

**Temple University
Department of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

M. Arch

Track I: (preprofessional degree + 60 graduate credit hours)

Track II: (undergraduate degree + 90 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board

9 April 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 an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.

Table of Contents

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

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The Team extends its appreciation to Kate and Val, in particular, and each of you for your hospitality during our stay. The Team Room was extremely well-organized and laid out.

We have come to understand the unique milieu that the Department inhabits within the Tyler School of Art. We also see the significant opportunities this relationship brings to the growth and development of Architecture – and vice versa. We clearly recognized the value of the brand of Tyler to both applicants and alumni.

Students – The M. Arch students are confident, diverse, respectful, and comfortable in collaborative settings, indicative of sound preparation for the profession. The students were supportive and enthusiastic with the new facilities, faculty, and administration of the Department.

Faculty - The faculty spoke positively of the teamwork between and camaraderie amongst themselves. There is a strong community aspect to the faculty, which permeates into their teaching and reaches the students in a positive way. Currently the faculty absorbs some of the administrative tasks in order to maintain a program that functions well.

Alumni – All recent M. Arch (two-year) graduates attended the Sunday evening visiting team session; a show of support for the Program and faculty. All are engaged as interns working for responsible practitioners.

Staff – The staff is professional and attentive to the needs of students and leadership of the Program.

Administration – The Department Chair has a clear vision of the potential for the Program and brings her unique enthusiasm and determination to bear on achieving that success.

Unique aspects of the program:

The large number of courses – seven - that it offers to non-architecture majors.

The inclusion through the Comprehensive Design Studio of real world projects from Bob Shuman's firm.

The New LEED Certified Building – the first on campus - provides expansive and well equipped space for students, faculty, and staff. The adjacency to the Tyler School of Art is a strong asset for the program.

The location of the Program within a hotbed of architectural diversity and urban conditions.

Art and Architecture Librarian, Jill Leudke's twice-a-week consultations for program students in the Tyler School of Art's "Artist's Palette" Café.

A series of 2014-2015 innovative interdisciplinary proposals are being pursued to enhance linkages between Tyler Arts and Tyler Arts Disciplines such as: Introduction to Art and Design, Making through Algorithms, and a Technology Working Group – all thought to be positive enhancements to the Program by this Visitation Team.

A strength of the curriculum review process is the tailored rubrics for all courses taught in the program and with unusually high documented feedback from instructors to students on a range of

class projects.

2. Conditions Not Met

- A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- II.3 Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-Professional Education

3. Causes of Concern

1. SCALING UP THE M.ARCH STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Currently the M. Arch has 12 students enrolled and has a goal of a total of 60 students.

The long-range planning narrative in the APR clearly describes the multi-year objectives for continuous improvement related to the mission and context for the program. A projection of enrollment numbers over the next accreditation cycle are necessary for the program and in the context of the other programs in the department and the administrative needs to support it.

An area of necessity for the program is to grow to the anticipated size. Currently all admissions are run through the Tyler Art School and there is a need for an additional admissions staff person to work with the Architecture Program

2. ADDITIONAL ADMINISTRATIVE FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The Program has demonstrated the appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement. However, there are some concerns of this Visiting Team that existing financial resources will need to be scaled up to address the potential increased demands of the two new M. Arch Program tracks. Additional financial support will be needed for increasing the infrastructure to address program advising loads, preprofessional admission reviews, and funding for graduate assistantships.

3. INCREASED ACCESS TO PHYSICAL RESOURCES AND TYLER ART SCHOOL CLASSES

There is a need to increase student access to classes in the Tyler Art School and to extend the access to software and hardware within the Department.

4. GRADUATE TEACHING ASSISTANTSHIPS

Students have expressed concerns over the lack of graduate teaching assistantships. According to the program, the department has scholarship funds, but does not have funds available for teaching assistantships.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2011)

2014 Visiting Team Assessment Overview: *Statement regarding Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2011): All B. Arch classes taught in 2011 have now been converted to M. Arch curriculum classes and the last graduating class will be in May 2014. The two-year cohort (Track One: M Arch, pre-professional + 60 graduate credit hours) graduated its first class in 2012. The three-year cohort (Track Two: M Arch, degree + 90 graduate credit hours) will not graduate its*

first class until the end of the spring semester 2016.

2009 Criterion 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.*

Previous Team Report (2011): While this criterion was met in the B. Arch program, that assessment was based on a holistic evaluation of work across a series of courses, most of which would not be converted directly at the graduate level and there was insufficient graduate level coursework to satisfy this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence of technical documentation was found in courses Arch 5152 Materials and Methods – Levine Hall and Christ Church projects, and Arch 8011 Advanced Architecture Design Studio and 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio – Shipley School project.

