Drury University
Hammons School of Architecture

2016 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture (168 semester credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
April 6, 2016

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Table of Contents

Section			Page
I.	Summary of Visit		1
II.	Progress Since the Previous Visit		2
III.	Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation		
	1.	Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	6
	2.	Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	18
	3.	Annual and Interim Reports	31
IV.	Appendices:		
	1.	Conditions Met with Distinction	32
	2.	Team SPC Matrix	33
	3.	Visiting Team	34
V.	Report Signatures		35

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgements and Observations

The members of the 2016 visiting team wish to thank President David Manuel, Provost Steven Combs, Associate Vice President Bruce Callen, Dean Robert Weddle, Associate Dean Karen Spence, Professor Marshall Arne, and the entire faculty, staff, and student body of the Hammons School of Architecture (HSA) for the hospitality extended to us during the re-accreditation visit. A sense of dedication to architecture, to the program, and to the success of this visit was readily apparent. It was clear that many hours were spent preparing for the visit. The team room, exhibitions, course binders, and logistics were well organized and well executed.

The HSA captures the social context of Missouri and its surrounding areas. Students in the school are engaged in a wide range of liberal arts, social engagement projects, travel programs, and internship activities. The requirements for study abroad and professional internships, coupled with the university's general education and global foundations coursework, make the experience at the HSA special and unique. The dean of the school reports directly to the university administration and has autonomy in allocating the Architecture Program Fee collected from architecture students.

University

It is clear that the HSA holds a prominent position among the many diverse programs on campus. The university's ongoing support to the HSA is evident in: (1) the high number of faculty members that the institution has tenured, (2) the recent repairs to the building's roof and envelope, and (3) the continued support for the Architecture Program Fee to be wholly allocated to the HSA to fund operating expenses and special projects. This fee supports many of the activities that make the Drury architecture experience distinctive and unique.

School Administration

The HSA has experienced high administrative turnover in the past 5 years, but the situation has now stabilized with Dr. Weddle being elevated from interim director to full dean of the school. Dr. Weddle's skill and dedication are evident and are helping define a path forward for the program that builds upon its special mission and proud heritage.

Faculty

The architecture faculty is highly diverse and brings a wide array of skills, interests, and research pursuits to the HSA. Faculty members are approachable and highly accessible to students. They take their primary obligation—excellent teaching—very seriously. They are dedicated to the success of their students and provide them with many noteworthy experiences. Today, conscientious engagement of faculty members and the associate dean proactively identifies weaknesses and curricular challenges in ways that help keep students on track. In the current absence of IT staff dedicated to the HSA, architecture faculty members with knowledge and expertise in digital modeling, fabrication, and rendering often fill in, and they are extremely valued by students for their approachability, unique skills, and willingness to pitch in where needed. Faculty members are also highly engaged in leading design/build programs (most recently, the Solar Decathlon project) and the community studies studio.

Students

The architecture students at Drury University are articulate, respectful, and conscientious. Many are attracted to Drury by the liberal arts and community engagement aspects of the university and the HSA. Students said that they value connections with their professors and have opportunities to

become highly engaged in projects within and beyond the HSA. They value the diversity of skills and approaches found among the architecture faculty, the preparation that they gain for practice, and the positive reputation that their program has among practitioners, particularly within the Springfield area. Remarkably, 85% of the architecture students at Drury earn minors and/or dual degrees. An impressive number of students earn them in 5 years, in addition to earning their accredited architecture degrees.

Practitioners

The relatively young HSA is enjoying a high level of success among graduates. Examples of this include: (1) high pass rates on the Architect Registration Exam, (2) high-profile design projects carried out by alumni, and (3) many design awards accrued by graduates of the program. Practitioners are actively engaged in the HSA as guest lecturers and jurors, employers for the students' required 360-hour internships, and employers of graduates.

b. Conditions Not Achieved:

B.2 Site Design
D.2 Project Management

II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2010)

2004 Condition3, Public Information: *To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the* NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the* NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Previous Team Report (2010): The Hammons School of Architecture does not include in its 2009/10 student handbook and 2009/10 academic catalog the required NAAB Conditions for Accreditation notification for catalogs and promotional materials. The notification is indicated on the Drury University website. The correct language was shown to be included in the new catalog 2010/2011 but not yet available. The statement that shall be included in future publications is located in Appendix A in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation 2004 edition, page A-1.

The Team has marked this condition as "Not Met". The public information statement should be included in future catalogs and promotional materials.

> **2016 Team Assessment:** The team finds this condition to be **Met**. Required notification for the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* is appropriately included on the HSA website under the titles "Program Overview – About the Program" and "Accreditation." The exact wording of the required statement is easy to locate on the HSA website and in the 2015-2016 Academic Catalog (p. 155), which is available online.

2004 Criterion 13.16, Program Preparation: Ability to *prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of*

site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

Previous FE Team Report (2010): The Team holds a concern that students do not develop "... the ability to prepare a ***comprehensive*** program for an architectural project...", but rather are exposed to the obvious characteristics of client space needs, analysis of site conditions, and some review of appropriate precedents and building types study. The Team understands that the previous coursework of Prof. Michael McCulloch was based on a "reader", whereas Prof. Jerry Hagerman has currently focused on the text, *Programming for Design*, by E. Cherry, and that this may have led to some variance of lack of focus on facilities program diagramming and analysis as a springboard for insightful design synthesis.

Students do not demonstrate an awareness of programmatic requirements of facilities equipment as required by NAAB, most especially an awareness of FF&E at the programming stage, nor does student work exhibit "...a review of the relevant laws and standards ..." , nor "...comparative assessments for site selection, along with awareness and understanding of programming methodologies."

Student design investigations lack "problem seeking" prior to "problem solving" and a more complete understanding of methods of data gathering from client bodies, as well as "re-programming" refinement prior to embarking on schematic design is not evident.

> **2016 Team Assessment**: The team finds this condition to be **Met**. Concerns previously identified have been addressed in ARCH 467 (Facility Programming) and in the studio work of ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio). However, sustainability requirements and assessment at the programming stage are not evident, and these issues do cause concern since the lack of sustainability and site assessment have ramifications for further stages of the project design process.

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

Previous FE Team Assessment (2012): Since the 2010 Accreditation visit, several steps have been taken to begin addressing the School's facility needs. In May of 2011, the University's Board of Trustees, put in place a deferred maintenance account, and funded an initial $4 million dollars this year, with the HSA's building being high on the list of priorities. This past summer, work began on roof repairs, window sealing and other building envelope repairs. The work is scheduled to be completed in the very near future.

At the same time, the HSA's Facilities Committee has undertaken a "systematic investigation," the purpose of which was to assess the schools "physical resource challenges." The resulting report identifies the short-term renovation needs as well as longer-term expansion requirements. Work to address short-term needs is not scheduled to get underway until the Fall of 2014 and funding is not identified. Renovations to address long-term expansion needs are not scheduled to begin until the Fall of 2016. Funding for this portion of the work is also not identified and fundraising is not scheduled to begin until Fall of 2013.

Although planning has begun, the reviewers are concerned over the lack of identified funding and the long timeline for implementation. That said, we also recognize that the 2010 Visiting Team found Physical Resources to have been met at the time of their visit, although they did identify the situation as Cause for Concern in the future. The focused evaluation team asks that the School continue reporting on the progress of this work within their annual reports moving forward and asks that the team conducting the 2016 Continuing Accreditation Visit pays particular attention to the HSA's progress at that time.

