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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The visiting team conducted the on-site review in accordance with the 2011 Procedures for Accreditation.

The visiting team thanks Drexel University for the excellent hospitality and organization of the team room and making the accreditation visit productive.

The visiting team was impressed with the support of the university and college administration, the leadership of the department head and program director, the dedication of the credentialed full and adjunct faculty, and the highly motivated, engaged student population.

The university president, provost and deans of the two colleges reinforced the importance of the college to the community and future development.

The move to the new facility with the potential synergies between the two program tracks and the allied arts, and the addition of two full-time faculty members are encouraging.

2. Conditions Not Met

None

3. Causes of Concern

A. Compensation for adjunct faculty — Compensation for adjunct faculty is below market rates and may present a risk to the program when economic forces reduce the number of willing practitioners available for services.

B. New technology, staffing, and maintenance — Update information technology infrastructure, equipment, availability to students and appropriate maintenance by technical staff to adequately support the program and meet Drexel University's high standards.

C. Ratio of full-time to part-time faculty members — Improve the ratio of full-time and part-time faculty to meet the program's mission and goals, and equitably provide for services to the students.

D. Architecture program exposure — The architecture program deserves to be celebrated in the university and given exposure worthy of a very unique, professional degree program, which is one of few comparable programs in the country.

E. Studio culture — Improve the studio culture across both program tracks to more accurately reflect the intent of the studio culture policy.

F. Diversity of the faculty — The diversity of the faculty does not necessarily reflect regional demographics. As faculty transition occurs, the visiting team encourages the program to implement a long-term plan to sustain the program and improve diversity.
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)

2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.

Previous Team Report (2006): Although the department, with the help of the university and the colleges, has made significant strides in addressing ongoing concerns regarding the physical resources of the program, there are significant issues of concern that lead the team to conclude that this condition is not met.

On the positive side, a recent conversion of the freight elevator to a passenger elevator has markedly improved accessibility to the fourth floor of the Main Building, and modifications such as ramps between level changes have made this area a workable environment. Lighting is functional, and the unique architectural qualities of the space allow it to function well for its somewhat limited use as a classroom and pin-up space. The space in Arch 3021 is a fine example of good studio and office space developed in a renovated building, with ample display and a shared central area for computers and plotters for students to use.

The greater need of housing the entire program in a single facility has not been resolved, but this issue is clearly a topic for planning discussion, both at the college and the university-wide level outside the department. A number of solutions appear to be available, and the department is working appropriately to further this important goal within the constraints of overall university planning efforts.

The following three areas raise the level of concern with respect to this condition:

1. The shop is a challenge from several aspects. It is not an accessible space. Although it was explained to the visiting team at the shop that students needed to take a safety orientation before being cleared to use the equipment, students made it clear that they had to enroll in a shop-related class and complete the class before this clearance. The classes are not designed for architectural students. The department is making strides in planning for extended shop hours, but this has not yet taken effect. The location of the shop off a dark alley is likely to prove a discouragement against evening and night use. The limitation on shop use is apparent in student work, little of which exhibits model making at the scale or complexity that could be afforded. COMAD has applied for a grant for rapid prototype modeling equipment, but it is not clear to what degree this equipment would be offered to architectural students or where it would be housed.

2. Plotting and printing facilities for all students are a critical issue. This is addressed in a satisfactory way for students in the first 2 years of the 2+4 program, in that a common plotter is provided for these students in the center of the studio area at 3021 Arch Street. As soon as these students move on to the third year and join other students in the night study program, this opportunity is lost. There is an assumption that students will be able to use plotters and printers at their places of work, but in practice this is not always the case. Some firms allow use while others prohibit it, and there are discrepancies in technology available at these offices. This places some students at a disadvantage. The department is encouraged to find a solution at the campus that affords all students the same access to printing and plotting technology.

3. The requirement that students be afforded space "... including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class," has not been successfully met for the students in the night program. The particularities of this program suggest a different response than what is customarily found in the studio environment where each student is
assigned a full studio station. But the students notice the disadvantages posed by having to bring their work for each class or critique and then take the work back with them, without a "home base" of any type. Not only is working studio space missed by students in the 2+4 program who have left such a space after the second year, but night program students also feel the lack. The department should strive to find creative ways, such as flexible work space for students outside class, and dedicated storage, such as student lockers, to satisfy this important aspect of this condition within the unique parameters of this program.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment:

1. The new model shop on the 4th floor of the Main Building is located proximate to the upper level design studios; it has several pieces of equipment needed for advanced model making including a laser cutter and small bench tools such as saws, drills, sanders, and hand tools. Space is very limited, however, and the location does not appear to support the existing 1st and 2nd year studio functions in the 3201 Building. Despite these limitations, there is ample evidence of model making at appropriate detail at all levels of design studio.

