July 30, 2015

Dr. Mary Ellen Mazey
President
Office of the President
220 McFall Center
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

Dear Dr. Mazey:

At the July 2015 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the Bowling Green State University, Department of Architecture and Environmental Design.

As a result, the professional architecture program: Master of Architecture was formally granted continuation of its candidacy for a period of two years. The continued candidacy term is effective January 1, 2015. Initial accreditation must be achieved by 2019, or the program will be required to submit a new candidacy application.

Continuing candidacy is subject to the submission of Annual Statistical Reports and any subsequent visits that may be required until initial accreditation is achieved.

The Annual Statistical Report is described in Section 10, of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended. This report captures statistical information on the institution and the candidate program.

Finally, under the terms of the 2012 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, paragraph j. (page 24), for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Sincerely,

Shannon B. Kraus, FAIA, NCARB, MBA, FACHA
President

CC: Salim Elwazani, Interim Director
Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA, Visiting Team Chair

Enc.
Bowling Green State University
Department of Architecture and Environmental Design

Continuation of Candidacy Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture (pre-professional degree plus 52 graduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
April 1, 2015

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.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments and Visit Summary

The NAAB visiting team extends its appreciation to the faculty, students, staff, and administration of Bowling Green State University (BGSU) for the exceptional hospitality and attentiveness during our visit to the Department of Architecture and Environmental Design. The access granted and the involvement and commitment to success on the part of those within and outside of the department were exceptional. It has been rare that a visiting team has had the breadth of audience provided, including the university president, vice president, provost, dean, associate dean, and a multitude of senior administration leaders. Even the mayor of the city met with us in support of the successful accreditation process and expressed thanks to the department, faculty, and students for their engagement in the community. The enthusiasm was heartfelt.

The BGSU central administration personnel, including President Mazey and Provost Rogers, are strong proponents of the architecture program becoming the first accredited professional program within the university. Their vision sees the architecture program as key to the future of the university. The possibility of creating a School of Built Environment is being studied carefully. The president envisions BGSU as an institution that differentiates itself as an applied liberal arts university. This perspective is consistent with the university's historic context and is epitomized by the development of the architecture program over the decades.

The Department of Architecture and Environmental Design is housed within the College of Technology, Architecture, and Applied Engineering, as is its companion Construction Management program. This context has added to the focus on pragmatic approaches to the profession. The department's graduates are recognized by practitioners within the region as productive, hardworking, and detail-oriented, and able to be contributing members of a team upon graduation, and even before, through a robust co-op program of internship experiences. The program does struggle to make creative design exploration a driving force within the curriculum due to the strength of the more technical aspects of architecture. Collaboration with the College of Business programs has resulted in a unique entrepreneurial emphasis. A new home for the department in an existing building with a $4 million renovation, which is closer to the campus than the current remote location of the department, should be ready for occupancy in mid-2016.

Stability and clarity in leadership is disjointed, with multiple interim department chairs providing guidance within the last few years. During the faculty meeting, two-thirds of those present had been chair or interim chair at some point in the not-too-distant past. The extended reliance on interim or rotating departmental leadership has resulted in an inconsistent, non-cohesive curricular structure and administrative ineffectiveness for the program.

The faculty is quite diverse for its small size. It does seem top-heavy with proportionally more senior positions than those at the mid or beginning levels within either the tenure or non-tenure track. The faculty is very caring toward their students and truly delight in the teaching experience. The implications of a newly formed faculty union and collective bargaining agreement are not yet fully understood.

Students are enthusiastic and articulate. They engage in discussions with intensity and make significant contributions. They are highly respected by the faculty. The students are eager to contribute to the success of the program. They are engaged with the profession and the community more than students in most programs. A high proportion of students work while going to school, and many are first generation higher education students with financial responsibility for their own education.
The alumni and the community are advocates and enthusiastic supporters of the program. Employers throughout northwest Ohio do more than simply give verbal encouragement to the students by hiring many of them as co-op interns while in school and after graduation. AIA Toledo and the Toledo Design Center are supportive of the students and program activities.

