



**Kent State University  
College of Architecture and Environmental Design  
Architecture Program**

## **2018 Visiting Team Report**

**M. Arch. [Bachelor of Science in Architecture + 44 graduate credits]**

The National Architectural Accrediting Board  
April 14-18, 2018

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

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

## Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Visit	3
II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	5
III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation	
Part One (I): Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	8
Part Two (II): Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	20
Part Three (III): Annual and Interim Reports	33
IV. Appendices	
1. Conditions Met with Distinction	34
2. Team SPC Matrix	35
3. The Visiting Team	36
V. Report Signatures	37

**I. Summary of Visit**

**a. Acknowledgments and Observations**

Acknowledgments

Preparation for an accreditation visit is a formidable task that demands acute attention to detail and a fine spirit of cooperation among the many faculty, administrators, students, and staff charged with its organization. The team is grateful to the entire College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) community for the curation of the team room and related exhibits, preparation of the APR and supporting written and digital materials, and a willingness to engage in probing discussions with a fine balance of enthusiasm and reflection. Further, the team appreciates that this visit occurred during an unusually intense period in the life of the College that included the conduct of seven faculty searches, still ongoing during the accreditation visit,

Our obligations were made all the more efficient to fulfill for the cordial welcome that we received and the collaborative spirit of the administrative team and faculty leadership. Special thanks are due Dean Mark Mistur, Associate Dean William Willoughby, and especially Architecture Program Director Jonathan Fleming, whose leadership provided a touchstone for all efforts made during the course of the visit. We also express appreciation to Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Mandy Munro-Stasiuk for generously offering her observations about the CAED from its overarching university context.

Observations

The team found much to admire in the program:

The team feels strongly that we arrived at the CAED at a great moment in the history of the school. There is much to celebrate: the construction of a new and richly furnished building, the arrival last year of a new dean, the promise of new hires to enrich and diversify the faculty community, and, most importantly, an optimistic and talented community of students and faculty. The CAED's aspirations to grow from a college of regional influence to one of national and international renown are noteworthy, and from all indications of this visit, achievable.

All meetings with students, faculty, and administrators evidenced the care, expertise, and professional commitment of a collegial academic community. Mutual respect, open discourse, and cooperation among the college's faculty and administrators, the college and university administration, among diverse faculty members, and between faculty and students, emerge as hallmarks of the university and essential ingredients of the learning environment in the CAED.

Demonstrated collaboration with programs and peers outside the program impressed the team. Dean Mistur's description of "knitting together silos" sets an aspirational tone for cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary endeavors within the academic programs and disciplines of the CAED and across campus. Both faculty and students benefit from mutually supportive relationships in teaching, learning, and research with the allied disciplines of interior design, landscape architecture, urban planning, and construction management, all within the college. Growing productive relationships with robotics, fashion, and, especially, the Design Innovation Initiative offer great promise for collaborative teaching, research, and scholarship that has great potential to enhance the professional program.

Student work and demeanor, together with observations of college leadership, alumni and friends of the college, and the students themselves, is marked by a strong work ethic

and vivid technical competence in drawings and systems articulation. Students' demonstrated commitment to and interest in obtaining professional licensure, contributions to community service -- particularly by student organizations -- and success in securing and learning from internships also speak to a pervasive professionalism among undergraduate and professional program students. There is no question that CAED graduates are held in high esteem and sought after by the regional professional community. In short, there is ample evidence that the CAED offers an effective and rigorous, yet intellectually diverse, professional curriculum.

The climate of intellectual richness and diversity created by the post-professional programs, and dual degree offerings that parallel and interface with the M.Arch. curriculum contribute to a strong culture of learning, creative practice, design thinking, and research opportunities. Similarly, in the pre-professional program, an enriched pallet of electives, opportunities to pursue minors, and options in the third-year design studio present students with ways and means to develop specialization and focus within their architectural training.

The robust campus community at Kent State, anchored by the CAED Center, is augmented by learning opportunities beyond the campus, including options for study abroad in Florence, pursuing the final year of the professional program at the Cleveland Studios, which houses the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative, and growing initiatives in learning and research through travel exemplified in initiatives and partnerships in Havana, Romania, Jedda, and Beirut. Together with studios that confront social equity in design through close study of pressing problems in nearby Ohio cities and towns, CAED students develop a balanced understanding of local and global issues in architecture and urban design. Present directed approaches to historic preservation, adaptive use, and infill in these contexts also enriches the curriculum, stimulating critical thinking about design, its historic precedents, and its social consequences.

The team believes that the dedication and commitment of the entire school together with the university will find creative solutions to meet the increasing demands of architectural education, particularly at the graduate level, as it evolves with the 21st century. In this context, the team also observed areas that beg continued thought for program faculty and the administration.

Student options to pursue the M.Arch. on the Kent State campus or in Cleveland both bring intellectual diversity and richness to the program and empower students to make choices in graduate research and design studios in accordance with personal interests and passions. Sustaining equity while maintaining this flexibility in curricular content and learning experiences requires continued attention.

The installation of state-of-the-art fabrication labs, shops, and research lab spaces offer opportunities and challenges of integration for the program in design studios, elective courses, and faculty and student research. They will remain provocative topics of interest for the CAED community as they seek to balance taking best advantage of these resources with ever-changing developments and expectations in professional practices and architectural research.

Although values and ethos of studio culture are understood across the CAED, studio culture remains a "work in progress." Developing and evolving studio culture protocols that serve and respond to an expanding population of students—in the professional graduate program, the undergraduate programs in architecture, professional programs in the allied disciplines, and post-professional graduate programs—and faculty in the still new CAED Center beg attention to maximize the potential of the learning environment and inculcate best practices of collegiality and collaboration. In parallel, post-occupancy study and understanding of the facility is required to address concerns that have emerged from "living" in the new spaces: with particular regard to pin-up space, flexible

spaces for diverse learning experiences, and office allocation to support ordinary business and underpin the evolving faculty research agenda.

The team has been made aware of on-going efforts in strategic planning, faculty development, and curriculum development, particularly efforts undertaken in response to the University's 2016-17 Strategic Plan and the five initiatives it articulates as well as campus-wide cross-disciplinary opportunities for research and learning. At the same time, continual and formalized evaluation and assessment of educational outcomes will be essential to sustaining excellence in the program. Taking best and most productive advantage of these burgeoning endeavors in research and collaboration invite new models for architectural education while preserving the integrity of the M. Arch. as a degree that, most importantly, prepares the next generation of designers.

**b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)**

The 2018 team found that all conditions have been achieved.

