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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments and Visit Summary

The 2015 NAAB accreditation team wishes to thank the University of Oklahoma administration—President David Boren, Dean Charles Graham, Division Director Hans Butzer, and Division Associate Director of Curriculum Development Tony Cricchio—and the entire faculty, staff, and student body of the Division of Architecture (DivA) for their hospitality during this accreditation visit. The many hours spent preparing for this visit were readily apparent. When the NAAB asked the program to assist in beta testing a streamlined process for accreditation visits, the leaders of this program thoughtfully agreed and worked carefully with the team chair to pilot test new features of the process. The team room, course exhibits, and logistics for this visit were well organized and executed.

The architecture program at the University of Oklahoma captures the social and environmental context of Oklahoma and its surrounding areas. The program channels creativity to the students through its faculty and curriculum. Intellectual freedom, artistic values, academic excellence, and social responsibility are just a few of the guiding values of the College of Architecture and the architecture program. The design studios and lecture courses reflect a clear demonstration of these values. The Division of Architecture is one of five divisions in the College of Architecture.

Administration

The team was highly impressed with the leadership and organization skills of Division Director Hans Butzer. It is obvious that Mr. Butzer enjoys the support of the faculty, college and university administration, and students. It was evident from the team’s interviews that he has successfully communicated his values and direction for this architecture program to all involved. This skill has led to consistent messages being delivered to all constituents, which is advancing the program toward a clearly defined direction and strategic vision. A dean, who provides professional connections, a collaborative spirit, and pedagogical knowledge, supports the director. There has been a clear shift in performance since the last Visiting Team Report.

Faculty and Curriculum

The architecture faculty is highly capable and is producing a growing body of research. Students cited the faculty’s responsiveness as one of the unique features of this program. Other highlights noted by students included multi-disciplinary collaboration, the ongoing trajectory of positive change, the design-build orientation of the new curriculum, the Bruce Goff Lecture Series, and the increasing range of travel options available. The team concurs with the students’ assessment of the program’s strengths and weaknesses.

Students

The greatest asset of this program, and indeed all architecture programs, is the student body. The visiting team found the program’s students to be energetic and enthusiastic about learning. They showed a great desire to obtain a full and extensive education. The projects presented to the team reflected a high level of detail in drawing and good organizational skills on the part of the students. The team meeting with the students was a delightful experience. Students were very responsive to questions, they understood their role in the educational experience, they were familiar with the professional role of architects, and they even expressed excitement at being part of this accreditation visit. They described very positive experiences and a strong commitment to the continued development of their program. They understood and supported the many changes that have been made by the administration relative to the curriculum for both the undergraduate and graduate programs. They viewed design studios as productive and supportive environments where a high level of dialogue, cooperation, and respect exists among students and faculty.

Physical Facilities
Prior to 2011, the architecture program suffered from less-than-adequate facilities. The university made a substantial and highly visible commitment to renovate and extend Gould Hall to its present state. Students and faculty now have access to a "state-of-the-art" facility. The visiting team was impressed with the construction and outfitting of this new building. This facility is an important source of support for the architecture program.

This NAAB accreditation team would, again, like to thank everyone involved in this accreditation visit.

2. Conditions Not Met

I.3.1 Statistical Reports
I.3.2 Annual Reports
B.2. Accessibility
B.3. Sustainability
B.4. Site Design

3. Causes of Concern

Student Project Display Area
Students were united in their desire to have spaces where they could hang drawings to view, reference, and display during the design process. Faculty members and the division's Professional Advisory Board shared similar concerns over the lack of pin-up space.

Ownership of Space
Studio, lecture, and common spaces provided throughout this new facility are cutting edge and are greatly appreciated by students and faculty. However, cultivating a healthy and productive sense of pride and ownership on the part of the architecture students requires that students and faculty have an adequate ability to both "use" and maintain the studio spaces as needed to work comfortably and to produce the necessary architectural models, drawings, and creative experiments.

Financial Autonomy
The institution distributes funds to the College of Architecture. The college's dean allocates resources to the program, but maintains control of finances for all five divisions of the college. The dean also maintains control of roughly $16,000 collected each year from architecture students for the Consolidated Course Fee, which appears to go into one large pot that is allocated at the dean's discretion. Fortunately, at this time, the architecture program has a great deal of input as to what kinds of resources, programs, and travel activities it would like the dean to fund. With past deans, this apparently was not always the case—and the existing system still has the potential to cause difficulty for the program. However, this level of budgetary autonomy appears to parallel that of other divisions of this size in the institution. There seems to be recent improvement in budgetary transparency for faculty members who are planning field trips and special programs. The team encourages continued refinement of the system for viewing and tracking budgets and expenditures.

Adequate Faculty Numbers
Faculty members face increasing expectations to produce high-quality, funded, and publishable research—while maintaining high numbers of student contact hours each semester. Architecture students insist that they are benefiting immensely from their faculty's high level of availability and willingness to help whenever called upon. The dean has a plan to fill one currently vacant faculty line this year and another next year. However, with additional retirements possible, it will be important to provide replacements. The current uncertainty and instability regarding funding for Graduate Assistants is an additional cause for concern on the part of the team.
Faculty Recognition
The architecture program has created an annual evaluation sheet that appears to be fair and to provide transparency. It has also established a new administrative structure.

