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I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

The team would like to thank the administration of Bowling Green State University University (BGSU), the College of Technology, Architecture & Applied Engineering (CTAAE), and the Department of Architecture & Environmental Design and its program chair, coordinators, faculty, staff, and collective student body for the dedication and hospitality that they demonstrated to the team during the visit. The team found the Master of Architecture program at BGSU to be a vibrant, energetic program that supports a learning environment dedicated to design and career development. The program benefits greatly from the support of local practitioners and the Toledo-area architecture community as well as from the dedication of faculty and staff. The efforts to present student work in the team room and the overall organization of the visit were greatly appreciated by the team.

The team’s observations of the program include the following:

- The learning environment of USGB architecture program promotes collaboration with local and regional professionals through the college’s Cooperative Education Program and the applied entrepreneurship courses.
- Administrative leadership at all levels provides strong support to the mission of the program.
- Faculty members are dedicated to teaching and demonstrate a strong connection between practice and the academic learning environment.
- The context of the program within the cities of Bowling Green and Toledo as well as the northwest region of Ohio offers many educational and professional opportunities to the students.
- The program understands the value of the internship experience and of understanding entrepreneurship.
- The students display a high level of professionalism and respect. This is demonstrated in their enthusiasm for the program.
- The physical campus and building of the architecture program at 103 Park Avenue provide an effective space for student learning and collaboration.
- While the faculty governance opportunities are informal, they are appropriate and 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.
- There is minimal evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is occurring or is available to students.
- The continued reliance on an interim program chair creates an ongoing leadership challenge. While a decision to fill the interim dean position in the CTAAE appears to have been made, and the new director for the School of the Built Environment is scheduled to begin in December 2017, continuity is critical for a new program.

b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

I.1.6 Assessment
II.1.1 B.2 Site Design
II.1.1 B.3 Codes and Regulations
II.1.1 B.9 Building Service Systems
II.1.1 C.3 Integrative Design
II.1.1 D.2 Project Management

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Causes of Concern

Program Leadership
2015 Team Assessment: 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 the 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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The team observed that there continues to be ongoing leadership challenges created by the 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. A decision has apparently been made on filling the interim dean position of the CTAAE, and this person is to begin in December 2017. A new director of the School of the Built Environment is also scheduled to begin at the same time.

Thus, the organization, administration, and leadership issues continue to be a concern for the team.

Model Shop and Digital Tools
2015 Team Assessment: 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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:
A “Design Shop” had been implemented at the program’s new location at the 103 Park Avenue building, which provides printing services, two laser cutting machines, a spray booth, and an assembly space for modeling. This shop provides 24-hour access for students who have passed the shop safety orientation. More information can be found in the APR (pp. 20 and 39).

Cooperative Education Program
2015 Team Assessment: 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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The co-op program remains an exceptional program and opportunity for students. At this visit, placement opportunity capacity does not appear to be a problem. The co-op program is also fully supported by the members of the Advisory Board. The BGSU Chapter of the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS) has supplemented the co-op program with a job opportunities database of architect/design-related firms in the northwest Ohio region.

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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:
Review of the March/October 2017 long-range plan does not indicate specific evidence of tracking progress toward the plan’s goals. The APR indicates that the program intends to complete the necessary review and analysis relevant to the plan; however, evidence in the form of a metric was not found. See the APR description as follows:

- “The informal element is that the program operates on an open-door policy that welcomes input from others; the department understands that collaboration and multiple perspectives are necessary in order to achieve optimal results.
- In group settings, we welcome being challenged to find the most creative solutions to complex challenges.
- The formal part of the department self-assessment process is composed of several parts. It includes, but is not limited to: solicitation from faculty; students’ and graduates’ views about the Program; individual course evaluations; and periodic faculty review of teaching and Program offerings.”

Evidence of the self-described formal metric was not found.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance:

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

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 looks forward to increased participation in decision-making.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

- Based upon discussions with the faculty and administration, the faculty governance opportunities are informal yet adequate for the program; however, there is no formal role for student participation in governance in the program, the department, or the college. Discussions with students confirmed this situation.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The expectations of the 2015 visiting team have been met. The new dedicated space allows for open design studios, which provide students with an excellent opportunity to learn from each other and observe design skills and activities of other levels, particularly beneficial for students at lower levels.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Pre-design principles are demonstrated in Arch 6210, 6220, 6310, and 6320. Pre-design (SPC B.10 has been included in the syllabus since the last visit.

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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Accessibility principles continue to be a concern and were not evident in ARCH 6610, ARCH 6620, ARCH 6310, or ARCH 6320. The level of understanding of the criterion and an ability to incorporate accessibility requirements were not evident in the students’ work.

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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

An understanding of its sustainability principles are demonstrated in the students’ work. The level of understanding and ability varies among student work products in ARCH 6210 and 6310.