2009 Criterion A.5., Investigative Skills: *Ability to gather, assess, record, apply, and comparatively evaluate relevant information within architectural coursework and design processes.*

Previous Team Report (2011): The team assessed this criterion as not met based on the graduate work available for review.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1, project – Le Corbusier’s Ronchamp Chapel and Arch 5596 Architectural Theory.

2009 Criterion A.7., Use of Precedents: *Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.*

Previous Team Report (2011): This criterion was assessed as “not met” because neither the graduate nor the undergraduate work was sufficient.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was found in course Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1 project “Precedent Study” Sunken House, David Adjaye. This criterion is now met.

2009 Criterion B.2., Accessibility: *Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems to provide independent and integrated use by individuals with physical (including mobility), sensory, and cognitive disabilities.*

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: It criterion is now met. The team found evidence of satisfying this criterion in the Nicetown-Tioga community center projects in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design.

2009 Criterion 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.*

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in course Arch 5232 Graduate Design Studio 2 (Sustainability Studio); the Benjamin Franklin Hall addition project.

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

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio; projects – Nicetown-Tioga Community Center projects.

2009 Criterion B.6., Comprehensive Design: Comprehensive Design: *Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project that demonstrates each student's capacity to make design decisions across scales while integrating the following SPC:*

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

B.2. Accessibility

A.4. Technical Documentation

B.3. Sustainability

A.5. Investigative Skills

B.4. Site Design

A.8. Ordering Systems

B.7. Environmental Systems

**A.9. Historical Traditions and
Global Culture**

B.9. Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

Previous Team Report (2011): Because the coursework which covered this criterion had not yet been offered at the graduate level, assessment defaulted to that made for the accredited B. Arch. In that case the team found evidence that some students had this ability, but the team could not find sufficient evidence that the work of all students in the program could meet this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio and the Nicetown-Tioga community center projects.

2009 Criterion B.8., Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design such as embodied energy, active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar orientation, daylighting and artificial illumination, and acoustics; including the use of appropriate performance assessment tools.

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in student work in courses Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1 and 5352 Environmental Systems 2.

2009 Criterion C.9., Community and Social Responsibility: *Understanding* of the architect' responsibility to work in the public interest, to respect historic resources, and to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors.

Previous Team Report (2011): The culture of the school seems to support this criterion, but the evidence presented to the team was inconsistent. Student work in Interior Architecture Studio 4: Event Spaces (INARC 6120) conveys a clear understanding of this criterion, however similar evidence of understanding is not found for any Architecture Studio (ARCH) class.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in Arch 8131 Architectural Research Seminar I paper: Cities for a Small Planet: Richard Rogers, Thesis Studio: Sky Neighborhood and Urban Workshop's Site Acupuncture collaborations.

2009 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.

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio – the Nicetown-Tioga Community Center projects.

2009 Criterion B.12., Building Materials & 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.

Previous Team Report (2011): The exhibited work for this criterion was proposed to be met in two course, one of which is the Comprehensive Design Studio (Arch 8013) and the second in a studio that is yet to be taught. Therefore the team concluded the criterion is not met.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence of complying with this criterion was found in examinations and case studies of meeting this criterion.

2009 Criterion C.2., Human Behavior: *Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.*

Previous Team Report (2011): The team did not find exhibited work at the graduate level that satisfied this criterion.

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. Evidence was found in course Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1, final exam topics – HVAC systems, thermal envelope, stormwater management, and electrical systems. Also in Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1 project – A room with a (point of) View.

Additional progress since the last visit

A summary of progress since the last visit is below. Many of the goals from 2010 are ongoing. This section is therefore coordinated with the 2013 Architecture Department Strategic Plan.

1. Increase excellence and advance profile of the department
--

This is in process. There are a number of resource and implementation points for this goal. These are outlined below.

Supplement current staff: Student workers to assist in the department office, woodshop, and IT lab have been increased. Department jobs for graduate students have been identified and some have been filled. There is a current search for a part time assistant for digital fabrication labs.

Align current administrative tasks for more equitable faculty load: Three faculty receive release time for advising and related tasks (Foundations Advisor, Undergraduate Programs Advisor, and Graduate Programs / IDP advisor). Dean Robert Stroker reorganized administrative posts in Tyler, creating an Associate Dean for Architecture (this was noted during the 2011 accreditation visit). The post is held by Senior Associate Dean Brigitte Knowles who is working with the department chair and dean's office on distribution of tasks to be carried out at department and school level.