**II. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit**

**2009 Criterion B.7, Financial Considerations:**

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

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

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion was eliminated with the articulation of the 2014 NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation*. Please see 2018 assessment for student performance criteria B.10., Financial Considerations. As noted in the APR, (p. 50), the team verified that this condition was addressed by the assignments, homework, and exams for ARCH40402, Methods and Materials II. The project uses a series of alternative curtain wall assemblies as applied case study for the percentage of building cost associated with the overall budget of a structure for which students develop technical documentation. More recently, additional lectures and outcomes were added to Methods and Materials II to address the 2014 articulated SPC B. 10, including outcomes related to construction scheduling that were not part of the 2009 condition.

**Previous Team Report (2012): Causes of Concern**

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

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** Students receive a written policy on studio culture, documented in the APR (p.17), at the beginning of each semester. An 8-page written policy, the document was developed by the administration without student or faculty input. With the new and open studios layout, a studio culture still is being established, and discussions in

team meetings with students and faculty revealed the presence of a strong studio culture of collaboration and mentorship among students at different stages in the curriculum.

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

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** Both the 2014 Interim Progress Report and the APR verify that that this concern has been addressed; (see pp. 6 – 8 IPR, and pp. 49-50 APR.) Following the 2012 visit, a comprehensive review of the curriculum was undertaken resulting in the following:

In regard to design studios, beginning in the Fall of 2017 options studio sections were added in third year fall semester and in the Master's Program year. At the Master's level, the studio offerings, pre-vetted by the program director, are presented by each of the faculty members followed by a lottery (selection system) that is optimized for student choice. Similarly, at the third-year level, each of the section heads presents his/her project in advance of a lottery selection and assignment process. The third-year studios are semi-autonomous under a coordinator and master syllabus with common learning outcomes that are addressed in different ways. Even in coordinated studios, varied emphases exist, fueled by faculty research and practice expertise. Review of student work produced in the above-mentioned studios substantiates the assertions of the IPR and the APR.

Response to this concern also resulted in an increase of the number of electives offered each term in the Architecture Program, and the adjustment of requirements to afford student opportunity to enroll in additional elective hours. Curricular changes passed in 2014 and implemented with the 2016 Catalog include alterations to the course offerings to increase the total number of General Electives in the Bachelor of Science in Architecture degree from 8 to 14; (see APR p. 50 and Section II.2.2). Graduate students can elect optional programs of study including dual degree programs: the Master of Architecture/Master of Business Administration, and the Master of Architecture/Master of Urban Design.

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

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** The program officially opened a new building, the Center for Architecture & Environmental Design (CAED), in the fall of 2016. The new building addressed the Cause for Concern, by providing a facility that consolidates the programs and studios of the CAED that had been distributed around campus into a single home. The building was designed to foster the desired learning culture by creating an open environment for exchange. Tours of the facility provided to the team revealed a state of the art facility, which now includes a highly advanced "fabrication lab" (model shop), placed in a prominent location on the campus. (See APR I.2.2. Physical Resources.)

- D. Faculty development:** Faculty research and scholarship remains low. Heavy teaching loads and lack of yearly review of performance are an impediment to the time needed to develop

research directions and produce scholarship that would take advantage of existing funding opportunities.

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** Evidence provided in the APR (p. 51), together with discussions with college leadership and faculty, demonstrate that this concern has been addressed. Discussions with faculty and program and college leadership noted that, historically, Kent State, and its CAED, has been a “teaching institution,” which currently is evolving a robust research culture. Several new hires were made in 2013 and 2017 to raise the profile and improve performance of faculty research and scholarship. Reductions of teaching load for productive faculty and encouragement of faculty dissemination of their research and pursuit of recognition for innovative and creative work also are evolving. The College Research Committee developed a strategic plan in Fall 2015 that included an agreed-upon system for distributing support to tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty. Further, the Dean, in his meeting with the team, articulated a commitment to increasing support for faculty commensurate with higher expectations for research and scholarship. The infusion of new faculty, with current searches being conducted in 2017-18 academic year, also figure in strategies to increase research and scholarly productivity. (See APR, Section 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development.)

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

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

**2018 Visiting Team Assessment:** Both the 2014 Interim Progress Report and the APR together with discussions with program faculty and program and college leadership verify that that this concern has been addressed to the greatest degree possible within the protocols mandated by Kent State University, (See pp. 10-11 IIPR, and p. 52 APR; see also APR, 1.2.1 Human Resources and Human Development.)



### III. Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation

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

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

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

**I.1.1 History and Mission:** The program must describe its history, mission, and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

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

##### **[X] Described**

**2018 Analysis/Review:** According to the APR (p. 8), Kent State University, "founded in 1910, as the Kent Normal School... is the oldest state university in Northeast Ohio, and reflects the advantages of the vital cultural and commercial region in which its eight campuses are located." Kent has maintained its commitment to provide national leadership in historical strengths of the University: professional education and the liberal arts. Further, the university offers "an environment of academic and artistic freedom...enhanced by an excellent research library and numerous opportunities to collaborate with other institutions, public agencies and the private sector." It is governed by a nine-member Board of Trustees appointed by the governor, and is supported by legislative appropriations and student tuition and fees. Major priorities and initiatives are established by the *Strategic Roadmap to a Distinctive Kent State*; they are: 1. Students First, 2. A Distinctive Kent State, 3. Global, Competitiveness, 4. Regional Impact, and 5. Organizational Stewardship.

Kent State's College of Architecture and Environmental Design (CAED) is a professional college, organized in non-departmentalized units headed by a Dean, assisted by an Associate Dean; its academic units are Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, Master of Science in Architecture and Environmental Design, Health Care Design, Architectural Studies, and Construction Management. Program Directors and Coordinators, faculty members within their respective areas, head the academic units. The CAED also includes an outreach center, the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative (CUDC), headed by a Director. Research units within the CAED are headed by faculty and include the New Ecology Design Lab (NEDLab) and the Robotics Fabrication Lab (RFAB). The CAED also houses the FabLAB, which is headed by the Fabrication Lab Manager.

The APR (p. 9) establishes that, "A six-year program of study leading to the degree of Master of Architecture was implemented in 1968 and involved completion of the four-year Bachelor of Science degree plus a two-year graduate program. Simultaneously, a one-year graduate program was instituted for persons who had completed a five-year professional architectural degree from an accredited program. On December 18, 1969, the Department of Architecture became the School of Architecture and Environmental Design." In 2002, the professional program was restructured into a 4-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture, followed by a one calendar year Master of Architecture (Professional). NAAB accredited the BSci+M. Arch. in July 2002, followed by a Spring 2004 focused evaluation. The Master of Architecture Post-Professional degree was eliminated in 2012, stopped admitting students in 2011, and graduated its last student in 2016." Rooted in a strong professional orientation, it is the intent of the architecture program to remain relevant to a diverse, global culture of design and building (APR, p. 10).