2009 Criterion B.5, Life Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Life-safety issues are evident in course work related to the pre-professional degree, however, this ability was not demonstrated in student work in the M. Arch. program. Specific areas that are absent were egress and accessibility.

2009 Criterion 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.5. Investigative Skills  B.4. Site Design
B.5. Life Safety

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

In the 2009 Condition for Accreditation, B6 Comprehensive Design had not been
incorporated into Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions, as it is in the 2014 Conditions.
Not all elements of comprehensive design skills are evident in existing courses and studio
work products. In particular, life-safety, sustainability, and accessibility are not clearly
demonstrated in the studio design solutions (2014 Condition II.1.1. C.3 Integrative Design).

2009 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.

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

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

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 are evident in the student work products found in
ARCH 6610. The team noted that the course material is exceptional.

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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio has very thorough coverage of building envelope
systems with many typologies and precedents. Understanding of building envelope systems
is evident in student work.

2009 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

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.
2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Evidence of an understanding of Building Service Systems with evaluation and analysis of mechanical, electrical, and acoustical systems on historic and modern-day structures with emphasis on sustainability is seen in student work in ARCH 6510 with the following exceptions: vertical transportation systems and fire protection systems. These two areas were not addressed (2014 Condition II.1.1 B.9 Building Service Systems).

2009 Criterion C.1, Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The team did not find evidence of student collaboration in multidisciplinary teams. Discussions with faculty and students confirmed the absence of collaboration in multidisciplinary teams. It is noted that the team in 2015 indicated that this was a concern. The team noted that there was discussion among the faculty and administration about “hope” for enhanced collaboration with the Department of Construction Management after the new director of the School of the Built Environment arrives and the new dean for the college is selected.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

An understanding of the client's role in architecture as well as an understanding of project budget and cost, project delivery and finances, entrepreneurship and business management is evident in student work in ARCH 6610. In addition, the AIAS chapter is planning to collaborate with Habitat for Humanity and the Department of Construction Management to build a home in the Bowling Green area in spring 2018.

2009 Criterion C.4, Project Management: Understanding of the methods for competing for commissions, selecting consultants and assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods
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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Evidence for this criterion continues to be in development. Review of the course work did not provide evidence that a complete understanding of project management has been achieved. The team did not find evidence of understanding of methods for competing for projects, selecting consultants, assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The team noted that evidence for satisfaction of this criterion continues to be in development. Review of the course work did not provide evidence that a complete understanding of practice management is being achieved. The team did not find evidence of understanding of methods for time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Understanding of the techniques and skills that architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities is evidenced in student work in ARCH 6620.

2009 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.
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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Evidence of understanding of legal responsibilities was found in student work in ARCH 6610 Professional Practice & Entrepreneurship.

2009 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.

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.

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

Evidence of understanding of ethics and professional judgment was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice & Entrepreneurship.

III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

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

This part addresses the commitment of the institution and its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program’s pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program’s benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university’s academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

[X] Described

[ ] Not Described

2017 Analysis/Review: The program has a positive relationship within the university context as well as an active relationship with local and nearby architecture communities. The program’s history, mission, culture, and pedagogy is also clearly described in the APR (pp. 5–9).
I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

[X] Demonstrated

Not Demonstrated


I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2017 Analysis/Review: The program’s policy on diversity and inclusion for current and prospective faculty, students, and staff is outlined in the APR (pp. 10-11). The university’s strategic plan for diversity initiatives is described in “Goal 5: Build a campus with community that fosters diversity and inclusion.”

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. Collaboration and Leadership. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.
B. **Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. **Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. **Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. **Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program’s response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

[X] Described

[ ] Not Described

2017 Analysis/Review:
The team found that there is evidence of collaboration among architecture students; however, there is little to no evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is occurring or that multidisciplinary collaboration opportunities are available to students. This multidisciplinary collaboration is necessary for students to understand the skills needed to collaborate on complex projects. While there are plans for future collaboration on design-build projects with the Department of Construction Management, there seems to be little attention given to expediting these opportunities for students.

The program emphasizes design and technology and has a strong connection to the core principles of the profession. This allows students to gain a basic understanding of integrated design and professional practice. The team observed that digital design tools have played a strong role in design studio courses. The Advisory Board and the university’s placement program support the school’s undergraduate co-op program and its graduate Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship course.

The program provides opportunities for students to participate in community service projects, such as Habitat for Humanity Design-Build projects. Students support architecture faculty by hosting the annual Rendering Day, which helps high school students develop designs for AIA Toledo’s design competition. In addition, ARCH 6210 emphasizes service projects involving regional constituencies.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the
program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

[X] Demonstrated

[] Not Demonstrated

2017 Analysis/Review:

The narrative describing long-range planning was found in the APR (pp. 14-15). The M. Arch. program at BGSU has identified multiyear objectives for continuous improvement within the context of the mission and culture of the university and the five NAAB perspectives. Data are collected routinely from multiple sources to inform future planning and strategic decision-making in the Department of Architecture. For example: the Advisory Board and faculty retreats play key roles in supporting strategic planning and decision-making.

