The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), established in 1940, is the sole agency authorized to accredit U.S. professional degree programs in architecture. Because most state registration boards in the United States require any applicant for licensure to have graduated from an NAAB-accredited program, obtaining such a degree is an essential aspect of preparing for the professional practice of architecture.
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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The school of architecture was repeatedly mentioned by both administration and members of the profession as one of the stars of the university along with the School of Fashion and Liquid Crystals Institute.

Dean Douglas Steidl, FAIA, a recognized national leader in the profession, brings a unique perspective to the college. In just over two years he has energized the college by providing vision and establishing the first-ever minors in the school, collaborating with other schools in the health care initiative, coordinating hires, and increasing the involvement of the College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) in university committees.

While representing only 2% of the student population, the school of architecture represents over 10% of the honor college students. The high caliber of the students was evident in the quality of work found in the team room and the desirability of the graduates. Every practitioner we met mentioned that Kent State graduates have the appropriate balance of design, technology, and professional practice and are productive members of their firm right out of school.

The high regard of the program by architects was demonstrated by the over 30 practitioners, both graduates and non-graduates, from Washington, DC to San Francisco, who joined us for the alumni reception.

The jewel of the program is the Florence experience. More than 80% of the undergraduate and 20% of the graduate students study for a semester in Florence. Because many of the students are first-generation college students, they have never traveled abroad or often out of northeast Ohio. This international experience is invaluable in promoting cultural diversity.

The team thanks Assistant Professor Jonathan Fleming, RA, for the well-organized and complete evidence room. It made the team’s work easy. The hospitality extended to the team was exceptional, especially Marti Ring’s homemade soup and salad. Finally, the openness of the students, faculty, staff, and administration was critical in helping us complete our mission.

2. Conditions Not Met

B.7 Financial Considerations

3. Causes of Concern

A. Studio Culture Policy – There is a strong studio culture as evidenced by discussions with the students and faculty, but the written policy was not developed by both the students and faculty.

B. Range of studio and elective offerings – The rigor and structure of the curriculum while instrumental in producing high quality work, needs to be evaluated to determine where there could be more opportunities for electives or self-directed student work. Currently the first four years of design studios are all directed with only the last 1.5 years of the graduate program allowing minimal student direction of site selection and programmatic ideas. The students repeatedly inquired about additional studio and elective options.

C. Facilities – While the facilities on the Kent campus are functioning for meeting the SPC as evidenced by the student work and renovations that have occurred since the last NAAB visit, they are not ideal. Current facilities limit the growth of the college in the future. We heard from
all stakeholders that a new building would enhance the pedagogical mission, recruitment ability, mentoring among students, and the social interaction between all members of the college. In 2011 the college was first on the list for a new building; however, due to the economy and state politics the building program has been put on hold. The program’s dedication to high performance design would be enhanced in a high performance building.

D. Faculty development: Faculty research and scholarship remains low. Heavy teaching loads and lack of yearly review of performance are an impediment to the time needed to develop research directions and produce scholarship that would take advantage of existing funding opportunities.

E. Faculty Assessment: Faculty teaching evaluations are conducted for each course and contribute to the teaching evaluation for each faculty member in the program. The university process for recording of progress toward tenure is structured and clearly laid out in the University Collective Bargaining Agreement. In addition, policies for advancement for tenure and promotion also exist in the College Handbook for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. Faculties going for tenure or promotion are expected to upload all documents electronically to a central system for review by both the college and university. Regular yearly faculty assessment after the attainment of tenure or promotion is lacking.

The University Collective Bargaining Agreement states that the faculty advisory committee may nominate faculty below the rank of full professor to a list of nominees for promotion. However, lack of an annual faculty record of self-assessment of peer-reviewed work and progress toward promotion does not build documentation as to the professor’s progress toward promotion, making review and the process for identifying possible candidates for promotions difficult. This continues to be a concern.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2006)

Conditions Not Met (2006)

2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Previous Team Report (2006): Two comprehensive elective courses exist that would easily satisfy this condition if made a part of the core curriculum.

2012 Team Assessment: This criterion is now met. The CAED created a new required history class, ARCH 20201 Beyond Western Architecture.

Causes of Concern (2006)

1. Preparation for NAAB Accreditation Visit (2006): The team noted that the program, in some cases, was inadequately prepared for the accreditation visit. While the Architecture Program Report (APR) was a comprehensive and lengthy document, it was prepared without sectional tabs to differentiate information conveniently, making it difficult to utilize in the evaluative process. The Team Room, while containing an abundance of exhibits, had inadequate computer facilities, tables for layout and discussion, and basic office supplies necessary to conduct the work. While this was remedied in the course of the visit, it posed an unnecessary distraction. Binders for each course were provided, but often were formatted inconsistently with one another. One binder containing a course description and syllabus for Western Traditions did not comply in any credible manner with minimal requirements to ensure a reasonable evaluation of this core subject matter. This binder had clearly not been reviewed by the organizer of the exhibits. The faculty in question
demonstrated complete disinterest in directing the team to the additional information needed to render an assessment of this condition.

No faculty exhibit was created. Rather, a collection of binders containing individual faculty portfolios was present in the Team Room, making it impossible for students, the faculty itself, or visitors to review their work.