2. Conditions Not Yet Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Not Yet Met</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures</td>
<td>B.1. Pre-Design</td>
<td>II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance</td>
<td>B.2. Accessibility</td>
<td>II.4.4 ARE Pass Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.3 Physical Resources</td>
<td>B.3. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5. Life Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6. Comprehensive Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7. Financial Considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.10. Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.11. Building Service Systems Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.1. Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.3. Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.4. Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.5. Practice Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.6. Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.7. Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.8. Ethics and Professional Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Causes of Concern

A. Program Leadership

An ongoing leadership challenge is created by the continuing reliance on interim chairs for the program and the fact that several of the existing faculty have rotated through the chair position in the past. The significant delay in filling the architecture program's chair position could impact program development. A decision on filling the current interim dean position in the College of Technology, Architecture, and Applied Engineering and a decision on the proposal for a School of Built Environment will likely have to occur before selecting a chair for the architecture program; therefore, these decisions should be expedited as much as possible.

Symptoms of the lack of stable and enduring leadership are revealed in several ways. The faculty does not seem to function as a cohesive unit. Students perceive the existence of strong divergent faculty personalities, which results in added student stress in studios due to mixed messages and conflicting objectives. Fragmented coordination and a lack of consensus among faculty regarding coursework, as well as disagreement on course content, exist. How and where NAAB student performance criteria are addressed in coursework is inconsistent.

Whether the organizational structure for the program is a department or a school, the chair or director leading the education of future licensed architects should be credentialed as a professional architect.

B. Model Shop and Digital Tools
A model shop with reasonable hours of accessibility does not exist for architecture department use. Students state that the existing shops in the Interior Design Department and the Construction Management Department would adequately serve their needs, but their use is restricted or they are inconveniently located. The college also has digital routers, plotters, and a laser cutter, but they are not managed for maximum utilization. A lack of prioritization for student access aligned with project deadlines hampers student productivity, as do prohibitively expensive printing and plotting costs.

C. Co-op Program

The co-op program is an exceptional program and should be celebrated. However, it may become increasingly challenging to sustain as the student population increases due, simply, to the limited availability of placement opportunities. Attention now might allow planning for how to address the potential of regional firms becoming saturated and the unpredictability of economic cycles.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2013)

2014 Condition I.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.

Previous Team Report (2013): Long range planning is evident at the university level through the Board of Trustees approval of the strategic plan entitled ‘Charting Our Future’ in 2009. Conversely, evidence of college or departmental specific strategic plans and measurement matrix for the future professional degree program was not found. Through review of the APR-IC narrative and list on page 13, the Department has identified the following goals for future implementation:

- a. Having one single location in place once Graduate Students arrive
- b. Allocated funding for faculty line and development
- c. Upgrade facilities and equipment to house digital fabrication lab
- d. Actively recruit female, minority, and international students
- e. Secure funding for more collaborative and outreach ventures

2015 Team Assessment: The long-range planning requirement is now Met. The department has made progress on goals identified in the 2013 VTR. A consolidated facility location is in the implementation phase and will be a reality in 2016, including upgraded facilities and equipment. Faculty and student diversity has improved. Collaboration and outreach is still being pursued, but the results are much the same as described in the 2013 VTR. Funding for faculty lines has not been released and is hindered by a decline in student enrollment. New goals have been identified. Faculty development funding has increased, but continues to present challenges.

2014 Condition I.2.3, Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

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

Previous Team Report (2013): From meetings with University Administration and the Office of Capital Planning, the team finds the university is in the midst of planning and implementing a significant campus master plan that will have a direct impact on the department. Currently, the department is housed in three separate academic buildings, two of which are located at the campus periphery. After speaking with students, faculty and staff, it is the assessment of the NAAB Visiting Team that the department would benefit greatly from contiguous spaces which promote the learning environments described above. While the program should be commended for its current successes, the disjointed nature of the department may stunt future program growth. However, it is important to note that the University and College Administrations are both aware of the situation and committed to a permanent and contiguous location for the Department. Furthermore, consideration is being given in the Campus Master Plan to the collocation of the department and affiliated building science programs in a signature renovation project to Memorial Hall along the main academic core. If completed, the renovation of Memorial Hall would geographically center the department between buildings housing the professional schools and the arts.