The Department of Architecture’s objectives for continuous improvement have been tied directly to the NAAB perspectives as part of the school’s ongoing five-year plan for satisfying these objectives. An annual calendar of meetings of administrators, administrators and faculty, faculty, administrators and students, and faculty and students provides the framework for the process of identifying and addressing the objectives for continuous improvement. The APR has provided a comprehensive outline of the school’s five-year plan for continuous improvement for the next one to seven years (2017–2024).

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. Program Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multiyear objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success.

B. Curricular Assessment and Development: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

[] Demonstrated

[X] Not Demonstrated

2017 Analysis/Review:

Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The APR (pp. 15-16) describes assessment as both informal and formal. For example:
• “The formal part of the department self-assessment process is composed of several parts. It includes, but is not limited to: solicitation from faculty; students’ and graduates’ views about the Program; individual course evaluations; and periodic faculty review of teaching and program offerings. The program is involved in and contributes to institutional self-assessment, both at the College and University levels which is reflected in the university-wide academic plan.”

The team did not find evidence of formal metrics to evaluate the above items.

Curricular Assessment and Development

The APR (p.16) describes that curricular assessment is being driven by the “University community.” For example:

• “The College Dean is responsible for coordinating, scheduling, evaluating, and improving the curricula and programs of instruction, including proposals for new courses or the modification or discontinuance of existing courses which includes the appropriate involvement of the faculty and college committees or councils……Following that, a curricular proposal and its assessment will be submitted to the department chair for review and approval by the chair and the faculty of the department. The department chair will then forward the proposal and supporting materials to the appropriate curriculum council of the college for approval and transmittal to the college dean. After approval, the dean returns the proposal and supporting materials to the proposal initiators, who then transmit the proposal and supporting materials either to the Undergraduate or Graduate Council.”

The team notes that an attempt to synchronize courses and faculty has occurred and adjustments have been made so that each faculty member is aware of and applies the relevant SPC and reflects these in his/her syllabus. The team observed that faculty members are working to reinforce the SPC that were “Met” in the classes they teach and are also transforming the SPC that were identified as “Not Yet Met” into “To Be Met” criteria. Some current catalog course descriptions are not yet quite aligned with the updated versions of the NAAB Conditions.

The team is concerned that the metrics for evaluation and assessment are not fully developed.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.

- The program must demonstrate that an Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of the Architect Experience Program (AXP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.

- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

The program provides financial support for faculty professional development. For example, tenured faculty are eligible to receive $1,500 per year to attend conferences and tenure-track faculty are eligible to receive $750 annually. In addition, the school has conducted undergraduate study abroad in the spring or summer annually since 2010.

The program lost its Architectural Licensing Advisor (ALA) in the summer of 2017, and a new ALA was appointed to assume this position in fall 2017. During the student entry meeting, students were informed of AXP and paths to licensure.

Academic advising is available to students by the college. Incoming students attend an orientation day where degree requirements are discussed. Students are required to meet, at least once with their advisor during the first two undergraduate semesters. Advisement appointments are available by calling or visiting the Undergraduate Student Services office, through the university’s online SSC system, or through direct e-mail or walk-in with their academic advisor.

Undergraduate students are assigned a faculty mentor for advising. Graduate M. Arch. students do not have a formally assigned mentor; the program chair and faculty are the main resource for advising graduate students. Personal advising, career guidance, and other student support services are offered at the university level. The team noted that architecture students are aware of these services and how to use them.
I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program’s pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

The university has demonstrated support of the Department of Architecture. This is evidenced on pages 40-42 of the APR. The team meetings with the dean of the graduate college, the provost, and the president provided additional evidence of this support. In addition, the university has demonstrated support of the department by providing a new facility for architecture.

The team identified the following concerns:

1. The need for additional funding for scholarships, research, and travel.
2. The potential rapid growth that is expected and the demands that a graduate program will place on financial resources. For example, the new graduate program will necessitate hiring more experienced adjunct faculty, which will require more funding for competitive salary scales. Compensation for adjunct faculty at BGSU is low in comparison with local peer institutions. This
issue will need to be addressed in order for the school and the graduate program to achieve their full potential.

Also, faculty and students are concerned with the need for funding for signature summer abroad “fieldwork” courses. While this is not currently mandatory for M. Arch. students, it is typical in master’s programs in the U.S., and the lack of funding may impact recruitment and retention.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Demonstrated
[ ] Not Demonstrated

2017 Team Assessment:

The university library provides all students, faculty, and staff with convenient and equitable access to literature and information as well as appropriate visual and digital resources. The library dean and the coordinator of collections are aware of the needs of the program, and they support faculty members’ requests for materials and resources. In addition, a Science & Technology team provides instruction and research assistance. Also, BGSU students can easily access materials with OhioLink, a consortium of 121 academic libraries among 93 Ohio college and university libraries.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- Administrative Structure: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.

