August 5, 2013

Steven Leath, Ph.D., President
Office of the President
Iowa State University
1750 Beardshear Hall
Ames, IA 50011-2035

Dear President Leath:

At the July 2013 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the directors reviewed the Visiting Team Report (VTR) for the Iowa State University, College of Design.

As a result, the professional architecture program Bachelor of Architecture was formally granted an eight-year term of accreditation.

This new, maximum term of accreditation was approved by the NAAB in March 2013 and put into effect for all decisions made after July 1, 2013.

The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2013. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2021.

Continuing accreditation is subject to two reporting requirements.

First, all program must submit Annual Statistical Reports (see Section 10, of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended). This report captures statistical information on the institution and the program.

Second, any program that receives an eight-year term of accreditation is required to submit an Interim Progress Report two years after a visit and again five years after the visit. This requirement is described in Section 11, of The 2012 NAAB Procedures. The next statistical report is due November 30, 2013; the first interim progress report is due November 2015. Please see (Sections 10 and 11 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2012 Edition, Amended).

Finally, under the terms of the 2012 Procedures for Accreditation, programs are required to make the Architecture Program Report, the VTR, and related documents available to the public. Please see Section 3, Paragraph 6 (page 22), for additional information.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Theodore C. Landsmark, M. Env.D., J.D., DFA (Hon.), Ph.D.
President

cc: Gregory S. Polermo, FAIA, Interim Chair
    Mitra Kanaani, Visiting Team Chair
    Visiting Team Members

Enc.
Iowa State University
College of Design

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (167.5 credit hours)

Master of Architecture (undergraduate degree + 100 credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
6 March 2013

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

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The visiting team was intrigued by the visibility, vibrancy and positive learning and teaching climate of architectural education at the College of Design on the campus of Iowa State University.

There are various aspects, and unique qualities, which have contributed to the development of a balanced and comprehensive center for architectural education at this institution based on a mission statement that emphasizes "study of architecture as a cultural discipline in which issues of practice of the multiplicity of social formations...are enfolded with the subject matter of building design—construction, space, material, form, and use."

The highly positive and dynamic climate of learning and teaching architecture at this institution relates to the fact that:

1. The institution is committed to preparing students for practice as visionary problem solvers and developed thinkers, as well as informed decision-makers for the betterment of society.
2. The framework of the program within the context of the university has demonstrated design innovation and interdisciplinary initiatives in architecture education. Students are trained and nurtured to become future practitioners and designers with a broad vision, while being equipped with requisite knowledge and skills to practice in a diverse globalized world.

Currently, the architecture program is situated within a celebrative and supportive climate of education, where:

1. The university's senior administration considers the renewal of accreditation as a healthy exercise toward providing further visibility for the architecture program, which is potentially well situated within the context of the university at a "sweet spot" between art and engineering and sciences. However there is a need for their understanding of the uniqueness of architecture with respect to research and scholarly works.
2. The College of Design is enjoying the presence of a supportive visionary dean who has provided a novel momentum of restructuring and reinstating various design disciplines and providing opportunities for development of new programs, such as the Bachelor of Design and a Master of Design in Sustainable Environments. Additionally, more opportunities for international studies have been facilitated in Shanghai and Berlin, as well as reaching out to the community by establishing the downtown studio Design on Main, and probable collaborative ventures with the Ames National Laboratory in Iowa.
3. The current interim-chair of the Architecture Department in his multilateral national engagement with various architectural educational and professional collaterals is augmenting the credibility of the institution.
4. A highly motivated faculty dedicated to the cause of architecture education has created a rigorous, challenging, and dynamic interdisciplinary climate for teaching and learning. Faculty provide opportunities for students to get engaged in various interdisciplinary option studios, as well as lead participation in the Solar Decathlon Project along with the faculty of engineering disciplines. The architecture faculty has led the development of two college-based minors, including Critical Studies in Design and Design Media Communication. Additionally, the College of Design is collaborating with the College of Engineering in the planning of the university's Student Innovation Center, where architecture faculty members are the key participants. However, the faculty, in general, needs more encouragement toward scholarly engagements. There is an expressed
desire for stronger mentorship, guidance and support along the path to tenure-track opportunities provided for adjunct lecturer faculty members.

5. The student body is extremely positive, optimistic, hardworking and supportive. While, taking education very seriously, they are maintaining a strong sense of pride for their institution, as well.

6. The faculty has worked to create an entirely integrated science-technology requirement, which works to not only teach the fundamentals of building systems, but also requires application of the acquired knowledge in the students’ studio designs projects. This was clearly evident to the team in seeing the before-and-after effects on studio works.

7. In recent years, the architecture program has been engaged in various notable outreach efforts. This includes the 2012 Fall Folklife Festival Exhibit at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., and the downtown studio, Design on Main.

8. The architecture program is benefitting from the support of an Advisory Council consisting of a team of highly motivated alumni who are instrumental in various leadership roles and voluntary contributions for the architecture program.

Regarding the curriculum of architecture, the architecture department is undergoing major rearrangement and overhaul of the course contents and reallocation of courses. While the new science-technology courses have been a major improvement in equipping students with the requisite technical knowledge for the Comprehensive Design studios, the existing model of required option elective courses is still raising doubts whether all the students are equally being provided with a well-rounded exposure to the entire NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC). The faculty of the architecture department pursues scholarly works on personal initiatives, with a high degree of assertiveness and success. On a case-by-case basis the director of research assists them with the selection of research topics and allocation of resources. While there is support for scholarly initiatives, the culture for pursuing externally funded research could be enhanced.

In essence, the entire administration, faculty, students and staff have demonstrated and performed to their utmost effort in collaborating with the accreditation process and in making it a celebrative and enriching process, as well as a constructive milestone.