2. The plotting room on the 4th floor of the Main Building is located proximate to the upper level design studios and has two color plotters and a large-format scanner. Space is adequate, and the equipment appears adequate to serve the needs of the department insofar as there are qualified student assistants to operate and maintain the equipment. Preponderance of hard copy throughout the studio indicates that the resources dedicated to plotting fulfill the current needs of the program.

3. In current configurations, studio space for the exclusive use of each student, without regard to his/her program track, is still not provided for other than full-time students in 1st and 2nd year. These spaces are located on the ground level of the 3201 Building.

4. The visiting team understands the entire program is scheduled to be relocated in September 2012 into a multi-story building currently under renovation. Multiple allied programs will be located in the same building; the architecture department will be assigned to portions of the 3rd and 4th floors. This relocation will allow the architecture program to make more efficient use of available space and will hopefully lead to greater collaboration between the allied arts. The visiting team finds that the move and its potential is perceived favorably by the students, faculty, and administration, and should help resolve historic concerns about adequacy of physical resources to support the architecture program. The move may also serve to increase demand for access to the program, and if the architecture program continues to expand, demand for more space will be at a premium.

2004 Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Previous Team Report (2006): The curricula of both tracks of the B. Arch. program comprise professional studies, general studies, and electives. In the fall of 2003, the total units for the degree program were raised from 192 to 209 with the intent to meet the NAAB requirement of 225 units before 2015. Of the 209 required units, 48 are university requirements (general studies), 87
are in the studio/thesis sequence, and 74 are in architectural studies. The program curriculum is 19.5 units short of the 67.5 quarter-unit requirement for general studies.

2012 Team Assessment: The 2011–12 curriculum meets 227 total required credit hours in the appropriate categories (professional, general, electives). Refer to section II.2.2.

2004 Criterion 13.25, Construction Cost Control: Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

Previous Team Report (2006): This criterion has not been met. The subjects under cost control are generally included in electives rather than in required coursework. Although some students do develop this understanding in their work experience, it is clear that student experiences vary widely. An effective means does not exist for either the department or the visiting team to confirm that this understanding is developed by all students in the program. There is little in the way of cost control material in the Architectural Construction course, and although these topics may be covered in some thesis projects, it is by no means clear that this is true of all thesis work. The program should have a number of means available to address this concern.

2012 Team Assessment: Refer to B.7, Financial Considerations.

2004 Criterion 13.29, Architect’s Administrative Roles: Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

Previous Team Report (2006): Exposure to the issues involved with the architect’s administrative roles is typically found in the Management Seminar. While the course content is comprehensive, it exists only as a professional elective. Because of the way that electives are structured, it is possible for a student not only to miss this important course content but to avoid or bypass the professional electives entirely (by focusing on history and other electives). While this topic may be augmented through work experience, there is no evidence that all students develop this understanding through the class, the studio, or the work setting.

2012 Team Assessment: Exposure to the issues involved with the architect’s administrative roles is now found in ARCH 335, Professional Practice I and ARCH 336, Professional Practice II. Both are now required professional courses for both the 2+4 track and the part-time evening option. These were previously taught as ARCH 435 Management Seminar.

2004 Criterion 13.30, Architectural Practice: Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Previous Team Report (2006): As with Criterion 13.29, Architect’s Administrative Roles, topics relating to Criterion 13.30, Architectural Practice, are covered in a comprehensive manner only in the electives in the two-class Management Seminar. Again, this understanding may be developed by many in the work setting, but the department has not yet developed an effective means to track or verify this experience and the understanding derived from it.

2012 Team Assessment: Exposure to the issues related to architecture practice is now found in ARCH 335, Professional Practice I and ARCH 336, Professional Practice II. Both
are now required professional courses for both the 2+4 track and the part-time evening option. These were previously taught as ARCH 435 Management Seminar.

2004 Criterion 13.33, Legal Responsibilities: Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

Previous Team Report (2006): While this may be met in some students through their experience, there is no apparent way to gauge or determine this. This material is partially covered in the Management Seminar, but this is an elective that may or may not be taken by all students. The department should develop either a means to measure and gauge what students are exposed to and earn in the work setting or ensure that this understanding is acquired in the classroom.

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: The basic understanding of the legal responsibilities of the architect is addressed in ARCH 336 Professional Practice II. This course deals with the legal and ethical responsibilities associated with the firm and project management as well as regulatory codes, agreements, services compensation, and professional services contracts. It is evident in the syllabus and the course work displayed that this course offering addresses the legal responsibilities of the architect in a general way.

