University of South Florida
School of Architecture and Community Design

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture
Track I – (65 undergraduate credit hours + 105 graduate credit hours [non-baccalaureate] – total 170 credit hours)

Track II – (pre-professional undergraduate degree + 51 graduate credit hours – total 171 credit hours)

Track III – (non pre-professional undergraduate degree + 105 graduate credit hours – total 225 credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
23 February 2011

Table of Contents

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team wishes to thank Dean Ron Jones, Director Bob MacLeod, and all persons associated with the University of South Florida, School of Architecture and Community Design (SACD), for their cooperation and assistance before and during the visit. We found the entire school community respectful and supportive of each other, and especially their students. The administration, faculty, and students were enthusiastic about the SACD and were clearly open and candid in their communication of information to the visiting team.

Without question the SACD has experienced periods of uncertainty throughout its history, both its standing within the university at large, and with its own leadership. This team was very pleased to find the program has weathered the obstacles/uncertainty and come out surprisingly strong. With the move of the SACD into the College of the Arts, a newly renovated HMS Architecture building, and the hiring of Bob MacLeod as the new director, the SACD is experiencing a renewed energy and vision for the Master of Architecture program.

The team room clearly expressed the pedagogical intent of the program, and while it seemed the program would benefit from having a stronger, more diverse theory foundation, the student exhibits were nonetheless exceptional in their depth of study and presentation techniques. The student work and exhibits were organized in a manner that easily highlighted the SACD values of making – value of craft, technological proficiency, exploration of emergent technologies, and design excellence as evidenced by the high level of student performance/scholarship.

The team was very impressed with the quality of the students at all levels within the Master of Architecture program. This is an obvious reflection of the high academic standards established by the University of South Florida, the College of the Arts, and the School of Architecture and Community Design. From casual discussions to formal presentations, the team continually recognized there is a high level of academic rigor at the SACD that is expected from students beginning the program through to their graduation.

While the team is of the opinion the program is still in a period of transition of leadership with its new director, the quality and dedication of the faculty (full-time and adjuncts) and students have been the program's strengths in the past and will be the foundation for Director MacLeod's leadership in the future. The university administration pointedly expressed high expectations for the SACD, and considering the tenuous position of the SACD in the recent past, the school has come a long way in a very short time.

2. Conditions Not Met:

> PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION
> > *II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees*
>
> > *II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates*

3. Causes of Concern:

A. Global mission: Goal I of the University of South Florida's strategic plan is to "promote nationally and internationally distinctive and prominent research and graduate programs." The SACD mission is to provide graduate level education that "offers wide ranging global learning experiences." While both USF and the SACD speak about the concept of global initiatives and student experiences, very little has been done to make these visions a reality. The SACD does have several international study programs; however, budget restrictions have impacted the frequency and participation in the international initiatives. As the SACD moves forward under the direction of Director MacLeod, the global practice of architecture needs to have a higher priority within the program.

B. Program self-assessment: While the team does feel the SACD administration and faculty have sufficient self-assessment procedures to meet the NAAB criterion, the program can benefit by developing a more structured, engaging self-assessment program that includes faculty and students. This is especially important as the program seeks to determine its place within the College of the Arts, the university, and the State of Florida. Numerous times during the various administration, faculty and student meetings the team heard comments' regarding the competition for high quality students within the state's various architecture programs. Given the current quality of the faculty, student body, and program leadership, a strong self-assessment procedure will be essential to determine the SACD's future direction.

C. Web site information: When reviewing the myriad of information about the SACD and Master of Architecture degree on the program's website the team found numerous conflicts. It is essential the website information be reviewed for accuracy as well as to provide the required links to the various documents required of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information.

D. Communication: Team discussions with students and student leaders revealed several instances of communication disconnects.

(1) Students voiced ignorance of curriculum changes that affect their course scheduling and slowed their completion of the program. As noted in I.1.5 of this VTR, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the Director's monthly meetings with student representatives result in curriculum assessment as documented in the SACD 2010 APR.

(2) While students in the upper levels of the program were aware of the various information resources via their Professional Practice coursework, the majority of the student body at the lower levels voiced ignorance of career development information resources regarding NAAB, NCARB, and IDP procedures.

(3) Students voiced ignorance of award and scholarship opportunities.

(4) Students were especially frustrated with the lack of information regarding new choices for completion of the thesis process.

E. Faculty Diversity: Both students and faculty identified the need for a more diverse faculty that encompassed not only race and gender, but more importantly faculty with varied educational and professional backgrounds. The percentage of full-time and adjunct faculty with degrees from Florida institutions is very high. The team strongly feels that the program can benefit greatly by having a faculty contingent with a more diverse educational background. The team also recognizes that to achieve this goal given the economics of higher education is a challenge; however, as faculty lines become available the SACD administration should place a high priority on acquiring individuals that are not Florida-educated.

F. Relevancy of Professional Practice Course Materials: The visiting team discovered several references in the ARC 6287 - Professional Practice I and ARC 6288 - Professional Practice II coursework of outdated reference and reading materials. While use of current newspaper articles and web information relevant to architectural practice was found, the use of outdated versions of the AIA Owner-Architect agreements and the AIA Practice Handbook was the predominant reference material for the course.

4.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (Year):

1998 Condition 5, Human Resources: *The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.*

Previous Team Report (2005): At the time of the visit and for the immediately preceding near term, this condition was not met.

The school has grown considerably since the last accreditation visit. In 1999–2000, there were 51 full-time equivalent (FTE) students; in 2004–05, there were 240 with 12 FTE faculty making for a 20-to-1 student-to-faculty ratio—well the above national average in accredited degree programs. Filling the four new faculty positions allocated by the provost is essential to help to alleviate the untenable situation. The SACD should fill one faculty position for the 2005–06 academic year.

Because of the SACD's increased growth, it has been necessary for the faculty to teach year round to keep the true course and studio sizes at acceptable figures.

The search for a dean has been suspended, leaving a potential leadership gap, at a minimum, until 2006. With the considerable growth of the program, an increase in staff also needs to be addressed.

The considerable focus towards teaching during this period of growth has made inadequate opportunity for the faculty to have enough time to do research/creative activity, which may generate a problem for the non-tenured faculty in their run towards tenure.

> **2011 Team Assessment:** This condition was reviewed in a 2008 Focused Evaluation site visit to the SACD and was deemed "Not Met" as a result of that visit; however that team's assessment of this condition focused on perceived budget issues and their "potential impact" on the SACD. Since the 2008 visit, the SACD has placed a new director, has not experienced a reduction in either full-time or adjunct faculty, and is in a newly remodeled building. This team finds 1998 Condition 5, Human Resources is now "Met."

1998 Condition 7, Physical Resources: *The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning: office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.*

Previous Team Report (2005): At the time of the visit and the immediately preceding near term and for the near future, this condition was not and will not be met.

The current facilities do not meet fire codes or accessibility standards. The shop is undersized for the complement of students; there is no paint spray booth even though signs of painting exist throughout the facility; and IT support equipment needs to be upgraded (with more printing capacity and the like). The space per student in studios is limited to the desktop and half of a 3-foot (~1m) aisle between desks. Shelves need to be stacked on top of desks in Rube Goldberg fashion by the students.

Funding for renovated space in Human Services (HMS) has been committed; programming and conceptual design have been started. The space, if built out, will meet the needs of the current number of students, but it does not have space for growth. Additional growth, if it were to occur, would place even more stress on the proposed facilities as well as on the program in general.

> **2011 Team Assessment:** This condition was reviewed in the same 2008 Focused Evaluation site visit noted above and was deemed "Met" as a result of that visit. As noted

in remarks above, the SACD is now located in a newly remodeled building. While the facility is not ideal space in all respects, it does appear to be adequate. This team concurs with the 2008 Focused Evaluation report and considers 1998 Condition 7, Physical Resources now "Met."

II.   Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (I): INSTUTIONAL 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 is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

The accredited degree program must describe and then provide evidence of the relationship between the program, the administrative unit that supports it (e.g., school or college) and the institution. This includes an explanation of the program's benefits to the institutional setting, how the institution benefits from the program, any unique synergies, events, or activities occurring as a result, etc.

Finally, the program must describe and then demonstrate how the course of study and learning experiences encourage the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Program history and mission was provided in the SACD 2010 APR. Evidence of the pursuit of these statements was provided in discussions with the SACD dean, director, program faculty, and the university administration.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
- *Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.*

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

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

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: The information provided in the SACD 2010 APR was insufficient to fully understand the Learning Culture and Social Equity environment of the program. Additional information was requested and received prior to the visit that provided sufficient clarity of SACD's Learning Culture. During the visit discussions, the team was made aware of on-going plans by both the dean and director

for continued diversification of faculty as resources are available. The teams finds the intent of the Learning Culture and Social Equity criterion is met.