- Governance: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described
[ ] Not Described

2017 Team Assessment:

Administrative Structure:

The APR notes the current administrative structure within the context of the current program. Personnel for the department are identified in the APR (pp. 6, 47, 48).

However, the team observed that there continues to be ongoing leadership challenges created by the continuing reliance on interim leadership for the program and the fact that the program
has relied upon several faculty members to fill the chair position in the past. Thus, the organizational symptoms continue to be a concern for the team.

**Governance:**

The APR notes the current governance role of faculty and staff; students’ role in governance is not identified. The APR (p.48) does describe some “responsibilities” that are shared.

Based upon discussions with the faculty and administration, the faculty governance opportunities are informal yet adequate for the program; however, there is no formal role for student participation in governance in the program, the department, or the college. Discussions with students confirmed this and the importance of their representation.
CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE.** This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this section. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work.

- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK.** This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education, and access to optional studies.

- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION.** The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.

- **PUBLIC INFORMATION.** The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to “describe, document, or demonstrate.”

- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.

- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.

- A review of websites, links, and other materials.
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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 Professional Communication Skills: Ability to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4 and ARCH 6800 Seminar in Architecture and Design.

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

[] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1, ARCH 6220 Graduate Design Studio 2, ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3, and 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4.

A.3 Investigative Skills: Ability to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

[] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210, 6220, 6310 and 6320 Graduate Design Studios 1, 2, 3, and 4, which require investigative skills for studio project descriptions on syllabus.

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: Ability to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

[A] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210, 6220, 6310 and 6320 Graduate Design Studios 1, 2, 3, and 4.

A.5 Ordering Systems: Ability to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

[A] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1, ARCH 6220 Graduate Design Studio 2, ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3, and 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4.

A.6 Use of Precedents: Ability to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

[A] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210 and 6310 Graduate Design Studios 1 and 3. The use of precedents in design studio project analysis and predesign assignments was noted with distinction.

A.7 History and Culture: Understanding of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Met

[A] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Understanding of history and culture is found in ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1 and ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3’s project analysis and predesign assignments as well as in ARCH 6800 Seminar in Architecture and Design.

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

[A] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team found evidence of architectural design skills, critical thinking, and visual communication in design studios. These skills are increasingly developed as the student progresses to higher-level studios. However, there is disparity in the quality of the product output among these studios.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

B.1 Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1, ARCH 6220 Graduate Design Studio 2, ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3, and 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4

B.2 Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[ ] Met
[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of site design and analysis was not found in students' work products. While the course lecture reviewed the elements and importance of site analysis, the student work products did not exhibit a comprehensive understanding of this design principle such as identifying existing site conditions and opportunities and constraints unique to the site to be effectively used to develop design alternatives and solutions.
B.3 Codes and Regulations: Ability to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was not found in student work prepared for ARCH 6520, Codes + Regulations. There is concern about principles of life safety and accessibility in design studio projects.

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

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4 and ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1.

B.5 Structural Systems: Ability to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement was found at the prescribed level in student work prepared for ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4 and ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3.

B.6 Environmental Systems: Understanding of the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement was found at the prescribed level in student work prepared for ARCH 6510 Sustainable Systems.

B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met
[ ] Not Met
2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6510 Sustainable Systems.
B.8 Building Materials and Assemblies: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6310 Graduate Design Studio 3.

B.9 Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[ ] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Insufficient evidence was found in ARCH 6510 Sustainable Systems, such as mechanical, plumbing, electrical, and fire protection systems.

B.10 Financial Considerations: Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship with distinction. Students are required to prepare a comprehensive business plan on the design and construction of a project to determine project financial outcomes.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The team found that SPCs in Realm B were met with the exceptions of three performance criteria: B.2 Site Design, B.3 Codes and Regulations, and B.9 Building Service Systems. The accessibility and life safety criteria were not developed consistently among the studio projects and there was insufficient evidence of understanding of building service systems.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.
C.1 Research: Understanding of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4.

C.2 Evaluation and Decision Making: Ability to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6320 Graduate Design Studio 4.

C.3 Integrative Design: Ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[ ] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The team found the integrated design skills, such as site conditions and analysis, life safety issues, and structural system selection, were not consistent in design projects presented in the team room.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Although the team found many variables of design challenges applied with integrated design solutions, some design projects demonstrated the basics of integrative thinking and technical solutions. In C.3 Integrative Design, the team found inconsistent abilities related to site conditions and analysis, life safety issues, and structural system selection.

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: Understanding of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community,
in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

*2017 Team Assessment:* Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship, and support by the Advisory Board, composed of local architects and business organizations, with distinction.

