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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments

The team wishes to recognize and acknowledge the exceptional commitment of Dean Charles W. Graham, AIA and his staff in their organization of this accreditation visit. We appreciate their consistent dedication and enthusiasm, as well as their assistance in keeping the team on schedule throughout our four day visit. Their initial preparation prior to our arrival, the ease of communication while organizing our visit and their willingness to maintain a flexible schedule, allowed this team to get a truly in-depth understanding of the University of Oklahoma architecture program. We especially want to express our most sincere thanks to Director Nick Harm, AIA for his tireless support in coordinating the efforts of the staff and the administration for this visit.

We would like to add additional thanks to Dr. Nancy Mergler, Senior Vice President and Provost, for her kind and frank discussion regarding the commitment of the University of Oklahoma System towards the betterment of the College of Architecture and its five academic departments.

We would also like to express our deepest appreciation to the students who shared their thoughts and concerns with the entire team, and for their commitment to the quality of their education and their desire to become good citizens of the architectural community.

The overall tone of the visit was exceptional and allowed faculty, staff and students to showcase their dedication to their architectural education. The overall presentation of the students' work and faculty accomplishments, coupled with candid discussions regarding concerns, were refreshing and aided the team greatly. The staff and leadership are genuine assets to the program.

The team observed that the current construction of new facilities, the appointment of a new Dean, the Dean's new mission and a reinvigorated faculty leadership are proving to be the impetus that the program has been searching for, and will serve as a catalyst to elevate the quality of education this program offers to its students.

The team wishes to acknowledge the challenges this program has been through since its last NAAB team visit. This team believes that the new directions and initiatives the program is undertaking will further improve the program's curriculum and will allow the program to serve as a campus-wide leader, as stated by the President and the Provost's vision.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

Condition 2, Program Self-Assessment (2003): The program must provide an assessment of the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission and achieving its strategic plan.

Previous Team Report (2003): This condition is not met. See Section I, Part 2, Progress Since the Previous Site Visit.

A strategic plan for the college must now be developed, which addresses the future of the Division of Architecture within the context of the college. A development plan for the college to raise money for the renovation of Gould Hall, the establishment of a vision for the Division of Architecture that aspires to educate beyond merely sitting for the registration exam and the integration of the collective resources of the five parts of the college should be an immediate priority.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has currently been met with concerns. Although many changes have occurred since the last visiting team's review, the program has been through some unique challenges in the past two years, which has led to the
hiring of a new Dean. The new Dean joined the program in August and has undertaken an in-depth reassessment of the program’s strengths, curriculum and mission, which will assist in complying with these criteria. For more in-depth commentary and assessment notes from the 2009 Team, please refer to the Section 1, Condition 2 of this VTR.

**Condition 4, Social Equity (2003):** The program must provide all faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with equitable access to a caring and supportive educational environment in which to learn, teach, and work.

**Previous Team Report (2003):** This condition is not met. See Section I, Part 2, Progress Since the Previous Site Visit.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion has currently been met with concerns, despite numerous changes which have occurred since the last visiting team review. For more in-depth commentary and assessment notes from the 2009 Team, please refer to the Section 1, Condition 4 of this VTR.

**Condition 5, Human Resources (2003):** The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.

**Previous Team Report (2003):** This condition is not met. The team is very concerned about the high student-faculty ratio, especially in the studios. The new enrollment management plan must be implemented starting fall 2003 to ensure future compliance of this condition. Using adjunct hires meanwhile would aid in reducing the studio student-teacher ratios.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion has currently been met with concerns, despite numerous changes which have occurred since the last visiting team review. For more in-depth commentary and assessment notes from the 2009 Team, please refer to the Section 1, Condition 6 of this VTR.

**Condition 7, Physical Resources (2003):** The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

**Previous Team Report (2003):** This condition is not met. See Section I, Part 2, Progress Since the Previous Site Visit.

**2009 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion has currently been met with concerns, despite numerous changes which have occurred since the last visiting team review. For more in-depth notes please refer to the Section 1, Condition 8 of this VTR.

**Condition 11, Professional Degrees and Curriculum (2003):** The NAAB only accredits professional programs offering the Bachelor of Architecture and the Master of Architecture degrees. The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include three components—general studies, professional studies, and electives—which respond to the needs of the institution, the architecture profession, and the students respectively.

**Previous Team Report (2003):** This condition is not met. It will be met by the recently approved new curricula for both programs that are scheduled to be implemented in fall 2003.
2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has currently been met. For more in-depth notes please refer to the criterion portion of this team VTR.

Criterion 12.1, Verbal and Writing Skills (M. Arch only) [2003]: Ability to speak and write effectively on subject matter contained in the professional curriculum

Previous Team Report (2003): This criterion is not met to a certain extent. See Section I, Part 2, Progress Since the Previous Site Visit.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has currently been met. For more in-depth notes please refer to the criterion portion of this team VTR.

Criterion 12.14, Accessibility (M. Arch only) [2003]: Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Previous Team Report (2003): This criterion is not met to a certain extent. While the ability to incorporate accessibility into the design process is evident in the B. Arch. Curriculum and demonstrated work, this ability is not apparent in the M. Arch. Program. The team is concerned that the international architects who choose to pursue a graduate education at the University of Oklahoma have had no prior exposure to the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) that governs accessible design and have limited exposure to it within the existing curriculum.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has currently been met. For more in-depth notes please refer to the criterion portion of this team VTR.

Criterion 12.16, Formal Ordering Systems (2003): Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Previous Team Report (2003): This criterion is not met. The team finds evidence of formal ordering systems' being introduced into the curriculum in the beginning-level studios, but is not convinced that all students are graduating with a developed understanding of this criterion. Along with the strong emphasis on professional and technical form determinants that dominates the upper-level studios, the exploration of formal ordering systems should be encouraged at all levels as a means to develop skills to shape space, express complex programmatic conditions, and further develop individual design skills.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion has currently been met.

[Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated March 12, 2003]:

6 Human Resource Development

Previous Team Report (2003): Human resource development requires a consistent opportunity for growth by both students and faculty. Consistency of opportunity was not found within the program. It is the team’s sense that the College has provided adequate funding for faculty exchange programs; faculty and student conferences; and student field trips. The visiting team recognizes the generous support for Human Resource Development through the Dean’s office. However, “consistency of opportunity” suggests that a formalized structure and budget be administered with established guidelines so all faculty and students are aware of available support.

There is currently no funded guest lecture program. It is particularly unusual to have an endowed Chair (the Goff Chair) without appointment(s) to that position within the present academic year. It
is also noted that there is no evidence of recent funding of any women lecturers; a particular problem considering the limited number of role models within the faculty for women students.