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

A. **Architectural Education and the Academic Community**. That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.[1] In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

    [X] The program has responded to this perspective.

    2011 Team Assessment: The University of South Florida has recently been recognized as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research Extensive Institution. As a result, the School of Architecture and Community Design benefits from the wealth of educational resources now available at the university.

    All full-time SACD faculty members are expected to meet all the requirements of teaching, research/creative work, and service in the context of a nationally recognized institution. During our team entrance meeting with the Associate Provost, he stated that the architecture faculty are meaningfully engaged in these activities and are making contributions to the institution.

    There are ongoing cross-disciplinary teaching and scholarly collaborations that the SACD faculty and students are engaged in with other university academic units such as the College of Public Health, the School of Art, Institute on Aging, and the Florida Center for Community Design and Research. These collaborations offer members of the learning community a rich opportunity to engage in the development of new knowledge.

    Additionally the SACD offers architectural coursework selections to students of other disciplines that are an integral part of their degree. Within the SACD's curriculum, coursework is offered that satisfies curriculum requirements in Urban Studies and the School of Business Real Estate Development Program.

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

    [X] The program has responded to this perspective.

    2011 Team Assessment: SACD students are exposed to a great diversity of experiences throughout their educational careers that includes flexible studio coordination, extensive travel opportunities, and collaborative work within the SACD and with other USF programs. The students recognize the richness of these opportunities and demonstrate great pride in these experiences. With the integration of the SACD into the College of the Arts, communication and collaboration among the various COTA programs has begun that allows SACD students to

---

[1] See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

engage in performance and visual arts activities. Student participation in these activities seems minimal at this time and thus, there is great room for improvement.

The travel opportunities provided through the studio curriculum are great assets to the global thinking and understanding of cultural diversity for the SACD students. This is made apparent in the spatial awareness and diagrammatic skills in the student exhibits. Students are also actively engaged with the local professional community through their adjunct faculty and visiting jurors. Student work has also been displayed to the community through AIA and governmental initiatives.

Although the SACD Studio Culture Policy is neither well developed nor well distributed, the culture among students appears to be quite healthy and fosters both competition and collaboration. Recognizing the weakness of the existing Studio Culture Policy, the new director has established a seminar to revisit the Studio Culture Policy and adapt it to the current and incoming student/faculty needs.

This camaraderie spills into the various student organizations (AIAS, CSI, GBC) that organize activities for architecture students as well as campus-wide events. The director meets on a semi-regular basis with student leaders as representatives of the student body to offer advice and counsel regarding student wide activities. While these student leaders voiced concern that engagement in such activities are limited based on available time students feel they can take away from their SACD studies, goals for new initiatives are being developed nonetheless.

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

[X] The program has responded to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: SACD students have a history and ongoing connection to the issues of architectural practice/regulation through regular and active engagement with the professional architectural community across the Tampa Bay region. Architectural practice within the Tampa Bay area is very diverse, and as such this education/practice connection establishes the framework for an understanding of the practice of architecture within the international, national, State of Florida, and local context. The SACD Professional Practice coursework (2 classes taught in sequence) also explores issues regarding the interaction of architectural practice within the myriad of regulatory environments.

During the school-wide meeting with the students, an overwhelming majority expressed a desire to be licensed, practicing architects. Given their exposure to licensed architects within both the full-time and adjunct faculty, the student's obviously benefit from and increased knowledge and awareness of architectural practice.

The overall content of the curriculum clearly establishes practice as a program outcome with students becoming involved in practice related issues in the design studio as well as the Professional Practice coursework. The SACD curriculum is somewhat unique in that there are two Professional Practice courses offered sequentially, and while some of the documentation and readings required of the classes appear to need updating (see this team's "Causes of Concern"), issues of internship, registration and continuing education are specifically addressed within the curriculum.

The SACD has identified an IDP Coordinator who attended the national IDP Coordinator's training session offered by NCARB. The school also arranged for a NCARB representative to come to the school and give a formal presentation on IDP that was very well attended by the

student body. The program's IDP Coordinator appointment was not actively communicated within the student body and as a result not all of the students were aware of the appointment. The director is aware of this issue and is taking steps to increase the IDP Coordinator awareness as well as IDP in general.

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

[X] The program has responded to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: As noted in the previous discussion, the SACD has a history and culture of connection to the issues of practice and the profession. With the significant portion of the full time and part time faculty comprised of licensed and practicing architects, the program's depth and breadth provides broad technical and professional resources complementing its design education capabilities.

Both the Urban Design Studio (Advanced Design C) and the Design Build Studio provide cogent student involvement and experience within real projects involving real people. The Urban Design Studio further presents additional opportunities for understanding the application and implementation of research into the execution of projects within urban and developing contexts. The Florida Center for Community Design and Research, contained within the SACD, provides a significant resource and vehicle for interdisciplinary community engagement. It is also a rich sustainability resource as USF pursues its stated mission and goals of becoming a leader on sustainable issues.

The school is located in the Tampa metropolitan area and as such provides opportunities for involvement in many local architectural practices. Even in this current economic climate, students still avail themselves of local architectural practice opportunities. To reinforce the SACD education/profession connection the Director has a professional advisory council that is active.

The school is directly engaged with AIA Tampa culminating with exhibitions of student work that are specifically focused on the quality of place and life in multiple neighborhoods of the local community. The students have active AIAS, CSI and GBC organizations along with their College Council. The SACD director has identified the need to form a National Organization of Minority Students (NOMAS) in order to better serve the minority students as well as strengthen the awareness of culture and diversity within the fabric of the school.

The school has a growing and ambitious visiting lecture program that brings in practitioners and scholars of note from around the world. That same program draws local practitioners, scholars and the public in their quest to provide another layer of education and experience regarding architecture. Local practitioners also participate in project reviews and as both visiting and adjunct faculty.

Core Design I focuses on the fundamentals of critical design thinking and making skills while the Design Development coursework provides a holistic understanding of not just the fundamental technical aspects of building systems but their poetic implications and impacts.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good**. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are prepared: to be active, engaged citizens; to be responsive to the needs of a changing world; to acquire the knowledge needed to address pressing environmental, social, and economic challenges through design, conservation and responsible professional practice; to understand the ethical implications of their decisions; to reconcile differences between the

architect's obligation to his/her client and the public; and to nurture a climate of civic engagement, including a commitment to professional and public service and leadership.

[X] The program has responded to this perspective.

2011 Team Assessment: The SACD's upper level design studio sequence offers multiple student involvement and research opportunities where students engage in community focused design projects. Specifically, Advanced Design 'C' Studio focuses on relevant urban design issues within the context of the Tampa Bay region. In doing so, the program stresses the importance of creating engaged citizen architects. There are also elective options within the SACD curriculum for the students to leave the campus and directly engage the community through the Design-Build Studio. This studio occurs annually and results in a pro-bono built project that typically provides an underserved community or non-profit organization with a new facility that fulfills a vital need that would otherwise have gone unmet.

Additionally, there are multiple study abroad opportunities that include trips to China, Europe and South America. The trip to China culminates in a studio project that exposes the students to architectural issues which require a response to meet the needs of a changing world. Additional national field trips within the United States nurture sensitivity toward civic engagement, public service and leadership.

Students are regularly employed through the research arm of the program, the Florida Center for Design and Community Research. In that capacity there are opportunities for the students to participate in both architectural and non-architectural research that is of direct benefit to both the Tampa Bay region and the State of Florida. These opportunities allow students the ability to collaborate across departmental lines.

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: Long range planning for the SACD emerges from the USF Strategic Plan, the Compact Plan developed by the College of the Arts (COTA), and internal SACD visioning and planning exercises conducted by the director and faculty.

The COTA's Compact Plan was a requirement of the USF Provost. The Provost required each college to develop their own course of action that responds to the USF strategic mission and goals. Encompassing all academic units within the COTA, the Compact Plan emphasis is 1) to insure, establish, retain, restore and insure quality and 2) promote globally competitive graduates and to expand the level of world class scholarly/creative endeavors.

The Compact Plan is divided into four areas: Maintaining Quality, Renovation of Existing Facilities, Interdisciplinary Thrust (Cluster Hire Initiative) and New Ventures. These four areas are the frame work from which long range planning is developed. The SACD uses it as a guide for anticipated hires, collaborative new ventures, and possible future improvements of physical facilities.