2. Conditions Not Met
   A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
   B.2 Accessibility
   B.5 Life Safety
   B.6 Comprehensive Design

3. Causes of Concern
   A. Physical Resources
   Physical resources have been identified as a concern to both faculty and students. Currently, the physical resources of the architecture department seem barely adequate for students' educational needs, supplemented by the innovative faculty solutions (such as Design on Main). However, support spaces such as the woodshop, lab, and other resources do not fully address the needs of the entire student body. Faculty offices are also becoming an increasing issue.

   B. Required Sets of Elective Options
   While the "required sets of elective options" allow for a deeper exploration of specific knowledge for both students and faculty, the existing structure of these courses still does not guarantee equal exposure to the entire NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC) for all students.

   C. Core Studies
Students and faculty have questioned whether the College of Design core courses in the freshman year (pre-architecture) prepare students for the B. Arch program, both in terms of rigor and relevant academic advisement.

4. **Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)**

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

**Previous Team Report (2007):** The team was unable to find adequate traditional examples in the undergraduate program of academic writing using documented multiple source research, the analysis of facts, the development of a rhetorical argument, bibliographic information and the proper citation of sources in papers available for review.

The graduate program had numerous examples of academic writing including ARCH 595, 596, and 597.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** This condition has been met as specified in the SPC requirement, A. 1, as the multitude of student writings in various students' works in both programs corroborate the ability for this criterion.

**2004 Criterion 13.8, Western Traditions (M. Arch. only):** Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them.

**Previous Team Report (2007):** The graduate program needs a broader historical view of the western architectural canons and traditions in architecture that includes periods before the 19th century. While a summer reading list is provided to matriculating students, this activity is not considered to be performance at the level of understanding.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion has not been met as specified in the SPC requirement, A. 9.

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

**Previous Team Report (2007):** Neither the undergraduate, nor the graduate programs address the non-western traditions to the level of understanding. Several students selected non-western research topics for papers but this is not consistently accomplished by all students. There are several excellent electives in this area. However, electives cannot be used to satisfy the student performance criteria.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion is now combined with Western Traditions in SPC A.9, Historical Traditions and Global Culture; neither program has met the requirement for this SPC.

Although several students selected Non-Western research topics for papers, this SPC has not been accomplished by all students. There are several excellent electives in this area; however, electives cannot be used to satisfy the student performance criteria.

**2004 Criterion 13.16, Program Preparation:** Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site
conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

Previous Team Report (2007): There is extensive and inventive evidence of program analysis, but no evidence of assessment of actual client and users' needs, detailed inventory of space and equipment size requirements beyond gross square footage notations or consistent design assessment criteria implementation.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition has been met as specified in the SPC B. 1.

2004 Criterion 13.17, Site Conditions: Ability to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

Previous Team Report (2007): The program has respond addressed this issue through analysis but there is no evidence in the design of large site contexts, site drainage, parking layout, and site circulation for required course work. Site conditions are addressed in the options studios but not in required studios, so it is possible a student may not be exposed to these important criteria.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition has been met as specified in the SPC B. 4.

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

Previous Team Report (2007): The team was unable to find evidence of construction cost estimating that includes life-cycle cost in student work.

While building economics is indicated as a learning outcome for Professional Practice (ARCH 482-582) the visiting team could not find any evidence of student work to indicate that this criterion is met by the required curricula.

There is evidence that this criterion is addressed in design-build elective studios but electives cannot be used to satisfy NAAB student performance criteria.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition has been met as specified in the SPC B. 7.

2004, Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation (M. Arch. only): Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

Previous Team Report (2007): Evidence of this criterion is found in the course work for Materials and Methods I (ARCH 240). The course effectively teaches students technical documentation through a combination of generating verbal and graphic documents and "red lining" each other's work. This process mirrors practice and effectively demonstrates a student's knowledge and ability. The team expresses a concern that the exclusive use of light wood frame structures inhibits the full potential of this course.

The graduate program does not exhibit the thoroughness of various building systems, the full range of scales or all the forms of representation that are typical of technical documents.

There is significant reliance on an elective course to inform the technical documentation knowledge; this course is not taken by all students.
2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition has been met as specified in the SPC A. 4.

2004 Criterion 13.28, Comprehensive Design (B. Arch only): Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability.

Previous Team Report (2007): Architectural Design V (ARCH 401) does not meet the requirements for comprehensive design. However, there was ample evidence that Architectural Design V when taken in concert with the elective Integrated Design Workshop (ARCH 528f) met the expectations for comprehensive design. However, electives may not be used to fulfill NAAB student performance criteria.

The team found Advanced Architectural Design III (ARCH 603) in the graduate program meets expectations even though there were inconsistencies among projects. The team found no explicit rubric for evaluation that is shared with students and describes all the variables that need to be considered when comprehensive design is combined in one studio course.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition has not been met for either program as specified in the SPC B. 6.

2009 Focus Team Evaluation Assessment on Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum: For one-year post-professional non-accredited M. Arch degree.

The program's submission for this review was limited to a brief letter by the chair outlining ongoing discussions about the particular issues of degree nomenclature subject to this Focused Evaluation. The program did not provide materials, describing the curricular and/or programmatic changes necessary to remove the noted deficiency. As a result at this time there is not sufficient information to make an informed decision about whether the program has removed the deficiency with respect to Condition 12, Professional Degrees and Curriculum.

2013 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is met. Per the NAAB focused evaluation of 2010, the university's change of the degree nomenclature of the post-professional non-accredited M. Arch. degree to the Master of Science in Architecture degree was considered in compliance with the requirement of NAAB Condition 12.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture 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 programs have fulfilled this requirement for narrative and evidence

2013 Team Assessment: The Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture programs are in alignment with the university’s history and mission as stated in their APR.