Life-Cycle Cost Analysis (Student Performance Criterion B.7. Financial Considerations)
Although the financial considerations criterion is Met in 2015, direct student output illustrating an understanding of life-cycle cost analysis (LCA) was sparse. More emphasis should be placed on LCA in coming years.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2009)

2004 Criterion 13.1, Speaking and Writing Skills (B. Arch) only: Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: The accredited architecture program has developed and begun to implement a writing program across the architecture curricula. Effective writing was demonstrated in advanced courses (by B. Arch students in ARCH 3543 (4543): History IV - Research and Critical Writing and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 5453: History III - Modern and Contemporary Architecture). Reading is a required component of many courses. In meetings with students, the ability to speak and listen effectively was demonstrated.

Today, there is clear evidence that teachers are providing feedback to improve student writing and are having students practice writing frequently. This is beginning to accrue results, although errors are still present in some student work. There is a new strategy in place (involving faculty workshops, writing intensive courses, and extensive feedback on draft papers) and, therefore, the team finds this criterion to be Met.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility (B. Arch) only: Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is still Not Met. Some evidence of ability regarding accessibility was found at the B. Arch level in ARCH 4755: Design VII - Systems and Content and in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and at the M. Arch. level in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II. However, student understanding appeared to be uneven and lacking in the many components of accessibility requirements. Consideration of universal accessibility design was not commonly apparent. Path of travel through a site, accessible parking, building egress, and restroom design were spotty and undeveloped.
2004 Criterion 13.22, Building Service Systems (B. Arch) only: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is currently Met. Work produced by B. Arch. students in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II provided evidence of students' understanding of building service systems and their integration.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design (B. Arch) only: 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

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: This is now Met, based on current requirements for Comprehensive Design. Work provided to the team indicated that each student was able to combine all of the 11 required elements, at the level now required, into a single project and to make decisions about how those elements would be integrated into the overall project design. Success was evident in the work presented for team review in the B. Arch. courses ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and in the M. Arch. courses ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: The specific requirements regarding an understanding of cost and financial considerations have shifted since the last visit. As a result, the 2015 visiting team found the new financial considerations criterion to be evident in multiple courses. Specifically, the team found the required level of understanding in the B. Arch course ARCH G5922: M LX Contemporary Practice and in the M. Arch. course ARCH 5922: M IX Contemporary Practice. However, understanding of life-cycle cost analysis (LCA) remains
minimal and, therefore, more emphasis should be placed on LCA in coming years, as indicated under Causes of Concern.

2004 Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

Previous Team Report (2009): 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.

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is now Met. Technical documentation, including assembly and communication of materials and components appropriate for building design, was found at the level of ability required for B. Arch. students in ARCH 4723: VII - Advanced Systems and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and for M. Arch. students in ARCH 5723: VII - Advanced Systems and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission:

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

2015 Team Assessment: The History and Mission portion of the APR is well developed in its description of the architecture program from its beginning in 1926 as part of the College of Engineering. The APR provides a complete description of the history of the institution along with the many phases of the College of Architecture up to the current program as the Division of Architecture (DivA). The 3-year effort to design a new undergraduate curriculum that started in approximately 2008 is described well. This new curriculum emphasizes coordination and collaboration among studio courses and core courses for design excellence. It enhances the program’s rigor and commitment to the natural, community, and professional environments. A similar task was undertaken in 2012 to consider improvements in the graduate curriculum; this effort was accepted by the University Regents in 2014 and is now being implemented. The History and Mission portion of the APR is very well written in that it explains in detail the progress that has taken place throughout the life of this program.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

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

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.
2015 Team Assessment: The values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation were evident in all meetings with all stakeholders held during the team visit.

The program emphasizes the principle of the "Transformative Power of Architecture" throughout all years of the program by giving students many opportunities to participate in service learning, study abroad, local travel, and interdisciplinary courses. A positive environment is maintained as students learn to work with others within multi-disciplinary courses and programs, and, in turn, appreciate the powerful place they hold within the larger scope of their field. The faculty and staff within the program have made great strides in creating programs that assist students in many areas where help may be needed. This includes the work of the Writing Enrichment Committee in helping improve students' writing skills and that of the Professional Advisory Board in providing mentoring relationships with local professionals. The atmosphere of positive learning is reinforced through a straightforward studio culture policy that specifically addresses the duties of the student as well as the professor.

The program should be recognized for the breadth of diversity found within its student body, and efforts should be made to implement this further within the faculty team, particularly with regard to the racial and ethnic diversity of the faculty. The program has made great strides with regard to the faculty's gender diversity. A system for promoting diversity in the recruitment of faculty is in place and has been carried out on recent faculty searches. The program is encouraged to continue cultivating diversity in its hiring in order to mirror the diversity of the university.

Overall, the university and program diversity policies and aspirations are clear, and many of them are posted on the university's website. The newly renovated Gould Hall is accessible for those with mobility impairments.