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

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy and a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.
- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Analysis/Review:** The Architecture Program provides enriching experiences that open doors to world cities, innovative technologies, methods, and materials of construction, as well as leadership and service opportunities. The APR, meetings with students, faculty, staff, and administration support this assessment.

The program demonstrated a positive learning environment. As stated in the APR (p. 17), “the University’s top priority, “Students First,” is set in motion in a vibrant studio environment.” In team meetings with faculty and administration, both advocated for students’ experience and new opportunities that have been made available to them. The CAED has taken substantial steps to ensure students have everything they need to succeed. The First-Year Orientation course has had a “profound impact on broad culture of what it means to be a university student,” as stated by a first-year professor. This course ensures students are made aware of the psychological counseling and accessibility services available to them through the university health center, as well as introducing components of time management. The Studio Culture Policy is introduced in this course as well, which was written by administration to outline the ‘Do’s and Don’ts’ of the studio environment. Once students have adjusted to the program, they still have access to, and are mandated to, visit their advisors each semester. The CAED also has three professional academic advisors who advocate for and aid students, (APR, p. 15).

While both the faculty and students stated in separate meetings that “it is a new building, we are still figuring out the studio culture,” a keen sense of mentorship among both faculty and students was demonstrated. Placing students in different years in one large open studio together creates a collaborative environment, where interdisciplinary interaction is encouraged as well. The APR lists leadership and service opportunities in campus organizations, such as the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), a new National Organization of Minority Architects (NOMAS) chapter, and a very active service fraternity Alpha Rho Chi (APX). There also was a very large number of students who either already had begun the architect licensure process or were planning to by third or fourth year.

Because the program includes many first-generation students, opportunities have been created to encourage learning outside of the classroom. Most third-year students take advantage of the study abroad program in Florence, Italy, considered a part of the CAED learning culture, as opposed to a supplementary experience. In a team skype call, students in Florence described an enriching experience in which they design for the challenge of creating something modern in historical districts. Along with the international experience, “field trips are common in studios including regular trips to nearby cities such as Cleveland, Akron, Pittsburgh, and Chicago and annual trips to New York City, Washington, D.C., Baltimore, and Boston.” (APR, p. 16). There are traveling workshops, site visits, and lecture series, in which lecturers often provide a master class or round table discussion with students prior to the lecture.

The option to participate in the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative (CUDC) in their fifth-year allows students to be immersed in an urban environment and do community related service projects.

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

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students during the next two accreditation cycles as compared with the existing diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution.
- The program must document that institutional-, college-, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Analysis/Review:** Evidence provided in the APR (pp. 17-23), together with conversations with the Dean, staff and students demonstrates the CAED's awareness of the continual need to develop diversity among its faculty, students, and staff. Of particular note is the university-wide Graduate Dean's award that is intended for underrepresented students in their discipline (see APR, p. 22). This initiative began in 2012, and the award doubles the student's stipend for each of two years of assistantship commitment from the CAED to the student. In addition, the APR (p. 20) documents the CAED's commitment to developing a diverse student population through several pipeline initiatives, including the ACE Mentoring Program, Making Our Own Space, Upward Bound and various programs at the Cleveland School of Architecture and Design.

Kent State's Division of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) that proactively and collaboratively shares its mission of promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout the University community. Its policies appear on the campus website, (see <https://www.kent.edu/hr/affirmative-action-plan>), and the CAED benefits from DEI initiatives at all levels: administration, advising, faculty, and students through programs, workshops, and various kinds of student engagement and outreach; (see APR, p. 19).

Kent State also commissioned a system-wide assessment of the social climate of the university in 2016, "Climate Study: Our Voices Count," accessible on the University's website (<https://www.kent.edu/voices>), the results of which were disseminated in university forums during the 2016-17 academic year. Dean Mistur provided a written statement that identifies the recommendations and actions that the CAED has taken in response to the Climate Survey. Significantly, this response noted that the CAED ranked 1st in "having the lowest percent of students who indicate they have experienced exclusionary behavior in the last year."

**I.1.4 Defining Perspectives:** The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that affect the education and development of professional architects. The response to each perspective must further identify how these perspectives will continue to be addressed as part of the program's long-range planning activities.

- A. Collaboration and Leadership.** The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences, and opportunities for leadership roles.
- B. Design.** The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value.
- C. Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.
- D. Stewardship of the Environment.** The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources.
- E. Community and Social Responsibility.** The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.

**[X] Described**

**2018 Analysis/Review:**

**A. Collaboration and Leadership**

The APR (pp. 24-27) asserts that the CAED supports leadership and collaboration that distinguishes its graduates “as effective collaborators and as leaders” by defining these roles throughout the entire educational sequence. Projects through the curriculum offered in the Foundation Studio (AED 10101), the Fourth Year Community Project Studio and the Fourth Year Integrated Design Studio demonstrate the achievement of this goal. According to the APR (p. 24), interdisciplinary collaboration begins with the Foundation Studio and is reinforced with community based projects in the Fourth Year Community Project (ARCH 40101), as evidenced by projects representing work in the Akron, Sandusky and Youngstown communities. These projects allow students to work with community leaders and to develop responses, based on the input of stakeholders. The collaborative effort continues in the Fourth Year Integrated Design (ARCH 40102) project that includes student teams working together with consultants to develop a complete project that responds to a community site. Through work with mechanical, structural and electrical engineers, “students understand their value to the process of building and the nature and importance of effective interdisciplinary collaboration,” (APR, p. 25).

Participation with student organization such as AIAS-including involvement in national AIAS, NOMAS and Alpha Rho Chi as well as the Dean's Student Advisory Board, and at the University level, detailed in the APR (p. 25) provide leadership opportunities. Discussions with program faculty pointed to opportunities for students to work with faculty in the FabLab, Digital Fabrication and Print Center. A meeting with student leaders (April 17) verified that participation and leadership in many student programs are encouraged and supported.

**B. Design**

The APR, the curriculum, the observed student-faculty culture, and the final products of design studios demonstrate that the program is responsive to the Defining Perspective of Design. The curriculum ladders from design fundamentals to integrated whole to research-based open-ended inquiry in a structured sequence, with a consistently building focus on design and process. The APR (pp. 27-29) expands upon this sequence, and examples of student work at each level

document its implementation. Meetings with Mandy Munro-Stasiuk, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, and CAED Dean Mistur indicate that many in the Kent State community view this as an exciting time for the CAED for development of design leadership through collaboration and interdisciplinary inquiry through design thinking and innovation initiatives. Student leaders described their engagement in opportunities for learning and collaboration across disciplines. To the students, the new facility represents an environment that they describe as open to interdisciplinary and collaborative design processes. The Cleveland Urban Design Center, with programs in Landscape Architecture and Urban Design collocated with architecture, furthers the opportunity for educating trans-disciplinary design leaders.