The following text is taken from the 2013 Iowa State University Architecture Program Report:

History: Iowa State University is a broad-based university of international stature. The majority of its students are from Iowa, but every state and more than a hundred foreign countries are represented in the student body.

The University is composed of the Colleges of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Business, Design, Engineering, Human Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College. In Fall 2011 the University had an enrollment of 29,987 students and a faculty of 1,766. In academic 2010-11, the university awarded more than 5,900 baccalaureate, advanced, and professional degrees.

Iowa State University was one of the earliest institutions established in the movement to create an educational system uniquely suited to an American democratic philosophy, providing access for a broader population. It was chartered by the Iowa General Assembly in 1858. Iowa was the first state to accept the terms of the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862. In March 1864, the General Assembly awarded Iowa’s grant to the chartered institution at Ames. In 1903 the university set the pattern of county cooperative extension that is now conducted throughout the United States. As Iowa State adapted the land-grant philosophy to the changing needs of the twentieth century, its program became that of a university with special teaching responsibility in science and technology, an extension education program throughout the state, and focused research interests to advance the frontiers of learning. Since 1959, it has been known as Iowa State University of Science and Technology. ISU is a Carnegie Research Very High university, one of 73 public universities and 108 totals in that highest rating category for research and doctoral-granting institutions. Iowa State University is also one of 34 public universities that are members of the 61-member American Association of Universities.

The College of Design is a comprehensive design school embracing a wide range of the visual and environmental design disciplines in the Departments of Architecture (Arch), Integrated Studio Arts, Industrial Design, Interior Design, Graphic Design, Community & Regional Planning (CRP) and Landscape Architecture (LA). Formed in 1978, the college originally united four departments that had long-standing reputations in other colleges in the university (Arch, LA, CRP, and Art & Design). During the
last two academic years of strategic planning ('10-'11 and '11-'12), the College suspended the original four-department structure and temporarily organized around degree programs. In May 2012, the College obtained Regents approval for a reorganization with the seven departments noted above.

Previously located in the College of Engineering, Architecture became an autonomous department headed by a chair within the College of Design in 1978. During the recent two-year period of collegiate reorganization, architecture was led by an Interim Director. During academic '11-'12, a search for a permanent chair did not result in a hire for that position. The dean is continuing the search during academic '12-'13. Currently, an Interim Chair heads the Department of Architecture.

Mission: Iowa State University Mission: Create, share, and apply knowledge to make Iowa and the world a better place.

1. To create knowledge, Iowa State must be a magnet for attracting outstanding students, faculty, and staff who will learn, work, and conduct world-class research and scholarship that address the challenges of the 21st century.

2. To share knowledge, Iowa State’s faculty, staff, and students must be able to communicate with and learn from diverse populations. The University must maintain a strong focus on student success and provide exceptional undergraduate, graduate, professional, and outreach programs that prepare students and citizens for leadership and success.

3. To apply knowledge, Iowa State’s faculty, staff, and students must be able to develop global partnerships to convert what they know into products, services, and information that will improve the quality of life for the citizens of Iowa, the nation, and the world.

The Department of Architecture Mission is stated in its Governance Document:

The Department of Architecture is a comprehensive center for teaching, research and public service in architecture. The department is an element of the College of Design and, together with other departments, forms a unique and innovative interdisciplinary environment. Although all academic programs are grounded in the requisites of the profession, each is distinctly different. The five-year undergraduate program positions architecture design as an armature within a broad-based field of studies. The graduate program is research-based and allows the student to explore special areas of interest in addition to the core curriculum in architectural design. The post-professional graduate program facilitates advanced studies in architecture. At all levels the department is committed to the study of architecture as a cultural discipline in which issues of practice, the environmental effects of buildings, and the multiplicity of social formations in which buildings exist are enfolded with the subject matter of building design—construction, space, material, form, and use. The complexity of architectural production is mirrored in an intentionally diverse student body and faculty.

1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

Finally, the program must document, through narrative and artifacts, its efforts to ensure that all members of the learning community: faculty, staff, and students are aware of these objectives and are advised as to the expectations for ensuring they are met in all elements of the learning culture.
• Social Equity: The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with a culturally rich educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. This includes provisions for students with mobility or learning disabilities. The program must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program’s human, physical, and financial resources. Finally, the program must demonstrate that it has a plan in place to maintain or increase the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students when compared with diversity of the institution during the term of the next two accreditation cycles.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a positive and respectful learning environment.

[X] The programs have demonstrated that they provide a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2013 Team Assessment: Learning Culture: Evidence was clear during meetings with students and faculty that the program hosts an incredibly positive learning environment. The team witnessed unwavering optimism with the AIAS representatives and general enthusiasm from all students’ meetings. The highly collaborative delivery approach in design studios fosters respect, sharing, and engagement. There are many opportunities for innovation between and among students and faculty, including the Solar Decathlon and various design competitions.

The learning culture is expressed in a studio culture policy created by AIAS and other student representatives. We understand that studios and reviews have been positive environments for learning, and that improvement can be realized through attention to schedules, review techniques, and learning styles.

Social Equity: During meetings with faculty, students, and staff, the team found considerable attention paid to social equity. We witnessed a very diverse student body. We learned there are procedures in place to identify English as a second language and provide assessment and support. Should a student fall behind due to disabilities, there are means for accommodation. All students have equal access to an adviser, with the ability to change if needed.

Various female faculty expressed concern about two gender-specific issues. First, female lecturers sensed that decisions on final teaching assignments (and, in one case, renewal of contracts) seemed delayed when compared to their male counterparts. Second, it was also noted more than once that only one full professor is female. With the student population at a 40/60 female to male ratio, it would be appropriate to have a higher ratio for female faculty throughout the ranks of faculty, including full professor. The university has a clear policy on diversity found on the university web site.

