Policy have recently been revised at the students' behest and is considered a living representation of the culture at the school. This is further reinforced by a strong and vocal student leadership.

Social equity, due in large part to the mission of the university, is evidenced in the inclusive nature of the school, embracing a plurality of ideas from a diverse range of faculty and students. This is enriched further, culturally speaking, by its exchange program with Poland and its new building in Italy. In addition, UDM Disability Support Services provides assistance to students, staff or faculty and reflects its responsibility to serve the educational needs of the community. As well, through strategic hiring and focused enrollment, the program hopes to further diversify but that will take time to come to fruition, especially given the new vice president of enrollment and student affairs hired this past year. Among the UDM student body, 42% are non-Caucasian + 11% reported as race unknown, 53% are female, and 18% are international students. Presently (term 1, AY2013-14) 8% of the full-time faculty of the SOA are ethnic minorities and 33% are women. In addition, 17% of the faculty are foreign-born. Of the 17 current adjunct faculty, 12% are minority (including the director of the co-op program, which is an ongoing 12-month commitment) and 35% are women. The hope is that with the advent of another faculty search next academic year, the faculty will further diversify.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: The SOA-through its degree programs, DCDC, and other initiatives-sets a strong, positive model of UDM mission/values in the areas of community engagement, service, and teaching. Administrators, faculty, and students are engaged in university-level committees.

Contributions in scholarship are primarily through (critical/applied/active) practice, in firms and the DCDC (vs. traditional research and discovery).

- 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.

[XI] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: The team found that students at the UDM School of Architecture are well-rounded, engaged and astute with an ample heart for service that reflects the mission and vision of the university. They embody strong leadership and professional qualities, due in part to their vocal student body and co-op requirements that make them well-positioned for future practice.

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

The service learning and civic engagement aspects of the program promote a vibrant and inclusive culture, especially peer to peer and with faculty. This is evident in course work, design projects and the Detroit Collaborative Design Center, now celebrating 20 years. That community engagement is a driving force in the school and is a strong motivator for students enrolling in the program.

Students also feel comfortable approaching the staff and administration at all levels with concerns or opportunities. Though the school has dealt with lower enrollment and financial concerns, the student body has adapted and thrived with an entrepreneurial spirit that is unique to Detroit and UDM in particular.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The team found strong evidence that students are aware of the pathways to licensure via multiple formats. This exposure starts in the first year with an all-school introduction by the IDP educator coordinator and a second presentation from the IDP student coordinator. This is followed by curriculum in the first semester of the third and fifth years. In addition, it is supported by the mandatory co-op program, through the AIAS chapter, and through a mentorship program offered by AIA Michigan.

Most of the students were aware that they should be keeping an IDP record and were familiar with the licensure requirements through NCARB. The IDP student coordinator provides a critical link between the awareness provided by the program and the support to the students in actually taking the steps to complete the application.

The program provides a variety of ways for the students to participate with the local community and work alongside professionals in a design context that also allows them to understand the path to licensure.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The team found strong evidence that the leadership and faculty of the program are committed to preparing students for the practice of architecture. The dean, associate dean, and program director presented a clear vision and commitment to leveraging the school's physical and human resources to that goal in a way that reinforces the university's and profession's commitment to service.

Despite the recent reflection of the difficult economy in somewhat lower student enrollment, the School of Architecture has made significant improvements to its physical resources (school renovations) and maintained faculty and student quality. The school's commitment to the

profession is also manifest in the relatively high level of tenured faculty who are licensed (between 64% and 77% over the past seven years). In addition, a very dedicated corps of practicing part-time faculty represent a range of practice types, including consultancies, small firms, and very large local firms; this provides a rich range of professional role models for the students.

The school's Detroit Collaborative Design Center provides students with opportunities for entrepreneurial professional experiences in an internationally acclaimed community design practice at the school. In particular, these and related service opportunities reinforce the collaborative nature of our profession and the importance of understanding the communities and clients we serve. Multiple opportunities for travel and study with students from Canada, Poland and Italy prepare students to practice in a global economy. The school's mandatory Professional Experience course (ARCH 3010) and work experience (co-op) provides students with useful skills and rich networking opportunities from which to launch their careers.