Previous FE Team Report (2006):

12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment: Per the 2006 VTR there were two issues embedded in the failure to meet this Condition. The first was the number of credits in the curriculum assigned to General Studies and the second was the total credits in the degree program. The curriculum has been changed to add twenty-one general studies credits to the architecture program by replacing nine credits of required professional courses and adding twelve new general studies credits. Because of this change the total credits for the curriculum as increased by twelve credits to 221. While on paper the general studies requirements have been fulfilled, the Team cautions the program to adhere to the general education requirements for the yet-to-be numbered Ethics for Architects course. For this class to be considered a general education course it should fulfill three conditions: be taught outside of the department; be a subject matter primarily non-architectural; and be taught to more than just architecture students.

In addition the program intends to fulfill the additional four credits needed to reach 225 by adding two two-credit professional practice courses to the required curriculum that will cover a variety of student performance criteria that were not met during the 2006 accreditation visit. The program expects these courses to be in-place by the Fall of 2010.
This Condition has now been met through the reorganization and expansion of the general education credits (69) by the curriculum revision.

**2012 Team Assessment:** Since the 2009 *Focused Evaluation Report*, two Professional Practice I and II (ARCH 335 and ARCH 336) courses with a total of 6 credits have been added to the 221 credit curriculum resulting in 227 credits. These two courses now cover the student performance criteria in professional practice, which was not previously covered in required courses.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being Met, the team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.)

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

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

[X] The program has fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence (In APR)

2012 Team Assessment: Most of the evidence is provided in the APR; additional information is confirmed on the Drexel University Architecture Program website and through interviews with the president, provost, and director.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR information provides information engendering positive and respectful learning while providing a culturally rich environment. The existing faculty, however, does not reflect the presence of a diversity of cultures to match the regional demographics. The architectural program and university are working to correct this condition. The institution demands that all equal employment opportunity guidelines are part of the hiring policies for the university. The university has an office of equality and diversity that addresses these specific issues. The university also has a scholarship program, “Liberty Scholars,” to aid in the support of local students who may otherwise not have the opportunity to attend the university.

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.
2012 Team Assessment: Studio Culture: At present, with regard to learning culture, the program demonstrates through the interaction between the students and faculty a mutual respect that fosters a healthy learning environment in the 2+4 program, especially in the 1st and 2nd year. However, in the Student Voice Survey, students highlight that there is not as much interaction that occurs in the final years of the 2+4 and the entire 7-year program. The lack of workspace and storage does not foster a collaborative environment for the evening students. Also, the separation of the two current facilities limits interaction that allows lower-level students to be mentored by the upper-level students. However, the relocation to the new facilities will improve on that. It is evident within the studio culture policy that the program encourages collaboration among years and majors that is expected to be accomplished in the new facility.

Diversity: Students come from different locations, stages of life, and backgrounds, which contribute to the cultural richness of the program. The lack of diversity among the faculty is a cause for concern as noted above.

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

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching. In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective. (Arch 5 studios, community planning)

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides information that the curriculum demands 69 credits (30%) be reserved for general and liberal arts education; the students engage in the new STAR (Students Tackling Advanced Research) initiative within the university community; students are involved in a number of interdisciplinary university initiatives, and the faculty is extensively involved in university and college committees.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Through increased exposure to the profession during their education and opportunities with the large number of practicing architects who are faculty members, students develop a level of preparedness and self-worth that lends itself to a fluid emergence as professionals within the field of architecture.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and;

prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The IDP coordinator is well versed in the program and is giving the students the information necessary to sign up for the program when the time is appropriate. The visiting team was presented with materials indicating that the students have been given ample opportunities to attend informational meetings regarding IDP, ARE, and the path to licensure. This information is also available online. In addition many of the students have signed up for the IDP.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to practice in a global economy; to recognize the impact of design on the environment; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; to understand the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of a diversity of clients and diverse populations, as well as the needs of communities and; to contribute to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Drexel's unique program of expecting students to work and gain practical experience in the architecture profession while pursuing their degree provides a fundamental framework to fulfill this perspective. The fact that most adjunct faculty are practicing architects also helps connect theoretical exploration in the classroom and studio with real world experience in real time.

The ARCH 335, ARCH 336, Professional Practice series and PHIL 317, Ethics and the Design Profession provide an academic framework linking practice to education through appropriate focus on the basic issues of professional practice.