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

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

and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The undergraduate and graduate architecture programs are generally responsive to this condition as evidenced in faculty involvement in committees at the department, college, and university levels. Architecture faculty collaborate with faculty from other departments, schools, and colleges within the university, and architecture students collaborate with students in other disciplines, as evidenced in such initiatives as the national Solar Decathlon project by Iowa State University and the 2012 Folklife Festival exhibit at the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C., in which the university's exhibit, "Transforming Communities: Design in Action," created by the College of Design and the university's Extension and Outreach initiative, highlighted the role of design in the land-grant mission.

The architecture department has pursued collaborative research with the School of Engineering, and there is significant opportunity to collaborate on a greater scale. The university provost has contributed $1 million to fund research between the College of Design and other disciplines across the university. The provost noted that Iowa State University's historical academic tradition of excellence is in the fields of science and technology, and that he sees architecture as a key part of the university's long track record as a national leader in this field. However, some architecture faculty expressed concern that the architecture department's contribution to the academic community may not be recognized by the university's top governance because it does not contribute to the metrics used by the university to maintain its membership in the Association of American Universities.

Architecture students expressed the view that their discipline is well regarded by their colleagues in other university fields of study, even if it is not totally understood. Several buildings on the campus were designed by faculty members of the Department of Architecture (such as the AIA national honor award-winning design for the main campus library by former architecture chair Cal Lewis) demonstrating to the university community the value of architectural excellence. Students noted, however, that they must make personal efforts to connect with the university's larger academic community, and this is often accomplished through student engagement in university-wide clubs and activities.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The foundational interdisciplinary structure of the pre-architecture core program has created within the students a culture of necessary collaboration, exploration, and leadership. In conjunction with this, the limited enrollment, high demand and expectation for admission into the Bachelor of Architecture program creates from the beginning a strong desire to work toward individual development and success in their academic studies. The prestige of being ranked a top-20 architecture program at both the graduate and undergraduate level, paired with affordability and responsiveness to an individual-based learning process, attracts students from numerous states and around the globe. This contributes to the multifaceted level of understanding architecture's varying cultural implications in the students' educational experience. Students also strongly look to the professional experience of their professors for guidance and inspiration in their own professional growth and development. They are prepared through the
curriculum, the design school’s culture, and faculty example to enter the workforce upon graduation with an individual expectation of professional excellence and continued education growth both within architecture and the more general discipline of design.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: Professional practice courses Arch 482 in the B. Arch program and Arch 582 in the M. Arch program cover these issues, as evidenced by the material found in the notebooks for these two courses. Also, individual interviews and responses to questions posed in the general meeting with students confirmed that they have effectively obtained the required preparation in these professional practice courses and have been duly informed of IDP enrollment procedures. At the time of the NAAB visit, there are 39 students with active IDP records. Many other students have registered to obtain free information about the program, but they have not yet paid to open an NCARB record. Primarily these students are in the final years of their study, indicating that most are not registering at the earliest point of eligibility.

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, while contributing to the growth and development of the profession.

[X] The programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: There was evidence of a satisfactory connection between education in this program and the profession. A high percentage of the faculty is licensed to practice architecture and have many years of experience. They bring an understanding of the profession of architecture to the education experience. Professional architects have also been included in studio lectures to enhance the students’ well-defined collaborative interdisciplinary roles. Evidence in course literature found in the team room and student works displayed in the team room show that students have gained the ability to understand the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects and related disciplines in practice; to respect client expectations; to advocate for design-based solutions that respond to the multiple needs of diverse clients and diverse populations in a variety of communities. Their work in the development of design-build projects and the Design on Main program contributed to the growth and development of the profession.

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 programs are responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: The architecture department demonstrates a strong commitment to architecture education and the public good. This includes faculty-conducted research in which students have participated, such as campus accessibility and soybean applications in the construction industry. The community design lab involves outreach programs, led by a tenure-track assistant professor in the department. In addition, they have been appointed to the Extension program supporting community projects.

Also, the school regularly offers a design-build studio option that responds to a variety of community need-based projects. The graduate curriculum also requires a service learning project. Several other design studio projects work to respond to the community, such as one that responded to the post-flood conditions of Cedar Rapids.

The students also expressed interest in pursuing a Freedom by Design chapter.

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 programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: The APR for 2013 NAAB Visit for Continuing Accreditation with Supplements 1 and 2, I.1.4 indicates that the university had identified multiyear objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture in a 2009-10 update of its strategic plan. Four themes were described to be pervasive in planning and practice campus-wide: Creating new knowledge through research and creative work; applying that knowledge through extension, professional practice and peer leadership; sharing that knowledge through teaching and extension programs; and serving Iowa and the world by addressing substantive issues as we move toward the future. There seems to be a need for a structured mentorship for new adjunct and lecturers in the program.

The department explained that since 2007 it has reviewed its program through the involvement of a range of faculty, students, and alumni on the Architecture Advisory Council. They responded to deficiencies and concerns that came from the previous NAAB team visit. The following were also studied and developed further: alternative degree structures and differential tuition, international exchanges and degrees, curriculum development and catalog, and collegiate programs and new collegiate structure.

They explain the description of the role the five perspectives play in long-range planning in Section I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives.

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

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
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 programs processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2013 Team Assessment: The APR for 2013 NAAB Visit for Continuing Accreditation with Supplements 1 and 2, I.1.5, Program Self-Assessment describes the process clearly.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The APR for 2013 NAAB Visit for Continuing Accreditation with Supplements 1 and 2, I.2 defines a satisfactory response to this requirement. Discussions with faculty and staff also verified this information.