2012 Team Assessment: The 2012 visiting team felt that the CAED preparation for the visit was very well done and complete. The APR was very comprehensive. The team room was exceptional in organization and display of student work, making the process of finding evidence very easy. The binders were well organized, tabbed, and complete. Plenty of supplies, tables, and electronic access were provided to assist the team. Also, when the team asked for additional information for items not found, the faculty was very accommodating in offering additional materials. A faculty exhibit was located directly adjacent to the team room allowing ease of access to review their work. This concern has been addressed.

2. Administrative Structure (2006): This is in flux. In the context of a university in transition, having established three colleges from what was formerly a single entity, a new, more efficient, and cogent administrative structure has been defined by the new dean of the CAED (now a college). This new administrative structure better utilizes limited faculty and administrative resources. It has been presented to the provost for review and is now under discussion with the dean.

2012 Team Assessment: Since the last NAAB accreditation visit, Dean Douglas Steidl was hired in 2010 and a revised college structure was implemented in April 2011. The CAED has defined college positions and has either implemented them or is currently in search of those positions. Faculty committees have been reinstituted since the last visit. This concern has been addressed.

3. Facilities (2006): While the existing physical facilities for the CAED are well served and well maintained, the team was concerned about the ambiguity over future growth, change, and accommodation. Specifically, the team was concerned about the following:

- The library has reached its capacity for its holdings many years ago. Many of these holdings need to be sent to the university depository because of a lack of shelf space. The library would benefit greatly from an area that would serve the dual function of a place to meet and a place to peruse large folios, especially those in the historic and rare book categories.

- The team was concerned about the availability of the shop for CAED students. These students are committed, dedicated, and excellent model makers. They work in any flat stock that can be cut with a number 11 X-ACTO® blade. However, some students complained that new small electric tools were causing noise and dust in the studios and signs were found posted addressing the issue of where such electric tools could be used. It is obvious that the desire to expand the repertoire of model-making opportunities exists. Some faculty noted that students were going to their own homes where they had shops available. Faculty expressed concern over the safety factor of and staffing required for a dedicated shop and hence the cost for these. Students use shops in art and engineering because there is none dedicated for their own use.

- Students have expressed concerns about computer facilities and computer technology. The team is likewise concerned about the inadequate size of the computer studio, the insufficient amount and location of plotting equipment, and the limited availability of laser cutters. The team has also recognized the students’ desire
for the availability of faster and more powerful computers that may be used for rendering and for a wider range of software.

The university and the college need to forge a vision for the future facilities of the college. The current condition is not ideal nor will it become so in the near future. The separation between the first 2 years and the upper 3 might only be remedied with a new building, and the 2000 Visiting Team Report (VTR) mentioned a long-range goal of actually building a new facility. No such mention was made in the APR intended for the 2006 visit. Rumors abound as to the future of the college’s physical configuration. It seems possible that more space might be made available when other programs move out of Taylor Hall, and the university administration clearly understands the importance of this concern.

2012 Team Assessment: This continues to be a concern; see section 1.2.3 Physical Resources for additional information.

4. Faculty Development (2006): Faculty should be encouraged to attend conferences and symposia in support of their research, scholarship, and creative endeavors. A plan and additional revenue sources should be established to support both tenure-track and tenured faculty in professional development activities.

2012 Team Assessment: This continues to be a concern; see section 1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development for additional information.

5. Advising (2006): The students of the CAED are currently without assigned counselors. With the disaggregation of the College of Fine and Professional Arts and the creation of the new College of Architecture and Environmental Design, the counselors previously assigned to architecture students have been displaced to some of the other colleges. Some students have expressed the desire to have academic advisors within the CAED who can guide them through their educational as well as professional activities, specifically in the field of architecture.

2012 Team Assessment: The 2012 visiting team felt that advising within the CAED is not a concern through discussions with students and the advising staff. Students stated that the structure of courses to complete a degree at the CAED is much prescribed and they utilize the faculty and advising staff as necessary if they need guidance. If students have non-architecture related issues, they are aware of other university-wide advising offices on campus they can use. This concern has been addressed.

6. Development (2006): There seems to be no formal mechanism for attracting financial resources to support or enrich the programs of the CAED. In a time of diminished funds for higher education in Ohio, supplementary financial assistance is clearly needed to support the discontinued CAED lecture series, faculty professional development, the Florence Program, upgrading of computers, and scholarships that could assist in achieving a more diverse student body. While a cordial relationship appears to exist between the college and its alumni/ae, the administration has not defined either a formal support group or even a program of annual giving. The extent of thinking on entrepreneurial development seems restricted to a culture of just keeping the CAED’s head above water and not to the perspective of achieving the objectives of its strategic plan.

2012 Team Assessment: The CAED hired a full-time development officer, Marti Ring, since the last NAAB visit. Dean Steidl is an additional asset to the development office through his connections to the profession. The CAED raised funding for the new CUDC space in downtown Cleveland and has increased the amount of financial resources substantially as noted in the APR. Scholarship endowments for the college have increased over two-thirds since the last visit. Fundraising continues to be a challenge in the current economic climate. This concern has been addressed.