### **C. Professional Opportunity.**

According to the APR (p. 29), “Kent State has the benefit of strong connections with surrounding AIA chapters in Eastern Ohio, Akron and Cleveland and Pittsburgh. Architecture alumni contribute significantly to the health of the profession in the region...Alumni are in leadership roles throughout AIA Ohio, local AIA chapters in Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York as well as national AIA.” This assertion was substantiated by alumni, faculty and local professionals with whom the team met. In addition, the APR also highlights an annual career fair that, typically draws more than 60 participants from across the nation (p. 29).

In terms of licensure, the APR (p. 30) states that the program’s Architectural Licensing Advisor (ALA) ensures that requirements “(Education, Experience and Exam) are discussed with every applicant that visits Kent State for the Bachelor of Science in Architecture or the Master of Architecture.” Furthermore, during the meeting with students, the team confirmed that new freshmen are introduced to the registration process; later, as part of a course requirement for ARCH40402/50402, Methods and Materials II, they are asked to establish an NCARB Council Record. Finally, as also noted in the APR (p. 30) and confirmed by completed student homework, the Master of Architecture ARCH65003, Leadership, Ethics and Office Management course “discusses traditional and non-traditional practice in detail.”

### **D. Stewardship of the Environment**

The CAED demonstrated its commitment to developing graduates who are prepared to understand their responsibility for and stewardship of the environment and natural resources in two very effective manners: first, as exhibited through the student work in courses ARCH 40001 Sustainable Design and ARCH 40102/50102 Integrated Design Studio in particular; and second, the CAED through the example of its new building. The building, on target for achieving LEED Platinum (as explained on the team’s tour of the building), provides a vital teaching and learning tool for students and faculty (see also APR, p. 39).

### **E. Community and Social Responsibility**

The Kent State Mission Statement articulates that *“We transform lives and communities through the power of discovery, learning and creative expression in an inclusive environment,”* (APR, p. 7). Core values include engagement that inspires positive change and a collaborative community. The team found that the program has a long history of civic-mindedness among students, faculty and alumni. This is nurtured through upper level studio service projects that operate through client influence. Studios partner with firms in nearby cities and engage with regional communities. Discussions with student leaders described student initiatives that inculcate social responsibility and community engagement ranging from participation in NOMAS and Alpha Rho Chi to a unique student run organization called “Barkitecture,” which serves animal protection organizations in Northeast Ohio with design, construction, and service, as well as service events such as Relay for Life and volunteering with Habitat for Humanity.

**I.1.5 Long-Range Planning:** The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies multiyear objectives within the context of the institutional mission and culture.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Analysis/Review:** The APR (pp. 34 – 41) provides evidence of the program's long-range planning efforts. In particular, the program identified how its planning is developed in a tiered process starting from the University President's "vision, mission and core values" guidance, then matured through the advancement of program strategic initiatives, and culminating in specific initiatives such as a Strategic Faculty Hiring Plan, which includes searches for at least 7 important and/or imminent vacancies. As noted in the APR, "hiring of diverse candidates for academic and staff positions is a priority of the CAED."

**I.1.6 Assessment:**

**I.1.6.A Program Self-Assessment Procedures:** The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

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

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

**I.1.6.B Curricular Assessment and Development:** The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments, and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Analysis/Review:**

**A. Program Self-Assessment**

The APR (pp. 42-48) enumerates methods by which the CAED and its programs assess themselves. Disparate assessments cover courses, instruction, tenure track faculty, and progress toward the college's mission and stated objectives as well as any deficiencies or causes for concern identified during accreditation visits. Meetings with faculty substantiated that there are broadly-understood program self-assessment processes through informal dialogue, committees, and faculty-staff retreats.

Many of these methods intertwine with curricular self-assessment. They include: course evaluation; tenure track faculty review; college advisory committee; college curriculum committee; faculty / staff retreats; exit survey; student advisory board public reviews, and the University assessment process called the Open Pathway. For the larger University, the assessment and continuous improvement process has changed over the past year, with it developing "Six Steps to Continuous Improvement of Student Learning (Closing the Loop)." From conversations with Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Munro-Stasiuk, Dean Mistur, and others, it is clear that there is a University plan and approach to assessment; its implementation at the college and program level remains in progress.

**B. Curricular Assessment and Development**

In addition to the methods enumerated in item I.1.6.A, the APR also states that the program follows the curricular development process described in the faculty handbook. Curricular assessment ranges from formalized processes to real-time weekly coordination and assessment meetings, which were noted by faculty for studios that may have a large number of sections taught by both full-time faculty and adjuncts.

In May of 2017 the CAED held an all-day faculty retreat, led by Dean Mistur and Associate Dean Willoughby, centered on the architecture program curriculum. The curricular changes that may come from that retreat are yet to be fully defined, and in meetings with faculty, the team found them engaged in the curriculum conversation. Associate Provost for Academic Affairs Munro-Stasiuk, Dean Mistur, and others emphasized the cross-discipline initiatives that are in part the result of assessment of the current curricula against the needs of society and the professional marketplace.



## Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

### I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

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

#### **[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Demonstration of appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement appears in the APR (pgs. 51-58), and was verified through conversations with faculty, administration, staff, and students, and review of CAED and University web-links to relevant policies and procedures. “Students First” is one of Kent State’s articulated initiatives that makes clear the importance of student achievement and the commitment of human resources to assure achievement of this objective. Meetings with both students and faculty reveal a collegial community in the CAED where faculty and students, accordingly, enjoy a mutually beneficial teaching and learning environment. Similarly, productive collaborative relationships among faculty in architecture with urban planning, interior design, and landscape architecture as well as with the allied disciplines of art, fashion, and physical geography, (to name only a few of many relationships noted), adds to the productivity and creative/intellectual energy of the school. The addition of construction science to the CAED also holds great potential for enrichment of learning and research among faculty and students as does the creation of the new Design Innovation Center, the conception and formation of which actively engaged CAED students and faculty.

The APR (p. 53) documents that faculty workloads, and processes and procedures concerning evaluation of teaching effectiveness, professional development, and service contribute to a learning culture that addresses faculty endeavors in research, scholarship, and creative practice in the context of the student learning experience that they support. A typical faculty workload is 24 workload units for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty per Faculty Handbook Section III.2. Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty have a workload of 30 units each academic year per University Faculty Handbook Section IV.4. Faculty are expected to maintain 5 office hours per week. Faculty contracts are 9 months for full-time faculty and part-time/temporary faculty are contracted per course on a semester by semester basis. The University recognizes creative work through professional practice as critical to the success of the CAED. Web links in the APR offer policies and procedures governing faculty service, at the school, college, and university level, see especially

Evidence that documents faculty workload includes links to university policies, manuals, rules, and regulations that ensure best practices in these areas, see especially: the University’s Collective Bargaining Agreement Article IX, (<https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/2012aaupptcba.pdf#page=48>); the University Faculty Handbook Section III.2, (<https://www.kent.edu/facultyhandbook/employment-policies-misc>); and the CAED Handbook (currently under revision).