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The APR for 2013 NAAB Visit for Continuing Accreditation with Supplements 1 and 2, Section I.2.1.B Students, define a satisfactory response to this requirement.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the programs

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.
2013 Team Assessment: The program is one of seven departments in the College of Design and is led by the department chair who reports to the college dean. The dean provided an organizational chart for the College of Design. Colleges in the university are seen as separate business units as explained by the provost. Each college is given an allotment of funds determined partially by a budget the dean establishes as necessary. The dean determines the distribution of funds to the departments.

In addition, the architecture department has included a differential tuition method, based upon the university model, in order to supplement funds for operations as determined by the chair.

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

**[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the programs**

2013 Team Assessment: The chair is assisted by his cabinet, composed of five coordinators. All faculty members participate individually in various committees, but most department decisions are determined by direct vote of tenured, tenure-track, adjunct, and lecturer faculty. Students are represented in the department by the AIAS leadership, who are invited to participate in all faculty meetings. They are also represented at the college level through the Design Council, having active participation and vote in 4 of the 20 college committees. All information on governance was provided by the dean and the chair and confirmed by the AIAS president. Staff had not participated until now, when the college is in the process of rewriting its governance policy. The committee doing so has a voting staff representative.

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

**[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the programs**

2013 Team Assessment: Faculty and students both identified physical resources as a concern. The physical resources of the architecture department are adequate for student learning, primarily due to innovative faculty solutions (such as Design on Main). Supplemental spaces such as the woodshop, lab, and other resources are barely sufficient in addressing the student needs. The size, outfitting, and management of the woodshop seem to be an increasing issue in terms of student needs for class requirements, as identified by both students and faculty. Currently, it appears to be operating beyond capacity. The faculty has 90 offices available, and with approximately 150 full-time faculty members, space availability is becoming an increasing issue.

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

**[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the programs**

2013 Team Assessment: The APR for 2013 NAAB Visit for Continuing Accreditation with Supplements 1 and 2, Section 1.2.4. Financial Resources, defines a satisfactory response to this requirement. There is always a concern for fluctuating government funding in higher education. It became apparent through discussions with department of architecture faculty and review of the Peer Land Grant Universities Faculty Salary comparisons (2001-2002 through 2011-2012) that salaries for full professors are significantly below peer institutions, and salaries for assistant and associate professors are higher than
those at peer land grant universities. That there have been few raises over the past number of years is a concern, especially in light of the comparatively low salaries for professors in relation to peer institutions. The architecture department works to compensate for this with the differential tuition, which is allocated by the college to the department and is managed by the chair in consultation with the dean.

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

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the programs

2013 Team Assessment: The Information Resources are a tremendous strength of the architecture department. The design reading room is located in the College of Design on the ground floor and contains an exceptional collection of publications, periodicals and journals. Full-time staff is on site to assist students and faculty with research and accessing resources from nearby Parks Library or by sourcing from outside publishers.

The visual resource collection is impressive as nearly 200,000 35mm slides are nearly all converted for digitized viewing for a comprehensive documentation of major works in architecture, landscape architecture, city planning, craft, and art.
PART I: SECTION 3 - REPORTS
1.3.1 Statistical Reports. Programs are required to provide statistical data in support of activities and policies that support social equity in the professional degree and program as well as other data points that demonstrate student success and faculty development.

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The statistical reports were primarily provided by the APR, and any additional information requested was provided to the team by the faculty.

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

---

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

2013 Team Assessment: Annual Reports were provided for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. Although most information is repetitive from year to year, the 2010 and 2011 reports also include information on temporary changes to the program structure.

I.3.3 Faculty Credentials: The program must demonstrate that the instructional faculty is 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.

2013 Team Assessment: Faculty résumés were provided, including courses taught, recent publications, and research. Also, a faculty teaching assignment matrix was provided. The team met with tenure and tenure-track faculty, and separately with lecturers and adjunct faculty.

\(^4\) The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team’s ability to view and evaluate student work.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW
The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2013 Team Assessment: This information was provided in a separate binder available in the team room, NAAB 2013 Departmental Information and Supplements.
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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of this in both the B.Arch. and M.Arch programs in Professional Practice course, Arch482/582, as well as required SAC (Studies of Architecture and Culture) electives, which are listed as demonstrating the department’s RWR (reading, writing, reading) course requirement.

For the B. Arch, it is also evident in the required course Arch222 History and Theory II without citations.

For the M. Arch, it was present in the required course Arch595 Seminar on the Built Environment 1: History.

The school feels that this requirement is primarily met in the RWR required elective. The team evaluated each of these optional elective courses to determine that the requirement was met universally. While it was determined as met, this method of SPC delivery is not conventional and must be strongly enforced to guarantee consistent student learning.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
2013 Team Assessment: For B.Arch., Arch 201 Boathouse project shows a progression of design thinking with study of various types of boats, study of precedents, and consideration of both public and private access. In Arch 302 we saw the skin and sun studies considering alternatives and alternative outcomes.

For M. Arch, Arch 603 Boston Symphony Center shows program breakdown and analysis, precedents, and development of structural and mechanical systems. This was a low pass.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B.Arch., traditional drawings are evidenced in works produced for Arch 230 Design Communication; all other media is evident in studio works shown for Arch 201, 202, 301, 302, 401, and 403. Web page design and Revit exercises are shown in the notebook for Arch 334.

For M. Arch, traditional drawings are evidenced in design works produced for Arch 505, while other media is evident on studio works for Arch 506, 507, 601, and 603.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B.Arch., technical drawings are covered in Arch 230 Design Communication and Arch 343S Building Science and Technology, also in studio work for Arch 201, 202, 301, 302, 401, and 402, including models; specifications are found on Arch 343 and 445 Notebooks.

For M. Arch, technical drawings and specifications are found in the notebook for Arch 644 Environmental Systems, and in studio work for Arch 506, 507, 601, and 603, including models.