7. Communications (2006): The lines of communication available among the administration,
the faculty, and the students remain informal. It is our hope that in conjunction with the finalization of the new administrative structure, the faculty and the student body will be fully incorporated into the dialogs that occur within the administration. We believe that this will give both groups the ability to articulate their own set of concerns formally to the administration.

2012 Team Assessment: Since the last NAAB accreditation, forums have been implemented to address this concern. The college reimplemented internal committees, appointed advisors to multiple student bodies (including AIAS and Alpha Rho Chi), implemented “First Friday/Wednesday” college-wide meetings with students and faculty, implemented “Conversations with the Dean,” instituted bimonthly meetings between the dean and the AIAS president and Student Senate representative, and blocked scheduling of CAED classes at certain times to provide more time for meetings. This concern has been addressed.

8. Faculty Assessment (2006): The team did not find any record of peer review of coursework or faculty performance evaluations. This evaluation deficiency may have contributed to complacency in regard to research and professional development among the ranks of the faculty. It was discovered during faculty meetings that there was no evidence of merit raises, therefore there were no incentives for the faculty to pursue scholarly work or research. A faculty performance evaluation would encourage the faculty to attend conferences and engage in research. The proposed architectural director would be responsible for setting up and conducting the evaluation process. A post-tenure review could help keep the tenured faculty abreast of new technology and relevant discoveries.

2012 Team Assessment: Faculty teaching evaluations are conducted for each course and contribute to the teaching evaluation for each faculty in the program. The process and recording of progress toward tenure is structured and clearly laid out in the University Collective Bargaining Agreement for all university faculties and in the College Handbook for the College of Architecture and Environmental Design. Faculty members going for tenure or promotion are expected to upload all documents electronically to a central system for review by both the college and university.

Regular yearly faculty assessment after the attainment of tenure or promotion is lacking. The University Collective Bargaining Agreement states that the faculty advisory committee may nominate faculty below the rank of full professor to a list of nominees for promotion. However, lack of an annual faculty record of self-assessment of peer-reviewed work and progress toward promotion does not build documentation as to the professor's progress toward promotion, thus making review and the process for identifying possible candidates for promotions difficult. This continues to be a concern.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being Met, the team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.)

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: This information was provided in the Architecture Program Report; see appendix 1.A History and Mission of the Institution and appendix 1.B History and Mission of the Program for more information.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

- **Social Equity**: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective 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.

2012 Team Assessment: In meetings with faculty and students, the team found evidence that the learning culture of the CAED was very positive. Students are very complimentary of faculty’s willingness to advise them on both course work and future curriculum planning. Their availability to students extended beyond just class time. Staff was very willing to help and work with students and faculty by assisting in advising and class scheduling, and helping to navigate resources such as the architecture library.
The APR contained a studio culture policy. Through discussion with the students, they commented on the value of their positive studio culture, but were not aware of the policy and stated that they did not participate in writing it. There was frustration expressed by the student body over the limited available participation and opportunity for inter-year dialogue, though this largely is a problem caused by the facilities. The AIAS has set up a peer mentorship program for AIAS members. The faculty has begun formalizing critiques of lower level design studios led by upper level students of the program, to create a collaborative environment for the different years of the program.

In the 4th year Integrated Design Competition (IDC) in ARC 5/40102, students partner with another student for a semester-long project. In the student meeting, students stated that experiences with this partnership are generally positive and that partners respect and understand what responsibilities they have. This not only confirms the comprehensive design skills of each student, but also reinforces the ability of students to work in a collaborative environment.

The CAED has added a coordinator of outreach and service who manages the ACE Program and the “Upward Bound” architecture programs at inner-city Cleveland John Hay High School and Collinwood High School (majority minority schools). The connections to these programs are intended to introduce architecture to minority high school students. This evidence is apparent in the APR.

Per the APR and in discussions with the dean, three of the last four full-time positions to the college were filled by women, including one international candidate and one minority. There is an opportunity with future hires to increase the number of women and minorities.

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.

2012 Team Assessment: CAED continues to contribute to the university community through enrolling the highest number of honors students within the university with about 20% of its first-year students receiving scholarships from the Honors College. CAED is 2% of the university’s enrollment but nearly 10% of its Honors College. The vice provost confirmed that Architecture, Fashion and the Liquid Crystal Institute continue to be the most nationally recognized and celebrated programs of study in the university.

The minor in Architectural Studies provides students from other disciplines in the university the opportunity to explore architecture.

The Florence program offers a model of how a regional student population can engage a different culture in an academic setting. Similarly the CUDC, a satellite campus for graduate students in

---

downtown Cleveland, continues to provide opportunities for collaborative projects with the community and offers a model of civic engagement for the rest of the university.

CAED faculty collaborated with other university programs including the Liquid Crystal Institute, Biology Department, and the Digital Sciences Program. Projects undertaken in the graduate design studios used the Kent campus as an object of study and contributed to the visibility and importance of architecture in the life of the university and future development of the campus.