ARE pass rates were the highest among Michigan graduates in 2012.

- 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.

2014 Team Assessment: It was clearly and consistently communicated via the APR and various meetings with the president, provost, faculty, and students that the SOA is very motivated and passionate to be active, engaged citizens and be responsive to the needs of a changing world. This culture of service is pervasive and is demonstrated within the university's core curriculum, as well as through the programs offered by the SOA (i.e., international programs, DCDC, MCD, student organization engagement).

t.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.

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of the SOA's commitment to continual improvement via long-range planning is demonstrated through the fact that the current strategic plan was adopted in October 2012. As documented in the APR, this was a comprehensive and very inclusive process, and is intended to be revised again for 2014-2020. The next update will coincide with this visit, as well as many other influences, such as a pending university-wide core curriculum and SOA redesign. It is anticipated that the official roll out of the already approved 3.5-year, post-non-professional M Arch track will coincide with the redesign of the SOA's curriculum, along with new approaches to better integrate courses and other disciplines. The new strategic plan will also address the approach to potential staff retirements.

Another sign of SOA's effort toward continual improvement is the mock team room conducted at the

end of each academic semester.

/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.

2014 Team Assessment: The team found strong evidence that the program is making progress toward achieving elements of its mission. It has established a new strategic plan that was finalized in October 2012 and updated in January 2014. The process was very collaborative, taking into account the 2005-2010 strategic plan, input from faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the vice president for academic affairs/provost. In addition, a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis has been completed. They provided a multilayered assessment, including mock team rooms where student work is assessed and gaps in student knowledge are discussed, leading to proposed curricular changes. Changes in curriculum are submitted to the Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Council and action is taken.

The program is also assessed by the Faculty Council, Student Advisory Group, the University Assessment Committee, Co-Op Employer Reviews, during faculty retreats, and through graduate surveys. The students indicated during the team's meeting with them that they were regularly completing course evaluations and that the program had made changes based upon their comments.

PART ONE {I}: SECTION 2-RESOURCES**1.2.1 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 /DP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of /DP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the /DP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends /DP 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

2014 Team Assessment: With the addition of new staff in the SOA office--office manager (since 2011), business manager(½ SOA, ½ DCDC, since March 2013), development officer(½ time; since Nov 2013), IT manager (.6 FTE, since Aug 2013)-the team found that human resources (faculty and staff) are adequate for the program. The team met with part- and full-time faculty as well as administrative leadership, technical, administrative and support staff. The development officer shares time with another unit within the university but did not think this diminished her ability to be effective. Likewise, the IT support person assigned to the school shares some time with another unit. That arrangement is temporary and is anticipated to be resolved soon. Policies related to personnel, position descriptions, and EEO/AA were provided in the team room, along with criteria for determining rank and tenure.

Conversations with faculty and staff indicated that students enjoy tutorial exchanges with faculty. However, a high proportion of faculty feel overloaded; they are active in service activities, serving as directors and in multiple units within the school (DCDC, Master of Community Design), which creates the very real danger of burnout. This might be particularly concerning in light of enrollments, which appear to be rising after years of decline, the likelihood of increased enrollment due to additional transfer students, the relative uncertainty of additional faculty lines and at least a few faculty at retirement age.

The IDP coordinator, Stephen La Grassa, serves on the national IDP committee and is actively engaged with students. Faculty and staff described opportunities for professional development including conferences and intramural technology training respectively.

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.

Students:

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

[XI Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The resources provided to students include a number of scholarships, tuition remission and grants. In addition, informal standard operating procedures include students in the governance of the school through the Student Advisory Group (SAG). The strong AIAS chapter is well funded, and members regularly attend conferences and events. Admission documentation was found in the APR for incoming students and addressed for transfer students in the team room binder "Transfer Students." The school has also demonstrated a continued commitment to providing opportunities for students to learn outside the classroom through numerous civic engagement projects and co-ops.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[XI Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR and with visiting team discussions with the associate dean, dean, provost and president that demonstrate that the university has governance and financial structures in place that provide sufficient autonomy for the program to meet the conditions of accreditation.