Full endorsement of the campus master plan is moving forward, however, it has not been reached. It appears from conversations with the University’s Capital Planning and Design Office, that capital funding approval and renovations to Memorial Hall will not be complete prior to the graduation of the professional degree’s first cohort of students. As such, special consideration of the department’s interim location is warranted.

Given that the period between this visit and the completion of the Memorial Hall may be a number of years, additional considerations may include the permanency, quality, and accessibility of current and interim departmental spaces.

2015 Team Assessment: The Park Avenue Warehouse remodel has been designed, soon will be bid, and is intended to be available for occupancy by the architecture program in this consolidated location during 2016. Its completion is eagerly anticipated.

2014 Condition I.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.
  - 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
    o Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    o Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    o 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.

Previous Team Report (2013): Statistical reports do not provide all the characteristics of the current pre-professional program. Future statistical reports should reflect the program’s student and faculty characteristics for the professional degree that will start in 2014.

2015 Team Assessment: Statistical Reports now meet NAAB requirements.

2014 Criterion 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.

Previous Team Report (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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 (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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 (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.
2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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 (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion B.5, Life Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

Previous Team Report (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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
- A.4. Technical Documentation
- A.5. Investigative Skills
- A.8. Ordering Systems
- A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- B.2. Accessibility
- B.3. Sustainability
- B.4. Site Design
- B.7. Environmental Systems
- B.9. Structural Systems

B.5. Life Safety

Previous Team Report (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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.

Previous Team Report (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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 (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is Met.

2014 Criterion 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.
Previous Team Report (2013): This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Met.

2014 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 (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Met.

2014 Criterion C.1, Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 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 (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.
2014 Criterion C.4, Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Not Yet Met.

2014 Criterion 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.

**Previous Team Report (2013):** This criterion was Not Yet Met.

**2015 Team Assessment:** This criterion is Met.
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission:

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

2015 Team Assessment: The APR-CC provided a detailed overview of the history and mission of the program and its vision for its future.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: Based on discussions with the faculty, administration, and students, both learning culture and social equity are assessed in the affirmative. There is the potential that, with the ongoing lack of a stable and enduring leader in the department chair position, the positive and respectful learning environment is at risk.

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

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. 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.

2015 Team Assessment: Through a review of the APR-CC and discussions with faculty and students, the Dean of the College of Technology, Architecture, and Applied Engineering, the Dean of the Graduate College, and the University’s Provost and President, the team finds that, as the M. Arch. program has developed, the Architecture Department has been working to align the department’s pre-professional and professional programs according to NAAB course criteria. The long-range plan for the department calls for a balance to serve both the graduate and undergraduate programs as the M. Arch. degree program unfolds, along with more of a research focus in the graduate courses. Required architecture courses for the undergraduate program are taught by three departments—Architecture, Construction Management, and Art History—providing students with disciplinary depth while concentrating on architectural studies. Undergraduate students also have course requirements in the all-university general education program, BG Perspectives, and these course requirements provide breadth in their education. At the graduate level, some of the coursework is focused on entrepreneurship, with one course being taught by an architect with a business degree and focus, which takes advantage of a cross-disciplinary relationship between architecture and business (ARCH 6620 Business Innovation by Design is currently being taught for the first time; ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship will be taught in fall 2015). The department requires all undergraduate students to have a co-op experience. This, along with strong contextually based learning through community engagement in a number of studio courses, provides a unique experience for the students.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: Students gain a broad perspective through coursework as well as through contextualized experiences such as site-based studio projects, co-op experiences, and international study tours. The department has an active and engaged AIAS chapter that sponsors a lecture series, workshops and seminars, and field trips. The students have many opportunities for professional engagement such as the AIA Toledo Celebration of Architecture Week and the invitation for them to participate in all AIA Toledo meetings and events free of charge. The AIA also sponsors annual awards for final-year undergraduate students. The AIAS has opportunities for financial support for activities from the university and the college. There is evidence of portfolio preparation and review, and graduate school preparation. The department takes advantage of campus and community venues for exhibits of student work, including the Toledo Design Center.