The 36-credit hour Kent core experience grounds students in a liberal arts based education.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The high rate of participation in the Florence and New York programs demonstrate a commitment to the study of diverse cultural environments. The students were articulate, mature and engaged in their education. Preparedness for practice is ensured through a large faculty involvement in practice, the comprehensive professional practice lecture series, and the commitment demonstrated by Kent State alumni to the college. It is also notable to acknowledge three of the YAF architects given recognition at the AIA convention were Kent State graduates.

Both alumni and practitioners with degrees from alternative institutions were present at a general reception and were quick to support the viability of Kent State graduates working in the field. The presence of graduates from both coasts, and the large number of non-Kent State practitioners who support the program academically and professionally is a testament to the program’s relevance to practice. With respect to education, the students were vocal in stating their respect for the program. At the student meeting, the concerns heard were almost exclusively facility-based. Students’ attitudes toward faculty interaction, curriculum focus, and preparation for the profession were very positive.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: IDP coordinator Jack Hawk, AIA, is an excellent resource and enthusiastic supporter for the students in regard to internship and the path to licensure. Jack attended the IDP Coordinator’s Conference for the past two years to stay abreast of the changes to IDP. Evidence explaining IDP and licensure was found in the required Methods and Materials classes and discussed in numerous school-wide meetings. In the all-student meeting, by a show-of-hand, over 90% of the students were familiar with IDP, 50% had established an IDP record, and 5% had already accumulated IDP hours.

Members of the Ohio Board of Architects regularly visit the program to discuss IDP and registration. The board also subsidizes 100% of the IDP registration fee for any student who applies.
In 2009, Kent alumni ranked in the top 20 in pass rates in 7 of the 9 registration exams, according to *Design Intelligence*.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: Program initiatives ranging from the integration of practicing alumni and consultants into design reviews and juries, including the 4th year “Integrated Design Competition,” diverse lecture series representing multiple perspectives from within the profession, projects coordinated with the university architect’s office to provide a client’s perspective, and a proactive approach to Career Day to encourage summer internships demonstrate the commitment to ensuring that students are well prepared to enter the profession upon graduation. In addition, the fact that the dean comes from practice has further reinforced the already strong ties between the curriculum and professionals.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The team has found evidence that the CAED maintains a high regard for education in the public good through dedicated course work in sustainability and ethics. Additional evidence was also found in specific research-based projects of the Graduate Studio for analysis and creation of public use gardens in inner city communities. The CAED has had an impact on the region through the Urban Design Center (UDC), the college’s outreach arm, through the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative (CUDC), and through engagement with communities through urban design service.

In the 4th Year Integrated Design Competition, students share ideas of process and work in teams, where professionalism and collegiality are prioritized over direct competition.

The team also found the college’s graduates are held in high regard for work ethic, technological knowledge, and civic mindedness through discussions with multiple faculty and visiting alumni. One example of such is an alumnus who leads an annual international design competition that focuses on civic projects in the region that will eventually culminate in built work.
**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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The APR states that “Kent State University and the College of Architecture and Environmental Design approaches long range planning as a continuous process which evolves in response to external and internal influences on the institution as well as the college. Changing societal needs, professional practice standards, technologies, design theory and financial capability are significant factors in influencing this need for change.

President Lester Lefton has established an Excellence Agenda for guiding long-range planning. The document focuses on the University’s six strategic goals:

- 1. Ensuring Student Success
- 2. Enhancing Academic Excellence and Innovation
- 3. Expanding Breakthrough Research and Creative Endeavors
- 4. Engaging with the world Beyond our Campus
- 5. Securing our Financial Future
- 6. Developing and Recognizing Our People"

Dean Steidl arrived in 2010 and began a visioning and planning process for the future of the college and developed a long-range plan that has either been implemented or is in the process of being implemented. The plan includes the following:

1. The development of three new master’s degree programs: Master of Science in Environmental Design (research oriented, replaces M Arch post professional degree); Master of Landscape Architecture; Master of Health Care Design
2. Established first-year common foundation studio and lecture course for architecture, interior design, and architectural studies
3. Established the first minors the college has offered: architectural studies; architectural history; and architectural preservation
4. Expanded the Collage Advisory Board to 17 members
5. Reorganize the administrative positions within the college
6. Greater emphasis on research
7. Enhance development efforts

**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, students’, and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.
The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The new dean has the support of faculty, students, staff, professional community, alumni and the university administration. This was widely evidenced in meetings with the faculty, administration, staff, and alumni who all voiced their support for the dean and noted his calm and personable demeanor and professional accolades. Equally the vice-provost is well informed about the college’s strengths and the dean’s mission. As a national leader in the profession, the dean brings the right skills and appears to be a good fit with the mission of the college and the university.

Program self-assessment exists at numerous levels within the university and college. Teaching evaluations are conducted for each course by students every semester and are used by the program directors and interim associate dean to measure how curricular objectives for the college are being met. In addition, the university conducts assessment of course work using the Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP). CAED faculty participates in committees across the university.

CAED recently conducted an electronic alumni survey (2011) that measured alumni perceptions of how their education prepared them for the future. The survey measured education, registration status, employment, program satisfaction, likelihood of recommending CAED, and skill development, among other questions. The survey supported the assertion of how well alumni are prepared for the profession and how satisfied they are with their experience at the CAED.