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

B. Arch [X] Met
2013 Team Assessment: For the B. Arch., evidence of the ability to meet this criterion was found in student studio works for Arch 201, 202, and 301.

For the M. Arch, evidence of the ability was found in student studio works for Arch 505, 596, and 601.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of the ability to meet this criterion was found in student studio works for Arch 202 and 302.

For M. Arch, evidence of the ability was found in student studio works for Arch 506, 507, and 601.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch., precedent use was very prevalent in design studio works in Arch 401.

For M. Arch, precedent study was evident in design studio works in Arch 603.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch., evidence of the understanding of this criterion was found in student studio works for Arch 302 and 401; For M. Arch, evidence of understanding was found in student studio works for Arch 505 and 506.
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.

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: For the B.Arch., the team determined that this requirement was not met to the necessary degree within the required history/theory sequence, Arch 221 History of Architecture I, and Arch 222 History of Architecture II. The program also strives to meet this requirement through the required electives component, Studies in Architecture and Culture (SACs). However, we found that some of the electives, particularly Arch 597, did not sufficiently cover non-Western architecture history, therefore not guaranteeing every student equal exposure to non-Western tradition. The course syllabus also did not identify itself as fulfilling this SAC required elective, even though students were advised that it would meet this requirement.

For the M. Arch, the same condition was found in terms of non-SPC fulfilling SAC required electives.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, Cultural Diversity is evidenced in work of Arch 426 Native American Architecture and 427 Chinese Architecture. For M. Arch, evidence was found in work prepared for Arch 598 Architectural Orphans. It is also evident in nearly all optional topics, required spring design studio (402, 404, 602, and 604). Although these are required electives, the team considered this criterion as met. It was evident that all students were exposed to and pursued these studies. Cultural Diversity is also well-engrained in the learning culture of the department.


B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of the understanding of this criterion was found in student work for Arch 271 Environment and Behavior, 341 Tech Systems 2, and 445 Technical Systems 3; For M. Arch, evidence of understanding was found in student work for 541 Technical System 1 and 596 Seminar on the Built Environment 2: Landscape & Society.
**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** The 11 SPCs in Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation provide the backbone of architectural conceptualization and communication. Generally the student work, in studio projects and in course work showed a firm grasp of these criteria, expressive at the level of drawings, writing, and especially model making. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, students exhibit understanding and ability in gathering and analyzing relevant information, developing ordering systems, relying on research, and communicating design ideas and abstract concepts. More attention needs to be focused on the context of history and global culture as they affect architectural design.
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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of the ability to meet this criterion was found in the student work for design studio 401, in conjunction with Arch 445 Technical Systems 3. It is also in Arch 341 Technical Systems 2.

For M. Arch, evidence of the ability was found in student work for design studios 601 and 603.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: Although there is ample evidence that Accessibility is thoroughly covered in the elective course Arch 571 “Design for All People,” the team could not find evidence of ability demonstrated in work of design studios or other required courses, both in the B. Arch and M. Arch programs.

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.
2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, low pass in Arch 401 shows the use of day-lighting, light sensors, and recycled insulation. A precedent study of a Herman Miller facility informed this student.

For M. Arch, low pass in Arch 601 (specifically a sustainable design studio) pursued a net zero building incorporating geothermal, solar panels and green roof.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of site design is found in design studio works Arch 301, 302, 401, 403, and 445 Technical Systems 3.

For M. Arch, evidence of site design is found in design studio works Arch 507, 601, 603.

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

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: No evidence of this SPC was found in the course work. Although the Arch 245 Building Science and Technology Module 2: Assemblies and Materials syllabus indicates it will be addressed, there was no further documentation of this. The second round of projects in the later submission addressed certain life safety applications; however, there were a considerable number of errors and code oversights, particularly in high pass projects. Similarly, the integration of life safety requirements in studio designs was not evident, with particular neglect of egress considerations.

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.2. Accessibility
A.5. Investigative Skills  B.4. Site Design
Global Culture

B.5. Life Safety

B. Arch
[X] Not Met

M. Arch
[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The B.Arch. and M. Arch programs have two comprehensive design studios (Arch 401 and 403; Arch 601 and 603). Although both documented multiple source research, the analysis of facts, the development of a rhetorical argument, bibliographic information, and the proper citation of sources in papers, there was no evidence found in the work shown that any students had developed the ability to integrate B.2 Accessibility and B.5 Life Safety into their project solutions.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B.Arch., evidence was found in the simultaneously co-taught Arch 401 Design Studio and Arch 445: Technical Systems 3.

For M. Arch, evidence was found in Arch 601 Sustainable Design Studio and Arch 644 Materials Systems 4.

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.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B.Arch., evidence of understanding for this criterion was found in the building science-technology works for Arch 245, 341, 342, 343, and 445.
For M. Arch, evidence of understanding was found in the building science-technology works for Arch 541 and 643.

**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.

- **B. Arch**
  - [X] Met

- **M. Arch**
  - [X] Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** For B. Arch, evidence of understanding for this criterion was found in the building science-technology work for Arch 245, 341, 342, 343, and 445.

For M. Arch evidence of understanding was found in work for building science-technology Arch 541 and 643.

**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.

- **B. Arch**
  - [X] Met

- **M. Arch**
  - [X] Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** For B. Arch, evidence was found in Arch 343 Building Science-Technology notebook and in studio work for Arch 401, 403, and 445.

For M. Arch, evidence is found in studio work for Arch 601 and 603.

**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.

- **B. Arch**
  - [X] Met

- **M. Arch**
  - [X] Met

**2013 Team Assessment:** For B. Arch, evidence was found in Arch 341 and 343 Building Science-Technology notebooks and in studio work for Arch 401.

For M. Arch, evidence found in Arch 644 Building Science-Technology notebook and in studio work for Arch 603.
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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of site design is found in design studios Arch 301, 302, 401, 403, and 445 Building Science-Technology 3.