The APR-CC indicates that there are opportunities for students to participate in governance through the AIAS and through university channels.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: A faculty member is acting as an IDP advisor in the department. She is active in presenting information about the licensing process to the students and in answering their questions. The Academic Advisor for the students, while new, is also aware of IDP and the licensing process. The chair of the Ohio Board of Architects visits the campus once a year to give a presentation about licensing and to answer questions. Every other year, an NCARB staff member is invited to make a presentation to the students. In meetings with the students, it was clear that they are aware of the licensing process and their responsibilities concerning maintaining records and reporting their activities.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: The department has developed a close and supportive relationship with the AIA Toledo chapter. Students have an open invitation to attend monthly meetings at no charge, and 8 to 10 of them generally do so. The chapter offers a prize to the best student annually. The chapter funds an internship for a student at the Toledo Design Center (run by volunteers from the chapter). The chapter is developing a pool of member volunteers to sit on studio presentation juries. The Toledo Design Center is working with the department to develop a collaborative effort to offer urban design and planning assistance to communities in the area. The AIA Toledo chapter's leadership was very clear in stating that they are pleased with the advent of the accredited program and are equally pleased with the preparation of the students whom they have had working in their offices.

The coursework reflects the need to respond positively to the environmental, physical, and social context in the design process. The courses taught in conjunction with the BGSU Business School provide a rich and detailed exposure to the collaborative process and project management. The first semester graduate studio was devoted to designs for two sites in downtown Bowling Green. It involved active participation by community members throughout the process. Following the final public presentation, the community members were asked to evaluate the project results, especially with regard to whether their concerns had been heard and addressed. The response was uniformly affirmative.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: The APR-CC, along with discussions with faculty, students, alumni, and community leaders, revealed a commitment on the part of the program, faculty, and students to making a positive contribution to the public good. Examples of recent efforts include: working with the city of Bowling Green in site planning and visioning through efforts to protect a city open space and influence the positioning of future city facilities; engagement with the Toledo Design Center, efforts through the ARCH 8800 Ethics course; and involvement in Habitat for Humanity. Connections with the community have been facilitated in part through the program's requirement of two co-op experiences for credit.

I.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.

2015 Team Assessment: The department completed its Long-Range Plan in August 2014. The plan is congruent with the college's Strategic Plan, which is, in turn, influenced by the BGSU Strategic Plan. The DA+ED Plan is also expressly influenced by the five perspectives. Sources for the data used to develop the department plan included "indigenous experience," "institutional resources," "accreditation guidance," and "architectural education trends."

The Long-Range Plan identifies and details specific goals (enumerated in the APR-CC) within five strategic areas:

1. Academic Preparedness and Identity
2. Research, Space, and Culture
3. Program Constituencies/Institutional Relationships
4. Outreach and Engagement
5. Resource Acquisition

I.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's, 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 do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2015 Team Assessment: With the recent adoption of the Long-Range Plan, as noted above, there is not yet specific evidence of broad data collection to track progress toward the plan's goals. The goals are susceptible to metric collection, and the APR-CC indicates the program's intention to do the necessary review and analysis with respect to the plan. While faculty have been actively involved in developing and refining the curriculum and the other aspects of the program—and the professional community has been encouraged to provide input—there is no evidence that student or graduate views on these issues have been solicited. Student evaluations of individual courses are obtained. Ongoing assessment would contribute to common goals and better programmatic coordination.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:
  - Faculty and 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
      descriptions.2
    - 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 and staff) are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The first M. Arch program courses are currently being taught (2014-2015). The
APR-IC stated that the Department of Architecture and Environmental Design is well positioned to
provide human resources for the current pre-professional degree, but that growth would require
additional resources. With program growth, students indicate the need for additional and varied
faculty voices. This year saw a new non-tenure track (NTT) hire, replacing an NTT faculty member
who left, and a new adjunct faculty member hire. A new tenure-track line is currently being searched,
and the APR-IC indicated a second FTE position in the department. Not counting the current interim
chair, of the seven full-time faculty members in the department, two are NTT senior lecturers, three
are tenured full professors (one is currently on leave), one is a visiting lecturer, and one is an NTT
instructor.