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

[XI Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Faculty, students, and upper administration all report that faculty and students are actively involved in governance at the school and university levels. The fact that university committees require representation from all schools/colleges results in SOA faculty serving on several committees, in order to represent this small unit on an equal basis with other units.

1.2.3 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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found that the school has addressed many of the concerns highlighted in the 2008 VTR, namely the renovation of faculty offices and studio spaces. A cause for concern is the wood shop, which is in need of renovation to address ventilation, safety, and equipment maintenance/replacement. The lack of a wood shop supervisor to ensure the safety and proper instruction of students is being bridged with work-study students but this not a long-term plan. There is a plan to renovate the shop with funds that will hopefully become available with the onset of a new university-wide capital campaign.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The SOA budget has increased by an average of 4% since 2009, with the largest increase in 2011 (6.7%). According to the dean, the current budget will remain in place for 2014-15 (no cut; no increase). There has been a significant increase in gifts and grants since the last NAAB visit. The DCDC is now supported by a multiyear grant from the Kresge Foundation. Students reported concern about increases in tuition.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found information resources and its supporting spaces more than adequate for the program. The library staff is dedicated and knowledgeable of the needs of the architecture program, both students and faculty. The available support of library services 24/7 demonstrates this commitment. The library spaces struck a balance between digital and print media, with both quiet and meeting spaces throughout. The volumes seem to meet the needs of the school and the budget for acquisitions is utilized over the course of the year.

PART I: SECTION 3-REPORTS

1.3.1 Statistical Reports. 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.

- o *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.
- o *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.
- o *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

- o *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.
- o *Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.*
Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
- o *Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.*
Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
- o *Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.*

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

2014 Team Assessment: Statistical reports were provided in the APR as required.

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

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

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

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

addenda should also be included.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Annual reports were provided in the APR document, as required.

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this was documented in the APR and in the faculty exhibit.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Most of the policies listed in Appendix 3 were found in the Misc. Policies notebook located in the team room. The Self-Assessment Policies and Objective, while not listed as specific policies, are thoroughly documented procedures and process in the APR under section 1.1.3. Again, policies on use and integration of digital media in architecture curriculum were not evident, however, catalog information showing ARCH 1160 and 2160 totaling six credits.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

11.1.1 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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of writing ability is well-demonstrated in essays prepared for ARCH 2520 History and Theory II, and is further reinforced in the final thesis books (ARCH 5100 & 5200). Evidence of effective verbal communication is demonstrated in videotaped studio and thesis presentations.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion in ARCH2100, where design studies for testing alternative massing configurations against stated objectives were found. Further evidence was found in ARCH5100 Thesis presentations.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in ARCH 1300 and 2100, and was clearly displayed in student work (drawings, models, videos).

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion is clearly shown in the drawings of student work displayed in the team room for ARCH 3010 and 3020..

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this ability was found in the final thesis books prepared in ARCH 5200.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion in ARCH1100 Architectural Design 1, including a design exercise in the process of generating architectural form for various sources. Exercises in ARCH1300 show evidence of the ability to integrate structure and form.

- 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

2014 Team Assessment: Use of precedents is introduced early in the curriculum, through Architectural Design II (studio), in which students examine the work of well-known architects. Precedent study also informs the Thesis work (ARCH 5100 & 5200).

- 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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in ARCH 1300 and 4100 student work examples (three-year development span displayed).

- 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 socio-economic, public health, and cultural factors.***

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Both student evidence and course content for ARCH 2120, 2220, 2340 & 2440 can be found within the SPC A.9 binder demonstrating historical traditions and global culture regarding architecture, landscape and urban design. Additionally, they are examined in terms of climate, ecology, technology, socioeconomic, and public health.

- 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] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: 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.

- 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

2014 Team Assessment: All M Arch students take on a self-identified, faculty-guided Thesis Project, which is developed over the course of two semesters (ARCH 5100 & ARCH 5200) and supported by ARCH 5110 & 5210, which focus specifically on the investigation that will inform the final design project. Thesis books document this process—from problem statement and site analysis, to precedents and design solutions—demonstrating a high level of understanding/knowledge, skill development, synthesis and design application.