Continue to build academic excellence of professional programs: A new faculty member with extensive professional experience (Robert Shuman) was hired to teach comprehensive design and professional practice in the M Arch program. Three new NTT faculty members, also with extensive professional experience (Clifton Fordham, Tim McDonald and Stephen Anderson) have been hired.

Develop academic linkages to other units in the university: Curricular linkages Tyler School of Art have occurred at the freshman level. Architectural history and theory courses at the graduate level are open to other majors in the Tyler School of Art.

Increase engagement in professional and academic work: New initiatives are underway. Students in the M Arch program have had opportunities to travel and visit a range of professional offices and have had visits from a range of architects for critique and discussion. For 2013-14 visiting critics in the M Arch program are invited to participate in workshop sessions the major studios. With budget set aside for support, this will be ongoing in the future. Accompanying booklets describing the workshops will be published and disseminated as a regular feature of the studios. This goal has been substantially met.

2. Increase department's research profile and dissemination of research

This has been partially met.

Objective: With new initiatives at the university level and in the department for increased research excellence, and with the need for research in relation to the practice of architecture, there is a need to find

administrative structures to support architectural research. During the 2009 self-study, the need for a center or centers for research for architecture was recognized by the school's administration.

This is in process. There are a number of resource and implementation points for this goal. These are outlined below.

Create center(s) for research: Currently, one faculty member has been given release time to make industry connections to support faculty research and the research committee chair is working with faculty in the department to define a research center based on the new departmental mission and identity statement.

Further articulate and enhance research clusters: The department's governance document includes a new research committee. Subcommittees meet when appropriate to continue dialog about faculty research agendas. This has been substantially met.

Provide support and release time for faculty research, bring research funding to the department: In addition to funds available at the university level (through grants in aid of research and other programs) there are currently funds available through the Center for the Arts – for faculty research and travel. Travel funds approved through the Center for the Arts are usually matched by department funds.

3. Work with university to develop state of the art facilities

This has been met.

The new Architecture Building has adequate facilities for students and faculty, as well as new equipment and a new sign that gives increased visibility. The building is used by a number of constituent groups from across the university and from the professional community. The increased traffic through the building has been positive.

4. Develop funding for graduate students

This has been partially met.

For 2013-14 there is graduate student scholarship support for students, based on academic preparedness and portfolio review. The department's endowed scholarships, now available to undergraduate professional program students, will be available for graduate professional program students beginning in 2014-15. Two travel scholarships – the Knowles Scholarship and the Riz Travel Award, are available to graduate students. The Knowles Scholarship has been used to supplement a workshop scholarship from the Japanese Government for students to attend an international design workshop at Meiji University in Tokyo in August. Internships for eligible graduate students include one with the Philadelphia City Planning Commission and with the Temple University Architect's Office. The department identifies jobs for students that have added value in relation to their degrees – exhibitions coordinator, research assistant, peer teacher, etc. The department continues to work with development personnel to build scholarship opportunities.

5. Increase professional program funding

This goal is partially met.

The Architecture Department students pay a tuition differential. The additional funds are used to support state of the art facilities and equipment and programming that will be a direct benefit to students. The

department's discretionary funds have increased since the last NAAB self-study was submitted in fall of 2010. Student numbers in the department have also increased resulting in increased credit hour generation, and the Tyler School of Art has been fully supportive of growing the department and planning ahead to fund initiatives. All of this helps to increase funding for faculty, professional organizations, and travel to conferences. Part of future planning is to continue to increase support.

6. Develop self-sustaining lecture series

This goal is met but is also ongoing.

Tyler Architecture alumni have donated to an endowed fund - the alumni lecture fund - to support an annual lecture and reception. April 2013 was the inaugural event and included Architecture alumni, faculty, and students and members of the Philadelphia architecture community.

7. Develop 1-year post-professional Masters Program

Work on this goal continues.

The post-professional degree program will reflect the strengths of the department and will complement the M. Arch program.

FINAL DRAFT

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The three focus areas that define the mission of the program: Philadelphia and urban contexts, design and materiality and leadership in a changing world, provide clear linkages that support the program's integration into the local urban context. The team would like a stronger written narrative that speaks of the linkages to the Tylor Art School, since this seems to clearly identify the unique attributes of this program.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: There is a strong learning culture in the program. Both the faculty and the students expressed the strength of this connection between them and the positive important role in the strengths of program's learning culture. Additionally, with the small class sizes in the MArch program, there is a strong sense of investment in the program on behalf of the students as each course is tailored to the shared interests of the faculty and students. The students likened every course to an engaging seminar in the most positive way because of this occurrence. Similarly, the students and faculty spoke highly of their collaboration on the revision of the Studio Culture Policy document, which included the addition of the statement on diversity.