Short term and long range planning within the SACD begins with the start of a new academic year. SACD administration and faculty conduct a series of meetings to assess the state of the program and propose both short term and long term initiatives. In the fall of 2010, after one year of residency, the new director conducted a workshop with the faculty to discuss the visions, directions, ideas and notions in response to the SACD Vision Statement crafted by the faculty in 2008.

Future planning and strategic decision making is informed routinely by multiple sources including university and school reports, committee and task force reports, and the school's advisory council.

I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:
▪ *How the program is progressing towards its mission.*
▪ *Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.*
▪ *Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.*
▪ *Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:*
  o *Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.*
  o *Individual course evaluations.*
  o *Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.*
  o *Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.*
The program must also demonstrate that results of self-assessments are regularly used to advise and encourage changes and adjustments to promote student success as well as the continued maturation and development of the program.

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

2011 Team Assessment: Self-assessment procedures within the SACD include a number of methods that fosters self-evaluation, reflection and consideration of future directions. The SACD administration and faculty meets approximately every two weeks where program assessment issues are continually discussed. If necessary, either a standing committee, or a specifically formed task force will be charged to address specific issues.

USF requires that all academic programs conduct student outcomes assessment. For the College of the Arts, the director is responsible for implementing the process within the SACD. The faculty is also involved in this assessment process with their primary focus on the thesis/masters project. An example of the assessment document was presented in the SACD 2010 APR.

Other outside organizations that are involved in assessment include local architects and alumni who participate in juried reviews, invited guest academic critics who review the final semester work and offer feedback, and the members of the Director's Advisory Council.

Course evaluations are conducted for each class every semester through a standardized questionnaire that is processed by the university. These evaluations are used to improve faculty teaching effectiveness, annual evaluations, tenure decisions and re-hiring decisions.

While the director meets monthly with the officers of the student organizations, there does not seem to be substantial solicitation and assessment of the students and graduates views on teaching, learning, and achievement opportunities provided by the SACD curriculum (see this team's "Causes of Concern).

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:
- *Faculty & Staff:*
  o *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions[2].*
  o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
  o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
  o *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

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

2011 Team Assessment:
- The SACD faculty, full-time and adjunct, is appropriate to support student learning and achievement. The team was impressed with the consistent quality of student work at all levels of the program.

- The team reviewed the EEO/AA policies of the University of South Florida and found them to be consistent with other institutions of higher learning. Such information is available on the USF web site.

- The faculty work load was discussed with faculty with no negative comments. Students expressed positive comments regarding availability/accessibility of both the full-time and adjunct faculty.

- The SACD recently identified a new IDP Coordinator, and the student leadership was aware of the individual and his IDP role.

- Five full-time faculty are tenured with an additional five on tenure track. Included in this process is the opportunity for individual professional pursuits. While the faculty did express general concern with university funding for such endeavors, there appears to be adequate opportunities at the time of this visit.

- The team reviewed documents that proscribed the process for determining rank, tenure and promotion within the University of South Florida. Such information is available on the USF web site.

- *Students:*
  o *An accredited program must document its student admissions policies and procedures. This documentation may include, but is not limited to application forms and instructions, admissions*

---

[2] A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

requirements, admissions decisions procedures, financial aid and scholarships procedures, and student diversity initiatives. These procedures should include first-time freshman, as well as transfers within and outside of the university.

o *An accredited degree program must demonstrate its commitment to student achievement both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities.*

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

2011 Team Assessment:
- The team reviewed documents that proscribed the admissions policies and process for students entering the SACD. Such information is available on the SACD web site. For additional information on the process for accepting transfer students into the SACD program see Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-Professional Education.

- The student body at SACD demonstrates a high level of student achievement, especially in their studio design work at all levels. Student achievement is a high priority and expected within the SACD and the university at-large.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:
- **Administrative Structure:** An accredited degree program must demonstrate it has a measure of administrative autonomy that is sufficient to affirm the program's ability to conform to the conditions for accreditation. Accredited programs are required to maintain an organizational chart describing the administrative structure of the program and position descriptions describing the responsibilities of the administrative staff.

  [X] Administrative Structure is appropriate (or adequate) for the program

  2011 Team Assessment: While not presented as an organizational chart, the administrative structure of the College of the Arts and the School of Architecture and Community Design was clearly described in narrative form in the SACD 2010 APR.

  The Florida Center for Community Design and Research is a designated research unit in SACD. Its Director reports to SACD Director Robert MacLeod. Director MacLeod reports to the Dean of the College of the Arts, Ron Jones, who in turn then reports directly to the Provost and Vice Provost of Affairs of the University.

  In addition to the NAAB accredited Master of Architecture degree, the SACD offers an additional non-NAAB accredited degree; the Master of Urban and Community Design

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

  [X] Governance opportunities are appropriate (or adequate) for the program

  2011 Team Assessment: Discussions with the Dean Jones of the COTA revealed that he provides academic freedom to SACD Director MacLeod and the faculty of the program. As a result Director MacLeod is responsible for all program administration and budget allocations.

  The director works most closely with the graduate and undergraduate advisors, and the office manager. Additionally, the director meets with faculty on a bi-weekly basis.

  During formal and casual discussions with the faculty it was indicated that faculty are involved and valued in decision making processes alongside the SACD Director. They also reiterated the concept of the formulation of specific committees based on need. An example is the formation of a committee to review and make amendments to the thesis curriculum.

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

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

[X] Physical Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program

2011 Team Assessment: As noted in this team's discussion of "Progress Since the Previous Site Visit", the SACD is now housed in a newly renovated HMS-Architecture building. The building is a four story structure with central core design studio/classrooms on the 2nd and 3rd floors. Access to these rooms is via a perimeter walk area and as such the rooms do not have windows. The 4th floor consists of design studio/classrooms that do project to the outside wall and have windows; however the plan layout of the 4th floor is somewhat complicated and confusing to navigate. Unfortunately, the HMS-Architecture building is also located some distance away from other College of the Arts buildings so any cross disciplinary initiatives are difficult at best. While there is a general feeling the renovation could have better addressed some of these issues, the building's location is fixed. The team sensed the USF administration feels they addressed the NAAB's Physical Resources deficiency as best as possible given their recent past and current economic conditions. Director MacLeod expressed a desire to make modifications to the HMS-Architecture building as funding resources are available. One such renovation project was underway during the visit that involved the conversion of three adjacent storage rooms on the 4th floor into an exhibition gallery.

Understanding the myriad of issues, the team feels the HMS-Architecture building is adequate for the program as it currently exists.

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

[X] Financial Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program

2011 Team Assessment: Given the current state, and national, economic climates, the SACD has maintained access to appropriate institutional and financial resources to support student learning and achievement. For the previous 2 years (2009-2010) finances for the University of South Florida and the SACD have been supplemented by Federal Stimulus monies; however, those funds are anticipated to end. During entry meeting discussions with the university's Senior Vice Provost state policies/positions with regard to budget issues were a topic of discussion. While the university did not have clear direction, the administration was preparing for the very real possibility of requiring budget reductions from each of their academic units. Indications were made that should budget reductions be necessary, the university would attempt as best as possible to limit the impact of such reductions for the SACD. While the team was encouraged by these discussions, the final decisions regarding higher education funding in the State of Florida are yet to be determined and as such it is the team's recommendation that the SACD keep the NAAB informed of its budget conditions via the program's Annual Reports.

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

Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and

develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information Resources are appropriate (or adequate) for the program

2011 Team Assessment: The library collections for SACD are housed in the main USF library (Tampa Library) and supported by a designated College of the Arts librarian. Discussions with the librarian have revealed significant growth in the collections since the 2005 NAAB Visit (106% increase in architectural serials; 76% increase in architectural monographs). Students are informed on the availability / use of the library's resources through a seminar in the first year of the program. This includes orientation to the inter-library loan program that students may use to access resources that may not be available at USF. As described in the APR, students and faculty can learn more about the available resources at http://usflibraries.typepad.com/arts/. The recently developed Learning Commons, within the USF library, has integrated tutoring and support services by means of grant monies for all students.

PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports[3]. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

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

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

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

---

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

2011 Team Assessment: As required by the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, statistical reports were provided in the SACD APR and in the team room during the visit.

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

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

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: Annual Reports for the academic years 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009, along with the NAAB responses were provided for the team's review. Reports for years 2005, 2006, and 2007 were included in the SACD APR. Reports for years 2008 and 2009 were provided in the team room.

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

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

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

2011 Team Assessment: Faculty credentials were provided for both the full-time faculty and the adjunct faculty, and demonstrated the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement at SACD.