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

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: Faculty, students, and staff are actively engaged in generating new knowledge with, and for, the larger academic community. For instance, faculty members publish and present their research on campus and beyond. They lead collaborative courses and academic conferences with, and for, the wider campus community. The program's focus on collaborative and multi-disciplinary teaching provides a multi-faceted academic environment; it affords architecture students the chance to take architecture-related courses alongside students of interior design, building construction, architectural engineering, art, and general education. University-funded "Presidential Dream Courses" (three prior and two upcoming) have been coordinated and taught by architecture faculty in collaboration with faculty from outside the architecture program. Within the program, there is an overarching ethos of community engagement and service learning that is supported in specific programs (such as the CASA

Playhouse project) and architecture courses (such as the multi-disciplinary collaborative design projects required of all students in the third- and fifth-year studios). This, combined with other practical aspects of the curriculum, provides holistic and liberal arts-based education for future architects.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: Students in the Division of Architecture are given a unique opportunity to explore other related fields of interest within the college or university due to the requirement to minor in another subject. This requirement emphasizes the importance of the student's place within the greater university. Students are given plenty of opportunities to advance themselves as leaders, both professionally and academically, by involving themselves in the Student Ambassador Program, any of the student organizations (AIAS, NOMAS, Design-Build Society, and Tau Sigma Delta), and the annual college events hosted by the AIAS (Beaux Arts Ball, C3 Design Week, and Urbanite). The program has a heavy emphasis on interdisciplinary learning, service learning, out-of-culture experiences, and equipping graduates with the capability to function in a multitude of environments. The Bruce Goff Lecture Series and the Distinguished Student Workshops give students the chance to see how architects function with other professionals in the real world.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located; and, prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The NAAB visiting team found great pleasure in meeting with the faculty, administration, and, particularly, the students of the University of Oklahoma DivA program. Students are afforded immense professional opportunities resulting from an insightful and conscientious administration; a wide variety of professional, well-trained faculty; and a competent staff. The faculty and students genuinely respect each other. The students have full and ready access to faculty during lecture and studio time, and during non-class hours as well.

One of the primary goals of the architecture program is to equip students with knowledge, understanding, and the desire to continue growing toward professional licensure after graduation. The curriculum is structured to result in a professional architecture degree as one of the first milestones toward becoming a licensed architect. The professional practice courses, comprehensive studios, and many of the other courses are designed to help students understand and meet licensing requirements.

Professional internship in the form of the Internship Development Program (IDP) is discussed in several of the courses: students were knowledgeable regarding IDP, and many students were signed up and working on their IDP Records. In fact, when asked who their IDP Education Coordinator and IDP State Coordinator were, many students knew their names and had worked with them. The Architect Registration Examination (ARE) requirement was common knowledge, with most students looking forward to the opportunity to take the exam. Most, if not all, hands
went up when the following question was asked: "How many of you are planning to become a licensed architect?" The team enjoyed the energy of the students because they were very positive, optimistic, and concerned with their own success.

Much of the coursework taken in the architecture program introduces students to the practice of architecture by focusing on professional conduct, contractual and legal issues, ethics, and social responsibility. A local board of architects has been set up and is presently functioning to mentor students outside the realm of their coursework, and this mentoring program is an important and growing part of the students' overall education. Distinguished practitioners provide professional direction so that students can understand the avenues toward licensure and the practices available to them as they journey toward licensure and after they become licensed.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: This college has recently overhauled the curriculum around the theme of “Creating_Making,” which is effectively preparing students for professional practice. A majority of architecture faculty members are licensed architects, and many practice architecture professionally. The curriculum and the guidance from these professionals are fostering within students the ability to succeed in the global economy. The team's question regarding how many students were planning to enter the profession upon graduation was answered positively by a large majority of students during the team's meeting with the student body. Coursework in architecture has given students an understanding of the diverse and collaborative roles and responsibilities of architects and professionals in related disciplines. The Division of Architecture has a Professional Advisory Board that advises on, and assists with, program development. Architects from the region continue to be involved in teaching, mentoring, hiring, and helping fund and shape the curriculum. Students work with clients and allied professions on service learning projects and in multi-disciplinary design competitions.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2015 Team Assessment: The program is committed to the importance of architectural education and the public good as evidenced by information provided throughout the APR and in work demonstrated throughout the team room. In general, design projects engage students in both urban and rural settings. These projects address challenges inherent in our society. Work produced in ARCH 1112: Cultures and Collaboration and ARCH 6133: Sustainable Design Analysis describes the importance of the architect's role in society.
Amid the challenges of being located in the Mid-West, the program exposes students to the greater global community by bringing in visiting lecturers as well as providing fieldtrips to various urban locations.

The university’s “Big Event” is an official day of community service, where students set out to help neighborhoods across the Oklahoma City metro area as a way of expressing their gratitude through service. The Raymond Harris venture helps to involve students in actively improving the quality of life of those who may not otherwise be able to afford professional services. These and several other events, at the program and university levels, fulfill the requirements for this perspective by making clear the necessity to serve the public good.

The responses to the five perspectives were Met with Distinction.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

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

2015 Team Assessment: The program has developed, and is in the process of implementing, a detailed strategic plan that aligns with the program’s internal management structure as well as the architecture profession’s five perspectives. Goals, objectives, strategies (which the program calls “means”), resources, accountability, timelines, and mechanisms for measuring progress and adjusting approach have been incorporated into the plan under four priority headings: Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Curriculum Affairs, and Program Affairs. The three associate directors and the overall program director each oversee one of these priority areas. Specific, measurable outcomes have been delineated, and directors have been empowered to collect and track data. Some of the mechanisms for tracking data (such as portfolio gateways, percentages of scholarships, and internship placements) are identified in the strategic (long-range) plan as items to be developed. Some—but not all—of the data tracking mechanisms are in place at this time.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

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

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

[X] The program’s processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.
2015 Team Assessment: The program recently developed and implemented new B. Arch and M. Arch curricula around the topic of Creating_Making. These curricula support the five perspectives as well as the mission and culture of the university, college, and program. The program has outlined specific multi-year objectives, has made progress toward achieving many of its newly stated goals, and intends to review and revise plans in light of the NAAB visit findings and emerging student learning outcomes. The program has created a good range of feedback-gathering mechanisms. These practices include regularly collecting stakeholder input (regarding the program, curriculum/pedagogical focus, individual courses, etc.) and using the data to guide and inform changes. The University’s own internal review of the program has been conducted parallel to the NAAB review.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

- Faculty and Staff:
  - An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies, which may include, but are not limited to, faculty and staff position descriptions.¹
  - Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
  - Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure, and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.