2016 Team Assessment: The 2016 visiting team finds that the conditions identified by the HSA Facilities Committee as short-term physical resource issues (as reported in the Focused Evaluation that the school submitted in 2016) have been resolved and are acceptable, with the exception of the following items that still need to be addressed:

- Worn and inadequate studio furniture
- Inadequate, uneven, and inefficient lighting
- Inadequate power distribution for technology

Studio furniture replacement is in progress. Prototypical workstations are in place and are being assessed for usability and durability. Although there is no definite schedule for the replacement, the existing studio desks, stools, and storage cubicles meet this team's expectations at the minimum level.

Lighting in the studios remains a concern and should be of the highest priority for upgrade. The outdated overhead fixtures are not energy efficient, and the light color and light levels are inappropriate for a work environment. During student interviews, an issue regarding glare during daylight hours in the studios was also identified, and blinds or shading devices were requested.

Power distribution is via floor boxes and is not efficient, but it appears adequate for workstation needs at this time. Alternate power distribution through studio furniture is being investigated.

Should the program experience the "controlled growth" of enrollment that program leaders anticipate, conditions identified by the HSA Facilities Committee as long-term physical resource issues (per the 2012 Focused Evaluation) will need to be addressed.

2004 Condition10, Financial Resources: *An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution.*

Previous FE Team Assessment (2012): Financial Resources remains a Cause for Concern as the University continues to reduce the School's operating budget. At the time of the 2010 visit, the Team noted that this budget had already suffered reductions of 43.5% in the prior 5 years to a level of $76,000 in AY 2010-2011. Since then, the budget has been cut to $65,213 in AY 2011-2012 and again to $58,000 in AY 2012-2013.

The school's response indicates that they expect the recently instituted Studio Fees of $1,000 per student/per semester will help 'back-stop' these budget cuts. Phased in gradually since 2010, the current academic year represents the first time that all students in the program will be paying these fees and initial indications are that they are generating

the expected surpluses, providing a buffer from the budget cuts and enabling the School to add programs aimed at enhancing the student's educational experience.

But these fees are also being used to fund an additional 3 faculty lines which were approved in connection with the recently approved Nomenclature Change from the B. Arch degree to the current M. Arch. The School's own Focused Evaluation Report expresses concerns about the effects of growing faculty salaries as the new hires mature and move towards tenure and the Focused Evaluation review team shares this concern as well as the impact of continued cuts to the operating budget.

While similar cuts have affected all units of the University, this team must concern itself with what is sees as potentially catastrophic effects on the health of the accredited M. Arch degree program.

Although this item was marked as having been met by the 2010 Visiting Team, they did identify Financial Resources as a Cause for Concern to the extent that it was added to this Focused Evaluation. This review team continues to see this as a Cause for Concern, possibly a greater one than what was anticipated by the prior visiting team and urges the School and the University to take steps to reverse the trend before the effects of continued budget cuts is evidenced in the performance of students.

The focused evaluation team asks that the School continue reporting on this item within their annual reports moving forward.

2016 Team Assessment: Financial resources, since the 2010 VTR and Focused Evaluation in 2012, have grown through the continued collection of the $1,000 per semester Architecture Program Fee that is required for participation in 8 of the 10 design studios. Previous NAAB visiting/Focused Evaluation teams have raised concern about reliance on this fee to fund faculty salary expenses. When the fee was initiated in 2010, it was expected to fund up to three new faculty salary lines in addition to enhancing operations. One faculty position was funded in 2011, and a second was added in 2012.

Based on previous NAAB (and school) concerns, the university's Office of Academic Affairs (OAA) recently agreed to the elimination of fee-based funding for faculty salaries, with the transition to be complete by the 2016-2017 academic year. This distinctly addresses NAAB's concern regarding separating the salary expense budget and the operations expense budget, and it will further strengthen the management of operations. Since the program fee began, the university has allowed 100% of the monies collected to remain allocated to HSA expenses, with the use of funds determined by the HSA administration. In meetings with the team, the university administration has verbally committed to making faculty salaries the full responsibility of the university by the start of the fall 2016 semester; however, having a written agreement would provide more assurance that this verbal commitment will be realized and maintained in the future.

The program fee funding model has given stability to the HSA's budgeting process, as the operations budget becomes less susceptible to cuts imposed by the university in response to broader institutional budget issues.

III. Compliance with the 2014 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: The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program's benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2016 Analysis/Review: In the 2016 APR, the Hammons School of Architecture (HSA) at Drury University has described its unique history, mission, and culture and explained how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development. The HSA was founded on, and is still firmly rooted in, a liberal arts-based educational philosophy. Since its founding in 1873, Drury has had inclusive policies, which include opening its doors to women and Native Americans. This set the stage for Drury's current core curriculum: "Engaging Our World." It is evident that the university, as a whole, and the HSA continue the original mission of the founders as they collaborate to "develop young men and women to be intellectually, socially, and culturally productive citizens." The HSA was one of the three professional programs that aided Drury's transition from a college to full university status in 2001. Across the HSA's history, there have been four directors. After the reorganization of the university's academic structure in 2014, Dr. Robert Weddle assumed the role of dean of the HSA, becoming the first person to hold this title in the school's history.

Students take electives from the university's four disciplinary divisions across all years of their matriculation. The university and the HSA have developed an interdisciplinary approach to education that produces graduates with practical knowledge, global awareness, and sensitivity to the greater community —and the architect's place within it. This is accomplished, in part, through M. Arch graduation requirements that include study abroad and a 360-hour architecture-related internship. It is further enhanced through community-focused design studios and the many extracurricular opportunities available to students. Together, the university's focus on "close and personal associations" and the intimacy of the HSA create a solid base for students to learn and access the resources and mentoring necessary for success. It is evident to the team that the HSA fully embraces the university's mission to educate students broadly using the liberal arts context as a catalyst for the curriculum. The school benefits from, and contributes to, the institutional setting. Students and faculty of the HSA experience and lead multi-disciplinary projects. They participate in university-wide initiatives in shaping the university's academic plan. The 2016 APR describes the availability of discipline-specific and elective offerings across a student's matriculation, the availability of many interdisciplinary opportunities, and the ability of students to receive minors (and even double majors) in addition to their terminal degree. These additional degrees are often achieved by students within a timeframe of just 5 years.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above,

the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to, participation in field trips, professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2016 Analysis/Review: The HSA recently adopted a new studio culture policy, which was developed and revised by a team of students and administrators. The policy addresses the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct. The prior policy was available online and in the Student Handbook during the 2016 re-accreditation visit, but, because the new policy had been adopted just prior to the visit, the updated version had not yet been posted online or published in the Student Handbook. At the time of the visit, printed copies of the policy had been posted throughout the building and were available for students to read. The team found work-life balance to be evident among professors and students across the HSA. For faculty, this balance is integral to policies and procedures that value and reward excellent teaching and provide many different avenues for life-long development. Students are encouraged and supported by their professors and administrators. Through the internship requirement, students learn in an office environment prior to graduation. They are able to fit minors and dual majors into the 5-year timeframe for graduation and, when they confront overlapping class times, they find that their professors are willing and able to accommodate them and keep them from falling behind in either class.

The community design studio not only helps students learn inside the classroom, but also within the community. The HSA offers students additional leadership opportunities through the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), Tau Sigma Delta, Greek Life, other organizations and intramural sports. Although membership in Drury's AIAS chapter is relatively low, the organization does offer a mentorship program and other activities that students say are successful and enrich their education. Opportunities for participating in other organizations and societies on and off campus is quite evident. Most students experience four funded field trips over 5 years. They each complete a 360-hour internship in an architectural office or other approved setting. Each student is required to complete an approved study abroad experience at least 5 weeks long; most students take a full semester at the Drury Center in Aegina, Greece. Now in its 13th year, the HSA's competitive Spring Break Internship Program allows students to spend a spring break week working in, and hosted by, top-level design offices across the country and abroad.