The APR provides evidence that the program has appointed an Architecture Licensing Advisor, Peter Marks AIA, who properly fulfills the requirements of his position, and that students are informed fully about the requirements of and preparation for licensure (APR, p. 54). Meetings with students (April 16) verified that they have been informed about the AXP, and an informal poll of students indicated that the overwhelming majority of candidates for the professional degree aspire to licensure. The team was impressed with the program's dedicated efforts to creating a climate that is remarkably supportive of engaging students with the licensure process through: presentations by the licensing advisor to students in first year, and again, in greater detail, at the upper level; in the required ARCH40402 Methods and Materials II course, all architecture students are required to establish their NCARB record.

Evidence provided in the APR (pgs. 54-55) together with faculty discussions of on-going research and creative activity (meeting with faculty, April 16) demonstrates that the faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement. For faculty, the appointment of Dean Mark Mistur has brought a renewed energy to the encouragement and pursuit of architectural research, and enrichment of the faculty cohort with new hires, expected to bring demonstrated research agendas to the CAED, will add to the robustness of its research culture. Faculty appreciate that the growth of a research/creative practice culture on the campus has come with the support for conference participation for disseminating scholarship and research as well as travel support for developing research programs., access to funding to competitive (internal) grants for research/creative practice endeavors, and release time. Support for faculty research and creative practice is available at both the university and the college level, notably with efforts in the CAED to increase support for research travel, research travel in conjunction with study abroad, and traveling fellowships, and, University funded research opportunities are substantial including a number of initiatives geared toward interdisciplinary research initiatives. Meetings with administrative staff made clear that the university provides continuing education opportunities and training for personal professional development. Specifically, the Division of Human Resources also provides many opportunities for training and development; administration, staff and alumni have opportunity for selection to the University's Institute for Excellence training.

The APR (pgs. 56-58) including links to policies, descriptive narratives and metrics documenting student demographics and participation, supported by discussions with the CAED professional advising staff, demonstrates that students in the program have access to and benefit from an effective portfolio of student services. Particular attention is paid to enculturating incoming freshman to the university and the college, including its services for academic and personal advising, through the Destination Kent State program, and a required First Year Experience course in the CAED. Professional advisors work with pre-professional students while the Graduate Program coordinator provides academic and professional advising to M. Arch. students. Although the CAED does not have a formal career placement service, it hosts an annual Career Fair, preceded by preparatory workshops. Faculty and administration assist students to the greatest degree possible in identifying and securing productive internships and, at the university level, trajectories toward traditional architecture practice are augmented with research opportunities through the Office of Student Research and in entrepreneurial endeavors by LaunchNET Kent State. Entrepreneurship is fostered in the MARCH/MBA Program and CAED student participation is high in both the Undergraduate Research Symposium and the Graduate Research Symposium where architecture students are recognized regularly.

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

Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

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

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, on-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

**[X] Described**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program has documented its compliance with the physical resource requirements in the APR (pp. 59-64) as well as through the team observation of the use of the building during the visit. (See [http://www.architectmagazine.com/project-gallery/kent-state-center-for-architecture-and-environmental-design-1678\\_o](http://www.architectmagazine.com/project-gallery/kent-state-center-for-architecture-and-environmental-design-1678_o))

The Center for Architecture and Design, opened in August 2016, provides more than 110,000 SF under one roof, housing the needs of the entire college. This space is supplemented by the Cleveland Urban Design Collaborative (CUDC) and the Palazzo Vettori in Florence, Italy. The single terraced studio loft, classrooms, crit boxes, labs, lecture facilities, Print Center with 2D, 3D and laser cutting shop and library provide students with facilities to support student achievement. The studio loft enhances the students' ability to participate in a collaborative environment. Several team members observed the CUDC facility (April 14). The popularity of the program and the growth experienced recently, as observed by students (April 17 meeting) and faculty (April 16 meeting) may provide a challenge for the program with expanding needs for studio and office space.

The FabLab and Digital Fabrication resources provide opportunities for hands-on learning opportunities. Space is provided to support student use of tools and equipment for both studio use and experimentation as discussed in meeting (April 16) with the lab manager David Clark. First-hand observation of the space by the team validated the information provided in the APR.

As established through meetings with students, faculty and staff, the facility provides new resources not previously available. Facilities for staff and advising provide centralized work areas accessible to meet student needs. With continued growth, faculty research may be challenged by the limited availability of space; (see APR, p. 60).

The APR (p. 64) provides links to information on faculty teaching, IT and course management support. University subscription services include access for all students, faculty and staff for online training modules in technology. Studio lab software is available to students for Revit, AutoCAD, 3D Studio, Studio Viz, Maya, Rhino, Adobe Suite. Wireless and Ethernet access is provided throughout the facilities. A meeting with student leaders verified the flexibility provided in the area of software use and availability.

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

**[X ] Demonstrated**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Budget information documented in the APR (pp. 65-68) together with additional financial data made available in the team room, and information provided in meetings with the college dean, architecture program director, the CAED financial director, and the CAED director of development demonstrate that the program has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

The University now operates on a Responsibility Centered Management system (RCM) that attributes tuition dollars and State Subsidy Income (SSI) directly to the college that generates the income. The system provides more authority to the individual college in regard to budgeting, planning, and financial control. It also encourages entrepreneurship. Overhead metrics and other formulas that take into account parameters for operating in the RCM model are articulated in the APR (p. 65). In this context, the college has maintained a positive fund balance allowing it to weather state-mandated tuition freezes, calls for salary increases, and costs accrued in the construction of the new building while maintaining a positive funds balance.

Since the last accreditation, the RCM model incentivized the addition of strategic programs at the graduate level in Urban Design, Landscape Architecture, Healthcare Design, and a Master of Science in Architecture and Environmental Design, anticipating the ability of those programs to support themselves financially while adding strategic disciplinary areas to the multidisciplinary mix, and, according to the CAED Dean, keeping the professional M. Arch. degree program fiscally robust. The recent addition of the undergraduate Construction Science program to the CAED also is expected to have a positive impact on the college financial resources. Parallel efforts to attract students who have obtained pre-professional degrees at peer institutions have potential to enhance intellectual diversity, increasing scholarship, reputation and ranking of the programs and college as well as to contribute to the overarching context of a solid financial foundation for the professional program and the college in which it is situated.