[X] Human resources (faculty and staff) are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The program’s human resources, allocation of workload, and provisions for faculty-student tutorial time are currently adequate to support student achievement.

The dean plans to fill one vacant faculty line this year and a second vacant line next year. The team believes that it is also important to fill any faculty lines that become vacant due to future retirements.

The program has voiced some concern because, several years ago, the budget for paying adjuncts and graduate assistants was eliminated. Currently, the people in these positions are paid with funds from the three unfilled faculty lines. However, because the dean is in the process of filling vacant faculty lines, funds may no longer be available to hire adjunct faculty and graduate assistants. There is a high level of instability regarding funding for graduate assistants, and this makes it difficult to recruit graduate students.

Personnel policies and practices were reviewed by the team and found to be clear, fair, and transparent. Written policies and forms are available to faculty and staff regarding: annual evaluations; criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure, and promotion; eligibility requirements for professional development resources; and Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action. Faculty and staff position descriptions were also available. The program’s diversity initiatives were detailed in the APR and appear to be thorough.

For the past few years, Associate Professor Marjorie Callahan has served as the IDP Education Coordinator (the program is using the older term for this position). Prof. Callahan attended the most recent IDP Coordinator training program and is widely recognized by the students as the source for information and assistance with IDP. She has regular interaction with students regarding IDP, as confirmed by the team’s APR review and on-site interviews. A new coordinator will soon replace Prof. Callahan. This person will assume leadership after completing the national IDP training this summer.

¹ A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
The APR describes very good availability of funding and programs for professional development, and this was confirmed in all aspects of the on-site visit. Faculty and staff alike have access to an online platform for learning new software. They also have access to training sessions on leadership and other aspects of administration. Each newly hired faculty member in architecture receives moving and start-up funds of about $18,000 as well as $400 for the purchase of library books. Experienced faculty members have equitable access to sabbaticals; five sabbaticals have been granted to members of this program since the last accreditation visit.

The faculty of architecture regularly accesses institutional grant funding to support: travel (averaging $1,100-1,800 per faculty member annually for attending conferences), specific research projects, and architecturally based Presidential Dream Courses. Within the program and college, faculty members have coordinated their own professional development programs and provided in-house workshops on topics ranging from Grasshopper to the creation of writing intensive courses. The faculty have been increasingly successful in securing external grant funding.

- **Students:**
  - An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to, application forms and instructions, admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshmen, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

[X] Human resources (students) are adequate for the program.

**2015 Team Assessment:** The APR and the university website describe the necessary student admissions policies, procedures, and forms. Information on financial aid (http://www.ou.edu/financialaid.html), scholarships (http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/apply/scholarships.html), and diversity initiatives (http://www.ou.edu/go2/campuslife/diversity.html) is widely available for freshmen, transfer students, and graduate students. Students have access to a wide array of individual and collective learning opportunities, both inside and outside the classroom. A clear concern for student achievement was evident throughout the APR and in on-site meetings. Student development is enhanced through diverse support mechanisms that include: admissions assistance, advising, retention rates above the university average, mentoring programs, IDP coordination, provision for internships, career fairs, design/build opportunities, new programs for writing enrichment, student research, design competitions, international exchanges and other out-of-culture experiences, field trips, and participation in student organizations.

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

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

[X] Administrative structure is adequate for the program.

**2015 Team Assessment:** The architecture program is one of five divisions within the College of Architecture. As such, the program has a high level of visibility and name recognition. It also has a good level of administrative autonomy, with a program director supported by three associate directors. The program director is charged with, and empowered to, oversee curriculum, faculty assignments, recruiting, evaluation, student admissions, and transfer credit evaluation. Each of the
divisions in the college elects one representative to the college’s “Committee A,” which makes formal recommendations ranging from evaluation, tenure, and promotion to budget allocations and faculty pay raises. This distribution means that the Division of Architecture, which has nearly half of the students in the college, has just 25% of the voting power. This seems unfair, but apparently is institutional policy and is applied consistently across the university.

The administrative structure is described in the APR and in an organizational chart created for the team. The administrative staff has doubled in size since the previous visit. The APR states that “the administrative structure of the [program] is intermingled with that of the College itself” and that this is generally effective. However, there seems to be some difficulty with budget transparency, which appears to make accounting more difficult than necessary. This seems to be exacerbated by the lack of an accountant for the college and the program.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program.

**2015 Team Assessment:** During the on-site meetings, the faculty, staff, and students confirmed that they have equitable opportunities to participate in the governance of the program and the institution. Members of the program’s faculty actively contribute to the division’s five programs. The program faculty elect one representative to the college’s “Committee A,” as described directly above. Faculty members confirmed that they have had equitable opportunities to inform the decision-making process. Tenured faculty members serve on college and university committees. Junior and senior faculty members participate in program committees.