The computer training for faculty is noted as a positive step in acquiring new skills. However, there is no additional evidence of how faculty remains current with advances in the profession.

There is minimal indication of an effective selection process for the hiring of new tenure track faculty in the deficient areas of gender diversity and program depth. University administration provides budget increases for hiring diverse ethnic or gender faculty into tenure track positions. Despite this funding, new tenure track positions have been filled by males. The visiting faculty positions appear to be used as “trial” positions, some for quite extensive terms. The team finds this to be a distinct system of marginalization of the younger faculty. Since this has been a concern in the past two reviews, specific attention must be paid to gender and ethnic diversity.

Although a formal mentoring program is referenced as providing resource development it has not been effective because it has not been applied consistently throughout the faculty. All tenure track faculty do not have mentors, and nontenure track faculty are not formally included in the mentoring program.

The procedures for advancement to tenure or promotion are very clear. The team is concerned that there have been no promotion advancements for existing faculty since 1991 or granting of tenure since 1995.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: The team heard of admirable opportunities for growth in recent years, though the program faces less leeway since the economy’s downturn. Students’ cocurricular advantages include special visiting lecturers/critics, scholarships, field trips and study-abroad programs, and financial support to student organizations along with faculty attention to those endeavors. Faculty members receive support for professional development, mostly for travel to conferences.

Efforts to move faculty members from the associate to the full professor rank have not yet been brought to completion, though final judgment by the university is expected this semester on several cases that have been put forward. Annual reviews have not been conducted consistently, which may hamper tenure-track faculty’s development. The college needs to complete its updating of bylaws with respect to tenure-track faculty to ensure further momentum in faculty development.

12.3 Research Skills

This criterion is a concern because it is conditionally met. The introduction of synthetic methods of analysis (for example, written evaluations, mathematical modeling, graphic analysis, and diagramming techniques) will aid in all students having a better appreciation of research as it informs the design process.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is now met

12.36 The Context of Architecture

Although met, this criterion is a concern. The team noted that the focus on registration as a singular goal of the program may well be too restrictive in complex and fast-changing times.

2009 Visiting Team Assessment: This criterion is no longer a condition of the 2004 Conditions for Accreditation.
3. Conditions/Criteria Well Met

1.5 Architecture Education and Society
5 Studio Culture
9 Information Resources
13.7 Collaborative Skills
13.17 Site Conditions

4. Conditions/Criteria Not Met

B Arch. Degree Only

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills
13.14 Accessibility
13.22 Building Service Systems
13.28 Comprehensive Design

B Arch. and M Arch. Both Degrees'

13.25 Construction Cost Control
13.26 Technical Documentation

5. Causes of Concern

4. Social Equity

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

As reported in the Architectural Program Report, Social Equity is mandated by The University of Oklahoma. The report states, "In national searches for new faculty, The Equal Opportunity Office of the University is involved at critical steps." The University as a whole should be commended for their ability to meet and exceed the diversity goals as represented by the number of Native American faculty, as well as women and minorities.

Since the last visit, the division continues to make an effort to change the social equity of the faculty. Two of four tenure-track positions have been filled with minority or women candidates. The University has equitable procedures and criteria for hiring and tenure, and recent searches have adhered to the standards.

However, based on the information provided, some evidence indicates that this issue has not been totally resolved. The salary reports the team was provided during our visit revealed that since the arrival of the new dean the entire architectural department had benefited from a salary adjustment, for whatever reason, the team found that a percentage of the women's faculty salaries seemed to a large extent be lower than their male counterparts.

The team observed a diverse student body and encourages the division to mirror that student diversity within the faculty. At present time, the faculty is beginning to hire new faculty and staff and has a great opportunity to match national standards and levels within the ranks of its faculty.

6. Human Resources

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.
Previous concerns regarding annual reviews have recently been addressed. An Annual Faculty Evaluation Template has been created to describe the annual faculty performance evaluation system for the division. Procedures for tenure are described in several publications, including the Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, the Criteria for Initial Appointment, Tenure, Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Increase and Promotion, and the Faculty Handbook.

The division head holds a 12-month appointment and is supported by two dedicated advisors and one assistant that is shared between all divisions in the college. The division also employs a full time adjunct professor that has a 50% appointment to assist the director. Although this level of administrative support is the norm throughout the College, a shared, single assistant staff position is barely sufficient to support the division head and operate the program.

Faculty teaches 12-18 credit hours, which generally translates to one studio and one lecture course, or multiple lecture courses for faculty not teaching studio. This course load allows sufficient time for research, practice or creative activities as well as service to the university. Studio ratios for the undergraduate program range from 1:27 in the freshmen year to 1:16.5 in the fifth year. Because freshmen studios only meet for 2.5 hours each week, the studio ratio does not facilitate sufficient time with full time faculty. Although faculty is supported by teaching assistants, these assistants should not be seen as an appropriate substitute for a primary instructor. Ratios of 1:6.3 in the graduate program are generous.

8. Physical Resources

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

Construction is underway on the renovation of Gould Hall and is expected to be completed by fall 2011. In the interim period, the school of architecture, interior design and construction are housed off-campus in three former retail buildings located in close proximity to each other on Main Street. Although this arrangement is not ideal since it separates the program from the main campus and diminishes the program's ability to interface with other departments, it appears that the faculty, students and staff have adjusted well to this situation. It is expected that the college will report on the status of construction in the next annual report.

One significant area of concern for this team was the projected growth the Department of Architecture is anticipating over the next six years as it relates to the number of occupants the new building will accommodate. Currently, the renovation of Gould Hall is based on the current 600 students and faculty of all five departments. If the program grows to 900, for example, the building will not accommodate the growth. Additionally, the program is currently enjoying a unique experience with all the architecture, interior design and construction technology students housed in one building and sharing studio space on a single floor. From the comments we were able to ascertain, both students and faculty are enjoying the camaraderie, collegiality and sharing of knowledge this situation has created. Once they move to the new facility, they will again be segregated by levels, floors and departments.

10. Financial Resources

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The program suffered financially under the previous administration. Under the new dean, many of the previous financial concerns have been targeted and are in the process of being remedied. Of special note by this team is salary compression, which has been addressed. Salaries of recent hires have been appropriate to what the market commands in other institutions. While the maintenance and operation budget for the Department of Architecture is still considerably low, faculty report no procurement or special funding issues that could diminish the educational experience for the students. Similarly, student representatives feel their financial requests are
well-supported and encouraged. The division has a continuing lecture series which is financed through the endowments of the Bruce Goff Chair, which has allowed the school to bring diverse and challenging individuals to the program. With an increased emphasis on research, practice, and creative activities, additional financial support may be required.