The IDP is designed to involve students and pre-professionals with the basic range of issues related to professional practice. In discussion with students it is evident they are being advised appropriately about the process and benefits of the program and there is substantial participation. Drexel has a dedicated IDP coordinator in Assistant Professor Schultz. From direct interaction it is evident he is an engaged advisor, student advocate, and coordinator who is connected to and involved with the national IDP. The IDP coordinator monitors a student's initiation of IDP record and progress during their education consistent with his/her developing experience. A hard copy record of current student NCARB IDP records is maintained by the IDP coordinator.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of this involvement can be found in the APR as well as in a number of the recent 5th year design studios, where students worked to gather information about the conditions of the neighborhood communities as the university begins its initiative to aid in local revitalization. These initiatives were confirmed during the team's interview with the university
president and provost. The APR also enumerates the extensive pro bono work carried out by the large evening faculty who teach in the program.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The program spells out the current changes and shifts in directions that are taking place. The department director also gave an update on the initiatives taking form as the new university's strategic plan is being implemented. In meeting with the university president and provost, it was made clear that the architecture program and the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts & Design are important elements in working to meet the goals of the university’s strategic plan. The Drexel University website currently contains this strategic plan, since the university has its overall (Middle States accreditation occurring this month,

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR contains highlighted items of the issues that have been identified by the faculty and students over the past years. Most of the issues involve the curriculum and student performance. The new department head and director have worked together to implement improvements to the curriculum and to track the students' advancement through the curriculum. The self-assessment process involved multiple meetings by the full-time and evening faculty with input from the students through student evaluations, the AIAS, and the Student Voice Survey.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- Faculty & Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative
leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions. Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.

An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.

An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.

An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The program administration and staff are sufficient to provide leadership and management for both tracks. It is apparent, through discussions with the director of the architecture program, that a new process has been implemented to improve the availability of the staff for academic advising and job placement opportunities. Additionally, the department head has implemented new guidelines to better balance workloads for the full-time faculty. This will allow proper time and opportunities for faculty research while recognizing the heavy service load demanded of the full-time faculty.

Students:

An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admission decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.

An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The team finds that the admissions policies are adequate as evidenced in materials in the team room and on the university website. It was noted that the program director works with current and transfer students individually to discuss their placement in the program. Students are updated annually and their progress discussed.

1.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The department of architecture + interiors is part of the Antoinette Westphal College of Media Arts & Design (AWCoMAD) and has operating links with the Goodwin College of Professional Studies (formerly Evening College). All full-time faculty are also hired through the AWCoMAD College and all degrees are granted through it. Adjunct faculty teaching evening courses are hired by the Goodwin College, which provides administrative services for all evening programs at the university. This dual relationship with both colleges has been in existence for 25 years, with each college having a defined role in the operation of the B.Arch. program. The department head and director of the architecture program collaborate closely with the faculty on curriculum and budget priorities. They also collaborate and coordinate with both colleges and university procedures.

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

Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: In 2010–2011, the department of architecture established a curriculum committee and a lecture committee. They have been meeting regularly to address a range of issues affecting the department, the college, and the university. In addition, ad hoc committees are created as needed by the department head and the program director in consultation with the faculty. One such committee is the search committee, which is currently in the process of recommending to the department head two finalists to fill the two new full-time faculty positions. Student representatives serve on committees, and the department has an open door policy for students to provide their input. The Student Voice Committee, which was created in 2010, participated in the evaluation of the candidates for the current department head position.

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.

Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The architecture program is currently housed in two separate buildings. Studios for the 2+4 entry level students, computer lab, and faculty offices are located in the 3201 Arch Street building while the upper level studios, model shop, and classroom space are in the main building, 4th floor. The 3201 Building has good space allocation and an environment supportive of the creative design process. The space in 4th floor main is primarily used for studio instruction without dedicated workstations for each student. Hang-up spaces are appropriate for the intended use and offer flexibility. While the main building is charming and has historic significance, the facility is old and environmental conditions are below modern standards.

The visiting team understands the entire program is scheduled to be relocated in September 2012 into a multistory building currently under renovation. Multiple allied programs will be located in the same building with the architecture department assigned to portions of the 3rd and 4th floors. This relocation will allow the architecture program to make more efficient use of available space and will hopefully lead to greater collaboration between the allied arts. The visiting team finds that the move and its potential are perceived favorably by the students, faculty and administration, and should help resolve historic concerns about adequacy of physical resources to support the architecture program. The move may also serve to
increase demand for access to the program, and if the architecture program continues to expand, demand for more space will be at a premium.