Students indicated the need for increased staff or work-study student support to provide proper
access to woodshop and digital tools such as the laser cutter, all of which are essential to
architectural education.

The Office of Equity governs Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action within the department
at the university level.

The faculty workload is governed by a college document on workload, which requires TT faculty to
教 9 of 12 credits per semester and requires NTT faculty to teach 12 of 12 credits per semester.
Faculty are able to apply for release from teaching to take on additional service or research activities.

An IDP Coordinator continues to be in place and is serving the same roles as reported in the last
team report. In addition, she teaches a freshman introductory class (Tech 2800 Introduction to
Architecture). A co-op program advisor for architecture students and an academic advisor for

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.
sophomore, junior, and senior architecture students for the department are part of the general administration at the college level. Opportunities for faculty and staff to pursue professional development, which are evident through publications, professional work, and university-sponsored courses, are available, but work schedules limit the possibilities for participation in these opportunities.

Criteria for determining rank, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources, are clearly outlined in the faculty handbook, a departmental document (in draft form, dated Aug 28, 2012), and a new collective bargaining agreement (dated May 1, 2013).

- 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 freshmen, 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.

2015 Team Assessment: The admissions requirements at all levels are accessible online.

Student diversity initiatives are noted in the 4-1-2014 enrollment strategy document, which addresses a multi-faceted approach to the student recruitment of freshmen and the transfer of undergraduate students. Recruitment also includes articulation agreements with community colleges, which can positively impact diversity.

Student achievement inside and outside the classroom is evident in the co-op program, study abroad program, student awards, lectures and exhibitions, and collaboration with community and design groups as well as professionals.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure and 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.

2015 Team Assessment: The administrative structure of the program within the university's overall lines of communication and authority is clear and adequate. However, it does seem that decisions directly affecting the program, made at a higher level, are made without full understanding of the implications of the decisions for the program and, more specifically, for accreditation issues. This is more an issue of communication than of organizational structure. The planned national search for a new program chair has been put on hold pending the search for a new college dean. In the meantime, the interim chair, Wil Roudebush, who is an architect and CM faculty member, has been doing a commendable job. The architecture degree programs have autonomy in the departmental structure of the college. While the 2013 team report notes that a national search for a new program chair was in place, the search was put on hold.
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 inadequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: Based upon discussions with the faculty and administration, the faculty governance opportunities are adequate for the program; however, there is no formal role for student participation in governance within the program, or at the department or college level. While it is clear that decisions made by the dean, the provost, and the president have been significantly influenced by the input of department leadership and faculty, communication between the administration and the department regarding decision-making may not be as unfettered as might be desired. The faculty look forward to increased participation in decision-making.

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 inadequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: While the current physical resources are scattered and generally inadequate, as noted by the previous team, the construction drawings for the renovation of the Park Avenue Warehouse are nearly complete. It is expected that all of the department functions will move into that facility for the fall 2016 semester. The warehouse plan calls for open design studios, which will allow students to have an excellent opportunity to learn from each other and envision the trajectory of their design skills. There appears to be ample space near the building for construction demonstration projects. While the new location of the department is somewhat distant (on the other side of the cemetery) from the center of campus and the main library, it is significantly closer to them than the department's current locations. The lack of a readily available model shop and digital resources is a deterrent to student work and a constant source of student frustration.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: Based on discussions with the program leadership and central administration, it is evident that the program has accomplished a lot with very limited financial resources. Enrollment in the department declined within the last academic year to 123 undergraduate students and 8 graduate students. Increased awareness of the need for more proactive recruitment to increase student population was evident. With the current limitations in the program's budget, the continued success of the program and, particularly, the vision for its future may not be sustainable. The university had committed $3 million for renovation of a campus facility to consolidate the program in one location and, based upon discussions with the administration, that amount has been raised to $4 million. A new system of financial budgeting, along the lines of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), is expected to be implemented over time by the university, which will place more control of costs and resource allocation in the hands of the college and the department.

The lack of an assigned responsibility for undergraduate recruitment at the college level could significantly hinder achievement of the growth objectives of the program. Recruitment efforts are
mentioned as being hampered by the candidacy status of the program, a situation that will be alleviated when accreditation is achieved.