As the program continues its growth, expands into its new facilities, increases its outreach and supports faculty travel and associated activities, additional funding resources will be required due to the State of Oklahoma's present zero-growth budget and financial hardships. This is an issue that causes extreme concern for the team. The new dean is undertaking multiple programs and processes that require the department to grow and the financial viability of these changes will depend on the institution's unwavering support.

13.3 Graphic Skills

The team observed that the use of computer based technology is not fully integrated in the early years and may not be in keeping with today's demands as exploratory drawings are integrated with new mediums. The program's reliance on free hand drawing is exceptional and must be commended. However, the visiting team could not find evidence that all of the students' abilities grew in a balanced fashion, as recommended by the NAAB Criteria.

13.16 Program Preparation

This condition has been noted as met with concerns for the B. Arch program.

It was only through detailed investigation and interpretation of student work that the various components of this requirement could be discerned. The students' ability was not as readily apparent as it could have been with clear documentation of the requirements.

This condition has been noted as MET by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team for the M. Arch program. All of the requirements of the conditions for this item were well met through a thorough investigation and documentation of program preparation particularly in the work product of the Research Methods-6243 course.

13.20 Life-Safety

This condition has been noted as met with concerns.

The visiting team found that, although this material had been covered in lecture courses, there was insufficient evidence that the program criteria had influenced or guided their problem resolution in the design solutions.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

This condition has been noted as met with concerns.

The team found that, although the student work showed a high level of building exploration, the sophistication of the building envelope did not rise to the complexity of the project as a whole. This was found to be more crucial in the 5th year studios.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The College of Architecture at The University of Oklahoma exists in an environment where opportunity and the desire for multi-departmental interaction and research based educational opportunities are currently being proposed and encouraged. This commitment is both desired and highly encouraged by the University’s President and its Board.

The program is also enjoying a renaissance period due to the appointment of the new dean. Under his leadership, the Institution is being enhanced and restructured in numerous ways. The architectural faculty has increased the number of tenure track faculty, expanded their public outreach studios, and engaged in a systematic program of developing joint studios with a diverse group of architectural programs throughout their college and new faculty hires

With these new found levels of enthusiasm come challenges indicative of growth and new found passion. The team believes that the faculty needs to engage in the new brand and visioning efforts. The current faculty presently enjoys not only a role in the emergence of the Institution’s desire to manage the quality of its architecture program, but also the desire to enhance the quality of the students’ academic experience. Their commitment and contribution to the community is well represented in their work as advocates for public and academic partnership by providing architectural, planning and design services to neighborhoods, cities or community sectors in an effort to create new livable cities.

The only remaining concerns for the team are the changes at hand. The faculty must engage in ways that enhance communication between faculty and students, between faculty groups, and between academic groups in order to maintain the growth with which the institution has challenged them.
1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program’s mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students’ diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The Team observed a positive relationship between students, faculty and the profession as a direct result of the community interactivity available through the preceptorship program and post-graduation employment. The preceptorship program seemed to be one of the most positive aspects of the bachelor degree program in terms of the students' understanding and "exposure" to the national and international context of practice. Because this opportunity is offered in the 4th year, the student must choose between practice and travel, not all students choose to participate in the preceptorship program.

The ability for students to travel abroad, especially with the support of Dean Graham, is one manner in which these students are cultivating an appreciation for diversity, as well as a global society. This appreciation is also cultivated within the doors of the College of Architecture through the Master of Architecture program, as well as an interest in targeting and accommodating international students. Cultural uniqueness seems to be acknowledged and fostered throughout both degree programs.

It is evident that the students are very active with the College of Architecture's faculty, administrative staff and the academic counseling staff. Academic agendas and course scheduling are communicated to and understood by the student body as a whole.

Collaboration amongst the divisions within the College of Architecture has grown immensely since the last visit. Residing in the temporary "Arc on Main" location, three divisions are working under one roof, allowing for an increased level of interaction and collaboration between multiple disciplines.

1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program’s relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students' understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The Professional Practice sequence, through coursework and visiting lecturers, does an excellent job of introducing students to the profession's IDP and licensure requirements. In addition, the students' exposure to community based projects allows them to experience the needs and expectations that licensure places on the professionals who practice within the Oklahoma community.

In 2005, University of Oklahoma students took 218 sections of the Architecture Registration Exam with a pass rate of 64%. 217 sections were taken in 2006 with a pass rate of 60%.

Administrators of the program expressed on several occasions that the NAAB professional degree (B. Arch and M Arch.) was to focus on developing good architects who can serve their community. Simultaneously, they wanted to offer additional, parallel, but non-accredited degrees enabling the student who does not want to practice in the traditional role of an architect to obtain a diverse degree that allows architecture to be part of his or her educational background.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program's particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice; how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects' obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The degree programs do a fine job of preparing students to practice in an ever-changing world. Community based outreach projects are visible throughout the studio levels; especially noteworthy are projects for the local Native American population. Local architects are involved in the division as visiting critics, adjunct professors, guest lecturers, and a recently restructured professional Board of Visitors to advise and assist the College with program development.

The students gain an insight into the practice of architecture not only though the professional practice courses, but many students participate in a preceptorship program and/or summer internship. A significant number of faculty members are licensed and maintain small practices or consult for larger firms as part of their development program.
This opportunity allows the faculty to maintain and comply with the University of Oklahoma System requirements for publishing and research.

### 1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as well met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The team understands that the school is committed to addressing social and environmental issues, as it develops among its students the capability to recognize situations and propose factual means to solve problems. An important aspect of the process of educating and sensitizing students to social issues is the commitment of the school and the involvement of individual faculty members in addressing crucial social and environmental problems that affect architecture on a global scale and how, in turn, they affect the State and the central region of Oklahoma.

In reviewing the studio programs that begin in the third year and progress through graduate level, it became evident that the faculty has selected many community based projects that address actual social and environmental problems. In the study of these issues, the students interface with a broad range of stakeholders - community officials, developers, consultants and critics. These projects offer students the opportunity to present to public boards, critique groups and governmental agencies. Examples of current efforts include the Oklahoma City University Field Lab, a Pediatric Clinic for Duncan, Oklahoma, the Norman Art Center for Andrews Park, a Core to Shore Master Plan for Oklahoma City and City of Stroud Oklahoma, Study of Commercial and Residential areas.

In addition, the University of Oklahoma has an extensive outreach effort with both the Native Indian Community and the new growing Hispanic community within the state. The College of Architecture is a critical element in this outreach effort. The American Institute of Architecture Students is also engaged in the "Freedom by Design" initiative, which aids the handicap community in meeting their needs.