The students describe some lack of transparency between the administration and students, which causes concern for the team. The general student body and the appointed Student Representatives indicated that they would like more detailed explanation regarding issues they have inquired about and more involvement in decision making and planning, particularly with respect to the use of the Architecture Program Fee and the schedule for building upgrades. The team is also concerned that, although the HSA's internal advising system is working well at the present time, the stakes are quite high for students who need to repeat a course (usually requiring the student to sit out an entire year until the course is offered again). This could discourage professors from holding a student back, even when the student needs more work in a given subject. The tendency for professors to assign high, and somewhat inflated, grades in courses could also present challenges in cases where a student needs additional work in a subject, but has earned high marks.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

2016 Analysis/Review: Drury University's policies and procedures regarding diversity and inclusion for staff, faculty, and students are published via the university's website and select printed materials. Employment opportunities for staff and faculty are publicly advertised on the university's website under "Human Resources." A Non-Discrimination Statement approved by the Board of Trustees is also provided. Recruitment, hiring, and retention of staff are regulated by the directives of the university's Staff Policy Handbook, which is available online. Sections VII.701 and 702 of the handbook include the university's Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Plan. Recruitment of faculty is conducted by search committees and is regulated by the university's Guidelines for Hiring of Faculty and Academic Administrators. These guidelines were developed and amended by the Office of Academic Affairs. The section titled "Hiring Philosophy" indicates that the university is an Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity institution. Policies and procedures related to faculty are in the Faculty Handbook, which includes chapters on affirmative action and the non-discrimination policy. Revisions to the Faculty Handbook are initiated through the Faculty Affairs Committee and are implemented by the administration and the Board of Trustees. The HSA adheres to the university's policies and procedures for staff and faculty recruitment, hiring, and retention. The program "actively seeks" diversity in all candidates. The team found the current architecture faculty to be quite diverse. Statistics on faculty diversity are provided in the 2016 APR (p. 8). Moreover, the APR includes plans for further diversification. The HSA has increased the percentage of ethnic minorities in the full-time faculty from 6% during the 2010 NAAB visit to 24% at the time of the 2016 visit. The percentage of women on the full-time faculty has increased over the same period from 20% to 33%, while the current national average is 29% (2016 APR, p. 8).

Student recruitment and admissions are conducted through the university's Office of Admissions. The admissions policy has a diversity directive for entering freshman, transfer, and international students. Initial admission and enrollment in the preprofessional program at the HSA is open to all qualified students. An application to enter the professional program at the beginning of the third year is required. Selective admission requirements are merit-based, as indicated on the HSA website under "Program Overview: Admission to the Program." Among students, the female participation of 38% is 3% below the national average (2016 APR, p. 9). The HSA benefits from the university's initiatives to promote a diverse student enrollment through international student recruitment, with a 12% increase in international student participation in the program since the 2010 visit (2016 APR, p. 8-9).

Although diversity is discussed in the 2016 APR, the HSA Assessment Plan and HSA Strategic Plan do not specifically include diversity initiatives.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. **Collaboration and Leadership.** The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. **Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed at addressing increasingly complex problems, engaging a diverse constituency, and providing value and an improved future.

C. **Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings, and in local and global communities.

D. **Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and by constructed human settlements.

E. **Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens that are able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies, in part, in the belief that architects can create better places, and that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development of, conservation of, or changes to the built and natural environment.

2016 Analysis/Review: The HSA's collaboration and leadership culture, in reference specifically to curriculum, is found most notably in ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio). In their fourth year, students engage in critical decision making, and are responsible, and take on leadership roles, for individual components of team projects while being accountable to their peers at the same time. The HSA also has developed a unique and strong culture of active student participation in extracurricular organizations that extends beyond involvement with the AIAS, which alone can be a significant commitment. Students have recently been involved with Habitat for Humanity, the Sustainability Council, and Solar Decathlon, for example. In addition, through The Art of Space, students and teachers promote arts in the city by creating interactive, environmentally sensitive, art installations in conjunction with the local community. The university's general education curriculum prioritizes investigation of global issues through its Global Challenges requirement.

The HSA culture and curriculum emphasize global community awareness and social/cultural understanding as students develop the ability to work in curricular and extracurricular activities. Drury's liberal arts culture allows students to approach design as a broad and expansive activity, which applies creative problem solving and technical knowledge to a wide range of challenges. The studio sequence starts with design fundamentals and progressively builds knowledge of technical issues and the architect's broader responsibilities. The thesis synthesizes professional/technical and liberal arts aspects of the curriculum, which prompts students to see design as the critical application of creative and technical skills to broader societal problems. The required participation of students in studios directed by the Center for Community Studies (CCS) (ARCH 417 Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio) helps to connect students with community members and to see design as an essential tool for approaching problems in strategic and creative ways. Other aspects of the program, such as the annual lecture series, are integrated with afternoon design studios. The HSA recently hosted a major symposium where award-winning practitioners gathered to discuss strategies and successes in bringing design to a wider constituency. The HSA celebrates design excellence through an annual end-of-year exhibition and an awards program juried by a pair of invited speakers. The school extends this design emphasis into its alumni through its biennial HSA Alumni Design Awards.

Professional opportunities are addressed in the curriculum, largely in MARC 569 (Professional Practice), by presenting client/practice models, project delivery types, business communication, and professional ethics. Although students are exposed to a variety of practice models through visiting professors and lecturers, most notable is the requirement in ARCH 461 (Internship) to complete 360 hours in a non-curricular internship. The internship typically occurs within architectural firms, although some students do their work in architecture-related non-profit or government agencies. A competitive Spring Break Internship Program places select students in high-achieving design practices, with 156 total placements having been completed over the past 13 years. Nearly 50% of recent HSA graduates began participation in the NCARB Intern Development Program (IDP) as students. The HSA's Tau Sigma Delta chapter

organizes and hosts a career fair each spring, and invites firms from across the region to attend it for networking, informal interviews, and portfolio reviews.

The formal curriculum introduces an understanding of environmental issues as early as the second year, although environmental stewardship is most evident in extracurricular activities at the HSA. ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems) clarifies the meaning of "sustainability" by helping students see the effects of architects' decisions on users, laborers, manufacturers, and community members. The HSA's Environmental Systems courses develop students' understanding of various building systems while also presenting energy-use reduction strategies. The HSA study abroad requirement further enhances students' awareness of environmental issues by exposing students to urban environments where density and careful use of resources are prominent issues. The work of fifth-year thesis students reflects analysis of brownfield remediation, water scarcity, building and infrastructure repurposing, and informal settlement. Unique to Drury's location, the HSA's extracurricular initiatives allow students to develop sensitivity to environmental responsibilities close to home and in hands-on ways.

After a tornado struck nearby Joplin, Missouri, in 2011, the Design-Build program helped rebuild community park spaces and advocated for energy-responsible reconstruction. HSA students and faculty took a leading role in Drury's 2015 Solar Decathlon international competition entry in collaboration with students and teachers from Crowder College and a variety of other majors at Drury. Over 100 students were involved in the Solar Decathlon house project. The HSA's prior work for the Joplin community inspired making the Solar Decathlon design shippable to disaster sites for assembly as well as being solar powered and storm resistant. Habitat for Humanity, Think Green, and other Design-Build program projects connect ethical and social responsibility directly to architecture. The Drury Volunteer Corps develops and implements community service projects with local non-profit organizations that address special needs issues, poverty, education, animal welfare, and the environment.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and/or planning process. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources, to identify patterns and trends so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college, and university.