CAED conducts regular faculty meetings attended by all ranks of faculty and staff. The dean, program directors, and studio coordinators regularly assess the trajectory of teaching within the college and adjust content and teaching techniques accordingly. Visiting full-time faculty from the Kent campus frequent the Florence program each semester to ensure continuity with 3rd year and graduate students in that program.

The program’s strengths are evident in the students’ exceptional work ethic and overall comprehensive approach to the architecture of high performance buildings. Students graduate from the program with a sound professional education that positions them well for practice. Conversations with alumni practitioners and the high number of offices that seek out Kent graduates confirm this point.

The rigor and structure of the curriculum while instrumental in producing high quality work needs to be evaluated to determine where there could be more opportunities for electives or self-directed student work. Currently the first four years of design studios are all directed with only the last 1.5 years of the graduate program allowing minimal student direction of site selection and program choice. Students expressed concern for the lack of time to pursue outside interests, while managing the rigors of design studio and in some instances the need to work while in school.
I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

**2012 Team Assessment:** CAED has human resource policies that guide hiring practices in accordance with Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action diversity initiatives. In 2010-2011 Kent State developed a diversity scorecard to track tenure and non-tenure track hires across the university and the ethnicity of student and staff populations in order to increase the percentage of minorities in the university.

The CAED is guided internally by its College Handbook for Architecture and Environmental Design, which contains operational policies, procedures for CAED, mission statement, definitions and qualifications of administration, faculty appointment employment procedures and regulations, and policies for reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

Faculty are engaged and aligned with the mission of the school and take pride in the quality of instruction offered and the excellence achieved by their graduates. While faculty teaching is exemplary, the teaching loads are cumbersome. Full-time regular faculty teaching two studios a semester with service assignments have little time for research and other scholarly pursuits.

Current faculty resources are sufficient and support the current direction of the program. In anticipation of master’s programs and certificates currently under development, the college is searching for two tenure-track and one senior tenured position to fill the associate dean position. Distant future needs include a search for one tenured and one non-tenured track position.

Adjunct professor Jack Hawk, the IDP coordinator for the school, has attended all required training sessions and has integrated IDP information into the curriculum in the required Method and Materials II course. The coordinator is available and eager to meet with students on IDP and actively looking for ways to engage entering students.

---

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
The criteria for rank and promotion are outlined in the University Collective Bargaining Agreement. Current policy that allows award of tenure at the level of assistant professor without promotion of rank to associate professor is being reconsidered by the university administration. Future award of tenure will also require promotion to associate professor to become more aligned with peer institutions.

- **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 freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.
  - An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.

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

**2012 Team Assessment:** Admission policies and procedures are available in general on the Kent State website and specifically on its CAED page, and include all required documentation, especially with regard to scholarships available. It is also evident from both curriculum and testimony from student and faculty that achievement is attained both inside and outside the classroom with a mixture of collective and individual learning via the honors college, the newly orchestrated peer mentor program, and collaborative learning.

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

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

**2012 Team Assessment:** The College of Architecture and Environmental Design is one of nine independent colleges at Kent State. The dean reports to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. The following positions report to the dean: associate dean, architecture program director, international studies coordinator, research coordinator, service/outreach coordinator, director of the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative, and the graduate coordinator. The organizational chart and job descriptions were provided in the APR.

- **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

**2012 Team Assessment:** Outlined in the APR, faculty members serve on 14 committees in the college. Both faculty and students serve on university governance committees.

**I.2.3 Physical Resources:** The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative (CUDC) moved into newly renovated space in downtown Cleveland in February 2010 and has a capacity for 34 students and additional space for expansion.

The Palazzo del Cerchi in Florence was expanded in 2007 for a capacity of 90 students in studios. Due to the popularity of the Florence program, the college is in the process of leasing additional space.

On the Kent campus the architecture program is housed in three separate buildings. Taylor Hall houses the administration, the library, computer lab, faculty offices, limited classroom space and first, second, and graduate studios. Third-year studios, the environmental tech lab, and one dedicated classroom are housed in an adjacent building, The Gym Annex. The 4th year studio with one oddly shaped classroom and a small print room are located a quarter mile away in Tri Towers Rotunda. The different buildings are accessed by key cards and students studying in Taylor Hall and the Gym Annex cannot access the Tri Towers with their keys. This situation limits interaction between the different year studios and informal mentoring opportunities.

Due to a lack of dedicated classroom space, classes other than studios are scheduled and located by the campus-wide scheduler; these classes are often at inconvenient times and locations. This also results in inappropriate spaces for some technical classes or requires students to lug materials across campus through the rain and snow. Students also mentioned the difficulties caused by the laser cutters only being located in the Gym Annex; in wet weather freshly cut material gets water logged during transport back to the studios.

While the facilities on the Kent campus are adequate for meeting the SPC as evidenced by the student work, they are not ideal and will limit the growth of the college in the future. We heard from all stakeholders that a new building would enhance the pedagogical mission, recruitment ability, mentoring among students, and the interaction between all members of the college. In 2011, the college was first on the list for a new building, but due to the economy and state politics the building program has been put on hold. The program's dedication to high performance design would be enhanced in a new high performance building.