D.2 Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[ ] Met

[X] Not Met

*2017 Team Assessment:* The team did not find evidence of understanding of methods for selecting consultants, assembling teams, and recommending project delivery methods.

D.3 Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

*2017 Team Assessment:* Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship; the course covered well-rounded business practices of the profession with distinction.

D.4 Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect’s responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

*2017 Team Assessment:* Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice & Entrepreneurship.

D.5 Professional Ethics: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

*2017 Team Assessment:* Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 6610 Professional Practice & Entrepreneurship.
Realm D. General Team Commentary: ARCH 6610 Professional Practice & Entrepreneurship course provides a strong foundation in many of the leadership and practice issues, while ARCH 6630 Applied Entrepreneurship provides an opportunity for hands-on experience with these same issues with understanding of business principles and the practice of architecture.

**PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 –CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK**

**II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:**

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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 Higher Learning Commission (formerly the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program’s country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** Bowling Green State University is accredited by the Higher Learning Commission, a commission of the North Central Association. For more information, refer to APR-IA Section 3.II.2.1

**II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum:** The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch. for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

**2017 Team Assessment:** The Master of Architecture, Preprofessional-plus, requires a minimum of 168 hours. Evidence is found in the BGSU APR (pp. 52, 57), as follows:
• The BGSU model of a pre-professional degree plus 52 semester credits is designed for students who hold a pre-professional undergraduate degree in architecture, such as the B.S. in Architecture offered at BGSU.

• The two-year program is also known as advanced standing. When combined with the 123 credit hours in the undergraduate program, the BGSU 4+2 offering totals 175 credit hours.

• Together, the total credit hours of the BGSU graduate and undergraduate course work exceed the NAAB minimum requirement of 168 semester credit hours.

• To be considered for admission, applicants must have a four-year pre-professional B.S. in Architecture or equivalency from a NAAB accredited institution for our two-year M. Arch.

Admission decisions will also be based on a minimum academic performance of a 3.0 grade point average on the scale of a 4.00 system.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student’s prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met  
[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The Master of Architecture, described by BGSU, is a preprofessional-plus, and requires a minimum of 168 hours. The APR, pp. 52, 57, describes the evaluation process for preparatory and preprofessional education.

The two-year Master of Architecture program admission is evaluated by reviewing the applicant’s undergraduate degree transcripts and portfolio. Each transcript is reviewed to ensure that the student has completed the minimum number of units of general study (non-architecture) course work and the minimum number of units of professional (architecture) course work. Evidence is found in the BGSU APR, pp. 52, 57.

The team found evidence of the public access to VTRs and APRs as required in the 2014 Conditions. Condition II.4.6 describes Admissions and Advising conditions.

The NAAB criteria, VTRs, and APRs are found on the BGSU website as follows:

Admissions evidence is found on the following website:

https://www.bgsu.edu/graduate/admissions.html

No evidence was found of a formalized advising plan. Discussions with facility indicated an informal approach of “mentoring” within the department. It is noted that the university has a formal advising program that is not specific to the architecture curriculum.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: The CTAAE website includes a statement about NAAB-accredited degrees. However, this statement does not follow the exact language prescribed by the NAAB. The following statement is the beginning of its accreditation statement on the website:

“The National Architectural Accrediting Board [NAAB] has granted BGSU’s Department of Architecture and Environmental Design continuing candidacy for its Master of Architecture professional degree. The accreditation process has involved the following:

• NAAB Visit for Initial Candidacy: 2013
• NAAB Visit for Continuing Candidacy: 2015
• NAAB Visit for Initial Accreditation: 2017 “

Also, the BGSU website cites for 6-year instead of 8-year term of accreditation.

It does not mention the Doctor of Architecture degree.

The same website also states that the Master of Architecture may “consist of a pre-professional undergraduate degree and a professional graduate degree that, when earned sequentially, constitute an accredited professional education.”

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2017 Team Assessment: Links for the NAAB Conditions and Procedures are provided on the BGSU website.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: BGSU has a Career Center, whose information can be found in the following website or in the Student Services Center Building on campus. https://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/Cooperative-Education-Programative-education-program.html

In addition, the College of Technology has a Cooperative Education Program for undergraduate students administered by the college. Further information can be found in the following link:

https://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/Cooperative-Education-Programative-education-program.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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.¹
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Links for all five items are provided on BGSU Technology, Architecture & Applied Engineering NAAB Accreditation website:


II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Not Met

[¹] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.
2017 Team Assessment: Since the first cohort graduated in 2015, there is no data on any graduate taking or passing the ARE.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met  
[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The five items described above can be found on the following website:
https://www.bgsu.edu/admissions/apply-now.html

Also, the team found evidence of the public access to VTRs and APRs as required in the 2014 conditions. Condition II.4.6 describes admissions and advising conditions.