---

[4] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

[X] The policy documents in the team room were responsive to the requirements of Appendix 3

2011 Team Assessment: The policy documents were provided in the team room and were responsive to the requirements of the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 3.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.1, Communication Skills is considered "Met" based upon
evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5256 Design Theory

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

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.2, Design Thinking Skills is considered "Met" based upon
evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6364 Advanced Design A

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.3, Visual Communication Skills is considered "Met" based upon
evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 5362 Core Design 2, ARC - 5363 Core
Design 3, ARC - 6364 Advanced Design A, and ARC - 6366 Advanced Design C

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.4, Technical Documentation is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6365 Advanced Design and ARC – 6481 Design Development

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.5, Investigative Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6936 Research Methods

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.6, Fundamental Design Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5362, Core Design 2 and ARC – 5363, Core Design 3

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.7, Use of Precedents is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5362, Core Design 1, ARC – 6366, Advanced Design C, and ARC – 6971, Thesis 2/Master's Project 2

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.8, Ordering Systems Skills is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5361, Core Design 1.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.9, Historical Traditions and Global Culture is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 5470 Intro to Technology, ARC - 5731 Architectural History I, ARC - 5732 Architectural History II, and ARC - 6311 Intro to Community and Urban Design.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.10, Cultural Diversity is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 5731 Architectural History I, ARC - 5732 Architectural History II, and ARC - 6311 Intro to Community and Urban Design.

A.11. Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion A.11, Applied Research is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6976 Thesis 1/Master's Project 1 and ARC – 6936 Research Methods.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Realm A Student Performance Criteria focuses on equipping students with the skills to apply research based ideas to their thinking, to think abstractly and communicate those abstract ideas in an understandable manner. The SACD students' understanding and abilities to present ideas in a variety of methods is exceptional and was readily apparent to the team. The arrival at such well crafted representations (graphic and physical) is supported by strong precedent studies and first hand research through travel. While the SACD's international initiatives are elective, domestic travel opportunities are done on a studio by studio basis and are well integrated into design courses to provide cultural perspectives.

The team found the students to be extremely articulate and able to communicate their ideas orally, graphically and with models as observed in desk critiques and formal juries during the visit. The students are also capable of written communication as demonstrated in their theory and history courses.

The team room exemplified a great mass of physical models in addition to digitally and traditionally produced graphic presentations. The skill sets to produce such work are introduced in the first Design Series and reinforced throughout the program. The introduction of their CDC router, 3-D printer, laser cutter combined with knowledgeable/supportive staff in both the digital labs and wood shop have promoted and expanded the opportunities for model building.

The significance of portfolio reviews in the completion of this program emphasizes the importance of strong visual communication skills for students. The Visiting Team deemed A.3, Visual Communication Skills, **Met With Distinction** due to the impressive student design work and their abilities to portray such work effectively in the form of models, presentation boards, and portfolios. Similarly, the Visiting Team deemed A.4, Technical Documentation, **Met With Distinction** as students' abilities to verbally and graphically show understanding of systems and materials is apparent in the form of models, presentation boards, and portfolios.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.1, Pre-Design is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6365 6365 Advanced Design B, ARC 6366 Advanced Design C, and ARC 6976 Thesis 1/Master's Project 1

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.2, Accessibility is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6365 Advanced Design B and ARC - 6366 Advanced Design C

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.3, Sustainability is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6936 Research Methods, ARC – 6366 Advanced Design C, and ARC – 5689 Environmental Technology

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.4, Site Design is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6365 Advanced Design B and ARC - 6366 Advanced Design C

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.5, Life Safety is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6365 Advanced Design B

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.6, Comprehensive Design is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5365 Advanced Design B and ARC – 6481 Design Development.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.7, Financial Considerations is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.8, Environmental Systems is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5689 Environmental Technology and ARC – 6481 Design Development.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.9, Structural Systems is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5470 Intro to Technology, ARC – 5587 Structures I, and ARC – 5588 Structures II.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.10, Building Envelope Systems is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6481 Design Development and ARC – 5470 Intro to Technology.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.11, Building Service Systems Integration is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5689 Environmental Technology and ARC – 6481 Design Development.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion B.12, Building Materials and Assemblies is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 5467 Materials and Methods and ARC – 5470 Intro to Technology.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Realm B addresses Student Performance Criteria that requires the student to comprehend the myriad technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and looks for design solutions that incorporates accessibility, well integrated building systems, life safety systems, applies principles of sustainability and demonstrates an understanding of constructability.

The examples of student work presented in the team room, both high and low pass, clearly demonstrates that SACD students have a firm foundation of knowledge in the technical aspects of building design and the ability to demonstrate this comprehension in their studio projects.

The team was particularly impressed with the curriculum and outcomes of the ARC – 6481 Design Development course. Students are engaged in explorations of the systems necessary to support a project they developed in Design Studio B. This translation of their design work to a realistic representation of a functional building demonstrates both the understanding and the ability necessary of the 11 criteria that constitute B.6 Comprehensive Design. The design development course also addresses criterion B.7 Financial Considerations for the project. As a result, the team finds Condition B.6, Comprehensive Design and B.9, Structural Systems as **Met With Distinction**.

The team also finds that B.3 Sustainability is **Met With Distinction**. Student projects are addressing sustainable issues in water environmental impacts, site design, building envelope systems, and the design of communities in a holistic manner addressing quality of place, quality of life, community needs, transportation, and neighborhood/historic texture.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.1, Collaboration is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC 5366, Advanced Design C; Urban Design Studio.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.2, Human Behavior is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC - 6366 Advanced Design C and ARC - 6311 Intro to Community and Urban Design.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.3, Client Role in Architecture is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.4, Project Management is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.5, Practice Management is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.6, Leadership is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.7, Legal Responsibilities is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.8, Ethics and Professional Judgment is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6287 Professional Practice I and ARC – 6288 Professional Practice II

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Criterion C.9, Community and Social Responsibility is considered "Met" based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: ARC – 6311 Intro to Community and Urban Design.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The Student Performance Criteria required from Realm C focus on the architect's abilities as a leader, manager and advocate. Students are taught how an architect is bound to conduct their practice legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public. Such tasks require keen collaboration sills in addition to business and leadership skills. Students are required to understand the multiple roles of the practicing architect that include societal and professional responsibilities, business relationships with clients and consultants, and how to integrate community service into the practice of architecture.

The development of these skill sets in the SACD student begins with a strong focus on collaboration exhibited as early as the all-school charrette in which the entire student body participates and enjoys the ability to mentor each other. That sense of collaboration is further enhanced in several studios that initiate projects as team projects that ultimately divide into separate solutions for particular parts of the whole while retaining a sense of cohesiveness. Professional Practice courses instill in the students the necessary foundation of understanding allowing them to be responsible professionals advocating for and to their clients, the community and the public.

An understanding of human behavior, the natural environment, the design of the built environment combined with the understanding of the client's needs, wants and goals provides the students with the tools to take leadership positions in the making or remaking of our communities. They learn to listen, then contemplate, strategize and ultimately implement the challenges that have been placed before them.

The Team believes that Condition C.9 Community and Social Responsibility provides a **Met With Distinction** level of accomplishment. The students have exhibited considerable knowledge and understanding of the responsibility that they have as professionals to incorporate the public or community's interests, the respect of historic resources and the quality of life/quality of place aspects into the fabric of our existing cities and neighborhoods. The students likewise have indicated a thorough understanding of the principles that guide and emphasize the demands of and needs for a healthy and sustainable community as a part of a holistic approach to city design. The students have not only indicated these basic knowledge facets but the skills to articulate their arguments and proposals convincing both to clients and the community at large.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The University of South Florida in Tampa, Florida is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) to award Associate's, Bachelor's, Master's and Doctoral degrees. The university was accredited in 2005 and is scheduled to receive its next reaffirmation of accreditation review in 2015.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture and Community Design at the University of South Florida awards the Master of Architecture degree based upon multiple tracks, depending upon the student's undergraduate preparation. The tracks are as follows:

- Track I – 170 credit hour program for students with 65 credit hours in a pre-architecture program or equivalent: 65 hours undergraduate + 105 M. Arch.
- Track II – 171 credit hour program for students with pre-professional degrees in architecture: 120 undergraduate + 51 M. Arch.
- Track III – 225 credit hour program for students with baccalaureate degrees in disciplines other than architecture: 120 hours undergraduate + 105 M. Arch.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Curriculum review and development within the SACD is primarily accomplished within a framework of regularly scheduled (every 2 weeks) faculty meetings. When necessary, sub-committees of the faculty are developed to address specific curricular issues. The faculty as a whole must approve new courses and course revisions. When new courses are proposed, the course is evaluated based upon how the course relates/supports the mission of the SACD.