For M. Arch, evidence of site design is found in design studios 507, 601, 603 and 644 Building Science-Technology 4.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: The 12 SPCs for Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills, and Knowledge focus on the myriad "real world" issues that architecture needs to address in order to create safe and serviceable built environments. For the most part student work, both in studio projects and in course work at the undergraduate and graduate levels, showed ability and understanding in addressing requirements in gathering and assessing information in the pre-design phase, how architecture integrates with the site and provides enclosure systems, and incorporates environmental systems, structure, and building materials. However, deficiencies were evident in the ability to design for accessibility and life safety, and to incorporate them into comprehensive design solutions.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met

M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, evidence of this was found throughout the undergraduate course work, particularly in design studios Arch 401, Arch 403, and Arch 482, which also works to teach them the different roles in a firm and how they work together.

For M. Arch, evidence of this was found throughout the undergraduate course work, particularly in design studios Arch 601, Arch 603, and Arch 582, which also works to teach them the different roles in a firm and how they work together.
C. 2. Human Behavior: Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch, the undergraduate requirement Arch 271 Environment and Behavior provides evidence of this.

For M. Arch, this requirement is evident in Arch 596: Seminar on the Built Environment 2: Landscape and the Built Environment.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch. evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. For M. Arch, evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook.

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

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch. evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. For M. Arch evidence found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met
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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. For M. Arch evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch was evidence found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. For M. Arch, evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. For M. Arch evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook.

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.

B. Arch [X] Met
M. Arch [X] Met
2013 Team Assessment: For B. Arch evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 482 notebook. The Arch 301 Ledges State Park project meets this by introducing building blocks for a variety of climbing, sitting, playing experiences for park visitors.

For M. Arch, evidence was found in Professional Practice Arch 582 notebook. Arch 581 exhibits this understanding through the bike skill park project.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: Student work in studio projects and in course work at the undergraduate and graduate levels showed ability in and understanding of the collaborative nature of architecture practice, service to the client, project management, legal requirements, leadership in the architectural enterprise, and the responsibility of the professional to the social dimensions of architecture on a global scale. The range of performance criteria in this realm were ably met, with particular distinction in collaborative teamwork.
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

2013 Team Assessment: From the NCACS web site, ISU (ID 1238) is shown as accredited until 2016.

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

2013 Team Assessment: The institution clearly states that it offers a NAAB-accredited Bachelor of Architecture (167.5 hours) and a NAAB-accredited Master of Architecture (100 hours).

It also states that the department offers a post-professional non-accredited Master of Science in Architecture.

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

2013 Team Assessment: The Curriculum Committee is elected by the faculty. Out of the five members of the Curriculum Committee, three are registered architects in a U.S. jurisdiction (Illinois, Iowa, and Colorado) and one is registered in Germany. Only one member is not a licensed architect.
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

2013 Team Assessment: For the B. Arch program, students transferring from an accredited architecture program will be considered for advanced placement after an evaluation of academic credentials, content of past courses, and a portfolio review. Admission to the B. Arch program is overseen by the undergraduate program coordinator, who recommends how transfer credits (if any) will be assigned to the B. Arch degree program.

For the M. Arch program, students with a pre-professional degree in architecture from an accredited U.S. program desiring advanced standing in the M. Arch program are assessed through an analysis of their transcripts and the content of pre-professional architecture courses, if their undergraduate degree includes substantial studio, technical, and history or sociocultural coursework. This includes a thorough review of prior coursework, transcripts, and portfolio. If this work is deficient, advanced standing may not be given for all course areas. The director of graduate education is responsible for assessing an individual student’s background and determining both advanced standing and any remedial requirements. Students admitted with advanced standing are given credit for no more than 40 credits from their pre-professional degree program. However, advanced standing is not granted to many students. Students with an architecture degree from a foreign architecture program are assessed through an analysis of their transcripts and the content of the architecture courses for general admission to the M. Arch program. Advanced standing with a foreign architecture degree is not offered.

There is a concern that students admitted to the M. Arch program without an undergraduate degree in architecture may not have sufficient exposure to courses such as calculus, trigonometry, analytical geometry, and physics. The assessment process for admission to the M. Arch program does not account for course content in these and other technical areas.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Up-to-date text for the statement on NAAB-accredited degrees was found in printed brochures and on-line information about the accredited architecture programs.

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

2013 Team Assessment: This information is available on the College of Design’s web site, through the architecture information page.

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

2013 Team Assessment: This information is available on the College of Design’s web site, through the architecture information page.
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

2013 Team Assessment: This information is available on the College of Design’s web site, through the architecture information page.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: ARE pass rates are provided in the program’s web site by a link to NCARB’s page on ARE pass rates by school, plus they also include a PDF file with a comparative chart of pass rates including 10 other schools of architecture in the Midwest region.
III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

   A. History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

       Reference Iowa State University, APR, pp. 1-4

   B. History and Mission of the Program (I.1.1)

       Reference Iowa State University, APR, pp. 4-6

   C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

       Reference Iowa State University, APR, pp. 11-13

   D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

       Reference Iowa State University, APR, pp. 13-16
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

A.4 Technical Documentation:
Students showed admirable skill in the design and construction of physical scale models.