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.

2015 Team Assessment: The central library staff are aware of the needs of the program and are conscientious in meeting program needs. There is an active reliance on Ohio-LINK to expand the program’s resource availability. The university has adequate digital resource collections.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 3 – INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

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
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity and 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 and 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.

2015 Team Assessment: Statistical Reports provide all characteristics of the current pre-professional degree, with one exception. Statistical Reports that compare the M. Arch. program students will begin with the current M. Arch. student cohort that started in 2014.

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.

---

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

2015 Team Assessment: Required Annual Reports were provided to the NAAB in 2012 and 2013, and to the current visiting team, along with the APR-CC, in the team room.

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

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

2015 Team Assessment: Evidence for this conclusion was found in the curricula vitae of the faculty and in the display of faculty work. For future reference, an expanded exhibit would better display the achievements represented.

---

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.

2015 Team Assessment: The comprehensive list of information required in Appendix 3 was presented in the team room.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE – EDUCATIONAL REALMS AND 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

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in communication skills is evidenced in ARCH 2330 History of Architecture 1, ARCH 2340 History of Architecture 2, and ARCH 3310 Theory of Architectural Design, which are all in the pre-professional degree program.

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

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in design thinking skills is evidenced in ARCH 3210 Studio 2 and in ARCH 4220 Studio 5 in the pre-professional degree program.

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

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in visual communication skills is evidenced in ARCH 1050 Design Representation 1, ARCH 2050 Design Representation 2, and ARCH 2710 Computer Applications in Architecture.
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

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in technical documentation is evidenced in ARCH 2710 Computer Applications in Architecture and in ARCH 3370 Mechanical and Electrical Systems.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in investigative skills is evidenced in ARCH 4210 Design Studio 4. This criterion is Met with Distinction.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in fundamental design skills is evidenced in ARCH 2220 Design Studio 1. While evidence of environmental principles of design is not found in ARCH 2220—just architectural principles—environmental principles are addressed in ARCH 3210 Design Studio 2 and in ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1.

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

2015 Team Assessment: Ability in the use of precedents is evidenced in ARCH 4220. This criterion is Met with Distinction.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of ordering systems skills is evidenced in ARCH 2220 Design Studio 1 and in ARCH 3210 Design Studio 2.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of historical traditions and global culture is evidenced in ARCH 2330 History of Architecture 1 and in ARCH 2340 History of Architecture 2.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of cultural diversity is evidenced in ARCH 4220 and ARCH 2330. This criterion is Met with Distinction.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of applied research is evidenced in ARCH 4210 Design Studio 4 and in 4220 Design Studio 5. This criterion is Met with Distinction.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: SPCs in Realm A contribute to the professional degree through pre-professional coursework. All of the SPCs in Realm A were met.
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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in pre-design principles is not yet evidenced in existing courses, but is indicated on the matrix to be addressed in the ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio, the thesis studio. The syllabus does not include SPC B.1. Pre-Design. The conflict between the syllabus, the matrix, and the course description should be addressed.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in accessibility principles is not yet evident. The matrix identified ARCH 3220 and ARCH 6210 as addressing this SPC, and, while there were a few elements within student work suggesting that the subject was discussed, a level of ability or even understanding of the criterion was not evident in either course.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in sustainability principles is not yet evident. ARCH 6510 Sustainable Systems demonstrates a deep understanding of sustainable building systems, but an ability to apply that understanding to design projects was not demonstrated in student work. ARCH 6220 Graduate Design Studio 2 studies sustainability and demonstrates an understanding of it, but evidence of the ability within the student work was not apparent.
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

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in site design principles is evidenced in ARCH 3210 Design Studio 2 and in ARCH 6210 Graduate Studio 1. It would be beneficial for the students to deal with sites that have more topographic challenges. The same sites were often used for projects in multiple years (typically in Bowling Green), which did not challenge the students' ability to deal with diverse sites.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in life-safety skills is Not Yet Met. An understanding of life-safety issues is evident in ARCH 3220 Design Studio 3 and in ARCH 3370 M&E Systems; however, a demonstration of this ability in the student work, particularly as it relates to egress, is not yet apparent.