**1.2.3 Physical Resources:** The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:
- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical resources are adequate for the program.

**2015 Team Assessment:** The Division of Architecture is presently housed within the newly remodeled and expanded space in Gould Hall. This facility provides 63,000 square feet of remodeled space and 45,000 square feet of new construction—totaling 108,000 square feet. This building renovation illustrates the university’s impressive commitment to the college and the program. Gould Hall is presently occupied, not only by the Division of Architecture, but also by the divisions of Interior Design, Construction Science, Landscape Architecture, and other disciplines. This multi-use of the space creates a positive setting for learning, collaboration, and observation of other disciplines. A variety of presentation spaces are provided throughout the facility. These accommodate a range of activities, from large group presentations to more intimate discussions. Specialty spaces are also provided throughout the facility for digital learning and presentation.

Every student within the program has an assigned work space and 1.5 desks, which meets NAAB requirements. Each student also has access to a lockable storage area, worktables, and general presentation areas. The program has a requirement for all students to have laptop computers with sufficient capacity to deal with very sophisticated computer programs. The program’s goal is for each student to have a personal laptop in studios.
The workshops inside the building and at nearby sites support a wide array of “making” and represent an impressive resource to support student success and the new Creating_Making curriculum.

Every full-time faculty member has an office along with access to a faculty workroom and lounge. Small conference rooms are located adjacent to the facility areas for coordination meetings and student advising. Several dedicated research spaces are provided throughout the facility, including, but not limited to: multimedia classrooms, Creating_Making labs, learning labs, crit rooms, etc.

Gould Hall provides students and faculty with a resource-rich environment in which to learn and teach. The design of this facility embodies the values of the program and offers insights into what makes the program not only unique, but also significant.

This condition was Met with Distinction.

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

[X] Financial resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The financial resources provided to this program are ample and meet the NAAB’s requirements. However, the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation (p. 15) state that the APR must include specific information regarding the program budget. The following items were not provided in the APR or the team room:

- Current fiscal year report(s) showing revenue and expenses from all sources.
- Forecasts for revenue from all sources and expenses for at least 2 years beyond the current fiscal year.
- Comparative reports that show revenue from all sources and expenditures for each year since the last accreditation visit from all sources, including endowments, scholarships, one-time capital expenditures, and development activities.

Nevertheless, there was no lack of resources adversely affecting the program.

However, the team did find some cause of concern regarding the process for allocating funds to the program, as identified below.

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

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

[X] Information resources are adequate for the program.

2015 Team Assessment: The program’s library is located in the new wing of Gould Hall, which makes access to information resources very convenient for students and faculty. It houses educational materials in a much safer location than their previously deteriorating home in the basement. The head librarian, not only hosts information sessions at the beginning of each year, but he also makes himself available in the hall of the faculty offices in Gould Hall every Tuesday morning. The University Libraries maintain subscriptions for many periodicals and digital databases, and the College of Architecture keeps a Visual...
Resource Library independently. One of the featured databases they have access to is GreenFILE, a research database that highlights topics of sustainability and the human relationship to the environment.

The library boasts two special collections in addition to about 30,000 physical books in its Gould Hall facility. One collection is a set of Bruce Goff and Frank Lloyd Wright blueprints. The other (the Lt. Orville S. Witt Jr. Memorial Collection) contains a vast amount of valuable content, ranging from blueprints to physical artifacts and books. In addition to the current resources provided, the librarian maintains a good relationship with the college by attending bi-weekly meetings with Dean Graham and the division directors. All new tenure-track faculty receive a one-time $400 allotment for the purchase of library materials, and students are encouraged to communicate with either their library liaison (Dr. Khosrow Bozorgi) or Prof. Butzer to request the purchase of new materials.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 3 – INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

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

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

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

[X] Statistical Reports do not provide the appropriate information.

2015 Team Assessment: The institution has submitted Statistical Reports each year, and these were certified by the institution’s associate provost and director in a March 24, 2015 letter. However, the team’s review of the Statistical Reports revealed inaccuracies regarding faculty education, faculty salaries, and student demographics. These inaccuracies occurred in multiple reports.

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

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to NAAB has been verified by the institution and is consistent with institutional reports to national and regional agencies, including the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System of the National Center for Education Statistics.

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses do not provide the appropriate information.

2015 Team Assessment: The Annual Reports available through the NAAB website and through the APR include the statistical information (which, as described above, contained errors and omissions). Also available was one Focused Evaluation Report dated 2012. The APR states: "The NAAB response to the 2012 Focused Evaluation Report is not posted on NAAB’s website." Such a response was also not available to the team via the NAAB website. On the other hand, the NAAB did provide a one-page response to the 2011 Annual Report. In it, 10 items received identical feedback: “The program provided no new information from that presented in the 2010 annual report.” Three items are identified as being satisfied or having progress made. It appears that the 2010 Annual Report contained less information than the NAAB expected. Incidentally, the team also looked for narrative responses to deficiencies cited in the 2009 VTR, believing that a narrative would have been submitted each year in this regard. These were not available on the NAAB website or in the APR. This item is cited as not providing appropriate information due to inaccuracies in the statistical data.