Another opportunity to review design studio curriculum occurs as student portfolios are reviewed at the completion of Core Design 3 and Advanced Design C. This is accomplished by the faculty assessing the student's work based upon the curriculum outcome expectations.

Students are involved with curriculum review and development via meetings of student leaders with the Director. Licensed architects are involved in multiple ways; 7 of the 12 full-time faculty are licensed architects, and 10 of the 12 adjunct faculty are licensed architects. Adjunct faculty are not involved in ongoing curriculum discussions; however, when subcommittees of the faculty are established to deal with specific curriculum issues, adjunct faculty are appointed to the subcommittees.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
Because of the expectation that all graduates meet the SPC (see Section 1 above), the program must demonstrate that it is thorough in the evaluation of the preparatory or pre-professional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The SACD architecture program, as originally conceived in 1986, was to develop a curriculum of architectural studies that would lead to the Master of Architecture degree for students who would be beginning their architectural studies with a four-year degree in a non-architecture discipline. The program has since evolved and the Master of Architecture degree is awarded to students based upon the student following one of three program tracks. The team reviewed the process of evaluation for placement of students within each track with the Graduate Advisor with the following explanation:

Track I – An admissions committee evaluates all student applications for admission into the SACD pre-architecture program. Those accepted complete 65 credit hours before entering into the 105 credit hour Master of Architecture program. Once completed the student graduates with Master of Architecture degree having a total of 170 credit hours of study.

Track II - The Graduate Advisor evaluates all student applications and transcripts as part of the application/acceptance process. If accepted students with non-architectural related degrees enter the 105 credit hour Master of Architecture program. Once completed the student graduates with Master of Architecture degree having a total of 225 credit hours of study.

Track III – The Graduate Advisor evaluates the transcripts of students with a four-year pre-professional degree in architecture. Transcripts are reviewed course by course to determine if the courses taken at the other institution are equivalent to the SACD course requirements. If the courses cover the requirements, the students enter a 51 credit hour program of study. If course gaps the courses must be completed at the SACD. Once completed the student graduates with Master of Architecture degree having a total of 171 hours of study.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: The descriptive program and degree information published by the SACD (specifically located on their web site, specifically under "About the SACD" in paragraphs "Accreditation and Licensure" and "School Accreditation" does not include the exact language as stipulated in *The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 5.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:
    The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation
    The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Access to hard copies of the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* and the *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* is available by request through the SACD's Office Manager. The team has issues associated with this criterion that are identified and described in this report's "Causes of Concern."

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:
    www.ARCHCareers.org
    The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects
    Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture
    The Emerging Professional's Companion
    www.NCARB.org
    www.aia.org
    www.aias.org
    www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: The SACD has appointed faculty member as IDP Coordinator for students. The individual attended the most recent IDP Coordinator's meeting. Additionally the SACD invited a representative from NCARB to give a presentation on IDP policies/procedures to the student body; and according to students, the presentation was well attended.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Team Assessment: Public access to hard copies of the SACD APRs and VTRs is available by request through the SACD's Office Manager.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: While ARE Pass Rate information was available to the team, the information is not available on the SACD website.

III. **Appendices:**

1. **Program Information**

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

A. **History and Mission of the Institution**

As the 21st Century begins, the State of Florida is the fourth most populous state and the Florida's population grew from 2 million to 18 million between 1950 and 2010. The growth has made Florida a cosmopolitan, mostly urban state, with extensive cultural, economic and social transformation. Along with the achievements of the boom years have come vast challenges in education, health care, social services, arts, the environment, transportation, and economic development. The University of South Florida is uniquely positioned to assist the state with the challenges of rapid development by providing increased opportunities for the education of Florida's citizens and outstanding research outcomes to improve the quality of life.

Established in 1956, the University of South Florida (USF) has rapidly ascended into the ranks of the nation's top tier research universities. In 2006, USF was classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in its highest tier — a *Research University with Very High Research Activity* (RU/VH). Today, annual research contracts and grants exceed $380 million, while USF's Research Park provides support for university researchers and industry to collaborate in commercializing discovery.

As a member institution of the State University System of Florida, the University is governed by the Florida Board of Governors and the USF Board of Trustees (BOT). The President and Trustees represent the University with one voice. USF is fully accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). In 2006, USF St. Petersburg was accorded separate regional accreditation by SACS.

Among the largest public universities in the United States, USF serves over 47,000 students on four campuses in Tampa, St. Petersburg, Sarasota-Manatee, and Lakeland. Campus boards, chaired by members of the BOT, provide fiscal oversight and fulfill important stewardship roles in the community. Each location presents a unique and distinctive learning environment for undergraduate and Masters level students. Doctoral and professional degrees are awarded at the Tampa campus. The delivery of high quality undergraduate education and enhanced academic success are important priorities for the University. A comprehensive range of degree programs is offered across 13 colleges and schools. Each year, more than 6,000 undergraduate and 2,000 graduate and professional degrees are awarded, and the University's alumni base has grown beyond 200,000. USF's endowment currently exceeds $300 million.

As the only institution of higher education in Florida designated by the Carnegie Foundation as *Community Engaged*, and one of only ten public research universities nationwide that hold both RU/VH and Engaged designations, USF is inextricably engaged with the community at all levels, from local to global. Community partnerships in health care, education, science and engineering, the arts, and business are an integral part of life at the University. USF is a member of the Big East Athletic Conference. In recent years, the University has strengthened its position as a top-ranked public research university; has improved its placement in the annual report of the Top American

Research Universities; and has stepped up a tier in *US News and World Report's* ranking of national universities.

USF's greatest strategic opportunities reflect the University's location: coastline, port, estuaries and beaches; fresh water supplies, clean energy, and other environmental subjects; urban infrastructure. Through research in bioengineering, life sciences, materials science, microelectronics, nanotechnology, information and communication technology, advanced manufacturing, and other areas, USF is an anchor for the vast Florida High-Tech Corridor, Florida's most effective knowledge-based economic development effort.

The location and population of Florida and the Tampa Bay Region create opportunities for the University of South Florida to make extraordinary contributions in areas of diversity, building on the region's cultural identities and ethnic heritage. USF is committed to making diversity and equal opportunity a fundamental, integral part of all university operations.
(From *University of South Florida Strategic Plan, 2007)*

2007-2012 Strategic Plan Overview
The 2007-2012 Strategic Plan is a bold, ambitious plan to elevate the performance and rankings of the University of South Florida as one of the nation's leading research universities. It provides the USF community with a clear vision, goals, strategies, and measures to promote alignment and success. It is clearly directed at ensuring student success, contributing innovation and new knowledge, and advancing economic development in Florida, the nation, and globally.

As a member institution of the State University System of Florida, the University is governed by the Florida Board of Governors and the USF Board of Trustees. The President and Trustees represent the university with one voice. Campus boards provide fiscal oversight and fulfill important stewardship roles in the community.

Vision
The University of South Florida envisions itself as a pre-eminent research university with state, national and global impact, and positioned for membership in the Association of American Universities (AAU).

Mission
As Florida's leading metropolitan research university, USF is dedicated to excellence in:
- Student access and success in an engaged, and interdisciplinary, learner-centered environment,
- Research and scientific discovery, including the generation, dissemination, and translation of new knowledge across disciplines; to strengthen the economy; to promote civic culture and the arts; and to design and build sustainable, healthy communities, and
- Embracing innovation, and supporting scholarly and artistic engagement to build a community of learners together with significant and sustainable university-community partnerships and collaborations.

Goals and Strategies

Goal I
- **Expanding world-class interdisciplinary research, creative, and scholarly endeavors.**

- Promote nationally and internationally distinctive and prominent research and graduate programs,
- Strengthen the University's research support infrastructure to enhance contracts and grants workflow and output – through critically examining the applicability of alternative models of F&A indirect cost distribution, and other innovative mechanisms,
- Focus on increasing the amount and proportional share of competitive federal research awards,
- Enhance and expand the talent pool of world-class, competitively-funded faculty members, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students,
- Establish a salary enhancement program that rewards highly productive faculty in the areas of teaching and learning; scholarship, research and creative endeavors; and service and engagement, and
- Strengthen and support integrated and synergistic interdisciplinary research across disciplinary, departmental, college and campus boundaries.

Goal II

Promoting globally competitive undergraduate, graduate and professional programs that support interdisciplinary inquiry, intellectual development, knowledge and skill acquisition, and student success through a diverse, fully engaged, learner-centered campus environment.