The students at the graduate level confirmed, there is an interest given to time-management. Several students also have part-time jobs while completing their degrees.

Diversity in the program is evident as students come from China, Iran, India, and Eastern Europe. As stated in the APR, there is an equal balance in the male/female ratio of students as well. This same cultural and gender diversity exists within the faculty. In addition to personal traits of students and faculty, diversity is explored in classrooms and within the building. Students expressed the great range of studio projects due to the diverse interests and backgrounds of the faculty as a highlight of their education. Architecture department students shared the Tylor School's Café with students from the other Tyler School departments increasing their understanding of the arts.

When compared to the diversity of Temple as a whole, the program is at or above the percentages for faculty as stated in the APR. For students, the program is significantly lower; however, this is most likely due to the small enrollment numbers of the program. It should be noted the program is well above in the international student category percentages.

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: Master of Architecture students at Temple University's Tyler School of Art are bright, mature, diverse, and motivated. Likewise, faculty are dedicated and engaged. Recent M. Arch graduates are all employed in architectural firms ranging from Philadelphia, Washington D.C., to New York City.

Students are organized and active in the American Institute of Architects' student chapter and Freedom by Design initiatives. Likewise, faculty outreach includes The Urban Workshop's Digging Deeper; Site + Building Design project which identifies points of restorative engagement (acupuncture) in the Village of Arts and Humanities in Philadelphia. The Workshop's restorative initiatives include an environmental center teaching pavilion, urban gardens, the Norris square expansion, and the Baobab Park exhibition site plan / threshold.

A number of Architecture courses are open to non-architecture undergraduates – a popular offering being Arch 0835 Guerrilla Altruism. The department offers an open lecture and exhibition series. Architecture faculty serve on the University Senate and International Programs Committee.

- 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

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

the profession; to understand the breadth of professional opportunities; to make thoughtful, deliberate, informed choices and; to develop the habit of lifelong learning.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: Temple students are focused and mature. There is diversity within the student body with ethnic origins from China, India, Iran, and Eastern Europe. Recent graduates are gainfully employed as architects. They are articulate in expressing their opinions and views of the profession. Leadership qualities are apparent. A Sunday night meeting with the team was well-attended - indicative of their passion for the program and profession. They are eager to make their mark on the profession.

Brian Szymanik and Denise E. Thompson, both of whom are Tyler architecture graduates, are co-winners of the 2013 Philadelphia Young Architect Award.

- 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: Students are encouraged to enroll in the Intern Development Program and begin tracking their experience pursuant to taking the Architectural Registration Examination. Students think highly of Rashida Ng, the program's IDP coordinator and advisor. They are exposed to the multiple regulatory requirements in their professional practice course.

- 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: Founded in Philadelphia in 1884, Temple University is located in a region of the United States known for its architectural legacy. Since early 1930, the Tyler School of Art has offered programs in architecture, art, design, music, and art education. Its faculty is multi-cultural; the school likewise, attracts both national and international students. Tyler School's mission is to produce inspiring individuals entering our society as architects, artists, art historians, and educators producing innovative work, publicly presented, and critically considered. The Tyler architecture department is focused on issues of design and materiality, Philadelphia and urban contexts, and leadership in a changing world. MArch students are confident, diverse, respectful, and comfortable in collaborative settings, indicative of sound preparation for the profession.

- 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: Recent M. Arch (2 year) graduates are engaged as interns and are responsible practitioners. Given the current economic climate, they are excited to have jobs in architect's offices. At the program level, discussions on theory and practice, ethics, and professional conduct are held in Professor Schuman's course Arch 8096. The department is actively engaged in campus planning and design decisions (proposed library). Professor Harrison's Urban Workshop actively seeks projects in the Philadelphia area to improve urban living conditions and welfare of the community. A responsible balance exists in the program between professional and public obligations.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The long-range planning narrative in the APR clearly describes the multi-year objectives for continuous improvement as the program related to the mission and context for the program. This visitation team would like to see more detailed long-range enrollment implementation over the next accreditation cycle for the growth of the program and the necessary administrative needs to support it.

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: Periodic reviews of all program units are conducted by the University. Department committees provide regular reviews and assessment of program needs. Student course evaluations aid in teaching efficacy and student learning. Annual peer to peer reviews are mandated and allow fine tuning of individual teaching skills.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment for Faculty & Staff and Students: All resources have been documented along with the Website links for the University's EEO/AA policies.