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

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit4 that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

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

2015 Team Assessment: The credentials described in Appendix 2 of the program’s APR (which contains faculty resumes) reflect the depth and breadth of knowledge and experience necessary to support student achievement. Appendix 1 of the APR (containing course syllabi) and the semester-by-semester teaching matrices provided to the team indicate an appropriate alignment of expertise and teaching area. The APR states that, in its recent hires, the program “has focused on bringing multi-disciplinary or cross-disciplinary expertise into the teaching faculty,” and this was evident to the team.

4 The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

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

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

2015 Team Assessment: All required policies were provided to the team, either in the APR or online via the university website, and they were accessed by the team during the visit.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Reading is a required component of many courses. In meetings with students, the ability to speak and listen effectively was demonstrated. Writing has been a clear weakness, and, in response, the program has developed and begun to implement a writing program across the architecture curricula. Effective writing was demonstrated in advanced courses. This was true for B. Arch. students enrolled in ARCH 3543 (4543): History IV - Research and Critical Writing, and for M. Arch. students enrolled in ARCH 5453: History III - Modern and Contemporary Architecture.

A. 2. Design Thinking Skills: Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The ability to think through the process of design toward a relative outcome is presented by the B. Arch. students in ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II. The program’s M. Arch. students demonstrate this ability in ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Students’ ability to use a range of appropriate media at all stages of programming and design was clearly evident among B. Arch. students in ARCH G5955: Design IX
Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and among M. Arch. students in ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Technical documentation, including assembly and communication of materials and components appropriate for building design, was found at the level of ability required for B. Arch. students in ARCH 4723: VII - Advanced Systems and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and for M. Arch. students in ARCH 5723: VII - Advanced Systems and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The required investigative abilities were clearly demonstrated among B. Arch. students in ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and among M. Arch. students in ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Comprehensive design projects illustrated the fundamental design ability of B. Arch. students in ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and of M. Arch. students in ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Evidence of the ability to analyze and comprehend precedents was found among B. Arch. students in ARCH 2354: Design III Crafting Place and ARCH 2454: Design IV Materials and Making, with the application of these principles being found in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II. For M. Arch. students, thorough analysis and comprehension of building precedents was found in ARCH 5516: Architectural Design I and ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I.
A. 8. Ordering Systems Skills: Understanding of the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of this skill was exhibited by B. Arch. students in ARCH 2354: Design III - Crafting Place and ARCH 2454: Design IV Materials and Making. Among M. Arch. students, an understanding of this concept was demonstrated in ARCH 5516: Architectural Design I and ARCH 5526: Graduate Architectural Design II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: A thorough understanding of a diversity of traditions, regions, and other culturally important factors appears among B. Arch. students in ARCH 2343: History of Architecture II and ARCH 3443 (4453): History III Modern and Contemporary Architecture. An adequate level of understanding of historical traditions and global culture was found among the M. Arch. students in ARCH 5143: Architectural History and ARCH 5453: History III - Modern and Contemporary Architecture.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found that an understanding of cultural diversity was evident among B. Arch. students in ARCH 2243: History of Architecture, and among M. Arch. students in ARCH 5143: Architectural History.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found an appropriate understanding of applied research in the B. Arch. course ARCH G5055: Design X - Comprehensive Architecture II, and in the M. Arch. course ARCH 5055: Design X - Comprehensive Architecture II.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Students in the B. Arch. and M. Arch. programs develop the skills in Realm A throughout their matriculation in the architecture curriculum. Comprehensive design projects submitted for the team's review indicate that appropriate skills have been developed among all students with regard to Realm A.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: All required aspects of pre-design were demonstrated in projects submitted by B. Arch. students in ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 4755: Design VLL Systems and Content and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: This criterion is still Not Met. Some evidence of ability regarding accessibility was found at the B. Arch. level in ARCH 4755: Design VLL Systems and Content and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and at the M. Arch. level in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II. However, student understanding appeared to be uneven and lacking in the many components of accessibility requirements. Consideration of universal accessibility design was not commonly apparent. Path of travel through a site, accessible parking, building egress, and restroom design were spotty and undeveloped.

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

[X] Not Met

2015 Team Assessment: All students appear to have an understanding of wind roses, the need to consider sun-angle diagrams, and the existence of LEED checklists; however, there was not enough indication of how sun and day-lighting, wind, and other environmental factors influence design decisions. Work provided to the team did not adequately reflect ability with regard to environmental
and material conservation, or the ability to produce designs that reduce environmental impacts into the future.

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

\[X\] Not Met

\textbf{2015 Team Assessment:} The team was not able to locate student work that involved complex site conditions. As a result, the ability to respond to the site characteristics listed above was not evident. Abilities with regard to other aspects of site design, such as parking and travel to and through a site, were inconsistently reflected in student work.

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

\[X\] Met

\textbf{2015 Team Assessment:} The B. Arch. courses ARCH 4755: Design VII Systems and Content and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II show drawing examples of building egress and life-safety systems. The M. Arch. courses ARCH 5536: Graduate Architectural Design Ill and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II both have content showing an ability to apply the principles of life-safety systems.