The NAAB criteria, VTRs, and APRs are found on the BGSU website as follows:


For admissions, evidence was found on the following website:

https://www.bgsu.edu/graduate/admissions.html

Advising remains a concern as no evidence was found of a formalized advising plan. Discussions with facility indicate an informal approach of “mentoring” within the department. It is noted that the university has a formal advising program that is not specific to the architecture curriculum.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
• The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Financial aid Information is provided by the university at the following website: https://www.bgsu.edu/financial-aid.html
The CTAAE provides departmental scholarship information in the following website: https://www.bgsu.edu/technology-architecture-and-applied-engineering/scholarships.html
PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the 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.

[X] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: The Associate Vice President, Institutional Effectiveness, certified on December 20, 2016, that all data submitted are accurate and consistent. The signed letter is included in the APR-IA Section 3.III.1.2

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2015 Edition).

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: This is the initial accreditation visit. The Interim Progress Reports requirement did not apply.
IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

(List number and title; include comments that describe the basis for the team’s assessment)

I.2.2 Physical Resources

The 103 Park Avenue building provides flexible, spacious, well-lit spaces for production, presentation, collaboration, and display including a 60-seat lecture hall, a 20-seat library/conference room, 10 faculty offices, administrative offices, a small conference room, studio spaces for 150, a public gallery, a design shop, and restrooms.

II.1.1.A.6 Use of Precedents

The use of precedents found in ARCH 6210 Graduate Design Studio 1, projects analysis and predesign assignments were well prepared.

II.1.1.B.10 Financial Considerations

ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship requires students to prepare a comprehensive business plan on the design and construction of a project to determine project financial outcomes.

II.1.1.D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture

ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship, and support by the Advisory Board, composed of local architects and business organizations.

II.1.1.D.3 Business Practices

ARCH 6610 Professional Practice and Entrepreneurship covered well-rounded business practices of the profession.
Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work was found that demonstrated the program’s compliance with Part II, Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and then added to the final VTR.
Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, ACSA Representative
Hsu-Jen Huang, Ph.D.
Professor of Architecture
Architect Licensing Advisor
Department of Architecture
School of Building Arts
Savannah College of Art and Design®
Eichberg Hall
229 MLK Jr. Blvd.
Savannah, GA 31401
Tel: 912.525.6868 | Fax: 912.525.6904
huang@scad.edu | www.scad.edu

AIA Representative
Ben Lee, FAIA, LEED AP
Principal, Clifford Planning & Architecture
55 Merchant St # 3020
Honolulu, HI 96813
phone: 808.537.1200
direct: 808.687.6649
cell: 808.391.6634
ben.lee@cliffordplanning.com

NCARB Representative
Richard McNeel, AIA
JBHM Architecture
308 East Pearl St., Ste. 300
Jackson, MS 39201
work 601 352 2699
cell 601 927 1129
rmcneel@jbhm.com

AIAS Representative
Nyx Valerdy, AIAS
Houston, TX 77054
cell: 361.752.0936
nyx.valerdy@gmail.com
V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Hsu-Jen Huang, Ph.D.
Team Chair

Ben Lee, FAIA, LEED AP
Team Member

Richard McNeel, AIA
Team Member

Nye Valerdy, AIA
Team Member
PROGRAM RESPONSE TO INITIAL ACCREDITATION VISITING TEAM REPORT

To: Helene Combs Dreiling, FAIA
   Interim Executive Director
   National Architectural Accrediting Board

Ellen S. Cathey, AIA
   Associate Director
   National Architectural Accrediting Board

From: Arsenio T. Rodrigues, PhD, AIA, LEED AP, EDAC, NCARB, CoA
   Director, School of the Built Environment
   College of Technology, Architecture and Applied Engineering
   Bowling Green State University

Date: February 09, 2018

Program: Department of Architecture and Environmental Design
   Master of Architecture (pre-professional degree plus 52 graduate credit hours)

Program Response to the Initial Accreditation Visiting Team Report is as follows:

I. Summary of Visit

   a. Acknowledgments and Observations

   The team’s observations of the program include the following:

   While the faculty governance opportunities are informal, they are appropriate and adequate for the program.

   Program Response:

   (See program response to condition ‘I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance’)

   There is minimal evidence that multidisciplinary collaboration is occurring or is available to students.

   Program Response:
In terms of multidisciplinary collaboration within the curriculum, all Architecture and Environmental Design (AED) students at the undergraduate level are required to complete three Construction Management courses (CONS 2350 + CONS 3360 + CONS 3380) as part of their Concentration, in addition to several electives. As part of electives in the undergraduate curriculum, AED students can avail of several course options outside the architecture curriculum, including Arts, Visual Communication Technologies, Engineering Technologies, Business, and Construction Management. At the graduate level, AED students are required to complete two courses in Business as part of the Business Core, in addition to one elective. Within this context, all AED students at the undergraduate and graduate level are afforded the opportunity to interact, engage, and collaborate in a classroom setting with their counterparts from other departments and Colleges across the University.