The team commends the School of Architecture for these Community Outreach Programs which help students achieve an understanding of architecture as a social art and provide the Division of Architecture with an excellent public image.
2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The architecture program has undergone enormous change since the last NAAB accreditation visit. The School of Architecture has a new administrative structure with a new Dean and is currently reassessing the programs' curriculum. This has required faculty to revamp committees that were dormant under the previous Dean, and to engage in self-examination in order to form new working methods and lines of communication between faculty, staff, administrators and departments. One result has been the formulation and redefining of the Faculty Standards and Expectations, Policies and Procedures Relating to Distribution of Effort, Performance Review and Promotion and Tenure as well as Promotion Standards.

In addition, the School has evaluated its degree offerings and curricular structure and has created additional non-accredited degrees with a strong central focus on research and sustainable design in order to align the School of Architecture with the institution's overall central mandates. The University's decision to focus on improving its research profile has created a new focus on faculty research and a redistribution of teaching loads, which has allowed for much discussion and change, and has created new faculty needs and tenure track positions for the program.

In response to the new Dean, the University has commissioned a new branding exercise for the program to reassess its image and role within the community. The school has also undertaken an evaluation of its core values and overall mission to provide the best architectural education in the State of Oklahoma. These core values are being preserved as the school creates a new vision and expands its degree offerings within the College of Architecture.

Academic roles and stewardship of each academic level are also being reviewed to ensure compliance with accreditation requirements and for the creation of a more cohesive program for students.

The current Dean has re-established the Board of Advisors, as well as the Board of Governors and the foundation, as a means of providing sound stewardship and counsel from alumni and those individuals who have a vested interest in the program.

The team feels that due to this number of initiatives the Dean and the faculty, who appear to be extremely excited by these challenges, have their hands full for the next few years. For some of us, this is a cause for concern.
3. Public Information

To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The University of Oklahoma 2006-2008 General Catalog, the College of Architecture website, and the Studio Culture booklet all contain the required language regarding the NAAB accredited degree programs that this institution offers. The team further identifies the efforts by the institution in their catalog and website to facilitate a public understanding of accredited and non-accredited programs.

4. 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 an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

As reported in the Architectural Program Report, Social Equity is mandated by The University of Oklahoma. The report states, "In national searches for new faculty, The Equal Opportunity Office of the University is involved at critical steps." The University as a whole should be commended for their ability to meet and exceed the diversity goals as represented by the number of Native American faculty, as well as women and minorities.

Since the last visit, the division continues to make an effort to change the social equity of the faculty. Two of four tenure-track positions have been filled with minority or women candidates. The university has equitable procedures and criteria for hiring and tenure, and recent searches have adhered to the standards.

However, evidence indicates that this issue has not been totally resolved. The salary reports reveal that while the minority faculty salaries are on par with non-minority faculty, for whatever reason, two-thirds of the women's salaries are substantially lower than their male counterparts.

The team observed a diverse student body and encourages the division to mirror that student diversity within the faculty. At present time, the faculty is beginning to hire new faculty and staff and has a great opportunity to match national standards and levels within the ranks of its faculty.
5. Studio Culture

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as well met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

It is clear to the team that extensive time and effort was spent in preparation of the University of Oklahoma's Studio Culture document for the School of Architecture. The Student Task Force made immense efforts to engage the entire student body and ensure that the purpose of the document remained focused. While the level of participation in the creation and writing of the document on behalf of the faculty is not easily evident, discussion with both students and faculty indicate that both parties are mutually aware of the core values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation and the purpose of the document. The graphic completion and format of the finished product is visually appealing and goes above and beyond the expectations of the criteria for the Studio Culture policy—the team commends the School of Architecture for the production of this booklet.

Simultaneously, it became apparent to the team that a noteworthy portion of the students who engage in activities outside the architecture school had to work late hours to keep up the pace with their classmates due to a select number of faculty members' studio demands, which seemed unaligned with the studio culture core values.

6. Human Resources

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

Previous concerns regarding annual reviews have recently been addressed. An Annual Faculty Evaluation Template has been created to describe the annual faculty performance evaluation system for the division. Procedures for tenure are described in several publications, including the Annual Faculty Evaluation Template, the Criteria for Initial Appointment, Tenure, Annual Evaluation and Merit Salary Increase and Promotion, and the Faculty Handbook.

The division head holds a 12-month appointment and is supported by two dedicated advisors and one assistant that is shared between all divisions in the college. Although this level of
administrative support is the the norm throughout the college, a shared, single assistant position is barely sufficient to support the division head and operate the program.

Faculty teaches 12-18 credit hours, which generally translates to one studio and one lecture, course, or multiple lecture courses for faculty not teaching studio. This course load allows sufficient time for research, practice or creative activities as well as service to the university. Studio ratios for the undergraduate program range from 1:27 in the freshmen year to 1:16.5 in the fifth year. Because freshmen studios only meet for 2.5 hours each week, the studio ratio does not facilitate sufficient time with full time faculty. Although faculty is supported by teaching Assistants, these assistants should not be seen as an appropriate substitute for a primary instructor. Ratios of 1:6.3 in the graduate program are generous.

7. Human Resource Development

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

Since the 2003 visit, the college has taken steps to respond to a number of concerns in this area. The student / faculty ratios in the 2nd through 5th years have been brought in line with generally acceptable standards with an average of 16.5:1. The graduate studio average is 6.3:1. The 1st year studio's ratio of 27.0:1 (9.6:1 with a TA) is considered high and attempts should be made to reduce this average.

A major area of concern is the demographic profile of the full time faculty. Of 16 full-time faculty members, 12 are tenured. Recently, three new tenure track faculty have been hired as a first step in addressing the perceived generational gap. In addition, the faculty does not have a complement of women and minorities reflecting the composition of the student body.

Many of the faculty committees which had been disbanded or made unappreciated under the previous administration have been reinstated and made operational once more, thereby giving the faculty more involvement on the governance of the program. A more defined and active mentoring procedure for tenure-track faculty is also being undertaken. Faculty evaluations are now being conducted each term, as scheduled.

Reviving the Visiting Distinguished Professorship (Goff Professorship) which would bring an outside architect of note to the school to broaden the studio experience is key to the ongoing renewal of ideas and trends to which students should be exposed.

A key event in the evolution of the College is the recent appointment of a new Dean who appears to have already had a very positive effect on the spirit of the faculty and staff.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

Construction is underway on the renovation of Gould Hall and is expected to be completed by fall 2011. In the interim period, the College is housed off-campus in three former retail buildings located in close proximity to each other on Main Street. Although this arrangement is not ideal since it separates the program from the main campus and diminishes the program's ability to interface with other departments, it appears that the faculty, students and staff have adjusted well to this situation. It is expected that the College will report on the status of construction in the next annual report.