The faculty spoke very positively of their teamwork and collegial camaraderie in working in this program. There is a strong community among all the faculty, which seems to permeate into their teaching and reaches the students in very positive ways. Currently the faculty absorbs some of the program's administrative tasks to assist the program in a number of areas such as admissions, advising and website authoring. There is some course release time given to faculty to take on the extra tasks. The program has stated there is an ongoing search for a technical assistant to increase access to the CNC machine.

The program seeks to grow the enrollment from the current 12 students to 60 which will drive the need for additional support in the admissions area. Currently all admissions is run through the Tyler School's admissions department. There is a desire for an additional staff person to work mostly with the Architecture department.

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 commented on the strong support for the IDP program and helpfulness of the IDP Faculty Coordinator, Rashida Ng. The strength of the Comprehensive Design Studio, by Bob Schuman, enhances this learning experience by providing students exposure to real world projects by bringing in working drawings from actual projects by his firm.

Financial Aid, although limited, is documented on page 75 of the APR. The limited financial aid is spread among students through graduate scholarships to provide help for many students as opposed to helping only a few through graduate teaching assistantships. Students do have a concern of the lack of graduate teaching assistantships. Likewise, improving support for more student supported research efforts has been identified.

Students leave Temple well prepared for the work force as evidenced by conversations with recent Alumni, based on all of the support that they receive from the program. All MARCH graduates from the 2012 and 2013 that the visiting team met with have jobs in architectural firms.

Temple Architecture is committed to the students by being a strong advocate to the AIAS and encouraging opportunities for expansion of the organization. When AIAS members recommended change to the relationship between the Freedom by Design program and AIAS, the faculty and staff were very understanding and open to the change. There is opportunity for additional student organizations in the program to increase the linkages between the multiple programs within the department and multiple disciplines within the Tyler School.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: The Program is within the Tyler School of Art. Tyler School of Art is part of the Center for the Arts at Temple University. This Center incorporates, not only architecture and art, but also The Boyer College of Music and Dance, the Division of Theater, Film, and Media Arts. This constellation of units forms an art community on the Main Campus of Temple University. This visitation team finds that the Department has sufficient autonomy and support based upon discussions and meetings with the Dean, Chair, staff, faculty and students.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the APR narrative as noted in Administrative Structure and confirmed in meetings and discussions with faculty and students. The governance opportunities are supported by the updated Studio Culture Policy that was a collaboration between the administration, faculty, staff, and students. Faculty participate on committees at University, School, and Department levels ranging from curriculum development to international relations to technology to admissions. The other degree programs offered within the Department are: the B Arch (phasing out - last graduating class in 2014); BS Architecture, BS Facilities Management, and BS Architectural Preservation. This visiting team confirms that the Department has demonstrated that it provides an equitable opportunity for all faculty, staff and students to participate in the department, college and institutional governance.

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: Evidence has been provided that documents: 1) in January 2012 the Department moved into its new LEED certified building – the first on campus - after the 2011 visit, and has done a good job in adjusting to the studio and support spaces; 2) the physical plant incorporates seminar rooms, lecture halls, studios, offices, exhibition and review areas, computer and workshop facilities along with both faculty and student research areas [as shown in the APR on pages 50,51, 55-58]; 3) computer resources [hardware, software, and computer network along with significant technical support and capabilities], wood shop tools/facilities [digital fabrication lab and support shop] within the program [as shown in the APR on pages 52-54] and students are also granted access to the facilities at the Tyler School of Art and at the University. No significant operational or service issues are apparent during this visit.

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 Visiting Team Assessment: The Program has demonstrated the appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement. However, there are some concerns of this Visiting Team that existing financial resources will need to be scaled up to address the potential increased demands of the two new M. Arch Program tracks. Additional financial support will be needed for increasing the infrastructure to address program advising loads, pre professional admissions reviews, and funding for graduate assistantships.

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 Met with Distinction for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The evidence demonstrates that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources in support of a professional education in architecture. This evidence was supported by team's visitation with the Art and Architecture Librarian at the library facilities and during, in particular, student interviews affirming their knowledge of these resources and the librarian's frequent consultations, instruction, and presence within the Department.

The Temple University Libraries, a member of the Association of Research Libraries, supports all the schools and campuses of Temple University. Paley Library on Main Campus holds the majority of the

system collections including architecture. The Libraries are under the aegis of the Dean of University Libraries and has an established Art and Architecture Librarian who supports architecture, art, art history, and art education.

Evidence of the extent of the library's visual resource collections, services, staff, facilities, and equipment is found within the APR on pages 61-67 and documents 1) the current collection; 2) the degree of support towards the facets (mission to research) of the department; 3) fully assesses the range of resources available; 4) demonstrates not only University level funding but also funding directly assigned to the Department; 5) affirms the team's sense that no issues, significant or otherwise, exist regarding operations or support.

