



DREXEL UNIVERSITY

Antoinette Westphal  
College of Media Arts & Design

Alan Greenberger  
Department of Architecture, Design & Urbanism

May 24, 2018

Ellen Cathey  
Associate Director  
National Architectural Accreditation Board  
1101 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 410  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Re: Drexel University Draft Visiting Team Report

Dear Ms. Cathey,

We would like to amend our report back to you regarding comments on the Draft Visiting Team Report (VTR), sent to us on May 14, 2018. In general, we had an excellent visit from the Accreditation Team in February and were pleased with the Draft VTR.

However, one of our faculty members – Daniel Chung - who is responsible for overseeing the Integrated Design Studio, shared with us his concerns on the team's assessment of Criterion C3 being 'Not Met'. We have tremendous regard for Professor Chung and did not feel that it would be appropriate to leave his concerns unaddressed. He writes:

*As stated in Drexel University's Architecture Program Report (APR page 70, October 2017):*

*"ARCH 361, 362, 363 are the comprehensive design studio and focus specifically on the practice of integrated architectural solutions. Understanding of criteria C.1 and ability in criteria C.2 and C.3 are demonstrated through weekly analysis and design exercises."*

*The architecture faculty at Drexel University would like to submit corrections of fact in regards to the following statement found within the Visiting Team Report as it pertains to Student Performance Criteria C.3 Integrative Design and that the condition was not met.*

*"... the team did not find consistent evidence of student ability to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of structural systems, accessibility, life safety, and technical documentation in ARCH 363-Studio 6-3..."*

*This statement appears to be incorrect based on the following:*

- 1. Statements made within the Visiting Team Report for B.3 Codes and Regulations (which includes life-safety and accessibility), B.4 Technical Documentation, and B.5 Structural Systems explicitly state that "Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for" either ARCH 361, ARCH 362, and/or ARCH 363."*

2. The NAAB team training guidelines for C.3 Integrative Design state that:
  - a. *“Programs are not required to demonstrate evidence of integration of all issues (i.e., environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies) simultaneously in single projects.”*
  - b. *“Integrative design may be taught in single studios, or over multiple courses ... Programs are encouraged to explore the best format for achieving this SPC. This must be described in the APR.”*

*Since the APR clearly states that ARCH 361, ARCH 362, and ARCH 363 are the comprehensive design studio and that this sequence of courses have been specifically focused on C.1, C.2 and C.3 this should meet the NAAB team training guidelines of being “described in the APR”. In addition since the Visiting Team Report found the Student Performance Criteria of B.3, B.4, and B.5 as being met via evidence from either ARCH 361, ARCH 362, and/or ARCH 363 then the conditions for meeting C.3 should be met within the courses listed in the APR.*

We would appreciate your relaying Professor’s Chung’s concerns to the the Team Chair, Jim Gersich, for any comment or follow-up. We are happy to discuss this with him as necessary.

Thank you again for your assistance in this process. We are especially appreciative of the professionalism of the visiting team and of you and your colleagues at NAAB.

Sincerely,



Alan Greenberger FAIA  
Department Head and Distinguished Teaching Professor

cc: Ulrike Altenmuller-Lewis, Program Director and Associate Professor