<p>Realm A. General Team Commentary: The program prepares students well to exchange ideas in written, spoken and visual forms. Exercises that develop and test these skills are introduced early in the curriculum and repeated throughout, with expectations and outcomes increasing in complexity and quality. In particular, fundamental design and representation skills are developed to an impressive level early in the undergraduate program. While the team found the SPC A.10 Cultural Diversity to be "not met" in a systematic, demonstrable way, we do believe that the vast majority of students are exposed to a variety of cultural contexts during their tenure, and develop an acceptable level of cultural sensitivity.</p>

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

2014 Team Assessment: Course work for ARCH5100-5200 includes analysis of user needs, physical, social and programmatic site conditions at an urban scale. It also includes evidence of inventory of building space and equipment requirements. However, no evidence was found in this course of ability to review relevant laws and standards (zoning and building code) and assess their implications for a project.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion in course ARCH4100 Integrative Design Studio in plans that are part of the assignment dedicated to accessibility. Plans indicated awareness of ADA Accessibility guidelines and accessible parking requirements.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team some found evidence of understanding and ability of this criterion in ARCH2140 Ecological Design. Case study assignments demonstrated an understanding of sustainable features through precedents. Students demonstrated ability to apply sustainable design strategies in small team design projects. There was no evidence in the ARCH4100 Integrative Design Studio of ability with regard to sustainable design strategies (water conservation, passive or active strategies) with the exceptions of daylighting and shading.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being taught is found in ARCH 2190 & 4100 course materials and is applied in the E'IXhibited student work and thesis book.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being taught is found in ARCH 4100 lecture materials and is applied in exhibited student work.

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

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| A.2. Design Thinking Skills | B.2. Accessibility |
| A.4. Technical Documentation | B.3. Sustainability |
| A.5. Investigative Skills | B.4. Site Design |
| | B.5. Life Safety |
| A.8. Ordering Systems | B.7. Environmental Systems |
| A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture | B.9. Structural Systems |

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion in the ARCH 4100 studio. Distinct biweekly exercises were focused on integrating particular components of Comprehensive Design. The selection of a very flat site and the lack of topographic information on drawings (grading plans, spot elevations, .indication of site drainage) made site design the weakest aspect of this criterion.

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

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: 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).

- 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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion in the following courses: ARCH 2140 Ecological Design, ARCH 2340 Environmental Technology I, and ARCH 2440 Environmental Technology 2. Specifically, case study/precedent studies provide evidence of student understanding of solar orientation and passive heating and cooling strategies. Heat load calculation problems and quizzes in ARCH 2340 demonstrate understanding of thermal comfort, indoor air quality and HVAC systems. Quizzes and homework assignments in ARCH 2440 demonstrate understanding of lighting and acoustics.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this criterion being met in ARCH 2130 Principles of Structural Behavior, ARCH 2330 Structures I, and in ARCH 2430 Structures II. Exams in ARCH 2130, problem sets and exams in ARCH 2330, and design problems, including calculations, in ARCH 2330 all demonstrate ability of this criterion.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in ARCH 2150, ARCH 2250, and ARCH 4100, with student understanding demonstrated via written word and graphics. Physical material testing/experimentation/exploration was also demonstrated.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in the course work of ARCH 2340 & 2440 and student exams provided.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding of building materials and assemblies integration in ARCH 2140 through course work and, especially, student exercise/projects.

Ability is also demonstrated in numerous studios such as ARCH 4100 Integrated Design.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The program has a strong focus on educated profession-ready designers, and strong student evidence of work in this realm reflects that focus. Co-op experience provides students with opportunities to strengthen technical knowledge gained in the classroom and put it in the broader context of professional design practice. Models, section drawings, and palpable student interest in the making of architecture were exciting to see.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The matrix points to ARCH 2140 Ecological Design as the primary source of this SPC. However, collaboration is NOT listed as a learning objective of the course, nor is this SPC listed as one of the NAAB criteria addressed. Nonetheless, this course, as well as ARCH 2250 Building Construction II and PYC 2650 Environmental Psychology, includes team projects as required assignments. Furthermore, some level of collaboration appears consistently in vertical studios (especially community design studios).