I.2.4 Financial Resources: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: As reported in the APR "Kent State University has changed the basic funding system for its academic units since the last NAAB team visit. The university now operates on a Responsibility Centered Management system (RCM), which attributes tuition dollars directly to the college that generates the income. The system provides more authority to the individual college as regards to budgeting, planning, and financial control." The college receives 57% of tuition dollars per student. This is further split 80/20 to the teaching college.

As a result of this system, the CAED received an increase in funding for fiscal year 2010 of over three-quarters of a million dollars over its 2009 allocation. Dean Steidl has retained the overage from the past few years for special projects such as matching funds for endowed chairs or the new architecture building.

In comparison with the school of nursing, the school of architecture is equability funded.
The endowment fund balance at the end of FY11 was $967,211 and the spendable fund balance was $459,331.

**I.2.5 Information Resources:** The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

**[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program**

**2012 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence in both the APR and physical facilities that the CAED has appropriate information services. The library is located in the main architecture building, Taylor Hall, and was expanded to the detriment of dedicated classroom space (see physical resources) and renovated in 2008 to accommodate additional computer terminals, shelving, and seating. The library is staffed and open to students, faculty, and the community six days a week for a total of 60 hours. The head librarian and senior library associate are available for in-person reference queries. The library is tied into the state-wide information network as well as the library at Cleveland State University for those needing material at the CUDC in Cleveland.

It is noted in the APR that the budget for FY 2010-11, CAED received $32,243 for library materials, but was cut to $4,071 for FY 2011-12. This cut was due to shortfalls in allocations by the state of Ohio to public universities. In discussion with the head librarian, the reduction was done in periodicals and journals, which are now available online to students, so the reduction was not in services offered.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS
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 & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: All required statistical data was provided. In addition, there were discussions that demonstrated an awareness of the need to best leverage opportunities to improve the percentage of minorities and females for both faculty and students. Kent participates in outreach programs such as “Upward Bound” programs at Cleveland John Hay High School, meetings with counselors in area middle and high schools and through the ACE mentorship programs at high schools in the Cleveland area in order to increase the potential for recruiting qualified minority students.

Due to retirement policies in Ohio, there will also be the potential in the next several years to increase female /minority percentages for faculty in both the tenure and non-tenure tracks. When positions become available, the Office of Affirmative Action, Academic Affairs works with faculty search committees and chairs of search committees to reinforce considerations of law and methods to increase the diversity of a pool of candidates.

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.

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
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.

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The annual reports included the correct time frame and documentation necessary. Statistical information, narratives, and NAAB responses were included, as well as the program responses to areas of concern and deficiencies, as specified.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty are adequately prepared to provide an architecture education within the mission, history and context of the institution.

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit\(^4\) that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

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

2012 Team Assessment: The focus on a curriculum that balances design with the technical aspects of the profession and preparing students for a full range of skill sets immediately upon graduation is appropriately reflected in the range of faculty résumés and credentials. The students noted the diversity of talents and specializations among the faculty and appreciated the range of learning opportunities it provided.

The faculty exhibit was directly adjacent to the team room displaying the range of work by all faculties.

---

\(^4\) 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

2012 Team Assessment: The required policies were found in the team room.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The proficiency of communication skills is well documented in the Kent State program, especially in ARCH 60301 Theories of Architecture and ARCH 60922 Methods of Inquiry in Architecture Studies. There is an encouraging level of differentiation among the methods of testing in Theories, transitioning from ‘filled answer’ recitation in preliminary exams into oral presentation evaluations and term papers. In Inquiry there is a high level of involvement with critical research, as well as technical and referential adherence, accompanied by a visible progression of ability in both high and low pass examples. There is an attested proficiency for oral explanation of studio design projects by a former jury member.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 60101, Graduate Design Studio I, where abstract concepts of patterning and chaos were synthesized to develop a house project. Students looked at concepts of schools of fish, connections, and other ideas to begin the baseline of their research to culminate in the final designs.

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

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: The ability to use a variety of tools of representation, both 2-d and 3-d in order to “tell the story” of a project, is well met and clearly demonstrated by work displayed in ARCH 60101, 60102 and 60103 Graduate Design Studios. In addition, specific course work in ARCH 20601, and 20602 Computer Applications I and II specifically demonstrates proficiency.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Outstanding evidence was found in ARCH 40102, Fourth Year Design Studio II in the Integrated Design Competition (IDC), where students design a 200,000sf+ office building, including the design of and calculations for structural, electrical, mechanical, and envelope systems. Full working drawings including wall sections are developed. Evidence is also found in ARCH 40402, Methods and Materials II where detailed wall sections and mock-up building skin models were created. ARCH 30401 Methods and Materials I tests students on outline specifications.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: There is a demonstrated proficiency in investigative skills as evidenced in ARCH 60101, 60102 and 60103 Graduate Design Studios, and ARCH 60922, Methods of Inquiry in Architectural Studies. Intensive research is present in Methods of Inquiry, and appears at a progressive level in design studio projects beginning in third year design studio. Written abstracts and reference adherence are visibly required and are seen to differentiate grade in the Methods of Inquiry course, delineating between general and specific research demands within the broader topic of investigative skill. It is also evident that investigative skills are valued in studio design projects.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: In ARCH 10101 and ARCH 10102 First Year Design Studios, the format of multiple choice quizzes combined with detailed drawings and models shows an additional high level of craft in satisfaction of this criterion.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 60150 Project Programming.