One significant area of concern for this team was the projected growth the School is anticipating over the next six years as it relates to the number of occupants the new building will accommodate. Currently, the renovation of Gould Hall is based on the current 600 students and faculty of all five departments. If the program grows to 900, for example, the building will not accommodate the growth. Additionally, the program is currently enjoying a unique experience with all the architecture, interior design and construction technology students housed in one building and sharing studio space on a single floor. From the comments we were able to ascertain, both students and faculty are enjoying the camaraderie, collegiality and sharing of knowledge this situation has created. Once they move to the new facility, they will again be segregated by levels, floors and departments.

9. Information Resources

Readable accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as well met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The Branch Library Self-Assessment of 2008 provides a thoughtful review of library services, organizational structure, and budgeting. Although located off campus during the Gould Hall renovation, the library will be located alongside the College of Architecture upon project completion.

Digital images are available via databases such as ARTstor, and the division's own digital database. Students and faculty can easily assess these assets online. Special collections of books/manuscripts are of particular note. Students and faculty are updated about library events.
through a periodic newsletter. Information literacy is addressed through group instruction and coursework.

With an increased emphasis on research, consideration should be given to expanding those parts of the collection which support special faculty interests as well as student work associated with the Master of Architecture program. The division's library does not maintain its own budget for acquisitions. Rather, the budget is administered through the main library.

10. Financial Resources

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The program suffered financially under the previous administration. Under the new Dean, many of the previous financial concerns have been targeted and are in the process of being remedied. Of special note by this team is salary compression, which has been addressed. Salaries of recent hires have been appropriate to what the market commands in other institutions. While the maintenance and operation budget for the division is still considerably low, faculty report no procurement or special funding issues that could diminish the educational experience for the students. Similarly, student representatives feel their financial requests are well-supported and encouraged. The division has a continuing lecture series which is financed through the endowments of the Bruce Goff Chair, which has allowed the school to bring diverse and challenging individuals to the program. With an increased emphasis on research, practice, and creative activities, additional financial support may be required.

As the program continues its growth, expands into its new facilities, increases its outreach and supports faculty travel and associated activities, additional funding resources will be required due to the State of Oklahoma's present zero-growth budget and financial hardships. This is an issue that causes extreme concern for the team. The new Dean is undertaking multiple programs and processes that require the department to grow and the financial viability of these changes will depend on the institution's unwavering support.

11. Administrative Structure

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). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

This program is an integral component and an independent college within the University of Oklahoma System and is located on the Norman, OK campus, an institution which has degree programs accredited by more than 20 nationally recognized accreditation organizations including the NAAB.

The present University System Administrative structure led by the president and provost supports and is trying to align the vision of the program with the institution and the relationship between the College and the University and within the College itself. With the recruitment of the new Dean, the program is in the midst of a new renaissance and enjoys financial and administrative support. The five programs under the stewardship of the Dean are working to further develop multi-disciplinary endeavors and programs.

The only exception is the program with over 600 students and faculty, has only one dedicated administrative staff position to support the dean and director in their everyday departmental needs, manage their schedules and travels as well as any other activity that comes their way. As the program evolves, expands and add new missions to its curriculum, the staff, and faculty will start to become overburden that it may begin to affect the dean and his leadership.

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></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team.

The University of Oklahoma is currently being visited and reviewed for the accreditation of both its five year B.Arch. program as well as a two+ year Master of Architecture program.

The structure of the School's curriculum and elective course offerings provide a sound foundation for accreditation with a professional degree in architecture (B. Arch.). As stated in previous VTRs, the program is tightly packed and provides some flexibility for its student body to gain a minor.

The structure of the graduate curriculum and elective course offerings provides a foundation for accreditation with a graduate level professional degree in architecture (M. Arch.). As stated in previous VTRs and in the University catalog, this program allows national and international students who do not have an accredited professional degree to complete an architectural education.

Under the new dean, the Architecture Program is undergoing a substantial evaluation to potentially include a new emphasis on research in its curriculum. This new emphasis will meet the needs of the University System for a Research Flagship institution in the State, as well as the dean's desire to broaden the school's offerings at the graduate level for years to come. This program also welcomes professionals who are looking to continue their education by advancing
research into design problems with strong urban and social implications, environmental and sustainable design practices.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was found to be not met at the B. Arch level only.

The team found that the writing skills in examples provided for the B. Arch curriculum showed a lack of clarity of thought, as well as numerous spelling and grammatical errors. The team also found that there was little evidence of faculty efforts to correct writing errors. The only example of any attempt to encourage these skills was in the professional practice sequence.

13.2 Critical 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 them against relevant criteria and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found that examples of this criterion was been covered extensively within their studio assignments, history and practice courses.

13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed that the use of computer based technology is not fully integrated in the early years and may not be in keeping with today's demands as exploratory drawings are integrated with new mediums. The program's reliance on free hand drawing is exceptional and must be commended. However, the visiting team could not find
evidence that all of the students' abilities grew in a balanced fashion, as recommended by the NAAB Student Performance Criteria.

13.4 Research Skills

Ability to *gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found that examples of this criterion was been covered extensively within their comprehensive studio, their graduate program research assignments, and we even found it within their first year design studio assignments.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of *the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed that the program has met this criterion which was identified as a not met during the last accreditation.

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to *use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found that evidence of this criterion throughout the studio project examples.

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to *recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visiting team identified this criterion as well met.

Since the last accreditation visit the program has expanded its community based projects, which tend to be collaborative in nature, to include multi-departmental studio
projects. This collaborative approach has yielded a new synergy among the students and a better appreciation for the professional needs of others. This has created a working model that could be an example for others to follow.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence of this criterion being met thru the program's history course work as well as thru their lecture and travel opportunities.

13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program has one series of studio projects that focuses on developing projects in non-western settings, thus allowing students to better appreciate cultural diversity as well as differing methods for construction.

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence of this criterion being met thru the programs history course work as well as thru their lecture and travel opportunities.
13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence of this criterion being met thru the programs history course work as well as thru their lecture and travel opportunities.

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence of this criterion being met thru the programs history course work as well as thru their lecture and travel opportunities.

13.13 Human Diversity

Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found evidence of this criterion being met thru the program's history course work as well as thru their lecture and travel opportunities.

13.14 Accessibility

Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was found to be not met at the B. Arch level only.

The team observed that although most projects included the required turning radius in restrooms, there was still not enough appreciation of the other needs of the physically challenged. It is apparent that this criterion could be met if a little more emphasis were applied to the studio requirements. The visiting team found better consistency in achieving this ability at the graduate level.
13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found both thru the application of sustainable design strategy’s on the studio work as well as their specialty programs focusing on LEED and Sustainable design criteria.