With regard to university and philanthropic investment, documentation in the APR (p. 66) and discussion with the CAED advancement officer note that there has been substantial investment in the CAED since the last accreditation: most significantly in the new building; as one of its Foundations of Excellence, the University invested \$44.7 million; and philanthropy added \$2.9 million toward the design, construction and FFE of the Center for Architecture and Environmental Design. The program further noted that from 2012-2018, \$20 million has been raised for scholarship program support and the new building.

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

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

**[X] Demonstrated**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The Joseph F. Morbito Architecture Library delivers information resources using both traditional (face-to-face) and electronic mediums. Although the overall footprint of the library in the new CAED building has been reduced according to the team's interview with library staff, the APR (p. 73) notes that there are: "Approximately 15,500 print titles are in the architecture collection at Kent State University. The majority are housed in the Architecture Library with additional materials accessible via online requests to the Northeast Regional Depository which is located in nearby Rootstown. A minimum number of architecture books are located at the University Library where a considerable collection of relevant visual arts material is also housed." The CUDC maintains a small library collection, supplement by resources from the public library and peer institutions, particularly Cleveland State University, for students who study there.

Also, the APR (p. 69) notes: "The goal of the library is to have staffed at all times graduate library science students in addition to undergraduate students and the Tenured, Associate Professor, Head Librarian and NTT Assistant Professor Librarian." The library staff deals with various levels of reference inquiries exemplified by the following: computer assistance for electronic databases; locating information in printed sources; directional questions; policy, loan, and circulation inquiries. First-hand observations by the team validated the information provided in the APR.

The program also maintains a library website (<https://www.library.kent.edu/architecture-library>), which provides the CAED community with state-of-the-art access to information and research tools and also provides access to the Belden Brick Materials Library that contains product samples from several hundred manufacturers specializing in items from bricks to upholstery. As noted on the website: "The material library also includes 'Material ConneXion,' a leading global platform for innovative and sustainable materials used in all types of design, building, and manufacturing. This collection is available for in-house use by signing in at the circulation desk of the Architecture Library."

**I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance:**

**I.2.5.A Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and school, college, and institution.

**I.2.5.B Governance:** The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

**[X] Described**

**2018 Team Assessment:**

**A. Administrative Structure**

The administrative structure is delineated in the organization chart contained in the APR (p. 76). Position descriptions for all key administrative personnel are provided, each with a clear outline of roles and responsibilities, (see APR, pp. 76-79). Conversations with Dean Mistur, Associate Dean Willoughby, Architecture Program Director Fleming and others reinforce the depth of administrative structure of the college. As evidenced by our conversation with Associate Provost Munro-Stasiuk, and supported by others, there is a clear hierarchy and structure of administration from University to College to Program.

**B. Governance**

The governance structure of the College and Program is clearly delineated in the APR (pp. 79-82). Conversations with numerous administrators and faculty affirmed a shared understanding of the structure. The team noted the extraordinary number of current initiatives, in part a result of concurrent searches for seven faculty and a new Program Director for Architecture. While the workload generated by these initiatives is significant, there appeared to be a clear understanding across faculty and staff of priorities and governance roles.

## CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

### PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

#### Part Two (II): Section 1 – Student Performance – Educational Realms and Student Performance Criteria

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

**Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the study and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. Graduates must also be able to use a diverse range of skills to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigating, speaking, drawing, and modeling.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

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

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for: ARCH 60301 Theories of Architecture, ARCH 5\_40001 Sustainable Design, and ARCH 30001 Site Design Writing Intensive Courses. In the work prepared for ARCH 60301 Theories of Architecture, students prepared encyclopedia entries and digital presentations conveying critical interpretations of architectural concepts and theory.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 60922 Methods of Inquiry in Architectural Studies and ARCH 5/40102 Fourth Year Design Studio. Examples of research proposals, project posters, exams on inquiry methods, detailed peer reviews and the drawing sets produced by the fourth-year design studios support this assessment.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for: ARCH 60922 Methods of Inquiry in Architectural Studies, ARCH 5/40001 Sustainable Design, ARCH 5/40101 Fourth Year Design Studio I, and ARCH 5/40102 Fourth Year Design Studio II. Examples of projects and papers show students thinking critically about site, sustainability and systems as they relate to their studio projects.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for the paired courses ARCH 50001/40001 Sustainable Design with ARCH 50101/40101, Fourth Year Design Studio I, and ARCH 50002/40002 Systems Design with ARCH 50102/40102, Integrated Design Studio.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for the paired courses ARCH 50001/40001 Sustainable Design with ARCH 50101/40101, Fourth Year Design Studio I, and course ARCH 60101, Graduate Design Studio 1.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 20101, Second Year Design Studio 1, ARCH 20102, Second Year Design Studio 2, and ARCH 60101, Graduate Design Studio 1. Examples of program briefs, case studies of precedents that include graphic analysis, historical research, and interpretative diagrams and writing, together with evidence in graduate projects that show precedent as a fertile generator for design support this assessment.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in ARCH 10011, Global Architectural History I and ARCH 20012, Global Architectural History II. Examples of midterm and final exams, analytical term papers, research and writing exercises, and responses to assigned readings, documented in the team room, support this assessment.

- A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity:** *Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and



individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures.

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement, at the prescribed level, in understanding the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures was found in ARCH 10011, Global Architectural History I and ARCH 20012, Global Architectural History II. Examples of midterm and final exams, analytical term papers, research and writing exercises, and responses to assigned readings, documented in the team room, support this assessment. Student achievement at the prescribed level of achievement in regard to the responsibility of the architect to ensure social equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures was found in the 4th Year Integrated Design Studio (ARCH 40102), demonstrated in design projects and, especially, iterative analysis that accompanied them.

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** Evidence of student achievement in Critical Thinking and Representation was successfully demonstrated in two-dimension, three-dimensional, and written presentations of student work. Students demonstrate appropriate ability and understanding in this realm across a broad range of the curriculum, from ARCH 10011 – Global Architecture History I – through Graduate Architecture Studios. Evidence of the ability to use precedents – SPC A.6 – is particularly strong. The team also observes a strength in the pairing of a 1-credit writing course with studio. Student work of these sequences demonstrates a robust understanding of design context and process, particularly in ARCH 50001/40001, paired with the ARCH 50101/40101 studio. There is consistent focus on model-making as a means of communication across the studio curriculum, and the overall body of final design work produced by the students at all levels shows both breadth and depth.

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

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

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

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 40001 Sustainable Design, ARCH 40102/40002 Architectural Design & System Design and ARCH 60150 Project Programming.