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

2012 Team Assessment: Examples found in ARCH 20101 2nd Year Design Studio I in the Water Sports Facility, where the river sets up the organization and hierarchy of the plan and form. An understanding of the formal ordering system is found in ARCH 10111 History of Architecture I in examples of student papers.

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

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in the three courses of architectural history, ARCH 10111, ARCH 20112, ARCH 20113 and ARCH 20201 Beyond Western 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

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence of Cultural Diversity is seen in the syllabus and comprehension found in ARCH 10111 Architectural History I. Other aspects of Cultural Diversity are covered in ARCH 30501 Environmental Technology I, with discussion and application of differing methods of ventilation, and heating/cooling used by differing cultures in contrasting climates.


2012 Team Assessment: Examples found in ARCH 60102 Graduate Design Studio II in the “invisible city” project. Students research through the Performative Architectural principles to develop a carbon neutral vertical city that encompass government, commerce, societies, and a self-satisfying ecosystem.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The students are well prepared in critical thinking and representation.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:
• Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
• Comprehending constructability.
• Incorporating life safety systems.
• Integrating accessibility.
• Applying principles of sustainable design.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence found in course Arch 60150 Project Programming through comprehensive programming and analysis. Detailed diagramming of different sites for large-scale projects includes a range of sites from the Caribbean to the Kent State campus.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence found in ARCH 40102 4th Year Design Studio II and ARCH 40402 Methods and Materials II for both interior and exterior accessible design concepts.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program’s commitment to sustainable design is evidenced throughout the curriculum. The concepts of sustainable design are introduced in ARCH 30401 Methods & Materials. Students apply the concepts learned in ARCH 40001/50001 Sustainable Design. In 4th year design studios, sustainable strategies are incorporated into the projects.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence found in Arch 30001 Site Design, Arch 30101 Third Year Design Studio, and Arch 60103 Graduate Design Studio III. Additional evidence found in Arch 30401 Methods and Materials I.
B. 5. Life Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Both detailed analysis and implementation in design projects were found in ARCH 40402 Methods and Materials II.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills
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.5. Life Safety
B.7. Environmental Systems
B.9. Structural Systems

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Comprehensive Design at Kent State is extremely well met. The student projects displayed in the evidence room showed a high level of understanding of both design and building systems. The program hires a mechanical, electrical, and structural engineer to consult weekly with the students on their project during the ARCH 40102 Fourth Year Design 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] Not Met

2012 Team Assessment: While there are elements of financial considerations included in curriculum, there is no evidence of discussion on how building assembly/system choices are related to the overall cost/budget of a project. This is an important element of “understanding of the fundamentals of building costs,” particularly based on current economic conditions and an increased focus on early decision making related to building systems associated with integrated project delivery and/or sustainable design.

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

[X] Met
**2012 Team Assessment:** Environmental Systems was met to an extremely high degree in the course ARCH 30501 Environmental Technology I through intensive lectures and the application of concepts and analysis tools that went beyond what was required. Extensive aspects of environmental systems are discussed in lecture, and all aspects except indoor air quality have multiple direct exercises that address techniques of analysis and use.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Comprehensive and extensive structural analysis is evidenced in Arch 20301 intro to Building Structures, and Arch 30301 Structural Systems I. Arch 40302 Structural Systems II drawings show 3-D modeling, framing plans and innovative use of structural systems.

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence was found in ARCH 40402 Methods & Materials II and in ARCH 40102 4th Year Design Studio II

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

[X] Met

**2012 Team Assessment:** ARCH 40502 Environmental Technology II contains excellent examples of the understanding of Building Service Systems 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

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence found in Arch 30401 Methods & Materials I, and Arch 40402 Methods and Materials II tracks student understanding through regular quizzes that require freehand drawing of building assemblies while placing materials into a contemporary context of sustainable design showed a varied approach to gauging student comprehension.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** The technical support courses and comprehensive design show exemplary understanding and ability.
Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence is found in ARCH 40102 4th Year Design Studio II where students partner in teams of 2 for a full semester for the Integrated Design Competition to develop site, building design, and building systems.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Arch 40101 4th Year Design Studio I projects incorporate analysis and acknowledgement of the interface of buildings and the natural environment with both passive and active solutions. Understanding of the interface of human behavior and the design of the built environment is demonstrated through project analysis of public, semipublic, and private zones in a variety of building types.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Courses Arch 65001 Real Estate & Development and Arch 65003 Leadership, Ethics & Office Management show evidence of the required core concepts. In addition, studios incorporate the “client” into studio work, either through the university architect’s office or students are required to attend planning and zoning meetings to better understand the public process.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in ARCH 65002, Contract and Planning Law