13.16 Program Preparation

Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns for the B. Arch program.

It was only through detailed investigation and interpretation of student work that the various components of this requirement could be discerned. The students’ ability was not as readily apparent as it could have been with clear documentation of the requirements. This condition has been noted as met by the 2009 NAAB Accreditation Team for the M. Arch program. All of the requirements of the conditions for this item were well met through a thorough investigation and documentation of program preparation particularly in the work product of the Research Methods-6243 course.

13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This Condition has been noted as well met.

This requirement was well met through a combination of strong interaction with the community on community based projects, interaction with professionals that contribute knowledge to the studio projects and through group research and common project analytical requirements.
13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found extensive evidence of the teaching of structural design thru their course as well as thru the final rendition of structural systems on the work presented at each level.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team found extensive evidence of the teaching of Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing design thru their course as well as thru the final rendition of Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing systems on the work presented at each level.

13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns.

The visiting team found that, although this material had been covered in lecture courses, there was insufficient evidence that the program criteria had influenced or guided their problem resolution in the design solutions.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition has been noted as met with concerns.
The team found that, although the student work showed a high level of building exploration, the sophistication of the building envelope did not rise to the complexity of the project as a whole. This was found to be more crucial in the 5th year studios.

### 13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was found to be not met at the B. Arch level only.

Although the team observed some level of understanding of the basic principles and application of "building service systems" in the 5th year studios, this level of knowledge was found to be inadequate in the "Capstone Project". In addition, the incorporation of plumbing, electrical, communication, security, and fire protection was not evident in projects in any of the other documented Studios II, V, and VI.

### 13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the studio work and projects been displayed.

### 13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the studio work and projects been displayed.

### 13.25 Construction Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This criterion was found to be not met.

The team found little evidence that this subject is being fully covered either in lectures or projects, especially when it involves the life-cycle cost aspect of the project. The evidence found was minimal and creates a concern for the team.

13.26 Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was found to be not met.

The documentation provided to illustrate this ability was very spotty and incomplete in scope, and does not rise to the level of ability that this criterion requires. While the team found that pieces of buildings had been detailed with some level of technical precision, there was not comprehensive and adequate information to suggest that the projects were adequately conceived from a technical and specification perspective to communicate the construction documentation requirements.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture

Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the studio work, projects been displayed and thru their public and community projects.

13.28 Comprehensive Design

Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion was found to be not met at the B. Arch level only.

We believe that this criterion is not consistently met throughout Studios IX and X. There seems to be a wide range of fluctuation between the students' capacity to demonstrate his or her ability in building program and site. This includes the development of
programmed spaces, including an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence and their public and community projects

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence and their public and community projects

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence, their public and community projects and thru the journals the students have to maintain thru their preceptorship program.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Arch. [X] [ ]

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence, their public and community projects as well as their multi-departmental studio projects completed in association with the interiors and construction department.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence and their public and community projects

13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The team observed this criterion thru the professional practice sequence and their public and community projects
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III. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Oklahoma Architecture Program Report.

In 1890, the University of Oklahoma was founded by an act of the first legislature of the Territory of Oklahoma. Seventeen years before Oklahoma became a state, this act stated that the purpose of the University was "to provide the means of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the various branches of learning connected with scientific, industrial, and professional pursuits."

Beginning in the fall of 1892, the University started accepting students, and four years later awarded its first undergraduate degree. In 1900, the University conferred its first Master of Art degree, while its first Master of Science degree was conferred in 1906. Its first Doctor of Medicine degrees were conferred in 1911, while its first Doctor of Philosophy degree was conferred in 1929. In the past 25 years, the University of Oklahoma has granted more than 100,000 bachelor degrees.

The entire University currently has an enrollment of nearly 30,000 students between its three campuses and its off-campus outreach program. Among the three campuses are the Norman Campus, the Tulsa Campus, and the Health Sciences Center in Oklahoma City.

On the Norman Campus, the University currently enrolls over 23,000 students with almost 19,000 undergraduates and over 4,000 post-baccalaureate students. These students are spread among nearly 250 undergraduate and graduate degree programs. The University's fourteen degree-granting colleges include: Academic Affairs, Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Atmospheric and Geographic Sciences, Business, Continuing Education, Earth and Energy, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Journalism & Mass Communication, Graduate, Law, and Liberal Studies.

Approximately 69% of the University's students are from the State of Oklahoma. The remaining 31% of the student body represents the other 49 states, four U.S. territories, and 100 countries. Twenty-two percent of the students are minorities, while 6% are non-resident aliens.

In 1994, President David L. Boren, former U.S. Senator and former Governor of Oklahoma, became the University's thirteenth president. Under Boren's stewardship, "almost $1.5 billion in construction projects have been completed, are under way or are forthcoming on OU's three campuses." In 2007, the University endowment reached $1 billion and at present, it totals over $1.1 billion. With this heightened funding, endowed chairs and professorships increased from 116 in 1995 to 463 in 2007. Additionally, President Boren places an emphasis on international programs and study abroad opportunities. The University currently holds over 170 exchange agreements with universities in 66 countries.

2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Oklahoma Architecture Program Report:

The University of Oklahoma strives to:
Provide the best possible educational experience for our students through excellence in teaching, research and creative activity, and service to the state and society.

The University of Oklahoma recognizes, appreciates and actively pursues its special responsibility to help make Oklahoma a good place in which to live and work. The university is also part of a world community of scholars, and its activities make national and international contributions. Graduates of the university hold important leadership positions in the state and throughout the world. As the university meets its broad scholarly responsibilities, it targets many activities to bring maximum benefits to the state.

To encourage excellence, the university attracts, develops and retains outstanding faculty and staff; attracts capable students who will provide future leadership for the state, region and nation; provides superior library, laboratory, classroom, performance and computer facilities; and engages in ongoing planning, analysis and management for the effective use of its resources.  

3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Oklahoma Architecture Program Report.

Although a few Architecture courses existed in the Engineering College as early as 1922, the School of Architecture was not formally established as a part of the College of Engineering until 1926. During this time, Joseph Smay headed the School. From 1936 to 1946, Henry Kamphoefner was the Chairman of the School of Architecture. Studio courses during these years followed the Beaux Arts Institute of Design's tradition, which was commonly taught in other American schools of architecture at the time. The objective of this teaching style was to gain national recognition for the School by winning design awards for student work from the Beaux Arts Institute's New York juries.  