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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 30501 Environmental Technology, ARCH 30001 Site Design (WIC), ARCH 30101 3<sup>rd</sup> Year design Studio I: ARCH 30002 Urban Design, ARCH 30102 3<sup>rd</sup> Year Design Studio II, ARCH 40402 Methods and Materials II, ARCH 40101 4<sup>th</sup> Year Design Studio I and ARCH 40102 4<sup>th</sup> Year Design Studio II.

- B.3 Codes and Regulations:** *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations, and include the principles of life-safety and accessibility standards.

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 40402 Materials and Methods II, as demonstrated in course lectures, student assignments and exams.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 40402 Methods and Materials II, ARCH 40102 4<sup>th</sup> Year Design Studio II, as demonstrated in lectures and student assignments.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level in student homework prepared for courses ARCH20301, Intro. to Building Structures; ARCH30301, Structural Systems; ARCH 40302, Structural Systems; and ARCH40102, Integrated Design Studio.

- B.6 Environmental Systems:** *Ability* to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems' design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH30501, Env. Technologies I and ARCH40502, Env. Technologies II, as demonstrated in student homework and labs prepared for courses.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for course ARCH 50102/40102, Integrated Design Studio.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH30401, Methods & Materials I; ARCH40402, Methods & Materials II; and ARCH30501, Env. Technologies I, as demonstrated in homework assignments, exercises and labs prepared for courses.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The team found very strong evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level for lighting, mechanical, plumbing, and electrical systems in student homework assignments, exercises and labs prepared for course ARCH 50102/40102, Integrated Design Studio. The team also found evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level through lectures and corresponding examination results relative to fire protection, vertical transportation, communication & security systems in ARCH40402, Materials & Methods II.

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

[X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work for courses ARCH65001, Real Estate Development, ARCH40402, Methods and Materials II, ARCH30401, Methods and Materials I and ARCH40502 Environmental Technologies II, as demonstrated in course materials and lectures, syllabi, and student exams.

**Realm B. General Team Commentary:** Evidence of student achievement in the Building Practices, Technical Skills, and Knowledge was successfully demonstrated in course lectures, student exams and presentation of student work. Among the courses cited, the work presented in ARCH 40102/50102 Integrated Design Studio demonstrates that the students comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials, and are able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. This includes integrating systems into building designs, understanding constructability and environmental stewardship. A strong understanding of mechanical, electrical, plumbing and lighting systems was evidenced in the student produced in ARCH 40402 Methods and Materials II.

**Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions:** Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to demonstrate that they have the ability to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

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

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH60922, Methods of Inquiry, as demonstrated in student homework and assignments.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH40102, 4th Year Design Studio II (Integrated Design Studio); and course ARCH40502, Environmental Technologies. The course work and practical application labs for course ARCH40502 were of particular note as they required students to analyze various systems, develop very realistic selection criteria and then provide a deliverable that included well-reasoned recommendations.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH40102, 4th Year Design Studio II (Integrated Design Studio); ARCH40502, Env. Technologies; and ARCH40402, Methods & Materials II, as demonstrated in student homework, assignments and lab project designs prepared for courses

**Realm C. General Team Commentary:** The team was able to confirm that student achievement of both the understanding of and ability to develop integrated architectural solutions had been achieved when coursework from multiple courses was taken in combination or on a holistic basis rather than from a single, senior-level studio or lab. It was expected initially that the studio project designs completed in ARCH 40102, 4th Year Design Studio (Integrated Design Studio) which serves as a “capstone” would

provide sufficient evidence to satisfy the Realm C criteria. However, it became necessary for the team to review the student work of other courses such as ARCH 40502, Env. Technologies; and ARCH 40402, Methods and Materials II to be satisfied that students had successfully achieved completion of the components of this realm.

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

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

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

**D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture:** *Understanding* of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process—client, contractor, architect, user groups, local community—the architect's role to reconcile stakeholders needs.

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH65001, Professional Practice, Real Estate Development, ARCH65002, Professional Practice Contract and Planning Law and ARCH65003, Professional Practice Ethics and Office Management, as demonstrated in course syllabus and student exams.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 65002 Professional Practice: Contract and Planning Law, as demonstrated in class lectures, student assignments and exams.

**D.3 Business Practices:** *Understanding* of the basic principles of a firm's business practices, including financial management and business planning, marketing, organization, and entrepreneurship.

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH65003, Professional Practice, Leadership, Ethics & Office Management for Financial Management and Firm Practice, as demonstrated through lectures, student work and information provided in the course text and syllabi.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for courses ARCH65002, Professional Practice Contract and Planning Law and ARCH65003, Professional Practice Leadership, Ethics & Office Management through the information provided in the listed syllabuses, course content and student exams.

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for courses ARCH65003, Professional Practice Leadership, Ethics, & Office Management ,through evidence provided in the course information, lectures and student examination.

**Realm D. General Team Commentary:** Evidence of student achievement in the business of architecture and ethical conduct, roles of key related participants and legal concerns was demonstrated successfully in the course documentation, lectures, and student exams as described under Professional Practice, including courses ARCH65001 Real Estate and Development, ARCH65002 Contract and Planning Law and ARCH65003, Leadership, Ethics and Office Management. The student work, lectures and examinations provided evidence of student understanding.

## Part Two (II): Section 2 – Curricular Framework

### II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation

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

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).
2. Institutions located outside the United States and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may pursue candidacy and accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture under the following circumstances:
  - a. The institution has explicit written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region.
  - b. At least one of the agencies granting permission has a system of institutional quality assurance and review which the institution is subject to and which includes periodic evaluation.

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accredits Kent State University. After successfully completing the reaffirmation of accreditation process during the 2015 cycle, Kent State University's continuing accreditation was reaffirmed through 2024. The APR (p.100) provides a link to a copy of the HLC's letter to university president Dr. Beverly J. Warren, dated February 4, 2015, that affirms the accreditation. See

[http://www.hlcommission.org/download/\\_ActionLetters/Kent%20State%20University%20AQIP%20Reaffirmation%20Action%20Letter%201-27-15.pdf](http://www.hlcommission.org/download/_ActionLetters/Kent%20State%20University%20AQIP%20Reaffirmation%20Action%20Letter%201-27-15.pdf).

**II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum:** The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs. The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore should not be used by nonaccredited programs.

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

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. All accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements:

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** As stated in the APR (p. 86), Kent State "phased out its post-professional Master of Architecture in 2012" with the last student graduating in 2016 after completing a Master's thesis." After reviewing the program's credit hour information and meeting with the program chair, the team noted that students can achieve a "pre-professional plus" degree by completing Kent State's

---

Bachelor of Science in Architecture (124 credits) plus its Master of Architecture (44 credits) for a total 168 hour NAAB-compliant curriculum.

## **Part Two (II): Section 3 – Evaluation of Preparatory Education**

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

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic course work related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.
- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted 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.
- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate before accepting the offer of admission. See also Condition II.4.6.