- Create and support globally competitive, relevant and distinctive academic programs that address the changing needs of the region, state and nation through innovative approaches to curriculum development and delivery,
- Provide increased access to excellence in higher education for students who demonstrate the aptitude to succeed,
- Enhance and expand the talent pool by shaping the enrollment profile of USF's undergraduate and graduate student body to reflect that found at a pre- eminent research university,
- Improve year-to-year retention and time-to-graduation; demonstrated acquisition of knowledge, communication and critical thinking skills; and competency to synthesize and apply new knowledge; together with providing an optimal college experience for all students,
- Build a sustainable campus environment at USF that meets the criteria for Carnegie classification as a "primarily residential" campus, and
- Improve and promote cultural and global literacy, foreign language proficiency, and the international competitiveness of USF graduates through significant growth in study abroad participation, an increase in fee-paying international students, and cross-cultural curriculum development.

Goal III
Expanding local and global engagement initiatives to strengthen and sustain healthy communities and to improve the quality of life.

- Establish a unified institutional structure to facilitate and promote community engagement, social enterprise, and global collaborations in education, research and service learning, including mechanisms for managing fiscal and human resources for student exchange, study abroad and international field placement programs, and faculty research, teaching, outreach and professional development opportunities,
- Develop an up-to-date clearinghouse of information about all the engagement currently occurring at USF and develop institutional systems to measure community engagement,
- Encourage and reward faculty effort in community engagement – require an annual faculty impact statement and explicitly introduce community engagement into USF's

promotion and tenure guidelines, and

- Encourage and reward student engagement in the community and explore the feasibility of acknowledging community engagement and other co-curricular activities on the official transcript.

Goal IV
Enhancing all sources of revenue, and maximizing effectiveness in business practices and financial management to establish a strong and sustainable economic base in support of USF's growth.

- Refine business practices to ensure a strong and sustainable economic foundation at USF,
- Promote and sustain a positive working environment, significantly improve service quality, and improve staff support through providing competitive salary structures, expanding professional development opportunities, and building cross-functional teams,
- Build USF's fundraising enterprise and endowment to a level commensurate with that found at a pre-eminent research university by completing a comprehensive campaign to support capital projects, endowed professorships and scholarships, and to supplement operating needs,
- Expand USF's national identity through developing and implementing a comprehensive, cutting-edge branding campaign grounded in the discovery and dissemination of new knowledge; interdisciplinary collaboration; commercialization and economic development; and global engagement,
- Expand the commercialization of emerging technologies to enhance regional and state economic development, and
- Build a sustainable environment to support an expanded and improved teaching and research mission, a more engaged residential community, and a university-based global village.

Values

The University of South Florida values:

- Excellence in teaching and learning; scholarship and research (both basic and applied/translational); together with community engagement and public service based on the highest standards of discovery, creativity and intellectual attainment,
- Outstanding research and scientific discovery, including the application of new knowledge to solve state, national and global problems,
- Recruitment and retention of world-class faculty and high potential undergraduate and graduate students,
- Access to a world-class, globally relevant and affordable education, including utilization of alternative modes of delivery,
- Student competitiveness, success and academic achievement through knowledge, communication and critical thinking skill acquisition,
- Cultural and ethnic diversity and inclusion along with an enhanced global experience, understanding, and appreciation,
- Integrated, interdisciplinary inquiry and collaboration across departmental, college and campus boundaries,
- Facilitating the optimal development of personal and professional potential of students, faculty, and staff, and enriching the quality of an engaged campus community,
- Shared governance structures that empower all USF stakeholders, campuses and entities to reach their full potential,
- The creation and support of a premier university system that adds value to the region,

state and nation while ensuring necessary levels of autonomy and preserving the distinctive regional and strategic identities of all member campuses and entities,

- An environment of collegiality based on the principles of academic freedom, respect, integrity, civility, the freedom to engage in debate, the exchange of ideas and intellectual discovery, and professional responsibility,
- Mutually beneficial partnerships and community engagement that increase the understanding of, and present solutions to, local and global challenges, with a mind to strengthening the economy and building sustainable healthy communities,
- An entrepreneurial spirit and innovation with a focus on defining, informing and generating "next best practices",
- The utility of proven and emerging technologies to enhance instruction, learning, research and engagement, and to improve service quality and efficiencies in institutional business practices,
- Focus and discipline in aligning the budget and fiscal resources with institutional priorities and action, and
- Transparent accountability along with timely and effective communication.

B.   **History and Mission of the Program**

The School of Architecture and Community Design at the University of South Florida was founded in 1986. It was operated between 1986 and 1994 by two units of the State University System of Florida, the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) and USF. After a national search, Alexander Ratensky was hired as founding Director— he reported to the dean of architecture at FAMU, and sat on the Council of Deans at USF.

The School of Architecture and Community Design at USF is the first public architecture program in Florida to be located in a metropolitan area. Indeed, the school was specifically linked to an urban mission in its implementing authorization from the state legislature, and was founded at about the time that the state recognized, through legislation, that its prodigious growth in population, and the impact of that growth on the environment, needed management.

The core professional program was a 4-year track (then 110 credit hours) designed for students with bachelor's degrees in non-architectural subjects. A limited number of students with prior study in architecture were admitted with advanced standing. The Master of Architecture program earned its initial accreditation by the NAAB in 1992 for term of three years.

By action of the Board of Regents on November 15th, 1994, the School of Architecture and Community Design was made exclusively a unit of the University of South Florida. Alexander Ratensky was named founding Dean, and reported to the Provost. The Master of Architecture program earned its first full five year term of accreditation by the NAAB in 1995.

In 1999, Alexander Ratensky retired from administration, after leading the program for 13 years. Because of its small size at that time (51 FTE students), the Provost made the School of Architecture a unit within the Office of Graduate Studies. Associate Professor James Moore was named Interim Director and reported to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The university approved a new graduate certificate and community design and development and architecture tracks within the bachelor of liberal studies.

After a national search, Stephen Schreiber was hired as Director in 2000. He reported to the Dean of Graduate Studies, and sat on the Council of Deans. The Master of Architecture program earned a five year term of accreditation by the NAAB in Fall 2000.

In 2001, the School implemented a "2 plus 4" track to the Master of Architecture (in addition to existing tracks). This track, and the liberal studies track, opened the school's programs to select undergraduates with strong architectural and/or visual arts education. The school began offering general education classes for undergraduates in 2002. Due to the interest in the new programs and increasing visibility of the school, enrollment increased dramatically. By the 2002-3 academic year, the School enrolled 157 FTE students. In early 2003, the Provost changed the School back to the equivalent of a college. Stephen Schreiber was named Dean and reported to the Provost.

Stephen Schreiber announced his desire to return to the faculty by Fall 2004, due to his increasing research/creative work activities, and obligations to national and statewide organizations. Associate Professor Dan Powers will served as Interim Dean while a national search is was conducted. This national search failed to land a suitable candidate for Dean and Professor Charles Height was appointed Interim Dean and stayed on in that position from 2005-08.

In the summer of 2008, the School of Architecture & Community Design was reorganized as an academic unit in the College of Visual and Performing Arts (now the College of the Arts, COTA). The position of Dean was redefined as a Director reporting to the COTA Dean Ron Jones.

Upon Dean Height's resignation in August 2008, College of the Arts Associate Dean Barton Lee served as interim Director and a national search for a new permanent Director began. Effective fall 2009, Robert MacLeod began his duties as Director of the School of Architecture and Community Design. For the 2009-10 academic year, the School enrolled approximately 200 FTE students.

2005 NAAB Accreditation Visit
The 2004/05 NAAB accreditation visit resulted in all 37 NAAB criteria in Part 2 being "met" or "well met". Part 3 caused concerns for the visiting evaluation team and a focused evaluation visit was recommended to review Condition 5: Human Resources and Condition 7: Physical Resources.

The university responded to these concerns, specifically Condition 7, by relocating the SACD to an existing building near the academic heart of the campus in January 2007. The new renovated 27,000 square foot facility is 9000 square feet larger than the previous facility and provides adequate studio and jury space.

The subsequent focused evaluation visit, conducted in September 2008 by R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA (representing the Academy) and Dennis S. Ward, AIA, NCARB (representing the Profession) expressed continued concern with Condition 5 (related to budget reductions and a hiring freeze) and found Condition 7 had been met with the program making "great strides in addressing inadequacies and concerns regarding their existing facilities noted during the previous visit in 2005".

The Florida Center for Community Design and Research
The Florida Center for Community Design and Research (FCCDR) is the research arm of the School of Architecture and Community Design. It is a Type II State University System (SUS) research center located in the SACD. The Center was founded in 1986 as a statewide research center to address urban and regional problems related to both the natural and built environment and to provide design expertise, technical assistance, and

applied research to assist Florida's growing communities. The Center employs faculty and graduate students from numerous academic disciplines and receives between $1.3 - $1.5 million in contracts and grants annually (although this number was lower in the 2009-10 AY due to the economic downturn and the inability for local/regional governmental entities to fully fund on-going research projects). The Florida Center serves as a primary vehicle for interdisciplinary community engagement at the University of South Florida. The Center has four fulltime research faculty, affiliated faculty from USF, and numerous full-time support staff and graduate students.