1.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that there is parity in fiscal allocation between the architecture program and other professional programs at the university. The architecture program’s operating budget has been stable since the NAAB visit in 2006. The program support per capita has grown from $4,033 in 2006 to $6,012 in 2012. This was a result of a rise in tuition and a decline in part-time enrollment. The increase of the annual technology fee allocation to $375 per FTE student has supported the equipment budget in the program. The program has scholarships to support its Study Tours Abroad and to support minority students. The Goodwin College provides scholarships and awards to students enrolled in the evening program, and the university offers scholarships for students in the 2+4 option. The architecture program’s endowed funds yielded $27,890 spending allocation in 2011.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: After visiting the library and studios as well as reviewing online access to literary resources, the visiting team finds that the school demonstrates adequate support for access to information resources. Also, as noted by faculty members, support is evident within the teaching environment which includes visits to the library and meetings with the librarian to discuss research projects such as thesis and case studies. The librarian and students noted the use of digital access is increasing in popularity especially in the night program. Access to the librarian and his knowledge of resources is available all day during normal business hours and by appointment up to 6:00 pm. After normal business hours, access to librarians is limited, which could prove problematic for the evening architecture students. Students in that program are encouraged to take advantage of the resources during the day between work and classes, and on weekends. The architectural historian noted that as of last year the use of the NA section was among the highest in the library as a whole.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports³. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

- **Program student characteristics.**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
  - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
  - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the Institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the "normal time to completion" for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

- **Program faculty characteristics**
  - Demographics (race/ethnicity & gender) for all full-time instructional faculty.
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the full-time instructional faculty at the institution overall.
  - Number of faculty promoted each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty promoted each year across the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty receiving tenure each year since last visit.
    - Compare to number of faculty receiving tenure at the institution during the same period.
  - Number of faculty maintaining licenses from U.S. jurisdictions each year since the last visit, and where they are licensed.

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

2012 Team Assessment: All statistical information requested above is contained in the APR and confirmed to be accurate.

I.3.2. **Annual Reports**. The program is required to submit annual reports in the format required by Section 10 of the 2009 NAAB Procedures. Beginning in 2008, these reports are submitted electronically to the NAAB. Beginning in the fall of 2010, the NAAB will provide to the visiting team all annual reports submitted since 2008. The NAAB will also provide the NAAB Responses to the annual reports.

³ In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team was provided annual reports from 2006-2011 digitally.

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The basic information is provided in the APR and is reinforced by the materials presented in the exhibition of the faculty work that has occurred since the last accreditation visit. The full-time faculty résumés in the APR are typically very specific about recent accomplishments, whereas the accomplishments of the large part-time faculty were available through the faculty exhibition. The information provided was adequate and revealed that the faculty knowledge and experience met the requirements of this element.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room met the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: All of the information required above was provided in the team room in the policies binder.

---

*The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Supporting material demonstrates compliance with the criterion found in the ARCH 343, ARCH 344, ARCH 345, ARCH 496 and ARCH 497 course work and plots provided in the team room. In addition the visiting team briefly observed the studio sessions, and the level of discussion and exchanges that occurred between the students and faculty demonstrated that this criterion is being met.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The fact that this ability is being developed throughout the program is evident in multiple course syllabi and student work, high and low pass, in multiple formats within both program tracks, through at least the following courses: ARCH 156 Graphic Communications, the entire Architecture Studio and Comprehensive Design Series 100, 200 and 300, and the Thesis Sequence I, II, and III, ARCH 496, 497 and 498. This condition is well met.

A.3. Visual Communication Skills: Ability to use appropriate representational media, such as traditional graphic and digital technology skills, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence that students are able to use appropriate representational media in ARCH 150, 153 Introduction to CADD I and II, in ARCH 151 Architectural Drawing II and in design studios.
A.4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This work is evident in the ARCH 150-153 course offerings as well as the Comprehensive Design ARCH 363 course and the ARCH 161 Construction offering. There is evidence of clear drawings, outline specifications and models that illustrate the assembly of materials systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: After review of the work provided in the team room, it was evident that the students have developed investigative skills within classes such as ARCH 361, 362 and 363, Comprehensive Design and Urban Design. Students have gathered site information as well as systems information in addition to historical documentation of the sites that are relevant in the coursework and design processes.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This ability is being developed throughout the program, evident in multiple course syllabi and student work, high and low pass, in multiple formats in both program tracks, through ARCH 155 Basic Architectural Drawing and at least the lower level studio courses Series 100 and 200. These basic design abilities continue to develop through the higher level studio courses.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This ability is evident in the work displayed for Comprehensive Design Studio ARCH 352/361, Thesis I, II and III, as well as a few 100 and 200 level courses; the use of precedents to facilitate a deeper understanding of the fundamental principles is well executed in these courses. Through the study of buildings and systems, students demonstrate an adequate aptitude to analyze and translate information in to their own projects. In regard to the comprehensive design studios, there was an incredible amount of research done to compile the campus master plan.