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

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in all three required Professional Practice courses, ARCH 66995, Real Estate & Development, ARCH 65002 Contract & Planning Law, and ARCH 65003 Leadership, Ethics, & Office Management.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: ARCH 65001 Real Estate and Development, ARCH 65003 Leadership, Ethics and Office Management, and ARCH 56995 ST: Workshop in Professional Practice demonstrate evidence that the key required principles are covered.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Evidence was found in two courses ARCH 65002 Contract & Planning Law, and ARCH 65003 Leadership, Ethics and Office Management.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The required graduate course ARCH 65003, Leadership, Ethics & Office Management thoroughly covers Ethics and Professional Judgment. Through lectures, student projects comparing different codes of professional ethics and analysis of professional ethical lapses in the news, student’s understanding of this criterion was found.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Courses ARCH 65001 Real Estate & Development and ARCH 65003 Leadership, Ethics & Office Management include core concepts integral to the understanding of Community and Social Responsibility. ARCH 60101 and 60102 Graduate Design Studios I & II include projects and sites that demonstrate the ability to apply design concepts that reflect an understanding of how to respect a variety of specific communities that are both global and multicultural.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The robust professional practice courses provide an excellent foundation for professional life.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The university is accredited by the North Central Higher Learning Commission. A letter certifying the accreditation was found in the APR and confirmed by the associate provost.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The following information was found in the APR:

“Kent State University’s Architecture Program is Category II; requiring a pre-professional degree in Architecture from an accredited Category II program sequence: Kent State’s Bachelor of Science in Architecture is 127 credits + Master of Architecture 44 credits = 171 credit hour NAAB curriculum.”

“A curriculum proposal is currently in the CAED College Curriculum Committee to discontinue the Master of Architecture 32 with Concentration in Post-Professional Studies (M. Arch. P.P.S.). The proposal includes the development of a new Master of Science in Environmental Design. For students seeking a Master of Architecture the Graduate Coordinator will utilize a student’s existing NAAB Accredited professional degree program as the source for completing the SPC review of their prior degree.”

Professional Studies credit structure is “Bachelor of Science in Architecture 127 credit hours – Pre-professional Degree and Master of Architecture 44 credit hours – Professional Degree”

General Studies are part of the “Kent Core Coursework (36-37 credit hours) – University-wide requirement; http://www.kent.edu/catalog/2011/policies/kent-core.cfm”

Architecture electives are grouped by concentration, and elective offerings by semester for B.S. and M.Arch. are outlined in the APR.

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

[X] Met
2012 Team Assessment: The program currently has three ad hoc subcommittees and three task groups as part of the standing curriculum committee. The college handbook outlines the process for reviewing and approving curricula changes.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The team reviewed the process and evidence of evaluating a pre-professional education of an individual and found it to be comprehensive.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The Appendix 5 statement is visible in exact language on the Accreditation tab on the Architecture page of the Kent State website, with a further statement of material lists available in the dean’s office.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: These documents are available in the dean’s office, and their presence is noted on the Kent State website (Architecture page) under the Accreditation tab.

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:
2012 Team Assessment: All resources are available on Kent State website (Architecture page) under the Accreditation tab

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Although these materials are not available electronically, as encouraged, they are available in the dean’s office as noted on the website:

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The ARE pass rates of the program are available in the Architecture Program Report, which is available to all in the dean’s office.
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 Kent State University, APR, pp 1-2.

B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)
   Reference Kent State University, APR, pp. 3-7.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)
   Reference Kent State University, APR, pp. 20-35.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)
   Reference Kent State University, APR, pp. 36-38.
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A.4. Technical Documentation
A.5. Investigative Skills
B. 3. Sustainability
B. 6. Comprehensive Design
B. 8. Environmental Systems
B. 9. Structural Systems
B. 11. Building Service Systems Integration
C. 7. Legal Responsibilities
C. 8. Ethics and Professional Judgment
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
Jane Frederick, FAIA, LEED®AP
Frederick & Frederick Architects
38 Meridian Road
Beaufort, SC 29907
(843) 522-8422
jane@f-farchitects.com

Representing the ACSA
Rocco Ceo, AIA, LEED®AP
Professor of Architecture
University of Miami
School of Architecture
1223 Dickinson Drive
Coral Gables, FL 33146
(305) 284-2269
(305) 284-2999 fax
rceo@miami.edu

Representing the AIAS
Grayson D. Bailey
825 C Street
Lincoln, NE 68502
(402) 541-3752
grayson.d.bailey@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
Pamela J. Loeffelman, FAIA, LEED®AP
POB 3918
Estes Park, CO 80517
(917) 370-7273
loeffelmanp@gmail.com

Non-voting member
Jack Baumann, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Project Manager
Cleveland State University
Division of Capital Planning
1802 E. 25th Street, PS 224
Cleveland, OH 44115-2214
(216) 875-9944
(216) 551-2538 mobile
j.l.baumann@csuohio.edu; jlbumann@att.net
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Jane Frederick, FAIA, LEED®AP
Team Chair
Representing the NCARB

Rocco Ceo, AIA, LEED®AP
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Grayson D. Bailey
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Pamela J. Loeffelman, FAIA, LEED®AP
Team member
Representing the AIA

Jack Baumann, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C
Non-voting member