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

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability in comprehensive design skills is not yet evidenced in existing courses, but is indicated on the matrix to be addressed in ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio, the thesis studio. The checklist of student learning outcomes near the front of the course syllabus does not include SPC B.6. Comprehensive Design; however, this criterion is included in the detailed description of student learning outcomes later in the syllabus. The conflict between the matrix, the syllabus, and the checklist of student learning outcomes within the course description should be addressed.

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 Yet Met
2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of financial considerations is not evidenced in any course descriptions.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of environmental systems is evidenced in ARCH 2360 Mechanical and Electrical Building Systems I and in ARCH 3370 Mechanical and Electrical Building Systems II.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of structural systems is evidenced in CONS 3360 Structural Design and in CONS 3380 Steel, Masonry, and Concrete Structures, which are both taught by the Construction Management Department.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of building envelope systems was evidenced in ARCH 3360 Architecture Materials and Systems in prior years, but was not observed in this year's course. ARCH 6520 Advanced Structure and Materials Methods showed limited evidence. Moisture transfer, energy, and material resources were not addressed to the required degree. ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3: Structural Methods and Material System Integration is described as also covering the topic, but this course will not be taught until fall 2015.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of building service systems integration is largely evidenced in ARCH 2360 and ARCH 3370 Mechanical and Electrical Building Systems; however, vertical transportation systems are not included in the syllabi for these courses.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of building materials and assemblies integration is evidenced in ARCH 6520 Advanced Structure and Materials Methods.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Progress has begun to be made in meeting NAAB criteria in Realm B; however, most of the SPCs covered in this realm are just beginning to be addressed in the graduate courses provided in the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An ability to work in collaboration with others will likely be evidenced in ARCH 6620 Business Innovation by Design, which is being taught for the first time this semester.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of human behavior is evidenced in the coursework for ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of the client role in architecture is expected to be evidenced in ARCH 6610 Professional Practice/Entrepreneurship, which will be taught in fall 2015 for the first time. The course syllabus presented is not yet sufficiently detailed to judge that likelihood.
ARCH 6800 Ethics in Architectural Design and Practice, being taught this semester for the first time, will likely partially cover this material.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of project management will likely be evidenced in ARCH 6620 Business Innovation by Design, which is being taught for the first time this semester. It is also intended to be included in ARCH 6630 Applied Entrepreneurship, which will be taught for the first time in summer 2015, but the course design for this class has not yet been detailed.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of practice management is expected to be evidenced in ARCH 6610 Professional Practice/Entrepreneurship, which will be taught for the first time in fall 2015. However, the course syllabus contained insufficient information to predict that likelihood.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of leadership techniques and skills is expected to be evidenced in ARCH 6620 Business Innovation by Design and in ARCH 6800 Ethics in Architectural Design and Practice, both of which are being taught for the first time this semester.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of legal responsibilities is expected to be evidenced in ARCH 6610 Professional Practice/Entrepreneurship, which will be taught for the first time in fall 2015. However, the course syllabus contained insufficient information to predict that likelihood.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of ethics and professional judgment is expected to be evidenced in ARCH 6800 Ethics in Architectural Design and Practice, which is being taught for the first time this semester.

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

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of community and social responsibility is evidenced in the coursework for ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1. This criterion is Met with Distinction.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: C.2. Human Behavior and C.9. Community and Social Responsibility are now met. The issues regarding C.1. Collaboration and C.4. Project Management are being addressed in a course jointly taught with the MBA program, which promises to cover the material in a unique and very effective way. C.8. Ethics and Professional Judgment is being addressed, in detail and in depth, in a course entirely dedicated to the topic.
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

2015 Team Assessment: The APR-CC, the BGSU website, and a confirmation letter indicate that the university is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission and is a member of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS).

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

2015 Team Assessment: BGSU provides the Master of Architecture degree (M. Arch.), which is identified as such on the website and in the university literature.