SACD VISION:
The vision of the School of Architecture and Community Design is to be nationally and internationally recognized as a distinguished center for study, research, design, and community engagement in architecture and urbanism. We envision a program that critically engages the built environment through academically diverse, socially and environmentally responsible inquiries that stress innovation and rigor in a learner-centered environment.

SACD MISSION:
Our mission is to provide graduate level education that:
- Provides a holistic design curriculum and instruction through a variety of pedagogical approaches.
- Encourages individual and collaborative discoveries.
- Emphasizes continuity between design and construction.
- Builds technical and professional proficiency.
- Offers wide ranging global learning experiences.
- Provides opportunities for engagement with diverse communities.

and for students and faculty to conduct scholarly research and creative activity that:
- Is innovative, disciplinary, and interdisciplinary.
- Advances the understanding of the built environment as it relates to society and culture.
- Contributes to theory and practice in the disciplines of architecture and urbanism.
- Relevant to local communities.
- Advances the contemporary state of critical practice.
- Provokes (stimulates/instigates) critical discourse on architecture and urbanism.
- Explores (embraces) emerging technologies.

Our aim is to graduate professionals who will be recognized for their design excellence in enhancing the quality of the built environment.

SACD VALUES:
The School values in their teaching and research:
- The poetics of design
- The past, history as informing the present, architectures past and historical precedent
- Making – value of craft
- Technological proficiency and emergent technologies
- Sustainable practices
- Quality in the built environment
- Architecture grounded in context
- How buildings become "Place"
- Design excellence – high level of student performance/scholarship
- Interdisciplinary connections – bridges

- Research scholarship, critical inquiry of faculty, research based inquiry and critical practice

The school values an academic environment:
- That is rigorous, effective and inspiring
- Where there is learning by doing
- That has a diverse student population
- Where there is cultural diversity, international discovery, connections and awareness of diverse cultures
- Where there are a variety of pedagogical approaches and viewpoints
- That has a collegial environment that encourages dialog
- That fosters faculty development

The school values in their global and community engagement:
- Improving the quality of the built environment
- Social responsibility
- Improving our surrounding community
(Approved by SACD Faculty, September 2008)

Community Engagement
The SACD has an established public presence through many years of community engagement. The School has a long history of involvement with the community through topical design charrettes, pro-bono projects, grant and contract work, scholarly research and multiple design/build projects.

The design build program is woven into the fabric of the curriculum and offers students multiple access point for hands-on, on-site learning. Design build studios develop fully permit ready construction documents working directly with engineering consultants. The studio/workshop participants are involved with every aspect of the construction process. To date, three award winning projects have been completed and the SACD led "Team Florida" (a four university consortium) will enter a zero-energy house in the 2011 US Solar Decathlon (one of 20 teams to gain entry to the international competition held on the Mall in Washington, DC in the fall of 2012)

C.   **Long-Range Planning**

Long-range planning for the School of Architecture and Community Design Emerges from both the USF Strategic Plan and the Compact Plan developed by the College of the Arts in addition to internal visioning and planning exercises. The Compact Plan (required by the Provost) responds to the University's strategic goals and determines a course of action for each unit within the COTA (Architecture, Music/Music Ed, Theater/Dance. Art/Art History and the Contemporary Art Museum/Graphic studio).

From the **USF Strategic Plan, 2007-12**:

Goals and Strategies

Goal I
- Expanding world-class interdisciplinary research, creative, and scholarly endeavors.

Goal II

- Promoting globally competitive undergraduate, graduate and professional programs that support interdisciplinary inquiry, intellectual development, knowledge and skill acquisition, and student success through a diverse, fully- engaged, learner-centered campus environment.

Goal III
- Expanding local and global engagement initiatives to strengthen and sustain healthy communities and to improve the quality of life.

Goal IV
- Enhancing all sources of revenue, and maximizing effectiveness in business practices and financial management to establish a strong and sustainable economic base in support of USF's growth.

From the **Compact Plan for the College of the Arts**:

While the Compact Plan represents the separate needs of the five COTA units, it is unified in two important ways: first, the emphasis is upon insuring, retaining, restoring and/or establishing quality; second, the goals are to promote globally competitive graduates and to expand the level of world-class scholarly/creative endeavors. The vision of the College, as recently edited is as follows:

The College aspires to achieve national and international recognition as a distinguished center for study, creation and research (in architecture & community environmental design, publishing of prints and sculpture multiples, visual arts, dance, music, theatre and contemporary exhibitions). The College will provide an innovative and exciting environment in which to prepare the nest generation of architects, artists, designers, educators, scholars, and audiences for these disciplines. The College will support and promote creative research (including history and theory), performance and production in these disciplines while continuing to engage the Tampa Bay community by enriching the cultural landscape and advancing sustainable practices.

The Compact Plan emphasis is to maintain instructional / curricular / program outcome quality now and into the future. I outlining future hiring strategies, each proposed position has an impact on student success and collectively the positions contribute to the priorities of the University:

- Community Engagement
- Global Literacy and Impact
- Integrated, Interdisciplinary Inquiry
- Research and Innovation
- Student Success

The Compact Plan is divided into four areas. The relevance of each to the School of Architecture is outlined below:

Maintaining Quality
Proposed faculty/staff positions and descriptions required to sustain and improve the program:

Assistant/Associate Professor: Architecture Design & Sustainability
Faculty position will teach in the design studio curriculum, develop a curriculum in sustainability, and engage university initiatives in this area

Associate Professor: Architecture/Design/Materiality
This position will bring an area of expertise in architectural design, materials and methods of construction, architectural detailing, and theory / materiality.

Digital Lab Technician in Architecture
This position will oversee the digital fabrication lab and wood shop/lab. Duties include supervision of work in lab, maintenance, training, and scheduling assistants.

Architecture Program Administrative Assistant
Duties will include assisting with undergraduate and graduate admissions, administration of new Master's of Urban Design program, organization of professional outreach efforts (local, regional and state AIA), development of SACD centered Alumni relations, graduate and undergraduate recruiting, among others.

Renovation of existing facilities:
This section of the Compact Plan focuses on the renovation of the areas within the existing Fine Arts Building to be vacated by the Music School's move to a new building in the late fall 2010. Included in the planned renovation is a new digital fabrication lab for the college, largely built around a new 5-axis CNC router. The College has twice submitted for University funds, generated through a student technology fee, to purchase this equipment and associated software. A decision is expected from the University in Fall 2010.
There is, additionally, the desire on the part of the SACD faculty to renovate the existing facility in order to improve the quality, versatility and efficiency of the building.

Interdisciplinary Thrust (Cluster Hire Initiative)
The "Cluster Hire Initiative" looks to enhance the educational and research opportunities for students and faculty across the university. This proposal is to recruit and search four regular tenure earning faculty positions which would be interdisciplinary in appointment and expectation and search for 2 research and non-tenure earning faculty. These appointments would be generally described as:
Architecture + Geography
Architecture + Engineering
Architecture + Environmental Science
Architecture + Business
Architecture + Florida Center for Community Design and Research (2 positions)

New Ventures
Digital Fabrication Initiative
The Digital Fabrication initiative outlines a 3 year acquisition and budgetary plan for technology that provides the appropriate level of support for the acquisition, repair and replacement of technology as developments emerge in the field.

To date, the following accomplishments can be noted:
- A Laser Cutter has been installed and is used extensively by SACD graduate students.
- OPS hours have been increased for the existing Shop Supervisor; duties now include oversight of the Digital Fabrication Lab and coordination of the Graduate Assistants assigned to the Lab.
- A group of GAs are in place to supervise the Lab and educate students;
- A two axis CNC router with an 8' x 8' bed has been purchased and will be operational fall 2010.

COTA Digital Fabrication Lab

A College of the Arts initiative to secure a 5 axis CNC router and support equipment, software and training has been funded by the Provost's Office by the USF student technology fee fund. The $282,000 grant will provide the college with a critical resource.

The entire Compact Plan document will be made available to the accrediting team in the Team Room.

D. **Self-Assessment**

The process of self-assessment is both continual and well developed within the School of Architecture and Community Design. A number of methods are used for self-evaluation / reflection and consideration of future directions. Among these are University and School reports and reviews; school committees; ad-hoc committees and task forces; group and individual meetings between administrators, faculty and students; the school's advisory council; NCARB licensing examination reports; regular feedback from professionals, alumni, and recent graduates; meetings with administrators and faculty of other accredited programs; previous accreditation reports; and the current generation of the Architecture Program Report.