Of exemplary note are the actions of and dedication to the architecture collection and resources support of the Art and Architecture Librarian, Jill Leudke. She consults and communicates regularly with the Department liaison regarding purchases, library services, instruction, events, new resources, research consultation, and major acquisitions. As a part of the University Library services she leads Analytical Reading and Writing workshops. Additionally, she literally sets up a desk within the schools main central passage (Tyler School of Art - Artist's Palette Café) twice a week to provide immediate, visible access for students and student interviews affirmed the availability and their usage.

FINAL DRAFT

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

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

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: On page 83 in the APR is the certification verifying the statistical data.

The program’s activities and policies are in support of social equity in the degree program and support is demonstrated towards student success and faculty development.

Program Student Characteristics —

Demographics

Evidence is found in the APR that the student population in the accredited degree program has been compared to numbers during the previous visit in 2011 and current number captured for 2014. Charts and summations are provided on pages 68 – 81.

The statistics (2010 to 2013) indicate that the percentages of African-American (8% to 0%), Asian (no change), Hispanics (no change) and two or more races are down (8% to 0%) while the International Students is significantly up (8% to 25%).

Qualifications —

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

Evidence is found in the APR for student qualifications of admitted students.

Chart is found on page 69.

The average GRE scores for verbal (2010 to 2013) are up 479 to 620. The average GRE scores for quantitative (2010 to 2013) are up 606 to 730.

The average undergraduate GPA for admitted and enrolled MArch students (2010 to 2013) are up 3.24 to 3.52.

Time to Graduation Rates —

Evidence is found in the APR indicating the percentage of matriculating students within the “normal time to completion” for the first two graduating classes (2012 & 2013). Narrative is found on page 69 of the APR.

2012 graduation rate was 89% and the 2013 graduation rate was 84%.

Program Faculty Characteristics —

Demographics

Evidence is found in the APR documenting the comparative demographics of the faculty for the previous visit, 2011, and the comparison to the University demographics. Narrative is found on page 69 of the APR.

The faculty demographics for 2011: 77% white, 8% African-American, and 15% Asian in 2011 and the

The faculty demographics for 2014: 69% white, 16+% African-American, and 16+% Asian.

The faculty demographics for 2014 for the University: 63% are white, 5% are African-American, and 9% Asian.

Faculty Advancement —

Evidence is found in the APR documenting the quantity of promotions of Department faculty versus the University statistics. Narrative and chart are found on page 70 of the APR.

Evidence is found in the APR documenting the quantity of faculty receiving tenure versus the University statistics. Narrative and chart are found on page 70 of the APR.

Two Program faculty members have received tenure since 2011 and one has been promoted versus the University statistics of 35 receiving tenure and 40 receiving a promotion.

Faculty Licensure —

Evidence is found in the APR documenting the quantity of faculty maintaining architecture licenses in 2011 and 2014. Narrative enumerating such is found on page 70 of the APR.

In 2011 5 faculty maintained architectural licenses and in 2014 9 faculty maintained architectural licenses and one faculty members maintains a license to practice in a foreign country.

Among the adjunct faculty the majority maintain licenses to practice architecture in the US or in other countries. Additionally, the adjunct faculty contains one registered planner, one licensed engineer and one licensed landscape architect.

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 addenda should also be included.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The team reviewed the 2011 and 2012 Annual Reports which included appendices of follow-up student work.

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: The faculty credentials provided demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to support the program's curriculum.

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: The policies provided in the team room were adequate.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:

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

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Communication skills were evidenced clearly in Arch 5122 Graduate Foundation Intensive 2 and in Arch 5296 Modern Movements and demonstrated through short papers. In class progress papers were provided, but would have been helped the team to see a range of the final full-length term papers. Also, Arch 5596 Architectural Theory, final papers demonstrated these communication skills through final papers.

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 in 8012 Arch Design Studio.

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: The team found evidence in Arch 8011 Advanced Arch Design Studio through use of several different types of visual communication from early hand sketching, process drawings and final renderings in a variety of digital software. Evidence was also found in Arch 8012 Arch Design Studio and in Arch 5011 Graduate Representation Intensive 1.

- 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 technical documentation was found in courses Arch 5152 Materials and Methods – Levine Hall and Christ Church projects, Arch 8011 Advanced Architecture Design Studio and 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio – Shipley School project.

- 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 was found in Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1, project – Le Corbusier's Ronchamp Chapel study and course Arch 5596 Architectural Theory.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence found in Arch 8011 Advanced arch design studio and Arch 8012 Arch design studio.