In 1947 Bruce Goff was appointed Chairman of the School of Architecture. Goff brought an abrupt change to the School's design philosophy, setting it apart from all other schools of architecture. This new approach stemmed from the American tradition of romantic individualism and was dominant in the School through the mid-fifties. During this era, the School's educational goals shifted from the Beaux Arts model to a focus on developing imagination and creativity within a professional curriculum. From 1956 to 1969, the School continued to place an emphasis on individuality and creativity in design, with professionalism as the primary focus. James Palmer Boggs, Mendall Glickman, and John York served as directors of the School during this period.

In 1968, the University President appointed a committee composed of academic and professional leaders to investigate the role of the University in architectural education as it related to the changing needs of society. The committee recommended the establishment of a College of Environmental Design to serve the University as "an educational melting pot for creativity and diversity." In 1970, the School of Architecture separated from the College of Engineering and was renamed the College of Environmental Design. Dr. Murlin Hodgell served as the first Dean and the Director of the College's only academic unit, the School of Architecture.

The College's Construction Science program began in 1978, followed by the incorporation of the University's Interior Design program and the initiation of the Landscape Architecture — both in 1982. Also in 1982, Ron Hess was appointed acting Dean. The following year, Raymond Yeh
was appointed Dean of the College with Tom Selland as Associate Dean and Richard Kuhlman as Interim Director of the School of Architecture. In 1984, the College was renamed the College of Architecture (COA) and divided into four professional divisions: Architecture, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, and Construction Science. The Department of Regional and City Planning moved from the College of Arts and Sciences in 1987 and joined the College of Architecture as the fifth division. In 1988, the College began the slow process of moving out of its location underneath the north bleachers of the football stadium and into the old petroleum geology building, Gould Hall, a project completed in 1991. In 1990, the University of Oklahoma initiated a post-professional M.Arch program in Tulsa with Robert Lawton Jones serving as its Director.

In 1993, Raymond Yeh resigned as dean and Jim Kudrna was appointed Interim Dean followed by the appointment of Deborah Dalton as Dean in 1994. In 1997, Eleanor Weinel was appointed Interim Dean, followed by the appointment of Bob Fillpot as Dean in 1998. In the fall of 2007, Bob Fillpot announced his desire to return to teaching, and stayed on as Dean until the end of the academic year. In May 2008, Associate Professor Nick Harm was appointed Interim Dean until Charles Graham’s appointment in August 2008.

This summer also presents a new horizon for the physical facilities. After years of discussion and planning, the $33 million Gould Hall renovation project commenced in August of this year. These comprehensive renovations are expected to take between two to three years. In order for these renovations to occur, the three COA Divisions housed in Gould Hall -- Architecture, Construction Science, and Interior Design--moved into a temporary space in Downtown Norman, along with the College Library. During the renovations, Regional and City Planning and Landscape Architecture will remain in Carnegie Hall on Parrington Oval, and upon the completion of Gould Hall, Regional and City Planning and Landscape Architecture will join the other divisions in the same building. When the renovations are completed, for the first time the same facility will house all five Divisions of The College of Architecture. This has been a dream for the College since its inception.

### 4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Oklahoma Architecture Program Report.

"Advancing architecture and society through education, scholarship and service."  

On Tuesday, August 19, 2008, the faculty agreed that the Division's mission could be further described in this manner:

The Division is dedicated to a comprehensive approach to architectural education which will instill in students the knowledge of and concern for the responsibilities of architecture and the related disciplines; train students to enter the profession and function effectively within multi-disciplinary teams; prepare students for lifelong learning; and develop students' ability to engage the forces of change. The Division is committed to advancing the profession through research, scholarship, and creative activity.
5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2009 University of Oklahoma Architecture Program Report.

The College of Architecture is at a crossroads in its distinguished existence. We have recently received commitments for $33,000,000 for additions and renovations to our building on central campus—Gould Hall. Although this puts the program in temporary facilities for two years, we have relocated and adjusted to the new location very well. The location is not without its problems: separation of faculty/administration from the main studio spaces and from central campus lecture courses, more difficult commuting to and from central campus housing and facilities, reduced office and studio space and continued separation from the two Graduate programs of Landscape Architecture and City and Regional Planning.

The primary mission of the Division of Architecture is to prepare creative professionals in architecture. Our educational focus has historically been the 5-year Bachelor of Architecture degree that is the most common path to licensing as an architect. Our accredited Masters degrees provide a similar path toward licensure for students that typically have a broader educational background from their previous degree and are thus generally better prepared intellectually to function as professionals. We have discontinued our 3-year Masters program in response to recent accrediting visits. We are working to focus our programs on more contemporary needs. Our post-professional Masters program helps us see beyond the constraints of the accredited degrees. We feel this degree is important to our personal growth and the growth of the profession and ultimately enhances our teaching in the accredited programs.

Strengths

Our strengths are a faculty committed to quality teaching and our location in a multi-disciplinary college. Although not formalized by curriculum there are many examples of inter-disciplinary academic experience that create unique opportunities for our students to work on team projects with other disciplines. Along with multi disciplinary opportunities, our minor requirements are often completed within other disciplines in the College.

Our foreign study programs have been a source of pride in recent years. Exchanges and field work have occurred in Istanbul, Germany, France and more importantly we have re-initiated our London program in the form a semester-long Euro studies program. This program allows students and a faculty member to study abroad while completing a semester of course work. In addition, we have completed two virtual studios with students and faculty from Universities in Turkey and Isfahan. These are all significant pieces of a foreign enrichment process that we would like to expand and on official aspect of our curricula. We need to institutionalize these opportunities and make it easier for the students to integrate them into their educational experiences.

The Bruce Goff Chair and the new Blaine Imel Professorship bring outstanding practitioners to the Division each semester. These outstanding architects work directly with students at all levels of the curriculum. They impart a currency, a depth of knowledge, and a sense of the unlimited potential that architecture promises. Over the course of a student’s education at OU, these encounters can have a profound influence in shaping the lifetime career of each student.

We also have a work/study experience. During the fourth year, B.Arch students have a one-semester preceptorship. Architectural offices throughout the Oklahoma City area accept students as temporary interns, agree to provide them with a wide range of professional experiences, and show them behind-the-scenes workings of an office. Students go to the
office three days a week in place of design studio. This program has recently expanded to include summer internships to allow our students preceptorships in offices throughout the country. This experience often leads to part-time employment following the semester and to full-time employment after graduation.

The new dean of the College of Architecture, Charles Graham was given a number of commitments by the University to improve and expand all divisions within the College. They include: increased graduate assistantship money over the next three years, progressive amounts of funding to address faculty salary compression, five new faculty positions and $1.2 million over the next three years as discretionary money to improve physical facilities, address an expanded shop/building lab and, finally, funding for adjunct faculty.