2016 Analysis/Review: Work in this area is weak due to a lack of specific multi-year objectives, a planning document ratified by the school's faculty at large, and a working system for collecting and analyzing data to inform planning and decision making. The 2016 visiting team was provided access to the university's Strategic Plan and to a new Strategic Plan for the HSA that had been adopted in March 2016, just before the team's visit. The HSA's plan aligns with the mission and vision of the larger institution, and it is to be revised at 5-year intervals. However, the HSA plan was written and adopted by a subcommittee of faculty members appointed by the dean and had not been voted upon by the school's faculty. It was not clear to the team whether all members of the faculty had input into this plan.

The HSA lacks a process and a culture of identifying weaknesses and defining specific multi-year objectives to address weaknesses, as required above. The dean appears to be aware of this problem and noted that the university is currently developing a more robust planning process that will soon require the school to list and describe specific "Action Items." This is an indication that the HSA's planning process is part of the university's larger system for planning, and, indeed, the level of detail in the HSA plan matches that of the university's Strategic Plan as posted on the Drury University website.

At the time of the visit, the HSA's Strategic Plan did identify general aspirations and goals. In a few cases, the school's plan also indicated strategies or resources needed to realize stated goals. In no cases, however, were timelines or specific multi-year objectives stated. The plan did not provide any Key Performance Indicators or other specific outcomes that would be measured, monitored, or assessed over time.

The team did find some evidence of data collection and analysis underway by the Assessment Committee, although this work was limited in scope and had not influenced practice or policy within the

HSA. The Assessment Committee's 2015 report was the sole location where the team was able to find explicit identification of weaknesses, analysis of ways the program is progressing toward its mission and goals, some form of multi-year objectives, and some processes for collecting data. Specifically, the Assessment Committee has been charged with evaluating one theme per year and developing recommendations. The schedule for its work is: (1) research and critical analysis in AY 2013-2014, (2) leadership and collaboration in AY 2014-2015, (3) numerical and technical application in AY 2015-2016, and (4) communication and representation in AY 2016-2017.

I.1.6 Assessment:

A. **Program Self-Assessment Procedures:** The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.
- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

B. **Curricular Assessment and Development:** The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

2016 Analysis/Review: The HSA's procedures and practices of self-assessment and curricular assessment/development are currently quite weak. Specifically, there was little indication at the time of the visit regarding: (1) how well the program was progressing toward its mission and stated objectives, (2) the school's multi-year objectives or its progress toward achieving them, (3) the explicit identification of strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program, or (4) the implementation of a process for continuously improving learning opportunities. A diagram of the intended assessment process was provided in the 2016 APR (p. 18), but it was a bit convoluted and was not working effectively prior to, or at the time of, the visit.

The current process for self-assessment was put in place in 2013. It involves two separate committees that report to the overall HSA faculty. Under this system, the Assessment Committee is the main avenue for self-assessment, data collection, analysis, and reporting. This committee, composed of five faculty members who are appointed annually by the dean, makes recommendations that are then given to the Curriculum Committee for consideration. The Curriculum Committee is to propose curricular modifications to the overall HSA faculty for consideration and implementation. Thus, the Curriculum Committee carries the major responsibility for adjusting the curriculum. However, implementation of recommendations made by the Assessment Committee was not evident at the time of the 2016 visit. It appeared that formal processes were just emerging in practice, although it was evident that informal processes had been used in the past.

The Assessment Committee is limited in scope to three specific activities: (1) producing an assessment of learning outcomes associated with one of four broad annual assessment themes, (2) delivering an assessment workshop through which the full faculty can share in the understanding and assessment of the given annual themes, and (3) conducting a formalized second-year portfolio review. Work on these three topics is underway, with little work conducted on the third item to date. Nevertheless, the Assessment Committee's 2015 report was detailed and included a helpful survey instrument, which was

developed by committee members for assessing leadership and collaboration. The report also included data provided by half of the faculty (n=7), who used this survey instrument.

Unfortunately, the HSA's system for implementing the findings of the Assessment Committee requires involvement of the Curriculum Committee. At the time of the visit, no reports were available from the Curriculum Committee, and it appeared that this committee was not yet implementing recommendations that had been made by the Assessment Committee. Overall, the team found self-assessment procedures to be in place, but not yet effective.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and the teacher that promotes student achievement.
- The program must demonstrate that an Architecture Licensing Advisor (ALA) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.
- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including, but not limited to, academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Overall, the team found the appropriate dedication of human resources necessary to support student learning and achievement. The team's main concerns regarding this condition have to do with: (1) the lack of a system for recording discussions and the outcomes of meetings, and the overall scarcity of written documentation regarding agreements reached at all levels, (2) the lack of written job descriptions for faculty, school administrators, and Student Representatives, and (3) the systems for the exchange of information between students and the administration.

Despite this, it was evident to the team—through its review of work and its interactions with faculty, staff, and students—that the HSA supports and fosters a well-balanced relationship between the students and staff. There is an overarching focus on student achievement and promotion of student success. There is an Architect Licensing Advisor (ALA), who is trained in all issues of IDP and fulfills the requirements of the ALA position. The ALA understands current and upcoming changes to the ARE and IDP programs, and students said that they are receiving the information they need regarding these programs.

The APR described good access to professional development for faculty, including access to sabbaticals and funds for conference attendance. Despite the lack of written job descriptions and written policies for accessing professional development funds, the faculty and staff said that they were comfortable with their roles and the current process for obtaining access to resources. Faculty indicated that HSA leadership is supportive and flexible.

Support services for students, such as academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship placement, are readily available. It was even noted by the team that the level of academic guidance within the HSA was a great strength, which appeared to aid in the on-time graduation rate of students across the curriculum. There remains, however, a disconnect, which is cited in prior VTRs, regarding a misalignment of advising between the university and the HSA. This continues to cause confusion for many students (voiced during the meeting with the student body), wherein entering students are assigned an advisor by the university and are unsure if, when, and how they can switch to an advisor within their own school. As a result, some students have followed inaccurate advice provided by advisors who are unfamiliar with the requirements of the architecture program. Students who transfer into the program benefit from being assigned to an advisor within the HSA from the outset, but some transfer students still expressed difficulty in understanding the complexities surrounding their situations.

Within the HSA, there did not seem to be a clear path of communication between the administration and the student body. Not all students had a clear understanding of how the Architecture Program Fee was

being utilized, and many students expressed concern over a lack of transparency. Most importantly, the true/overall cost of the travel program and of completing the degree was not clear to all students, and this had caused problems for a number of students who were trying to budget ahead. Specifically, many students said that they had trouble determining the overall cost (tuition, plus program costs, plus required study abroad, plus a required laptop purchase) and found themselves struggling financially, or unable to purchase software or extras such as the $50 AIAS membership. In addition, students felt that they did not have a direct path for voicing concerns to the administration despite having an elected slate of Student Representatives from each studio. The system for communicating student concerns, following up, and reporting back to students seemed unclear to students and their representatives. Some of these problems stem from the lack of a current HSA Student Handbook.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited, to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[X] Described

2016 Team Assessment: Overall, the HSA building provides studio facilities, didactic and interactive learning space, faculty support space, and information resources that are adequate to meet current needs. As described in detail below, the team's main concern has to do with the poor quality of lighting in the HSA studios and learning spaces.