- 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: Evidence was found in several courses: Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1 project "Precedent Study" Sunken House, David Adjaye; Arch 8011 Advanced Arch Design Studio found in the "Improve on the Highline" project and the use of a range of precedents that directly linked into final project outcome; Arch 8012 Arch Design Studio found in the Negin Dadkhah St. Michaels Studio project that showed this evidence very well; and Arch 8011 Advanced Arch Design Studio Course found in the Landform Project.

- 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 was found in several courses: Arch 5231 Graduate Design Studio 1; Arch 5251 Structural Analysis for Architects, which provided this knowledge in formal ordering systems presented.

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

[X] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was not found in Arch 5296 Modern Movements, since this course does not provide an understanding of parallel and divergent canon and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design.

Arch5141/5142 Architectural History, based on the syllabus found in the team room, has been targeted to meet this requirement. However this course has not been taught yet due to its sequence within the three-year track of the Program.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in course Arch 8131 Architecture Research Seminar-Urban, through readings and investigation into Islamic and Chinese Cultures, and Brazilian cities just to name a few examples.

- 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: Evidence was found in Arch 8133 Arch Research Tech Course and in Arch 8352 Environment Systems 2 through the Acoustic Design Analysis Lab.

<p>Realm A. General Team Commentary: The evidence supports that students are being broadly educated, value lifelong inquisitiveness, and are obtaining a comprehension of people, place, and context as delivered through these Program courses.</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: Evidence was found for satisfying this criterion in the Nicetown-Tioga community center and Shipley School projects – course Arch 8013.

- 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: Evidence was found for satisfying this criterion in the Nicetown-Tioga community center projects – course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in course Arch 5232 Graduate Design Studio 2 (Sustainability Studio) in the Benjamin Franklin Hall addition project.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio in the project – Nicetown-Tioga Community Center projects.

- 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 the ability to apply life-safety (egress) principles was found in course 5351 Environmental Control Systems 1 in both the Linderman Library and Annenberg School of Communication Environmental Study Analyses and in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio in the Nicetown-Tioga community center projects.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills

B.2. Accessibility

A.4. Technical Documentation

B.3. Sustainability

A.5. Investigative Skills

B.4. Site Design

A.8. Ordering Systems

B.7. Environmental Systems

**A.9. Historical Traditions and
Global Culture**

B.9. Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

[X] Met With Distinction

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in course Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio and the Nicetown-Tioga community center and Shipley School and Art Center projects. This visiting team found this comprehensive design course to be one of the most well organized capstone courses that we have reviewed. The course uses a clear rubric system for evaluating the student work with extensive documented written feedback provided to students on their project's design process and periodic deliverables.

The projects reviewed clearly identified all eleven component parts.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Course outline topics for Arch 8096 Professional Practice include cost modeling, construction cost estimating / value analysis, and life-cycle cost analysis.

- 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: Evidence was found in student work in courses Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1 and 5352 Environmental Systems 2.

- 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: Evidence was found in Arch 5251 Structural Analysis Course.

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 was found in Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio, Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1 and Arch 5232 Environmental Systems.

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 was found in Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio, Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1 and Arch 5232 Environmental Systems 2.

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: Evidence was found in Arch 8013 Comprehensive Design Studio, Arch 5351 Environmental Systems 1 and Arch 5232 Environmental Systems 2.

<p>Realm B. General Team Commentary: Temple's architecture curriculum and delivery is technically sound. Students are well-equipped to enter the work force. The curriculum is an exemplary model for technical instruction.</p>

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 with Distinction

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in Arch 8096 Prof Practice. This is a well-designed course that uses the latest practice information and instructor is able to use real projects from his active practice to bring into the classroom.

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: Evidence was found in Arch 5231 Grad Design Studio 1; Arch 5232 Grad Design Studio 2; Arch 5351 Environ Systems 1; Arch 8012; Arch 9991 Directed Research and 9996 Architectural Thesis.

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 8096 Prof Practice.

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

[X] Met with Distinction

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in Arch 8096 Prof Practice. The team found the depth of experience, use of the latest documents, and the holistic view of managing a project to be beyond a typical practice course. This is great example of a practice class that prepares students for the emerging challenges of the practice world.

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 with Distinction

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in Arch 8096 Prof Practice. The team found the depth of experience, use of the latest documents, and the holistic view of managing a project to be beyond a typical practice course. This is great example of a practice class that prepares students for the emerging challenges of the practice world.

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 in Arch 5231 Grad Design Studio 1; Arch 8096 Prof Practice; and Arch 8012 Design Studio.