Weaknesses

Our facilities and furnishings are a weakness for the program. With major commitments by the University to expand and renovate the building, this weakness will be eliminated. Ethnic diversity in our faculty has been considerably improved, but is still lacking. Gender equity is similar to that of the profession, but is not at the same level as in other University programs.

Self-assessment continues to be one area of the program that needs considerable work. We have had a history of not tracking student success rates, course revisions and administrative structure.

Under the previous administration of the College, a number of committees were abandoned or became dysfunctional. Most of those abandoned committees have been reconstituted and new undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees have been formed. Additional committee work is being established within the Division to create a Professional Advisory Board and expand strategic planning.

Since the last National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) Visit, we have revised the curriculum twice in committee. We worked to realign NAAB accreditation criteria to be addressed in the appropriate courses. We also revisited course sequencing. For example, we realigned the structures sequences, which shifted the history sequence back one semester in the curriculum. Lower level studio courses are now given greater weight in terms of credit hours. The curriculum committee also established guidelines for graduate thesis committees—how those committees should interact with the graduate students, clarified evaluation of graduate student performance, and clarified graduate faculty responsibilities.

When we were evaluating these curricular changes, we utilized the NAAB student performance criteria matrix. Though we have made a series of positive changes to our curriculum since the last NAAB Visit, we acknowledge that this is a continuous process and that we need to make revisions more often than in the past.

As mentioned above, we suffer from the lack of a Professional Advisory Board. We have relied on local professionals' input to our program on an informal basis, with little continuity from year to year. A faculty committee to develop goals and responsibilities for the PAB has been formed recently. Though we are beginning to address the lack of formal professional involvement, it remains a deficiency of our program.

Presently, our faculty is small and does not contain redundant faculty expertise in most areas of study. This has led to a condition of limited discourse in areas of expertise within the Division. Strategic goals and the initiative established by Dean Graham are beginning to address this issue, but hiring new faculty to remedy this problem will depend on strategic goals, new faculty allocation, and finding suitable candidates.
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Nestor Infanzon, FAIA, RIBA
Vice President, HOK
2711 N. Haskell Avenue
Suite 2250
Dallas, TX 75204
(214) 720-6000 ext. 5872
(214) 720-6005 fax
nestor.infanzon@hok.com

Observer #1
Mohamed Yusuf Alkoheji, BSC, MSC, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
University of Bahrain
Isa Town Campus
Building 35, Room 102
Isa Town–Bahrain
(973) 17 87 6101
alkoheji2000@yahoo.co.uk

Representing the ACSA
Mr. Carmi Bee
The City University of New York
School of Urban Design and Landscape Architecture
Shepard Hall, 103
New York, NY 10031
(212) 650-7118
(212) 650-6566 fax
cbee@rktb.com

Observer #2
Ben Graves, Senior Principal
Architects in Partnership, P.C.
3220 Marshall Avenue
Norman, OK 73072
(405) 360-1300
(405) 640-3880
b.graves@aipok.com

Observer #3
Fred Schmidt, FAIA, Principal
Frankfurt Short Bruza Associates
5801 Broadway Extension
Suite 500
Oklahoma City, OK 73118
(405) 840-2931
fschmidt@fsb-ae.com

Representing the AIAS
Ashley Wilson
6821 E. Laurel Ridge Lane
Mooresville, IN 46158
(317) 828-6834
arwilson@bsu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Jane Frederick, AIA
Frederick & Frederick Architects
38 Meridian Road
Beaufort, SC 29907
(843) 522-8422
jane@f-farchitects.com

Representing the ACSA
Glenn E. Wiggins, Ph.D.
Professor and Department Head
Wentworth Institute of Technology
Department of Architecture
550 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02115
(617) 989-4470
(617) 989-4591 fax
wigginsg@wit.edu

Observer #4
Ashley Wilson
6821 E. Laurel Ridge Lane
Mooresville, IN 46158
(317) 828-6834
arwilson@bsu.edu
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Team Visit to the University of Oklahoma

Saturday March, 7, 2009
7:30 PM Team arrives, gather for informal meeting and get together at Montford Inn
7:30 PM Team dinner at Benvenuti's Restorante

Sunday March, 8, 2009
7:30 PM Team breakfast at Montford Inn
8:30 AM Team orientation and strategy session, review APR and set assignments at Montford Inn
12:00 PM Lunch at Legend's with Dean and Director
3:30 PM Team tours main campus and school facilities and Team Room with Dean and Director.
   Work session as time allow's.
5:00 PM Team meeting and informal reception with Faculty and Staff in Gallery Hall
7:30 PM Team Dinner at Charleston's Restaurant and First Day debrief-work session

Monday March, 9, 2009
7:30 AM Team Breakfast, Montford Inn and kick off meeting with Dean/Director
8:30 AM Formal meeting with faculty in Room 106 (1 Hr.)
9:30 AM Meeting with Staff and Counselors, Dean's Conference Room (1 Hr.)
11:30 AM Lunch with Student Leaders at Faculty Club
   With no staff or faculty representative (1 Hr.)
1:00 PM Meeting Architectural Students in Room 107 no staff or faculty (1 Hr.)
2:00 PM Provost Mergler Meeting with Provost President (1 Hr.)
3:00 PM Work session and studio visits
5:00 PM Reception with Alumni, Practitioners and Program Supporters in Gallery Hall
6:30 PM Team Dinner at Seven47
   Second Day debrief-work session and begin drafting the VTR findings

Tuesday March, 10, 2009
7:30 AM Team Breakfast at Montford Inn meeting with Dean and Director
8:30 AM Work session and studio visits
   Follow up Meeting with development, mentoring and counseling staff as required
   Time for Requested additional meetings
7:00 PM Team Dinner at Blu Restaurant
   work session at Montford Inn to draft report and recommendation

Wednesday March, 11, 2009
7:30 AM Team Breakfast meeting at Montford Inn with Director
9:00 AM 9:00-10:30 Exit Meeting with Provost Mergler and Dean Graham
10:30 AM Exit Meeting with Faculty, Staff and Students AOM106
12:00 AM Team Departs
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

Nestor Inferson, FAIA, RIBA
Team Chair

[Signature]

Representing the AIA

Carmi Bee, FAIA
Team member

[Signature]

Representing the ACSA

Ashley R. Wilson, FAIA
Team member

[Signature]

Representing the AIAS

Jane Frederick, FAIA
Team member

[Signature]

Representing the NCARB

Glenn E. Wiggins, AIA, Ph.D.
Team member

[Signature]

Representing the ACSA

Mohammed Y. Alkoheji, BSC, MSC, Ph.D.
Observer

[Signature]

Ben Graves, AIA
Observer

[Signature]

Fred Schmidt, FAIA
Observer
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