To begin the academic year the faculty holds a series of meeting to not only address the upcoming year in administrative terms, but to assess the state of the program and propose both short-term and long-term initiatives. These goals are revisited and set as action items in regular faculty meetings.

As an example, prior to the start of the Fall 2010 AY, the SACD held a one-day "world café" style workshop exploring a series of questions posed by the director.

The faculty meeting was framed as a "discussion of visions, directions, ideas, initiatives and notions" in response to the Vision Statement crafted by faculty in Summer/Fall 2008.

VISION:
The vision of the School of Architecture and Community Design is to be nationally and internationally recognized as a distinguished center for study, research, design, and community engagement in architecture and urbanism. We envision a program that critically engages the built environment through academically diverse, socially and environmentally responsible inquiries that stress innovation and rigor in a learner-centered environment.

The "world café" workshop questions allow the faculty to take its own temperature relative to a range of immediate, short-term and long-term issues. List 3 areas of on-going strength in the SACD:

1. List 3 areas in need of nurturing/development in the SACD
2. List 3 areas of focus for our next faculty hires
3. List 3 ways in which our presence in the College of the Arts can work to our advantage
4. List 3 changes in the curriculum worthy of consideration
5. List 3 changes/upgrades/alterations to the physical plant / facilities
6. List 1 new program, degree or certificate we should consider developing (and why should we consider *this* specific idea)
7. List 3 continuing education classes/educational opportunities the SACD could offer to regional architects
8. List 3 new areas of community engagement the SACD should consider
9. List 3 ways in which we can *immediately* improve our School
10. List 3 ways through which the SACD can fundraise

11. List 3 ways through which we can develop faculty interaction, collegiality, mentorship and engagement (including both F/T and adjunct faculty)

School
Committees: The School and the Program aim to institute the most appropriate and effective faculty assignments and committee responsibilities. The guiding principles are to develop the minimum number of committees to accomplish the necessary tasks.

The faculty as a whole must approves new courses and course revisions. When proposing a new course, faculty are required to submit a syllabus, an explanation of how the proposed new course relates to school mission and goals, and an explanation of the impact on teaching loads.

Concerns and proposals may come from any individual or group, and find their best route for evaluation, be that a standing committees or special task force. An issue may ultimately come before the full faculty for open discussion and resolution.

College
The self-governance structure for the College of the Arts includes several standing committees with member ship from all units.

Student Participation: Course evaluations are conducted for each class every semester through a standardized questionnaire that is processed by the University. Students respond to a series of general questions with a 1-5 ranking and can add additional hand written remarks. These evaluations of faculty performance are used to improve faculty teaching effectiveness and play an important role in part-time re-hiring decisions.

The student body is small enough that issues needing discussion and action can often be handled either within the studios of a particular year, or by individual conversations with faculty and administrators. The Architecture College Council and the AIAS are active student organizations that participate in policy-making issues as well as social and organizational events. The Director holds a monthly meeting with officers of the Student Organizations to discuss issues of importance to the school and each organization's goals and programs.

The Director also holds open "brown-bag" lunch meetings with students of each level in the program (years 1 – 4) at least once each semester.

Faculty Evaluation of Student Work: The School seeks to develop within students a wide range of capabilities that will prepare them for leadership roles. Students are asked to think critically, to gather and examine large amounts of information, to define problems, to analyze, to explore alternatives, to synthesize, and to then communicate those ideas and solutions in a clear and professional manner. Evaluations are based on the above criteria in accordance with our "core principles," and therefore include both process and outcome.

University

The following groups in the University are involved to some degree in assessment of the Program:

Faculty Senate: the Faculty Senate has the right of review and action with regard to formulation of institutional aims; creation of new colleges, schools, and departments and divisions; major curricular changes and other matters which in the opinion of the

President of the University or his delegate affect the institution as a whole; requirements for admission and graduation and for honors and scholastic performance in general; approval of candidates for degrees; policies of appointment, dismissal, and promotion in academic rank.

Outcomes Assessment: The Provost has assumed responsibility for ensuring that outcomes assessment occurs at USF. The Director is responsible for implementing student outcomes assessment in the Architecture Program. The Faculty Senate continues to play a role in the development of our assessment program as well. SACS

Dean's Council: A periodic meeting of Deans across the University that addresses management and administration issues as well as broader perspectives regarding the direction of the University. Information from these meetings is transmitted to the Director in the monthly Director's Council Meetings chaired by the COTA Dean with all Directors and the Associate Dean in attendance.

Graduate and Undergraduate Councils: The Senate Graduate Council, in consultation with college (school) and the Dean of Graduate Studies is responsible for maintaining and enhancing the quality of graduate education in the University and its graduate centers. The Undergraduate Council is responsible for maintaining and enhancing the quality of undergraduate education in the University and its campuses.

External

Other outside organizations which are influential in our assessment include: local and regional chapters of the AIA and who regularly assess our successes and opportunities; the Florida Board of Architecture and Interior Design; and academic associations, including ACSA, in which faculty are actively involved regionally and nationally. Involvement in association conferences always generates much discussion about what and how we teach and how that compares to other programs.

Faculty peer review is a function of the tenure process, and the more informal collegial interaction of the faculty within the School, College and University. Faculty members also regularly, and successfully, submit papers and creative work for juried review, and enjoy close interaction with practicing professionals and alumni through juries and lectures.

Alumni often participate in the student assessment process within the School. They attend juried reviews of student work in design classes at all levels of the curriculum, and give invited lectures. They assist students with projects that involve professional consultations. Several alumni and local practitioners teach in the School on an ongoing basis as adjunct professors and offer a long-term perspective of the School in addition to forging a strong link to professional offices throughout the region.

The final review of Master's Project (formerly thesis) work is reviewed by both regional practitioners and national educators. The School has started the tradition of inviting several external guest critics to review the final semester work and offer feedback for future consideration. The Spring 2010 guest reviews included:

Martin Gundersen, Associate Professor, School of Architecture, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

Doug Hecker, Associate Professor, School of Architecture, Clemson University, Clemson, SC

Robert McCarter, Ruth & Norman Moore Professor of Architecture, Washington University, St. Louis, MO

Martha Skinner, Associate Professor, School of Architecture, Clemson University, Clemson, SC

Nichole Wiedemann, Associate Dean, School of Architecture, University of Texas, Austin, TX

The Director's Advisory Council assists the School in community, professional and university liaisons and fund raising. The Council participates in the assessment process by advising and assisting the Director on these matters but particularly in the area of fund raising.

2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**

A. 3. Visual Communication Skills: ARC - 5362 Core Design 2, ARC - 5363 Core Design 3, ARC - 6364 Advanced Design A, and ARC - 6366 Advanced Design C

A.4.Technical Documentation: ARC – 6365 Advanced Design and ARC – 6481 Design Development

B. 3. Sustainability: ARC – 6936 Research Methods, ARC – 6366 Advanced Design C, and ARC – 5689 Environmental Technology

B. 6.Comprehensive Design: ARC – 5365 Advanced Design B and ARC – 6481 Design Development.

B. 9. Structural Systems: ARC – 5470 Intro to Technology, ARC – 5587 Structures I, and ARC – 5588 Structures II.

C.9. Community and Social Responsibility: ARC – 6366 Advanced Design C and ARC – 6311 Introduction to Community and Urban Design.

(Team comments for each of the Conditions Met with Distinction are included in the "Realm General Team Commentary" narratives.)

3.   The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the NCARB
C. William Bevins, FAIA
FreemanWhite, Inc.
8845 Red Oak Boulevard
Charlotte, NC 28217-5593
(704) 523-2230
(704) 523-8958 fax
wbevins@freemanwhite.com

Representing the ACSA
Michael J. Buono, AIA, LEED® AP
Director and Professor
Hammons School of Architecture
Drury University
900 North Benton Avenue
Springfield, Missouri 65802
(417) 873-7288 office
(417) 873-7446 fax
(417) 818-2425 mobile
mbuono@drury.edu

Representing the AIAS
Becky Joyce
3201 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(484) 809-2043
rjoyce0131@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
Joe Douglas Webb, AIA
Principal
Webb Architects
3701 Kirby Drive
Suite 916
(713) 522-8544
(713) 522-2814 fax
jwebb@webbarchitects.com

Non-voting member
Andrew M. Hayes, AIA, LEED® AP
Principal
Hayes, Cumming Architects
689-a Ninth Street
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
(727) 894-6633
(727) 894-6616 fax
ahayes@hc-arc.com