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

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

\[X\] Met

\textbf{2015 Team Assessment:} Work provided to the team indicated that each student was able to combine all of the 11 required elements, at the level now required, into a single project and to make decisions concerning how these elements would be integrated into the overall project design. Success in this regard was evident in the work presented for team review in the B. Arch. courses ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II,
and in the M. Arch. courses ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I and ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The 2015 visiting team found the new financial considerations criterion to be evident in multiple courses. Specifically, the team found the required level of understanding in B. Arch. course ARCH G5922: M LX Contemporary Practice, and in the M. Arch. course ARCH 5922: M IX Contemporary Practice. An understanding of life-cycle cost analysis (LCA) remains minimal and, therefore, more emphasis should be placed on LCA in coming years, as indicated under Causes of Concern.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of an understanding regarding environmental systems in the work produced by B. Arch. students in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II, and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Among B. Arch. students, an understanding of structural systems appropriate for contemporary buildings is adequately covered in ARCH 3223: Structures II and in the work presented in drawing form in ARCH G5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I. Among M. Arch. students, adequate information is presented and documented to the level of understanding of structural systems required in ARCH 5133: Architectural Structures I and ARCH 5233: Architectural Structures II.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Work produced by B. Arch. students in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II provided evidence of students' understanding of building envelope systems.
B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration: Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems such as plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Work produced by B. Arch. students in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II and by M. Arch. students in ARCH 5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II provided evidence of students' understanding of building service systems and their integration.

B. 12. Building Materials and Assemblies Integration: Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance, including their environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: At the B. Arch. level, an understanding of construction materials and their inherent characteristics is presented in ARCH 2423: M IV Materials and Form and followed up upon in ARCH G5055: Design X Comprehensive Architecture II. At the M. Arch. level, information and material presented in ARCH 5723: M VII Advanced Systems and ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I meet this criterion to the level of understanding required.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The Comprehensive Design Sequence is the culminating, capstone experience in both the B. Arch. and the M. Arch. programs. The integrated approach is being refined and scaffolded through a clearly defined sequence of methods courses. These methods courses are tied directly to the studio sequence leading up to the Comprehensive Design studio. The team identified a number of areas in Realm B where more refinement is warranted. The team wishes to emphasize that a viable plan to address these weaknesses has been developed and is being implemented, and an impressive level of preliminary success in this regard is evident. There is a clear plan in place to address current weaknesses, and the necessary resources exist to execute this plan.

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

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

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

[X] Met
2015 Team Assessment: The ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects was found among B. Arch. students in ARCH 3555: Design V Architectural Making I and among M. Arch. students in ARCH 5955: Design IX Comprehensive Architecture I. This criterion was Met with Distinction.


[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Human behavior concepts were found to be met at the level of understanding required in ARCH 2354: Design III - Crafting Place, ARCH 3555: Design V - Architectural Making I, and ARCH 5955: Design IX - Comprehensive Architecture I for the B. Arch. program, and in ARCH 5536: Graduate Architectural Design III and ARCH 5955: Design IX - Comprehensive Architecture I for the M. Arch. program.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: B. Arch. students demonstrate an understanding of the architect’s role regarding the client owner and the public in coursework produced for ARCH G5922: M IX Contemporary Practice. M. Arch. students demonstrate an understanding of the architect’s role regarding the client, owner public, and community at the level of understanding required in ARCH 5922: M IX Contemporary Practice. Service learning and interdisciplinary design projects give students the opportunity to practice reconciling the concerns of diverse stakeholders.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: B. Arch. students received information and presented content in assignments and exams related to commissions and delivery methods in ARCH G5922: M IX Contemporary Practice. At the M. Arch. level, assignment work prepared by students in ARCH 5922: M IX Contemporary Practice involved representing methods, selecting consultants, and assembling teams.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: At the B. Arch. level, evidence of an understanding of management, planning, and practice is found in both ARCH G5922: M IX Contemporary Practice and ARCH G5022:
MX Leadership in Practice. At the M. Arch. level, each one of the components of practice management is met in ARCH 5022: MX Leadership in Practice at the level of understanding required.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: Leadership topics are covered in B. Arch. course ARCH G5022: MX Leadership in Practice and in M. Arch. course ARCH 5022: MX Leadership in Practice. Students practice using leadership skills in the multi-disciplinary design projects that are required in the B. Arch. curriculum.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: In the B. Arch. coursework presented to the team, an understanding of reviewing registration laws, building codes, environmental regulations, and historic preservation was found in ARCH G5922: M IX Contemporary Practice and ARCH G5022: M X Leadership in Practice. The M. Arch. course ARCH 5022: M X Leadership in Practice also presented this information to the graduate students at a level sufficient for them to gain the understanding required.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The relevant ethical issues were found to be presented at the level of understanding required in ARCH G5022: M X Leadership in Practice for the B. Arch. students, and in ARCH 5955: M IX Contemporary Practice for the M. Arch. students.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: An understanding of this responsibility was found in ARCH 3655: Design VI - Architectural Making II and ARCH G6055: Design X - Comprehensive Architecture II for the B. Arch. program, and in ARCH 5922: M IX - Contemporary Practice and ARCH 5022: M X - Leadership in Practice for the M. Arch. program.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The program has demonstrated strength in educating students in the professional aspects of architectural practice, such as client roles, project management, leadership, social responsibility, legal issues, ethics, community engagement, and social responsibility. However, the role of human behavior, the natural environment, and the design of the built environment are not
consistent over the course sequence through all years, and, although the team was able to locate enough evidence to deem these criteria met at the required level, the team believes that students would benefit from better integration of these topics in future years. The curriculum generally appears to be thorough and effective in addressing criteria within this realm, with the involvement of, and interaction with, local and regional architects furthering professional development.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The University of Oklahoma holds accreditation with the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS), with its next reaffirmation visit scheduled for 2022-2023, as indicated at http://www.ncac.hlc.org/component/directory/?Action=ShowBasic&Itemid=&instid=1642&lang=en.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: As required, the architecture program uses the titles B. Arch. and M. Arch. exclusively for NAAB-accredited programs. The programs it offers that are non-NAAB-accredited do not use these titles. All students have access to professional, general, and elective studies, and the APR states that all undergraduates in the college must "complete a minor or articulate an area of concentration" from over 100 minors approved by the university. Most B. Arch. students choose one of the four minors offered by the College of Architecture, and some complete dual degrees. However, the faculty, staff, and students in the program say that it is possible for students to earn a minor outside of the architecture program and that choosing non-architecture courses and minors is actively encouraged.