C.1 Collaboration:
Collaboration was not only required in many levels of learning in both the B. Arch and M. Arch, but integral to the learning culture of the school both for students and faculty as they acknowledge it as essential to professional work and interpersonal relationships as a whole.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Mitra Kanaani, Chair
Undergraduate Department
NewSchool of Architecture and Design
1249 F. Street
San Diego, CA 92101-6634
(619) 235-4100 ext. 109
(858) 663-2127 mobile
mitra.kanaani@yahoo.com

Non-voting member
Janice Legg, AIA
115 Cottonwood Place
Decatur, GA 30030
(404) 822-5750
leggstein@prodigy.net

Representing the ACSA
Michael J. Crosbie, Ph.D., FAIA
Associate Dean & Department Chair
Department of Architecture
College of Engineering, Technology, and Architecture
University of Hartford
200 Bloomfield Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117
(860) 768-4755
(860) 768-5198 fax
crosbie@hartford.edu

Representing the AIAS
Joy M. Newberry
640 Berkeley Drive, Apt. 1
Clemson, SC 29631
(724) 553-8036
joy.morgan.newberry@gmail.com

Representing the AIA
Morris Brown, MFA, AIA,
Director
Texas Tech University College of Architecture El Paso
9050 Viscount Boulevard, Suite A625
El Paso, Texas 79901
(915) 594-2030 ext. 224
(915) 274-3153 mobile
morris.brown@ttu.edu

Representing the NCARB
Arq. Raúl Rivera-Ortiz, AIA, NCARB
President
Rivera & Lastra Architects, Psc
115 Calle Del Parque
San Juan, PR 00911-1956
(787) 723-6000
raulrivera@r-architects.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Mitra Kanaani, D.Arch, AIA, ICC
Team Chair
Representing the ACSA

Morris Brown, MFA, FAIA
Team member
Representing the AIA

Joy M. Newberry
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Raúl Rivera-Ortiz, AIA, NCARB
Team member
Representing the NCARB

Michael J. Crosbie, Ph.D., FAIA
Team Member
Representing the ACSA

Janice Legg, AIA
Non-voting member
Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report
2 May 2013

Cassandra Pair
Manager of Accreditation
National Architectural Accreditation Board
1101 Connecticut Ave., NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Re: Iowa State VTR Correction of Fact Review

Dear Cassandra,

On behalf of the Department and College, I would like to thank the Visiting Team for their thorough and thoughtfully written accreditation review of our Master of Architecture (100 credits) and Bachelor of Architecture (167.5 credits) accredited degree programs. The 2013 Team Assessment commentary throughout the report will be very helpful as we work toward the future.

We are pleased that the technical corrections we noted regarding the preliminary draft were incorporated into the VTR Final Draft. There remain two previously noted non-correction clarification items for which we would like to provide context. These are attached separately. Please feel free to contact me further if you, the Visiting Team or Team Chair Mitra Kanaani would like further information.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Gregory Palermo, FAIA
ACSA Distinguished Professor and
Interim Chair
2 May 2013

As noted in our cover letter of this date, we are very pleased with the thoroughness and thoughtfulness of the Visiting Team Report, and the many positive findings with respect to Conditions, criteria and SPCs met. The commentary on potential areas for improvement and unmet SPCs will prove to be very helpful. Beyond this, there are two areas where we would like to offer clarification.

Clarifications/Context:

Pages 1-2: Paragraph #4, under Team Comments and Visit Summary:
We wish to clarify two items noted regarding scholarship and advancement:

1) With respect to "However, the faculty, in general, needs more encouragement toward scholarly engagements." (p. 1): We provide support for faculty improvement leaves of one semester or longer (7 since our last accreditation visit), and travel stipends for tenure-track and tenured faculty (up to $3,600 per faculty member from a pool of $40,000 per year). With respect to fostering scholarship, we have tenured five assistant professors who were promoted to associate professor (a 100% promotion rate), and have had two successful promotions from associate to full professor since the 2007 visit. The scholarship needed to establish national and international contributions and recognition in the discipline has been supported with research and development leaves and course releases. Several senior faculty who have not recently prepared conventional peer reviewed scholarship have active professional practices that directly build upon their expertise and contribute to curriculum. Lastly, across the faculty five books are currently in preparation. While we believe we actively support faculty scholarship and advancement, we receive the finding for encouraging more scholarly engagement as helpful to our strategic objectives.

2) With respect to providing "... support along the path to tenure-track opportunities for adjunct lecture faculty members" (p. 2): The department provides travel stipends for lecturers and adjunct faculty for presentations and poster exhibitions that contribute to professional development. They are also eligible for internal grants and participation in external grants – several of which have been successful. Such financial support and research opportunities for non-tenure-eligible faculty are rare in the university. Since the last accreditation visit in 2007, six lecturers, with our support, have developed teaching and scholarship resumes and obtained tenure-track positions here at ISU and other institutions following national searches. Nonetheless, the expressed desire for improved mentorship is informative and helpful for us.

Page 8: 4th full paragraph under Team Assessment of 1.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity
While this Condition has been met, we wish to clarify two items noted with respect to "gender-specific issues":

1) "... female lecturers sensed that decisions on final teaching assignments ... seemed delayed when compared to their male counterparts." Lecturer appointments may be full- or part-time, and most lecturers have assignments in the department as well as college-wide. Thus, often there is a mix of notification dates regarding contracts and teaching expectations for both men and women – particularly those that require multiple program assignments and funding. That mix is shaped by seniority, area of expertise, original contract type, range of participating programs, etc. We will take this comment under advisement to improve communication regarding notification and contract renewals.

2) With respect to female faculty ratio: "With a student population at a 40/60 female to male ratio, it would be appropriate to have a higher ratio for female faculty," an implication that women are not well represented in our faculty. Of three current tenure-track assistant professors, two are women and our newest assistant professor, joining us in the fall of 2013 is a woman. Of ten tenured associate professors, four are women. Of 21 faculty who are not administrators, eight are women who teach at all levels of both accredited degree programs across a range of specialties and studios. Of 18 adjunct professors and lecturers, seven are women – again teaching across both degree programs at all levels. We continue to actively seek, foster and retain a diverse faculty in gender, multi-cultural background, and intellectual position in all of our searches.