- 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: Evidence was found in Arch 8096 Prof Practice, in particular Seminar 5.2, Standard of Care/Professional Negligence/Errors and Omissions.

- 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: Evidence was found in Arch 8096 Prof Practice, Seminar 1.2 Ethics and Professional Conduct.

- 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 was found in Arch 8012 Design Studio and Arch 8131 Arch Research Seminar – Urban.

<p>Realm C. General Team Commentary: Collaboration is endemic throughout the facets of this Program. Significant concentration is evidenced in the project and practice management areas. Community and social responsibility is underpinned by a recognition human behavior and interwoven amongst all criteria within this Realm.</p>
--

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Temple University's Regional Accreditation was reaffirmed on June, 24th 2010 by a letter from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

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

[X] Met

2014 Visiting Team Assessment: All BArch classes taught in 2011 have now been converted to MARCH curriculum classes and the last graduating class will be in May 2014. The two-year cohort (Track One: M Arch, pre-professional + 60 graduate credit hours) graduated its first class in 2012. The three-year cohort (Track Two: M Arch, degree + 90 graduate credit hours) will not graduate its first class until the end of the spring semester of 2016.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Curriculum review occurs at three levels: the department level, the school level, and the university level. At the department level the curriculum is reviewed and voted on by all full time faculty in the department (currently 13 people). Review includes scrutiny for overall academic excellence as well as professional content. Curriculum development occurs at the department level. The Architecture Department's full time faculty is made up of members who take care to balance academic and professional content. Currently there are 9 licensed architects as part of the department's full time faculty (8 in US, 1 in another country). Adjunct faculty and alumni advisors also participate in curriculum development.

A strength of the curriculum review process is in the development of the tailored rubrics for all courses taught within the Program and with unusually high documented feedback from instructors to students on a range of class projects.

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] Not Met

2014 Team Assessment: This visiting team did not see the clear identification of the SPCs that have been satisfied in the pre-professional program from review of each applicant's materials. The evidence provided shows an evaluation of each of the applicants' course credits that were presented in binders for acceptance of pre-professional program credentials. The program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. The Program needs to clearly map out what information in the portfolios and transcripts is meeting the SPC requirements.

FINAL DRAFT

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Evidence was found on the Program's website.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team confirmed that these items are located in the main office of the Department secretary.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

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

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional's Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aiaa.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: Over half of the evidence was easily found on the Program's Website, however, direct access should be provided for the following documents: The Emerging Professional's Companion, Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture, and The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

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

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team confirmed that these items are located in the main office of the Department secretary.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team confirmed that these items are located on the program's web- site.

FINAL DRAFT

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference Temple University, *APR*, pp. 1-2

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

Reference Temple University, *APR*, pp. 2-6

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

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

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Temple University, *APR*, pp. 29-32

FINAL DRAFT

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

(list number and title; include comments where appropriate)

- B. 6. Comprehensive Design
Professor Shuman's Comprehensive Design course is well organized, intense, and thorough.
- C. 4. Project Management
The Team acknowledges Professor Shuman's practice class is a great example that prepares students for the emerging challenges of the practice world.
- C. 5. Practice Management
The Team acknowledges Professor Shuman's practice class is a great example that prepares students for the emerging challenges of the practice world.
- I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.
- I.2.5 Information Resources
Of exemplary note are the actions of and dedication to the architecture collection and resources support of the Art and Architecture Librarian.

FINAL DRAFT

3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Thomas Fowler IV, AIA, NCARB
Distinguished Professor ACSA
Director: Graduate Program in Architecture
Director: Community Interdisciplinary Design Studio (CIDS)
Architecture Department
California Polytechnic State University
One Grand Avenue
San Luis Obispo, CA 93407
(805) 756-2981
(805) 756-1500 fax
tfowler@calpoly.edu

Representing the AIA
Joe Douglas Webb, AIA, Principal
Webb Architects
3701 Kirby Drive
Suite 916
Houston Texas 77098
(713) 522-8544
(713) 522-2814 fax
jwebb@webbarchitects.com

Representing the AIAS
Hayley Johnson
1105 West Carson Street
Muncie, IN 47303
(847) 400-7708
hayleyagjohnson@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Marzette Fisher
ArchitectureWorks, LLP
POB 130991
Birmingham, AL 35213-0991
(205) 515-4882
Marzettefisher@gmail.com

IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



Thomas Fowler IV, DPACSA, AIA, NCARB
Team Chair

Representing the ACSA



Joe Douglas Webb, AIA
Team member

Representing the AIA



Hayley Johnson
Team member

Representing the AIAS



Marzette Fisher
Team member

Representing the NCARB