In an effort to increase multidisciplinary collaboration and improve outreach efforts, the Departments of Construction Management and Architecture & Environmental Design are currently working with Habitat of Humanity of Wood County, Ohio on design-build projects. Students and faculty from both departments are currently engaged in the process of collaborating with local architects and construction professionals to design and build projects for the local community. This effort is being spearheaded by Mark Ohashi (Executive Director, Habitat of Humanity of Wood County, Ohio). The design-build team last met on January 24, 2018 and is set to meet again on February 14, 2018.

The continued reliance on an interim program chair creates an ongoing leadership challenge. While a decision to fill the interim dean position in the CTAAE appears to have been made, and the new director for the School of the Built Environment is scheduled to begin in December 2017, continuity is critical for a new program.

Program Response:

(See program response to ‘II. Progress since the Previous Site Visit – Causes of Concern – Program Leadership’)

II. Progress since the Previous Site Visit

Causes of Concern

Program Leadership

2017 Visiting Team Assessment:

The team observed that there continues to be ongoing leadership challenges created by the 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. A decision has apparently been made on filling the interim dean position of the CTAAE, and this person is to begin in December 2017. A new director of the School of the Built Environment is also scheduled to begin at the same time.
Thus, the organization, administration, and leadership issues continue to be a concern for the team.

**Program Response:**

An international search for the Dean’s position of the CTAAE is currently underway and will be concluded by end of spring semester 2018. The new Director of the School of the Built Environment (Dr. Arsenio Rodrigues) joined BGSU in December 2017. The Director is currently engaged in the process of consulting with the faculty of the Architecture and Environmental Design (AED) Department to elect a permanent Chair for the Program. The AED faculty and School Director are set to make a decision by end of spring 2018. The newly elected Chair will begin in fall 2018.

**I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance:**

**Governance:**

*2017 Visiting Team Assessment:*

*Based upon discussions with the faculty and administration, the faculty governance opportunities are informal yet adequate for the program; however, there is no formal role for student participation in governance in the program, the department, or the college. Discussions with students confirmed this situation.*

**Program Response:**

Formal structure for faculty involvement in governance at the Department, College, and Institution level does exist and is available in the ‘Collective Bargaining Agreement - CBA’ (Effective: July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019) – Article 10 Governance, and also in the Academic Charter. A link to the CBA is copied below (see page 19):

[https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/documents/policies-guidelines/cba-2-updated-article-38-.pdf](https://www.bgsu.edu/content/dam/BGSU/provost/documents/policies-guidelines/cba-2-updated-article-38-.pdf)

The Academic Charter is available at:

[http://www.bgsu.edu/faculty-senate/academic-charter.html](http://www.bgsu.edu/faculty-senate/academic-charter.html)

Appropriate data and links were made available in the BGSU Architecture Program Report (APR) under Section 4 -Supplemental Material under the following categories (see page 60 of BGSU APR):

- The institution’s policy regarding human resource development opportunities, such as sabbatical, research leave, and scholarly achievements.
- The policies, procedures, and criteria for faculty appointment, promotion, and when applicable, tenure.
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.3 Social Equity:

2017 Analysis/Review: The program’s policy on diversity and inclusion for current and prospective faculty, students, and staff is outlined in the APR (pp. 10-11). The university’s strategic plan for diversity initiatives is described in “Goal 5: Build a campus with community that fosters diversity and inclusion.”

Program Response:

Per the visiting team analysis/review, this condition has been fully described by the BGSU Program. The ‘Social Equity’ compliance condition per the analysis/review is positive and has been met. However, this compliance condition in the visiting team report is missing the “[X] Described/Demonstrated” designation, as demarcated for other conditions in this section.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

2017 Team Assessment:

The program provides financial support for faculty professional development. For example, tenured faculty are eligible to receive $1,500 per year to attend conferences and tenure-track faculty are eligible to receive $750 annually. In addition, the school has conducted undergraduate study abroad in the spring or summer annually since 2010.

Program Response:

It is to be noted that tenured faculty as well as probationary tenure-track faculty (both categories) are eligible to receive the same amount, i.e., $1,500 per year to attend conferences. In addition, non-tenure track faculty are also eligible to receive $750 per year to attend conferences. Within this context, faculty (regardless of their tenure-status or rank) may receive funding greater than the amounts specified above, when: 1) the nature/quality of the professional development activity is approved by the Director; and 2) the need for additional funding is demonstrated, without which the faculty member may not be able to successfully participate in the endeavor and/or may not be able to carry out her/his scholarly activities, effectively.
I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

2017 Team Assessment:

Administrative Structure:

The APR notes the current administrative structure within the context of the current program. Personnel for the department are identified in the APR (pp. 6, 47, 48).