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

2015 Team Assessment: Course approval and curricular approval are governed by university policy, with subsequent approvals reached at the college and university levels. The interim chair, the department’s faculty/IDP advisor, and four architects licensed in the U.S. are part of the department’s eight full-time faculty members. At the department level, evidence of curriculum review and development is indicated in the Long-Range Plan. The department has been working on the alignment of courses with NAAB requirements, which includes aligning co-op and international undergraduate student experiences. There is also evidence of curriculum review in self-assessment procedures, which includes the directive to align studios with support courses as well as implement effective teaching strategies. Comments from students about the need for curricular coordination indicate that curricular review at the department level is in need of additional attention. As the M. Arch program develops, it is important that the department continue to formally and regularly assess the whole curriculum.
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

2015 Team Assessment: Through a review of the team room materials and the APR-CC, as well as discussions with the program administrators and faculty, it is apparent that the 4-year pre-professional BS in Architecture degree program at BGSU meets many of the SPCs necessary for a pre-professional student to be admitted to the M. Arch. program currently being developed at BGSU. The program also has articulation agreements with some 2-year community colleges. Portfolio review is required for a student to be accepted into the Master’s degree program from the BGSU 4-year program, as well as for those entering from other 4-year programs. While portfolio review is not currently required as part of a transfer assessment within the undergraduate program, transfer credits are critically reviewed and only those classes that are substantially similar to BGSU classes are accepted for transfer credit.
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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: The NAAB-required designated candidacy text is included on the BGSU website in the Technology, Architecture, and Applied Engineering section under the subsection titled NAAB Accreditation Status. However, the BGSU website Admissions section states: “The undergraduate program is an affiliate of the National Architecture Accreditation Board, and approximately three-fourths of the architecture students pursue graduate studies in architecture at other institutions. Beginning in the fall of 2014, BGSU will welcome its first cohort into the accredited master’s program in architecture.” In the Architecture and Environmental Design section of the website, the wording is: “The BGSU Department of Architecture and Environmental Design offers the graduate professional Master of Architecture (M. Arch) degree and the undergraduate pre-professional Bachelor of Science in Architecture (BS Arch) degree.” Neither of these references complies with the required NAAB text.

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

2015 Team Assessment: A link to the NAAB website is provided by the program at the following URL: [http://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/architecture-and-environmental-design/architecture-and-environmental-design-program/statement-on-status-of-accreditation.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/architecture-and-environmental-design/architecture-and-environmental-design-program/statement-on-status-of-accreditation.html), which allows download of the NAAB Conditions and Procedures.

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](http://www.ARCHCareers.org)
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- [www.NCARB.org](http://www.NCARB.org)
- [www.ai.a.org](http://www.ai.a.org)
- [www.aias.org](http://www.aias.org)
- [www.acsa-arch.org](http://www.acsa-arch.org)

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The prior VTR identifies links to the required references. These are located at the following URL: [http://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/architecture-and-environmental-design/architecture-and-environmental-design-program/outreach-and-partnership.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/architecture-and-environmental-design/architecture-and-environmental-design-program/outreach-and-partnership.html).
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

2015 Team Assessment: These documents are located in the department office.

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] Not Yet Met

2015 Team Assessment: Since there have been no architecture graduates as yet, there have been no opportunities for the ARE to be taken and passed.
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 Bowling Green State University, APR-CC, pp. 1-2

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

Reference Bowling Green State University, APR-CC, pp. 2-5

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Bowling Green State University, APR-CC, pp. 14-18

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Bowling Green State University, APR-CC, pp. 18-20
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**

   A.5. Investigative Skills

   A.7. Use of Precedents

   A.10. Cultural Diversity

   A.11. Applied Research

   C.9. Community and Social Responsibility
3. The Visiting Team

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

Representing the Academy
Kate Wingert-Playdon, Chair
Temple University
The Architecture Department of the Tyler School of Art
1947 North 12th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122-1803
(215) 204-8813
(215) 204-5481 (fax)
mwingert@temple.edu

Representing the NAAB
Frank M. Guillot, FAIA
Guillot-Vivian-Viehmann Architects
284 South Union Street
Burlington, VT 05401
(802) 862-9631
(802) 660-9010 fax
fg@gvarchitects.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
Team Chair

Representing the Profession

Kate Wingert-Playdon
Team member

Representing the Academy

Frank M. Guillot, FAIA
Team member

Representing the NAAB