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion is met with strong evidence of the understanding of human behavior found in PYC 2650 Environmental Psychology.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 5100 thesis books in the form of program studies and site analyses. While not required, the large number of opportunities for service provide robust evidence of this criterion. It is somewhat concerning that it is met in thesis, which is highly variable, and criteria for projects are set by students. Evidence of understanding of this criterion was not found in the ARCH 5590 Architecture and Construction Law exams or in ARCH 5190 Profession of Architecture. The syllabus for 5190 lists the NAAB SPC addressed in the class but does not list this one. Client relationships and contract negotiation were covered but nothing related to understanding or

reconciling needs of various parties. Inconsistent evidence was found in ARCH 2100.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met was found in the course work for ARCH 5190 and 5590 and the student exams included in the SPC C.4 binder.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in ARCH 5190 & 5590.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found of an understanding of leadership as it pertains to the collaborative work of architects in ARCH 5190 - Profession of Architecture and especially the co-op experiences students receive while working in architecture practices, a requirement in ARCH. 3010/3020.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence of an understanding of legal responsibilities for architects in ARCH 5590 and ARCH 5190, especially the implication of contracts, client relations, considerations for public safety and other laws impacting architecture practice.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found sufficient evidence of an understanding of ethics and professional judgment in ARCH 5590 and ARCH 5190, especially in student course work that addresses social, political, and cultural issues that impact architecture practices.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence demonstrating this SPC was found in several required courses, including ARCH 2140 Ecological Design and ARCH 5190 Profession of Architecture. Students have additional exposure to these values in optional student experiences (vertical studio option in community design, work experience in the DCDC).

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team found ample evidence of students fulfilling the student performance criteria in Realm C and in some cases meeting those criteria with distinction. Due to the strong influence of collaborating with community groups in and around Detroit, students are well-prepared to work in practice where teams are essential to moving a project forward. As well, the social responsibility of the student body reflects the vision and mission of the university and the school's curriculum. Coupled with the two required co-ops working at architecture firms or similar practice environments, their experience in project and practice management is well-grounded. In addition, their robust AIAS chapter and role in spearheading community-oriented projects gives testament to their leadership capabilities.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 - CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

11.2.1 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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion being met can be found in the APR by copy of the letter from the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS) dated July 11, 2007, approving the University of Detroit Mercy a full ten-year accreditation..

11.2.2 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

2014 Team Assessment: Per the curriculum statement and chart in the APR (also found on the school website), the curriculum meets the NAAB requirement for general/non-architecture studies (45 hrs.), graduate level studies (at 34 hrs.), and total credit hours (171 hrs.)

11.2.3 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

2014 Team Assessment: The curriculum is developed by the Curriculum Committee within the Faculty Council. The committee consists primarily of studio level coordinators and is chaired by the associate dean. University-wide changes to its core curriculum will be implemented in the near future. These revisions have the potential to directly impact the school's curriculum. In light of this, the dean is waiting for those changes before undertaking a deep review of the school's curriculum. The dean has expressed his intent to use the NAAB report and new NAAB Conditions, in addition to feedback from students and the Curriculum Committees review, to review and develop the curriculum. Practicing part-time faculty will have the opportunity to contribute to this process through the Faculty Council, although they do not vote. The high percentage of full-time faculty who are licensed and on the Curriculum Committee, including the dean and associate dean who will lead the curriculum review, ensures that licensed architects are included in curriculum development.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence of a process between the SOA and the University Registrar has been documented in the APR as well as demonstrated in the materials provided in the Transfer Student binder. A case-by-case curriculum plan is developed for each transfer student, intended to fit them into the 5-year M. Arch curriculum, with varying degrees of advancement or credit given. Students report varied experiences-from fair to less than equitable-whether they come from community colleges, traditional 4-year institutions, or abroad. While there seems to be some consistency with repeated transfers from some institutions, the process could be further developed.