A.8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Review of course curriculum and physical examples of student work indicate understanding of this condition across both education tracks. The primary manifestation of this understanding is through representation and continuing development of more complex design solutions in three dimensions, in context. Course work in the ARCH 231, 232 and 233 series offers good examples of this core curriculum at both high and low pass levels, in both education tracks. Further development of this understanding is demonstrated though numerous examples of more advanced studio and comprehensive design responses.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: These conditions are met in the ARCH 141, 142 and 143 Arch and Society course offerings. It is clear in the course description, the syllabi, and student course work that these topics are covered adequately. A general review of the course offerings, slides being presented and the examinations given bear this out.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team found evidence of students’ understanding cultural diversity in the PHIL 517 Ethics and the Design Profession course. It was also evidenced in the Drexel University Campus Master Planning project in ARCH 361 (352/Winter 2011) Comprehensive Design Studio I.


[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Supporting material demonstrating compliance with the criterion was found in ARCH 241 (Studio 4-1) and ARCH 496 & 497 (Thesis) materials and course work in the team room. Within the Thesis materials the level of rigor and investigation varied depending upon the focus of the thesis, but there is satisfactory demonstration of the understanding of the role and significance of applied research.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Evidence was found that students meet all SPC under Realm A.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
• Incorporating life safety systems.
• Integrating accessibility.
• Applying principles of sustainable design.

B. 1. Pre-Design: Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, such as preparing an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Pre-Design is developed primarily through the comprehensive design studio series course work and ability is evident at both high and low pass levels. Site design specifically is well developed throughout the design studio sequence and space programming. Ability to articulate applicable codes and regulations for land use and construction of buildings is less well developed in the examples provided. Pre-Design is also covered extensively in elective courses ARCH 431, Architectural Programming, and ARCH 432 The Development Process.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This SPC is being met through the ARCH 336 Professional Practice II course offering as well as the ARCH 100-series studio offerings. It is clear from reviewing course work, syllabi and examinations that the program understands the conditions and is exposing the students to the information necessary to prepare them to deal with accessibility design for sites, facilities and systems.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This SPC is being met through the ARCH 336 Professional Practice II course offering as well as the ARCH 100-series studio offerings. It is clear from reviewing course work, syllabi and examinations that the program understands the conditions and is exposing the students to the information necessary to prepare them to deal with sustainability issues dealing with conservation, reuse of resources, building environments, LEED requirements, and carbon-neutral design.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Site design concepts are addressed conceptually and in various degrees of intensity in the 3rd and 4th year Design Studios ARCH 241 and ARCH 351. Ability is evidenced
through more in-depth project development such as with all of the Urban Design Studios ARCH 352 and 353, and prominently in specific Comprehensive Design projects, ARCH 360 series.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This SPC is met through the ARCH 102-106 Studio courses from basic life safety and egress concepts in the ARCH 102 Studio to more complex life safety and code-related issues in the ARCH 106 Studio. It is apparent that the faculty understands the critical issues related to life safety and the need to apply those principles in site planning and design. These principles are being taught and tested in these studio experiences.

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 SPCs:

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** ARCH 362 and 363 Comprehensive Design Studios II and III and Thesis I, II, and III address this SPC. Thinking skills and technical documentation as well as investigative skills are evident in the work displayed. Historical traditions are evident in some of the work demonstrating the existence of that criterion in the course structure. Life safety, accessibility, sustainability, site design (basic), environmental systems and structural systems are all evident in the work shown. Individual lectures are presented during the studios that inform the students of the various criteria embedded in this SPC and the students' designs demonstrate the lessons have been learned and the criterion satisfied.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This SPC is met within the ARCH 363 Comprehensive Design Studio III. The fundamentals of construction cost estimating at the schematic design level are adequately addressed. More detailed estimating methods such as quantity take-offs and unit costs are not evident
in the current coursework. The visiting team encourages the program to implement more detailed cost estimating coursework.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This SPC is met in the ARCH 261, 262 and 263 course offerings. ARCH 261 focuses on HVAC systems as they relate to overall building design. ARCH 262 introduces plumbing systems, site distribution, waste systems, and fire protection. It also deals with vertical transportation systems. ARCH 263 covers electrical systems, lighting, daylighting, and applicable codes.