The program's physical resources align with the program's mission as stated in the 2010-2011 HSA Student Handbook (the version that was available online during the 2016 visit). The program resides in a 42,000 square-foot building (since1990) that accommodates up to 200 students and 16 faculty members (2016 APR, p. 32). The building appears to comply with ADA and applicable building codes. Studio workstations are adequately sized. Areas for critique/exhibits are provided throughout. Spaces for administrative and support services, classrooms, a "crit lab," an auditorium, a conference room, a wood fabrication shop, a digital lab, a photo documentation room, and a student lounge are provided in the building. Each full-time faculty member has a private office of adequate size, and there is a shared workroom in close proximity to the studios.

The 2010 VTR identified concern regarding the building's size with respect to supporting growth, the building's wear and the apparent lack of maintenance, and the overall quality of the space, furniture, fixtures, and equipment (FFE). The 2012 Focused Evaluation found that repairs of the building's roof, envelope, and windows were underway and that plans for long-term and short-term renovations appeared to be acceptable. FFE were found to still require updating, but the program's planned implementation of FFE replacement was also considered acceptable. The spatial constraints that had previously been identified as problematic were deemed suitable at the time of the report due to the reduction in program participants and the re-programming of existing space.

The 2016 visiting team found that the conditions identified by the HSA Facilities Committee as short-term physical resource issues (2012 Focused Evaluation) have been resolved and are acceptable with the exception of the following:

- Worn and inadequate studio furniture
- Inadequate, uneven, and inefficient lighting
- Inadequate power distribution for technology

Studio furniture replacement is in progress. Prototypical workstations are in place and are being assessed for usability and durability.

Lighting in the studios remains a concern. Outdated overhead fixtures are not energy efficient, and the light color is inappropriate for the work environment. During interviews with students, an issue regarding glare in the studios during daylight hours was identified, and blinds or shading devices were requested. University administrators said they understood that improving the lighting conditions within the building was a priority.

Although power distribution is provided via floor boxes and is not efficient, it appears adequate to meet workstation needs at this time. Alternate power distribution through studio furniture is being investigated.

Technology resources are identified in the 2016 APR (p. 35-36). The fabrication lab resources are limited, but appear to be adequate for the student population. Students entering the professional program are required to purchase a laptop for their work, although the laptop policy is not consistently enforced at the present time.

The current number of students is appropriate for the building's size and spatial arrangement. Should the program experience growth (as anticipated), the conditions identified by the HSA Facilities Committee (in the program's 2012 Focused Evaluation to NAAB) as long-term physical resource issues will need to be addressed. Renovations that had been scheduled to start in the fall semester of 2016 are now unlikely due to current budgetary constraints. University administrators explained that existing facilities on campus will be utilized to support enrollment growth and other emerging needs of the program in lieu of (or prior to) building an extension or other new construction. The team finds the following to be problematic: the absence of a long-range plan that identifies funding and other resources that could potentially accommodate the anticipated "controlled growth" of the program (2016 APR, p. 41).

The university's interdisciplinary study abroad program (where most HSA architecture students spend 5 weeks to one semester studying) resides in a 3,900 square-foot building in Aegina, Greece. The facility was recently renovated. The learning space uses an open plan arrangement, and the studio workstations appear to be adequately sized. Support spaces are adjacent and include private faculty offices, classrooms, a library, a lounge, and access to technology resources (2016 APR, p. 37).

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: Following the 2010 and 2012 NAAB evaluations, the $1,000 per semester Architecture Program Fee has been fully and continually paid by students enrolled in 8 of the 10 design studios and has become a more stable funding solution for the school. The fee has generated sufficient funds to maintain and/or expand programs that supplement student coursework. It has supported the purchase of new digital output technology, and the financing of faculty/student research, lecture series, field trips, HSA-specific marketing and enrollment efforts, and other operational needs. In the past, the fee was also used to fund one full-time and one visiting professor. HSA and university administrators emphasized to the 2016 visiting team that, since the inception of the program fee, 100% of the funds generated have been allotted to the HSA to use at its discretion. Furthermore, as of fall 2016, the fee is not expected to fund faculty lines or improvements to the physical facility. University administrators said they understood that improving the lighting conditions within the school was a priority.

The university determines salary lines and amounts, with individual salaries being determined at the time of hiring and standard adjustments being made following promotion. The faculty and staff had not

received raises for the 5 years preceding this team's visit. The vast majority of HSA faculty members are tenured and have good access to professional development funds and sabbaticals. The lack of a written policy regarding these items has not caused problems, according to faculty members during this team's meeting with them.

With the new organizational structure (elevating the former director to dean status) that was implemented in 2015, HSA leadership now has greater input regarding these salary lines through consultation with the Office of Academic Affairs. HSA funding is allocated through an annual budget from the OAA based on tuition and fee revenues in response to budget requests made by the HSA dean. In past years, HSA budget lines have been divided between: (1) salary expenses, and (2) operations expenses primarily funded through the Architecture Program Fee. Since the program fee was imposed, the university has kept 100% of the fee-based revenue allocated toward funding HSA expenses, and the university has also allowed the program to roll annual surpluses into reserve funds available for special projects. The administration has verbally agreed that the program fee will not be used for faculty salaries after the start of the fall 2016 semester. The university administration has verbally committed, in meetings with this team, to making faculty salaries the full responsibility of the university, although a written agreement would provide more assurance that this will remain the case.

Budgetary constraints led to a university-wide announcement that 12 faculty members at the institution will not be re-hired for the upcoming year. Two of these non-reappointments were to include HSA faculty. At the time of the visit, alternative funding had been located for just one of these positions (the half-year visiting professor), but one non-tenured faculty member faced probable layoff despite having reached the length of time-in-service needed for making an application for tenure.

The current university president (who met the team) will be retiring in May 2016. The announcement of a new president was made shortly after the visit. Current and past leaders of the university (Drury OAA) showed strong commitment to the HSA program. Drury's architecture program appears to be a highly distinctive program at the university. It is described as a primary driver of international and extra-regional (i.e., far-domestic) enrollment.

Regarding other financial resources and expenditures, collaborative student-faculty research and design-build activities benefit from major outside funding. The TKF Foundation awarded a $585,000 grant to a Drury-led team to explore the design and construction of a memorial Butterfly Garden and Overlook at Cunningham Park in Joplin, Missouri, following the 2011 tornado. That grant provided hands-on, design-build experience to Drury architecture students, as well as students from other university fields. Funds for special projects and expenses associated with the 2015 HSA Solar Decathlon Team were provided by the U.S. Department of Energy, supplemented by funds raised by faculty members totaling over $450,000. The HSA's CCS is largely self-sustaining and brings in $3,000 to $7,000 per studio project from the various communities and non-profit organizations it serves. This money is used exclusively to support the activities and projects of the CCS.

In addition to funds directly provided to the HSA (noted above), other university divisions contribute to the architecture program through their own budgets, including academic departments that heavily serve HSA students. These include Physics, Art/Art History, and the Drury Core general curriculum. The HSA also benefits indirectly from funding to non-academic campus departments/programs, including residence life, first-year experience, facilities and grounds, computer services, campus recreation, campus clinic and wellness programs, counseling, and career services.

Architecture students receive additional support in the form of scholarships and grants. The HSA's NAAB statistical report (AY 2013-2014) indicated that 87% of architecture majors received institutional grants from the Drury Office of Financial Aid. Twenty-one percent of majors received federal grants, 27% of majors received state and/or local grants, and almost 60% of majors received student loans. HSA students compete for annual scholarships, including the Alan Bates Scholarship and the B.J. Glazier Scholarship. Students are also eligible to receive scholarships from sources that include AIA Springfield,

AIA St. Louis, AIA Mid-Missouri, the Springfield Contractors Association, and the National Association of Women in Construction Springfield Chapter.