However, the team observed that there continues to be ongoing leadership challenges created by the continuing reliance on interim leadership for the program and the fact that the program has relied upon several faculty members to fill the chair position in the past. Thus, the organizational symptoms continue to be a concern for the team.

Program Response:

(See program response to ‘II. Progress since the Previous Site Visit – Causes of Concern – Program Leadership’)

Governance:

The APR notes the current governance role of faculty and staff; students’ role in governance is not identified. The APR (p.48) does describe some “responsibilities” that are shared.

Based upon discussions with the faculty and administration, the faculty governance opportunities are informal yet adequate for the program; however, there is no formal role for student participation in governance in the program, the department, or the college. Discussions with students confirmed this and the importance of their representation.

Program Response:

(See program response to condition ‘I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance’)

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:

Program Response (Important circumstantial information related with visiting team assessment of SPC’s):

During the visit, the visiting team chair informed the BGSU AED Program Chair that only graduate courses may be considered toward meeting the 26 NAAB SPC’s. Subsequently, the visiting team identified only graduate-level course artifacts as having Met/Not Met various NAAB SPC’s. The original NAAB SPC matrix provided in the program submitted APR (see
page 49 of BGSU APR) shows SPC’s distributed (and as such to be evidenced) across the curriculum (pre-professional track curriculum + Master’s degree curriculum). Although appropriate evidence from the courses in the pre-professional track was made available to the visiting team in the same area (team room) where evidence from graduate courses was available, it is to be noted that none of the pre-professional track courses (i.e., Bachelor of Science in Architecture Degree curriculum courses) were considered by the visiting team toward meeting NAAB SPC’s (also compare page 49 of the BGSU APR and page 36 of the BGSU VTR).

Per NAAB visits conducted at other institutions, it is to be noted that course artifacts from the pre-professional degree track curriculum (undergraduate courses) may be used in the team room toward meeting NAAB SPC’s. See (attached and publicly available) visiting team reports of (other) programs that align with (are similar to) the BGSU Architecture and Environmental Design Program Pre-professional degree + M. Arch. degree:
2. University of Maryland (2017 Visiting Team Report, pg. 11-25)

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge:

B.2 Site Design: Ability to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[ ] Met 
[X] Not Met

2017 Team Assessment: Evidence of site design and analysis was not found in students’ work products. While the course lecture reviewed the elements and importance of site analysis, the student work products did not exhibit a comprehensive understanding of this design principle such as identifying existing site conditions and opportunities and constraints unique to the site to be effectively used to develop design alternatives and solutions.

Program Response:

Within the context and evidence presented above (i.e., Important circumstantial information related with visiting team assessment of SPC’s), the BGSU Program requests that the NAAB SPC ‘B.2 Site Design’ condition be considered as ‘Met’, since artifacts from the undergraduate course ‘ARCH 3210’, although available in the team room during the visit, were not assessed by the visiting team toward meeting the criteria.

B.9 Building Service Systems: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.
2017 Team Assessment: Insufficient evidence was found in ARCH 6510 Sustainable Systems, such as mechanical, plumbing, electrical, and fire protection systems.

Program Response:

Within the context and evidence presented above (i.e., Important circumstantial information related with visiting team assessment of SPC’s), the BGSU Program requests that the NAAB SPC ‘B.9 Building Service Systems’ condition be considered as ‘Met’, since artifacts from the undergraduate courses ‘ARCH 2360 and ARCH 3370’, although available in the team room during the visit, were not assessed by the visiting team toward meeting the criteria.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

2017 Team Assessment: The CTAAE website includes a statement about NAAB-accredited degrees. However, this statement does not follow the exact language prescribed by the NAAB. The following statement is the beginning of its accreditation statement on the website:

“The National Architectural Accrediting Board [NAAB] has granted BGSU’s Department of Architecture and Environmental Design continuing candidacy for its Master of Architecture professional degree. The accreditation process has involved the following:

• NAAB Visit for Initial Candidacy: 2013
• NAAB Visit for Continuing Candidacy: 2015
• NAAB Visit for Initial Accreditation: 2017”

Also, the BGSU website cites for 6-year instead of 8-year term of accreditation. It does not mention the Doctor of Architecture degree. The same website also states that the Master of Architecture may “consist of a pre-professional undergraduate degree and a professional graduate degree that, when earned sequentially, constitute an accredited professional education.”

Program Response:

The Program acknowledges that this condition was not met during the visit and has taken appropriate steps to address and meet the condition. To that effect, the Program has corrected the ‘Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees’ on the website (see link below):

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

2017 Team Assessment: Since the first cohort graduated in 2015, there is no data on any graduate taking or passing the ARE.

Program Response:

The Program acknowledges that this condition was not met during the visit and has taken appropriate steps to address and meet the condition. To that effect, the Program has added a link to the website titled ‘ARE Pass Rates’ (see link below):