As well, UDM has a collaboration agreement with the University of Windsor, which is just across the bridge in Canada, for earning a BFA of Visual Arts and the Built Environment as a result. Windsor students can also transfer over completely to UDM to complete the B.S. in Architecture during their 4th year and then apply for the M. Arch for their 5th year.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4- PUBLIC INFORMATION

11.4.1 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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this being met in recruitment material and the School of Architecture's website, found here:

<http://architecture.udmercy.edu/programs/arch/awards/index.htm>

11.4.2 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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this being met on the School of Architecture's website, found here:

<http://architecture.udmercy.edu/programs/arch/awards/index.htm>

11.4.3 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

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this being met on the School of Architecture's website, where links to the above websites are located.

<http://architecture.udmercy.edu/programs/arch/awards/index.htm>

11.4.4 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

2014 Team Assessment: Access to these documents is provided on the program's website, at <http://architecture.udmercy.edu/programs/arch/awards/index.htm>

11.4.5 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

2014 Team Assessment: The program's website (<http://architecture.udmercy.edu/programs/arch/awards/index.htm>) provides access to this information (located on the NCARB website):

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 (1.1.1)**
Reference University of Detroit Mercy, APR, pp. 3-4
- B. History and Mission of the Program (1.1.1)**
Reference University of Detroit Mercy, APR, pp. 4-6
- C. Long-Range Planning (1.1.4)**
Reference University of Detroit Mercy, APR, p. 18
- D. Self-Assessment (1.1.5)**
Reference University of Detroit Mercy, APR, pp. 18-25

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

- A. **A.6. Fundamental Design Skills**--the ability to study, understand and develop conceptual ideas into complex design solutions is developed rapidly within the program.
- B. **C.1. Collaboration**--the civic engagement aspect of the school allows for an exemplary level of collaboration with community groups, with exchange students and between studio years.
- C. **C.9. Community and Social Responsibility**--this criterion is manifested in courses throughout the program; in addition, the DCDC and activities of student organizations have led to a meaningful impact through design advocacy.
- D. **Architectural Education and the Public Good**--the vision and the mission of both the university and the school resonate throughout the program. The drive for service learning and community engagement reflects the Jesuit and Mercy traditions and is manifest in the numerous projects that have a real and lasting benefit to the communities of Detroit.

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Michaele Pride, AIA, NOMA
Associate Dean for Public Outreach & Engagement
School of Architecture+ Planning
University of New Mexico
2401 Central Av SE
Albuquerque NM 87131-0001
(505) 277-6470 office
(513) 284-9651 mobile
mlpride@unm.edu

Representing the AIA
Thomas Ahleman, AIA, LEED®AP
Principal
Studio Talo Architecture, Inc.
1234 Sherman Avenue, Suite 202
Evanston, IL 60202
(847) 733-7300
(773) 620-7232 mobile
thomas@studiotalo.com

Representing the AIAS
Stephen Parker, Assoc., AIA
SmithGroup JJR
1700 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 100
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 842-2100 office
(202) 974-5164 direct
(843) 902-0577 mobile
stephen.parker@smithgroupjjr.com

Representing the NCARB
Rick L. Benner, AIA
Director and University Architect
Office of Facilities Development and Capital Budget
Western Washington University
Physical Plant 112A
Mailstop 9122
(360) 650-3550
(360) 319-0321 mobile
rick.benner@wwu.edu

Non-voting member
Carolina E. Lopez, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
SmithGroup JJR
35 E Upper Wacker Drive, #2200
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 641-0770 office
(312) 641-6765 direct
(312) 316-0026 mobile
(312) 641-6728 fax
carolina.lopez@smithgroupjjr.com


IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,




Michaela Pride, AIA, NOMA
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA



Thomas Ahleman, AIA, LEED®AP
Team member

Representing the AIA




Stephen N. Parker, Associate AIA
Team member

Representing the AIAS



Ric(i) L. Benhei, AIA
Team member

Representing the NCARB



Carolina E. J., 9
Team member

Non-voting member