The HSA has encountered enrollment declines in recent years, which is consistent with many architecture programs as the recession, declines in national graduation, and other factors have caused high school students and their families to question the long-term viability of architecture careers. In response to this, the program has collaborated with the Drury admissions and marketing-communication staff to more clearly articulate the distinctive nature of the HSA program as one of the few liberal arts-based professional architecture programs in the nation. At the university level, enrollment has declined, which reflects regional demographic shifts as well as pressures that are affecting most private liberal-arts institutions.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[X] Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: It is evident to the team that access to literature, visual information, digital information, and support staff is adequate for students, faculty, and staff. Support staff and the architectural collection containing more than 20,000 volumes are both housed in the campus library, which is a short walk from the HSA. Funding for library resources and staff has been reduced in recent years, in part due to the greater integration of technology within the library and access to digital resources beyond the university. Although stress is apparent due to decreased funding and the decreased number of library staff, services remain adequate for an accredited architecture program. The HSA is working to leverage the resources allocated and to continue to build upon them.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and the school, college, and institution.
- **Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[X] Described

2016 Team Assessment: Although, at the time of the visit, specific job descriptions were not available for any employees other than the HSA's administrative assistant, the 14-15 Faculty Handbook for Drury University does describe the institution's overarching structure of governance and identifies the governance roles that faculty, staff, and students are expected to take. The 2016 APR describes governance roles that are specific to the program and identifies how the school's governance relates to that of the larger institution. Specifically, the organizational charts provided in the APR (p. 45) identify administrative structures and relationships among key personnel within Drury University and the HSA.

An outdated (2010-2011) Student Handbook was available at the time of the visit. An updated version is currently under development, but was not yet available to students or the visiting team. This document will help communicate to students their role in governance.

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: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing, and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

A.1 **Professional Communication Skills:** *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 253 (Theories of Architecture), ARCH 427 (Professional Communication), and MARC 557 (Architecture Seminar). Communication skills were evident in several courses across the curriculum in the form of critical essays, case study presentations, and studio project documentation.

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

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V), ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), and MARC 521 (Architectural Design X: Thesis Studio).

A.3 **Investigative Skills:** *Ability* to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio), MARC 520 (Architectural Design IX: Exploration), and MARC 557 (Architecture Seminar).

A.4 **Architectural Design Skills:** *Ability* to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 213 (Architectural Design III) and ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V). Architectural design skills were evident in studio work (see SPC B.2 regarding the detailed application of environmental principles).

A.5 **Ordering Systems:** *Ability* to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 112 (Architectural Design II) and ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V). The ability to apply ordering systems was evident in the work of several studios (see SPC B.2 regarding the detailed application of natural ordering systems).

A.6 **Use of Precedents:** *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V), ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), and MARC 521 (Architectural Design X: Thesis Studio).

A.7 **History and Culture:** *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 251 (History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism I), ARCH 252 (History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism II), and ARCH 456/458 (Culture and Place). A clear understanding of history and culture was evident in the form of critical essays, research assignments, and examinations.

A.8 **Cultural Diversity and Social Equity:** *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 251 (History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism I), ARCH 252 (History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism II), and ARCH 456/458 (Culture and Place). A clear understanding of cultural diversity and general social equity was evident in the form of critical essays, research assignments, and examinations. Although the ability to integrate equity of access into buildings and structures was apparent in standalone research on the topic, the ability to integrate these concerns into more complex design

solutions was not clearly evident (therefore, see SPC B.2 regarding the integration of access into design solutions).

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Overall, the requirements outlined in Realm A were apparent throughout the coursework reviewed by the team. The integration of critical thinking and representation was noticeable not only in the architecture-specific curriculum, but also in the Drury general studies curriculum, occurring outside of the architecture program, which is dedicated to "engaging our world." In addition, the team saw evidence of Realm A skills woven into the extracurricular activities available to students, such as Art of Space, Solar Decathlon, Habitat for Humanity, and various design-build projects.

The HSA curriculum expressly focuses on broadly educating students in "comprehending people, place, and context" and in recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society. The foundation for these requirements is firmly seated in first-year programming, which includes the history of art, architecture, and urbanism. These themes continue throughout the 5-year matriculation at Drury via studio work, study abroad, and internships.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately.

B.1 **Pre-Design:** *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio) and ARCH 467 (Facility Programming). Concerns previously identified in the 2010 VTR (p. 18) have been addressed in ARCH 467 and are evident in the studio work from ARCH 417. However, the review of "relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project" was often lacking at the programming stage, and this led to weaknesses in environment-related decision making at later stages of complex projects (as identified in SPC B.2).

B.2 **Site Design:** *Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation in the development of a project design.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Although the team looked for evidence of student achievement in site design in work prepared for ARCH 213 (Architectural Design III), ARCH 214 (Architectural Design IV), ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V), ARCH 334 (Structures II), and ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), the team did not find evidence of achievement at the prescribed level. Specifically, the work did not adequately illustrate the ability to respond effectively to site characteristics, particularly regarding social equity/site accessibility, site/building integration, building orientation, and environmental sustainability. Students' site design work reflected some response to context, topography, ecology, and climate, but in abstract and superficial ways (e.g., isolated course assignments). Examples of work were not at the level of complexity and integration required for this SCP.

B.3 **Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio). Projects reviewed illustrated an ability to incorporate codes and standards into the design. Life-safety diagrams, egress calculations, and isolated assignments concerning building accessibility standards and design elements are illustrated in student work prepared for MARC 519.

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

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 315 (Architectural Design V), ARCH 427 (Professional Communication), and MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio). Technical drawing and specification is found in classwork for ARCH 427. Projects reviewed for ARCH 315 and MARC 519 utilize digital models to illustrate the assembly of materials, systems, and components.

B.5 **Structural Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 234 (Structures I), ARCH 334 (Structures II), MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio), and MARC 539 (Structures III). Structural coursework and examinations in ARCH 234, ARCH 334, and MARC 539 collectively illustrate student ability in basic structural systems and associated force resistance. Projects reviewed from MARC 519 illustrate the integration of basic structural systems into building design graphically.

B.6 **Environmental Systems:** *Understanding* of the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 335 (Environmental Systems I), MARC 538 (Environmental Systems II), and ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems). Isolated assignments and examinations in ARCH 335, MARC 538, and ARCH 233 illustrate an ability in principles of environmental design/systems.

B.7 **Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems), MARC 538 (Environmental Systems II), and MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio). Isolated assignments and examinations in ARCH 233 and MARC 538 illustrate student ability in basic principles of building envelope design. Projects reviewed from MARC 519 illustrate material/envelope development with regard to aesthetics only graphically.

B.8 **Building Materials and Assemblies:** *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems) and ARCH 427 (Professional Communication). Isolated assignments and examinations in ARCH 233 and ARCH 427 illustrate student ability in basic principles of building material selection. However, environmental impact, including material reuse, is not evident and is an area of concern since it is a component of sustainable design (see SPC B.2 regarding the detailed application of environmental principles).

B.9 **Building Service Systems:** *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 335 (Environmental Systems I), MARC 538 (Environmental Systems II), and ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems). Isolated assignments and examinations in ARCH 335, MARC 538, and ARCH 233 illustrate an understanding of basic principles of building services.