General studies are provided in the B. Arch. program and are a pre-requisite for those entering the M. Arch. program. Specifically, B. Arch. students earn 160 credits, which exceeds the 150 minimum credit hours required by the NAAB, and the university requires all applicants to the Master's programs to have a minimum of 120 credits coming into the university. This, combined with the 36-53 credits that the Master's students earn at the university, exceeds the 168 minimum credit hours required by the NAAB for M. Arch. students.

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The APR describes a clear process for developing and implementing curricular changes. The program has just undergone an extensive curriculum review and overhaul, which has involved curricular review by licensed architects inside and outside the university, in addition to review by
the institution itself. The development and refinement of B. Arch. and M. Arch. curricula are core elements of the program's long-range/strategic plan.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

In the event a program relies on the preparatory/pre-professional educational experience to ensure that students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist. Likewise, the program must demonstrate it has determined how any gaps will be addressed during each student’s progress through the accredited degree program. This assessment should be documented in a student’s admission and advising files.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The program has established a clear and well-organized process for evaluating incoming students’ transfer courses, including preparatory and pre-professional education. The evaluation process identifies gaps with regard to SPCs so that these can be addressed. The forms provided in the APR and the examples of evaluations provided to the team confirm that the system is being implemented appropriately.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team located the required statement and verified wording on March 11, 2015, via the Division of Architecture’s website: http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/undergraduate/naab-info.html and http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/graduate/naab-info.html.

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

- The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
- The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met


II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information: In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

- www.ARCHCareers.org
- The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
- Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
- The Emerging Professional’s Companion
- www.NCARB.org
- www.aia.org
- www.aias.org
- www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: All items listed above were accessed on March 28, 2015, via the Division of Architecture’s website: http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/undergraduate/naab-info.html and http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/graduate/naab-info.html.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs: In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
All Annual Reports, including the narrative
All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: All documents listed above were housed together in hardcopy in the architecture library and openly accessible to the public. In addition, the team accessed the 2008 APR, the 2009 VTR, and the 2009 final decision letter from the NAAB on March 11, 2015, via the Division of Architecture’s website:
http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/undergraduate/naab-info.html and
http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/graduate/naab-info.html.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates: Annually, the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered to be useful to parents and prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and their parents, either by publishing the annual results or by linking their website to the results.

[X] Met

2015 Team Assessment: The team accessed NCARB’s ARE Pass Rate web page on March 11, 2015, via the Division of Architecture’s website:
http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/undergraduate/naab-info.html and
http://www.ou.edu/content/architecture/division_of_architecture/graduate/naab-info.html.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)
   Reference University of Oklahoma, APR, pp. 1-2

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)
   Reference University of Oklahoma, APR, pp. 2-6

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)
   Reference University of Oklahoma, APR, pp. 43-49

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)
   Reference University of Oklahoma, APR, pp. 50-53
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

I.1.3 Responses to the Five Perspectives

The work presented in response to the five perspectives has gone above and beyond what is necessary in order to give the NAAB team a full picture of the experience of a student in this program. Not only were all five perspectives well represented by a physical presentation in the team room, but events and special programs were also linked to public websites through QR codes. This ensures that any prospective student, current student, or alumnus would be able to fully understand the program’s connection to the academic community, the students, the regulatory environment, the profession, and the public good.

1.2.3 Physical Resources

As noted in the opening statement, the university made a highly visible commitment to remodeling, expanding, and updating Gould Hall to its present state.

C.1 Collaboration

The program does an excellent job of connecting students and curriculum content by requiring competitions. Many of these involve vertical and interdisciplinary collaboration. Such opportunities are recognized by the students as some of the most influential experiences they have while in the program. The program’s success regarding collaboration is largely due to housing all divisions of the college under one roof.
3. **The Visiting Team**

Team Chair, representing the ACSA
Shannon Chance, Ph.D., RA
Marie Curie Research Fellow at Dublin Institute of Technology
Dublin School of Architecture, Linenhall
DIT Bolton Street Campus
Dublin 1
Ireland
+353-85-788-4677
shannon.chance@dit.ie

Representing the NCARB
Dennis B. Patten, AIA
P.C. Architects, Inc.
301 E Tabernacle, #206
St. George, UT 84770
(435) 673-6579
dbpatten@infowest.com

Representing the AIAS
Jenn Elder
104 Applewood Valley Drive
Hendersonville, TN 37075
(615) 681-7938
jelder4@utk.edu

Representing the AIA
Morris Brown, MFA, FAIA
Instructor and IDP Coordinator
Texas Tech University College of Architecture El Paso
700-B San Francisco Ave.
El Paso, TX 79901
(915) 594-2030 ext. 224
(915) 309-8290 mobile
morris.brown@ttu.edu
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