B. 9. Structural Systems: Understanding of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: There is clear evidence this topic is well met through the required curriculum and manifested in the students' work, primarily in testing of engineering principles and then by application through the comprehensive design projects. The CIVE Sequence 261, 262 and 263 Materials and Structural Behavior are courses specifically designed to address students' understanding of the engineering principles of structure and materials. The Comprehensive Design course ARCH 361, 362 and 363 as well as thesis projects provide opportunities to apply these principles in design solutions.

B. 10. Building Envelope Systems: Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 161 Architectural Construction and the Design Studio sequence covers the understanding of these basic principles and the SPC is well met. Building materials, including envelope systems, are studied and assemblies are investigated. The course syllabi along with sample homework assignments and solutions make it evident that the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and assemblies is being taught in this course offering.

B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The building service systems integration is evidenced in ARCH 161 Arch Construction and the ARCH 261, 262, 263 series (Environmental Systems) course offerings. Basic principles are addressed in the Arch Construction course, and more detailed information regarding plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems is addressed in the ARCH 261-series course offerings.
B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: **Understanding** of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** The concepts of building materials and assemblies integration is addressed in the ARCH 161 Architectural Construction course offering by studying the construction principles and use of materials to develop architectural assemblies, providing a conceptual framework to integrate construction and design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Realm B. General Team Commentary:</th>
<th>B.9 Structural Systems and SPC B.10 Building Envelope Design are met with distinction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPC B.7 Financial Considerations is met and is now part of the required course work; however, the visiting team encourages the program to go further in developing a more detailed understanding of cost estimating/financial considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Realm C: Leadership and Practice:**
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** This condition is met primarily through the upper level design studios such as ARCH 351, Urban Design Studio I and ARCH 499, Special Topics: Drexel Smart House. Collaboration among students, faculty, and members of the community is evident in the students' work as required by exploring large-scale, complex urban design studies, and site-specific special projects such as Smart House. Ability is demonstrated by students at high and low pass levels through well documented analysis of existing urban configurations and development of theoretical studies. Further, teamwork is a requirement of the ARCH 499 course to research, analyze, document, and formalize design responses.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** The ARCH 141, 142 and 143, Architecture and Society I, II, III offer specific curriculum to address this SPC. Course work and testing results found in the course binders demonstrate appropriate understanding at high and low pass levels. There is also evidence these
principles are further developed in the Urban Design Studio I course work and Comprehensive Design through exploration of complex urban conditions.

C. 3 Client Role in Architecture: **Understanding** of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and reconcile the needs of the client, owner, user groups, and the public and community domains.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Understanding the client's role and the responsibilities of the architect related to the client, user groups and stakeholders is covered in ARCH 335 Professional Practice I. The syllabus and course work address the concepts of client relationships, ethics and professional judgment as they relate to the practice of architecture.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Exposure to the basic issues involved with organizing and managing a practice is found in ARCH 335, Professional Practice I, and ARCH 336, Professional Practice II. Both are required professional courses for the 2+4 track and the part-time evening option. The two courses are well organized and comprehensive, and student work found in the course binders demonstrates good understanding of the subject matter.

C. 5. Practice Management: **Understanding** of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Exposure to the basic issues involved with organizing and managing a practice and the architect's administrative roles is found in ARCH 335, Professional Practice I, and ARCH 336, Professional Practice II. Both are required professional courses for the 2+4 track and the part-time evening option. The two courses are well organized and comprehensive, while student work found in the course binders demonstrates good understanding of the subject matter.

C. 6. Leadership: **Understanding** of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** The leadership and collaborative role of the architect is addressed in the ARCH 335 Professional Practice I course offering. This course work addresses the varied roles in which the architect serves including collaboration and leadership. A basic understanding of the architect's role in team-building, coordination, and scheduling is demonstrated in the course materials.

C. 7. Legal Responsibilities: **Understanding** of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, and historic preservation and accessibility laws.
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The basic understanding of the legal responsibilities of the architect is addressed in ARCH 336 Professional Practice II. This course deals with the legal and ethical responsibilities associated with the firm and project management as well as regulatory codes, agreements, services compensation and professional services contracts. It is evident in the course work displayed that this course addresses the legal responsibilities of the architect in a general way.

C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment: Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues, and responsibility in architectural design and practice.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: This SPC is covered in PHIL 317 Ethics and the Design Profession. This course studies the critical understanding of the issues of ethical and moral importance in the practice of architecture. Ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues in architectural design and practice are listed as some of the primary student performance criteria in this course. ARCH 336 Professional Practice II also addresses ethics and professional judgment.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Coursework in PHIL 317 Ethics and the Design Profession, ARCH 335 Professional Practice I, and ARCH 499 Special Topics: Intro to Historic Preservation, and the ARCH 141, 142 143 Series, Architecture and Society all have dedicated content addressing this condition. There is ample evidence these topics are presented appropriately and understood as broad and narrow concepts through relevant references and reading materials, homework assignments, and student testing results found in the course binders.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: All SPC are met in Realm C.