B.10 **Financial Considerations:** *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 233 (Introduction to Building Systems). Isolated assignments and examinations in ARCH 233 illustrate an understanding of the fundamentals of building costs.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The components of Realm B are most evident in isolated coursework assignments or examinations. Limited evidence is present for the incorporation of these principles into studio work. The team regards B.2 Site Design to be Not Met. A review of projects did not indicate an appropriate degree of site analysis and response relative to accessibility, climate, and environmental sustainability. An area of concern is sustainable design at all phases of project development.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Comprehending the importance of research pursuits to inform the design process.
- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.
- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.
- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1 **Research:** *Understanding* of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 557 (Architecture Seminar), ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), and MARC 521 (Architectural Design X: Thesis Studio).

C.2 **Evaluation and Decision Making:** *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio), and MARC 521 (Architectural Design X: Thesis Studio).

C.3 **Integrative Design:** *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 519 (Architectural Design VIII: Comprehensive Studio), ARCH 417 (Architectural Design VII: Community Studies Studio), ARC 233 (Introduction to Building Systems), and ARCH 427 (Professional Communication).

Realm C. General Team Commentary: All sub-categories of Realm C are Met. The ability of the students to articulate information broadly is sufficiently evident in the work that the team viewed in the

Comprehensive Studio, Thesis, and Architecture Seminar courses. However, in the Comprehensive Studio course, analysis was sufficient but not effectively used by all students to inform their design decisions. Our concerns specifically relate to site orientation and site integration (therefore, see SPC B.2 regarding the detailed application of environmental principles).

Realm D: Professional Practice: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1 **Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect, and other key stakeholders, such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment, and understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice) in both assignments and examinations.

D.2 **Project Management:** *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

[X] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Partial evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice). The importance of project management and the role of a project manager are clearly addressed, as well as project delivery methods and when they should be recommended. However, an understanding of assembling consultant teams (who typically work with an architect), and identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements is not evident in the student work.

D.3 **Business Practices:** *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm, including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice) in both assignments and examinations. A project assignment asks students to design and brand a firm. Although firm structure, marketing, and entrepreneurship are clearly indicated, financial management and business planning do not appear in detail in the work. One examination does address the annual budgeting of a hypothetical firm. Although their relation to firm management and the future of the business plan is weak, these principles are evident at the level of understanding in the work.

D.4 **Legal Responsibilities:** *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice) in both assignments and examinations.

D.5 **Professional Ethics:** *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for MARC 569 (Professional Practice) in both assignments and examinations.

Realm D. General Team Commentary: MARC 569 (Professional Practice) addresses most of the Realm D criteria through a combination of content delivery methods that includes lectures, assignments, and examinations. The team finds SPC D.2 to be Not Met. Some aspects of D.2 are present, but not all. Specifically, an understanding of project management (for D.2) is ensured and tested with respect to the role of a project manager and the differing construction methods regarding how projects can be delivered and why. Other aspects of D.2 that should be understood, however—such as selecting consultants and assembling project teams, and identifying project work plans, project schedules, and time requirements—are not evident in the curriculum content or in the student work.

In the 2010 VTR, there were concerns that 3.1.4 Architectural Education and the Profession did not illuminate the diversity of practice in various building-type specialties, the opportunities available in government roles, and the allied specialties as consultants. In an earlier APR's "Program Activities in Response (2010-2015)," the program indicated that "the number of large responsibilities for this course [MARC 569] do not allow it to describe in-depth the many related fields open to graduates of architecture programs. However, the program emphasizes this diversity of potential career paths in a variety of other ways." Although this may be the case regarding internships, the Community Studies Studio course, the lecture series speakers, and the completion of double majors and/or minors in other fields, it is not evident or ensured that all students attain this understanding.

The 2016 visiting team noted an apparent lack of understanding in student project work related to planning, project schedules, and time requirements, which led the team to identify SPC D.2 as being Not Met. D.3 has been indicated as Met even though financial management and business planning were addressed rather minimally in the content, assignments, and examinations of the courses.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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).
2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The APR included an official letter of affiliation from the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The 2016 APR (p. 5) provides the following summary: "The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools has continuously accredited the university since 1915. Drury received a ten-year Reaffirmation of Accreditation in 2011."

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch, M. Arch, and/or D. Arch are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch, M. Arch, or D. Arch for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The exact wording of the required text is publically available and easy to locate on the HSA's official website. The M. Arch title is used exclusively for the school's NAAB-accredited professional degree program. The minimum number of credit hours for the M. Arch designation is met. This includes 168 semester credit hours, which the 2016 APR (p. 48) notes include: 55 credit hours of General Studies (NAAB requires a minimum of 45); 15 credit hours of Optional Studies (NAAB requires a minimum of 10); 113 credit hours of Professional Studies (there is no minimum NAAB requirement); 132 credit hours of Undergraduate Credits (again, there is no minimum NAAB requirement); and 36 credit hours of Graduate Credits (NAAB requires a minimum of 30). The curriculum provides sufficient flexibility to allow students to pursue special interests either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking elective/optional courses within the architecture program.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB Student Performance Criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event that a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain SPC, the program must demonstrate that it has established standards for ensuring these SPC are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: The HSA has a clear and consistent process for evaluating the prior academic coursework of transfer students, for verifying that NAAB standards have been met, for identifying any gaps that exist, and for communicating the implications of transfer credits on the students' length of time and path to graduation. The process is described in the 2106 APR (p. 49). With the increase in the number of transfer students and the increasing complexity of the scenarios they present, this area will require continued development.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This statement can be found on the university's Hammons School of Architecture website on the "Program Overview/About the Architecture Program" link, as well as on the "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents" link.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The Conditions for Accreditation in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Access to this information can be found on the university's Hammons School of Architecture website on the "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents" link.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Access to this information can be found on the university's "Career Planning & Development" link (under the "Life at Drury" tab). It is also accessible on the Hammons School of Architecture website by following the "Resources" link to "Student Resources/Career & Internships/NCARB," then clicking "Student Resources/Professional Internship Form," and then clicking "Job Internships."

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.[1]

[1] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Access to this information can be found on the university's Hammons School of Architecture website on the "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents" link.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: This condition is **Met with Distinction.** Access to this information can be found on the university's Hammons School of Architecture website on the "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents" link.

II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions.
- Admissions requirements, admissions decision procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing.
- Forms and process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content.
- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships.
- Student diversity initiatives.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Access to this information can be found on the university's "Admissions" webpage and on the Hammons School of Architecture website under "Program Overview/Admission to the Program," where several specific links can be found under "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents."

Regarding student diversity initiatives, although the team was able to find public documentation about the university's Diversity Scholarship Program and Diversity Center, the information was difficult to locate. The team could locate the information using a search, but only when knowing very specific keywords, which many website visitors would not know. At the time of our visit, the HSA's website lacked readily apparent direct links to the Diversity Scholars webpage.

II.4.7 Student Financial Information:

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.
- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Access to required information can be found on the university's "Admissions" tab using several links under "Financial" and on the Hammons School of Architecture website under "Admission Information/Scholarships," with several specific links found under "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents." Although financial information is available to students in this online format, a number of students expressed concerns regarding the flow of information. They said that they were confused and strained by the actual overall cost of the program, particularly the additional fees and expenditures required in order to earn an architecture degree (e.g., the cost of laptop, programs, study abroad, etc.). It appears that students may not know when, where, or how to access this information.

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit Annual Statistical Reports in the format required by the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*.

The program must certify that all statistical data it submits to the 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.

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: A letter appended to the 2106 APR (p. 132)—signed by the University Registrar, Cindy Jones, and dated August 3, 2015—confirms that the data submitted annually to the NAAB is accurate and consistent with the data submitted to federal, state, and regional agencies.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports: The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 11, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2012 Edition, Amended).

[X] Met

2016 Team Assessment: Annual Statistical Reports for 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015 are included on specific links found on the university's Hammons School of Architecture website under "Accreditation/Accreditation Documents."

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

The team reviewed the ARE pass rate information on the NCARB website via the required link on the HSA website. The NCARB website publishes pass rates by institution for each section of the ARE. The team discovered that the pass rates for Drury architecture graduates had exceeded the median rate nationally, and this was true in all seven sections of the ARE 4.0 (administered since 2011).

The fact that Drury architecture graduates are performing well on the ARE is a testament to the educational background of the candidates before and during their internships.

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

NAAB STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA MATRIX

2016 Re-Accreditation Visit
Hammons School of Architecture

NAAB STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA MATRIX

Hammons School of Architecture
2016 R-Accreditation Visit

Primary Responsibility: ●

Pre-Professional Program
1st - 2nd Year

			REALM A: CRITICAL THINKING & REPRESENTATION								REALM B: BUILDING PRACTICES, TECHNICAL SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE										REALM C: INTEGRATED ARCH. SOLUTIONS			REALM D: PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE				
			A1 Ability: Professional Communication Skills	A2 Ability: Design Thinking Skills	A3 Ability: Investigative Skills	A4 Ability: Architectural Design Skills	A5 Ability: Ordering Systems	A6 Ability: Use of Precedents	A7 Understanding: Historical Traditions and Global Culture	A8 Understanding: Cultural Diversity and Social Equity	B1 Ability: Pre-Design	B2 Ability: Site Design	B3 Ability: Codes and Regulations	B4 Ability: Technical Documentation	B5 Ability: Structural Systems	B6 Understanding: Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies	B7 Understanding: Building Materials and Assemblies	B8 Understanding: Building Service Systems	B9 Understanding: Financial Considerations	B10	C1 Understanding: Research	C2 Ability: Integrated Evaluations and Decision Making	C3 Ability: Integrative Design	D1 Understanding: Stakeholder Roles in Architecture	D2 Understanding: Project Management	D3 Understanding: Business Practices	D4 Understanding: Legal Responsibilities	D5 Understanding: Professional Conduct
			A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
Drury CORE	CORE 101	Drury Seminar																										
	(various)	Drury Foundations (written and oral expression)																										
	(various)	Ethical Foundations																										
	EXSP 220	Personal Wellness																										
History & Theory	ARCH 251	History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism I							●	●																		
	ARCH 252	History of Art, Architecture, and Urbanism II							●	●																		
	ARCH 356	History of Modern Architecture																										
Math, Structures & Technology	MATH 203	Mathematics and Inquiry																										
	PHYS 201	Principles of Physics														●	●	●	●	●			●					
	ARCH 233	Introduction to Building Systems													●													
	ARCH 234	Structures 1																										
Studios & Representation	ARTZ 111	Foundations of Studio and Design																										
	ARTZ 123	Drawing					●																					
	ARCH 112	Architectural Design II																										
	ARCH 124	Architectural Representation																										
	ARCH 213	Architectural Design III				●						●																
	ARCH 214	Architectural Design IV																										
	ARCH 225	Introduction to Computers in Architecture																										

Professional Program
3rd - 5th Year

			A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
Drury CORE	CORE 201	Global Foundations																										
		Foreign Language Sequence																										
International Studies	ARCH 418	Global Studio																										
	ARCH 426/426	Travel Journal							●	●																		
	ARCH 456/457	Culture and Place																										
History & Theory	ARCH 253	Theories of Architecture	●																			●						
	MARC 557	Architecture Seminar	●		●																							
Structures & Technology	ARCH 334	Structures II (formerly ARCH 336)													●													
	ARCH 335	Environmental Systems I														●	●		●	●								
	MARC 536	Environmental Systems II (formerly ARCH 437)													●													
	MARC 539	Structures III (formerly ARCH 438)																●					●					
Professional Practice	ARCH 427	Professional Communication	●																									
	ARCH 461	Internship									●																	
	ARCH 467	Facility Programming																										
	ARCH 469	Professional Practice																						●		●	●	●
Studios	ARCH 315	Architectural Design V		●		●	●	●			●	●		●								●						
	ARCH 417	Architectural Design VI: Community Studies Studio		●				●					●	●	●		●						●					
	MARC 519	Architectural Design VII: Comprehensive Studio			●																	●	●					
	MARC 520	Architectural Design IX: Exploration			●																							
	MARC 521	Architectural Design X: Thesis Studio		●				●																				
			A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	C1	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5
			A1 Ability: Professional Communication Skills	A2 Ability: Design Thinking Skills	A3 Ability: Investigative Skills	A4 Ability: Architectural Design Skills	A5 Ability: Ordering Systems	A6 Ability: Use of Precedents	A7 Understanding: Historical Traditions and Global Culture	A8 Understanding: Cultural Diversity and Social Equity	B1 Ability: Pre-Design	B2 Ability: Site Design	B3 Ability: Codes and Regulations	B4 Ability: Technical Documentation	B5 Ability: Structural Systems	B6 Understanding: Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies	B7 Understanding: Building Materials and Assemblies	B8 Understanding: Building Service Systems	B9 Understanding: Financial Considerations	B10	C1 Understanding: Research	C2 Ability: Integrated Evaluations and Decision Making	C3 Ability: Integrative Design	D1 Understanding: Stakeholder Roles in Architecture	D2 Understanding: Project Management	D3 Understanding: Business Practices	D4 Understanding: Legal Responsibilities	D5 Understanding: Professional Conduct

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, representing the ACSA
Shannon Chance, PhD, RA, NCARB, LEED®AP
Marie Curie Research Fellow at Dublin Institute of Technology
Room 442
DIT Bolton Street
Dublin 1
IRELAND
+353-85-788-4677
shannonchance7@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
F. Michael Ayles, AIA, NCARB
Principal, Business Development
Antinozzi Associates
271 Fairfield Ave
Bridgeport, CT 06604
(203) 377-1300 ext. 2422
MAyles@Antinozzi.com

Representing the AIAS
Nicole Gerou, Assoc. AIA
Architectural Designer|NORR Architects Engineers Planners
M. Arch 2015
Lawrence Technological University
21000 W. Ten Mile Road
Southfield, MI 48075
(906) 360-0517
ngerou@ltu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Deborah Suzan Huff, AIA, LEED®AP BD+C, NCARB
Master Architect/Senior Associate
SSOE Group
320 Seven Springs Way, Suite 350
Brentwood, TN 37027
(615) 372-7884 direct
(615) 347-5929 mobile
(615) 661-7585 ext. 8237884
DHuff@ssoe.com

Nonvoting member
Jason Dale Pierce, LEED®AP BD+C, NCARB
Senior Associate, Project Architect
HOK
10 South Broadway
Suite 200
St. Louis, MO 63102
(314) 754-4017
jason.pierce@hok.com

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Chance, PhD, RA, LEED®AP
Team Chair
Representing the ACSA

F. Michael Ayles, AIA
Team Member
Representing the AIA

Nicole Gerou
Team Member
Representing the AIAS

Deborah Suzan Huff, RA, LEED®AP BD+C
Team Member
Representing the NCARB

Jason Dale Pierce, LEED®AP, NCARB
Nonvoting Team Member