C.9 is met with distinction
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Drexel University is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS) and currently is preparing for its reaffirmation of accreditation visit at the end of the month.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The 2009 Focused Evaluation Report indicates movement to address curriculum deficiencies; 2011-12 curriculum meets 227 total credit hours required in the appropriate categories (professional general, electives). The APR portions that clearly lay out the new curriculum matrix for the 2+4 program and the part-time evening program options list the equivalencies and means by which each option satisfies the required courses for the accredited degree (Bachelor of Architecture).

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
The program must describe the process by which the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited degree program is evaluated and how modifications (e.g., changes or additions) are identified, developed, approved, and implemented. Further, the NAAB expects that programs are evaluating curricula with a view toward the advancement of the discipline and toward ensuring that students are exposed to current issues in practice. Therefore, the program must demonstrate that licensed architects are included in the curriculum review and development process.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The newly developed course matrix and new student record review procedure have greatly enhanced the curriculum evaluation process to ensure that each student has completed all of the required courses to satisfy the conditions for accreditation. The addition of the Professional Practice courses, the Ethics course and the transposition (switching) of the Comprehensive Design and Urban Design studios improve the curriculum and bring the sequence into alignment with the stated mission and goals of the program. The improvements to the curriculum have proceeded through the departmental and collegial approval process, and the courses have been implemented and proper documentation has been provided to demonstrate that these courses (in the curriculum) properly satisfy the Student Performance Criteria.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.
In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program has adequately addressed placement for pre-professional candidates. The program director conducts an in-depth assessment of the students’ aptitude to transfer into the program.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 5.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team found evidence that the “Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees” exists on the Drexel University Architecture Program website.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
- The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team found links on the Drexel University Architecture Program website for both the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation 2011.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
- www.ARCHCareers.org
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- www.NCARB.org
- www.aias.org
- www.acsa-arch.org
[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team found links on the Drexel University Architecture Program website addressing the links above.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

- All Annual Reports, including the narrative
- All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
- The final decision letter from the NAAB
- The most recent APR
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The visiting team verified that all the documents above have links on the Drexel University Architecture Program website under Resources/Education.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The pass rates are published on the Drexel University Architecture Program website.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

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

Reference Drexel University, APR, pp 1-2.

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

Reference Drexel University, APR, pp. 2-9.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference Drexel University, APR, pp. 23-25.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference Drexel University, APR, pp. 25-30.
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

B.9 Structural Systems – The team found the curriculum related to understanding and applying the principles of structural engineering were very well developed in course work and many examples in comprehensive studio.

B.10 Building Envelope Design – Course work evident in the team room and studios demonstrated a strong understanding of building envelope design and construction principles and building envelope assemblies. This was evidenced by models, drawings, and descriptive course work. This is a by-product of a faculty actively engaged in architecture practice.

C.9 Community and Social Responsibility – The administration, faculty and students are dedicated and engaged in the revitalization of the surrounding community as evidenced in projects exhibited in the team room. This reflects a broader theme of civic involvement and will be enhanced by the design-build program.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Dr. Ikhlas Sabouni, Dean
Prairie View A&M University
School of Architecture
P.O. Box 519, M.S. 2101
Prairie View, TX 77446
(936) 261-9810
(936) 261-9827 fax
issabouni@pvamu.edu

Representing the AIA
Jon Luft, AIA, LEED® AP
Senior Project Manager
HDR Architecture, Inc.
8690 Balboa Avenue, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92123
(858) 712-8387
(619) 921-3419 mobile
jon.luft@hdrinc.com

Representing the AIAS
Amanda N. Gann
1715 Volunteer Boulevard
Knoxville, TN 37996
(615) 336-1057
agann3@gmail.com

Representing the NCARB
Mark L. Aspaas, AIA
Vice President & Principal Architect
Architecture, Inc
POB 2140
Sioux Falls, SD 57101-2140
(605) 339-1711
markaspaas@architecture.com

Non-voting member
Jonathan Brooke Harrington
POB 129
Cushing, ME 04563
(207) 354-7025
(215) 870-6467 mobile
jharrington@temple.edu
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Khalis Sabouni
Team Chair
Representing the ACSA

John Luft, AIA, LEED®AP
Team member
Representing the AIA

Amanda N. Gann
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Mark I. Aspaas, AIA
Team member
Representing the NCARB

Jonathan Brooke Harrington
Non-Voting Team Member