### **[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The process for evaluating preparatory or preprofessional education is delineated in Section II.3 of the APR. The team's understanding was reinforced by conversations with Associate Dean Willoughby and Architecture Program Director Fleming, as well as through review of redacted files of admitted students. Evaluation of prior student work on admission is the responsibility of the Program Director, who is also the Master of Architecture Graduate Coordinator. A relatively small proportion of students currently enter into the Master of Architecture from institutions other than Kent State.

## **Part Two (II): Section 4 – Public Information**

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

### **II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees:**

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

### **[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** This statement appears on the program's website; see <https://www.kent.edu/caed/naab-accreditation>.



#### II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures:

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

*The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*

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

*The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* (edition currently in effect)

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program's website <https://www.kent.edu/caed/naab-accreditation> provides a link to the 2014 Conditions of Accreditation is: [http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/01\\_Final-Approved-2014-NAAB-Conditions-for-Accreditation.pdf](http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/01_Final-Approved-2014-NAAB-Conditions-for-Accreditation.pdf).

The program's website <https://www.kent.edu/caed/naab-accreditation> provides a link to the 2009 Conditions of Accreditation is: <http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2009-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf>.

The program's website <https://www.kent.edu/caed/naab-accreditation> provides a link to the 2015 Procedures for Accreditation is: [http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Procedures-Final-Approved-Edition\\_copyedited-052915.pdf](http://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2015-Procedures-Final-Approved-Edition_copyedited-052915.pdf).

#### II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information:

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

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

The program has established a website to provide this information at the following link: <https://www.kent.edu/caed/naab-accreditation>.

The webpage also includes the following subtopics and web links:

#### Career Development Information:

The Architecture Program recommends the following sources for information on careers in Architecture. Students are encouraged to discuss career plans with faculty and advisors, consider taking the ARCH 44611 Portfolio and take advantage of Career Fair Preparation Workshops and the CAED Career Fair each year. Please find additional career development information on the Architecture Experience Program page as it relates to Licensure. Professor Peter Marks is the Architecture Licensing Advisor for the Architecture Program. You may also consider visiting Kent State Career Exploration and development.

The NCARB handbook for Interns and Architects  
Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture  
The Emerging Professional's Companion from AIA  
[www.archcareers.org](http://www.archcareers.org)  
[www.NCARB.org](http://www.NCARB.org)  
[www.aia.org](http://www.aia.org)  
[www.aia.org](http://www.aia.org)  
[www.acsa-arch.org](http://www.acsa-arch.org)  
[www.naab.org](http://www.naab.org)

US Bureau of Labor and Statistics  
ARE Pass Rates

#### II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs:

In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- All NAAB Responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012).
- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB.
- The most recent APR.<sup>[1]</sup>
- The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda.

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program's website for prior VTRs and APRs is:

[https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/Kent%20State%20University%20VTR\\_%5BFinal%20Draft%5D\\_0.pdf](https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/Kent%20State%20University%20VTR_%5BFinal%20Draft%5D_0.pdf),

and

<https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/17%20NAAB%20PART%20III.pdf>;

[https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/11NAAB\\_APR\\_Kent%20State.pdf](https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/11NAAB_APR_Kent%20State.pdf)

#### II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates:

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

#### [X] Met

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program's website for ARE pass rates and other data is:

<https://www.kent.edu/sites/default/files/file/pass%20rates%20web.pdf>

#### II.4.6 Admissions and Advising:

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

This documentation must include the following:

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program's website for admissions and advising is: <https://www.kent.edu/caed/advising>. The team appreciated the caring and commitment to the students and their success that the advising staff demonstrated in our meeting.

**II.4.7 Student Financial Information:**

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The program's website for financial aid is: <https://www.kent.edu/financialaid>

### **PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS**

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

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

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The APR (p. 100) affirms that Annual Statistical Reports have been submitted to NAAB, and includes an accessible web link (<https://du1ux2871uqv.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/file/17%20NAAB%20PART%20III.pdf>) to them, together with a letter of verification from Kent State's Office of Institutional Research.

**III.2 Interim Progress Reports:** The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (see Section 10, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2015 Edition).

**[X] Met**

**2018 Team Assessment:** The Interim Progress Report, dated Fall 2014, was submitted to NAAB as required. The report is consistent with the stipulated requirements and includes responses to the issue raised in the previous (March 2012) VTR. The APR (p. 98) includes an accessible web link to the Interim Progress Report. (<https://du1ux2871uqv.cloudfront.net/sites/default/files/file/17%20NAAB%20PART%20III.pdf>).

**IV. Appendices:**

**Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction**

A.6. Use of Precedent

ARCH 20101, Second Year Design Studio 1, and ARCH 20102, Second Year Design Studio 2 establish a strong foundation for research and analysis of precedent as an essential component of design thinking through case studies of precedents that include graphic analysis, historical research, and interpretative diagrams and writing. Project research and execution in ARCH 60101, Graduate Design Studio 1, demonstrates that precedent studies remain a fertile generator for design in the most advanced studios of the professional curriculum.

C. 2. Evaluation and Decision Making

The coursework and practical application labs for course ARCH 40502, Environmental Technology II, were of particular note as they required students to analyze various systems, develop very realistic selection criteria and then provide a deliverable, which included well-reasoned recommendations with great clarity.



### Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

#### **Team Chair, Representing the ACSA**

Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D., Assoc. AIA  
Associate Dean and Professor of Architecture  
Fay Jones School of Architecture + Design  
University of Arkansas  
129 Vol Walker Hall, Fayetteville, AR  
479-575-3805, office phone  
egoodste@uark.edu

#### **Representing the AIA**

Judy L. Johnson, AIA, LEED AP BD+C  
Principal, Architect  
Harriman  
123 Middle Street  
Portland, ME 04101  
207.775.0053  
207.838.9186 (mobile)  
jjohnson@harriman.com

#### **Representing the NCARB**

Michael R. Merino, RA/NCARB, PMP, LEED Green Associate  
Principal Architect, IDS Group  
1 Peters Canyon Rd., Ste.130, Irvine, CA 92606  
949.387.8500 ext. 115  
714.624.5700 mobile  
michael.merino@idsgi.com

#### **Representing the AIAS**

Noor Ul Ain  
Chapter Vice-President  
American Institute of Architecture Students  
The City College of New York  
B.Arch. Candidate, Class of '20  
(347)421-0895  
noorulain6153@gmail.com

#### **N-VTM (NAAB-appointed)**

Brian K. Craig, AIA, LEED AP  
Director | Graduate Program in Architecture  
Kendall College of Art and Design | Ferris State University  
C 231.629.5007  
O 616.451.2787  
[BrianCraig@ferris.edu](mailto:BrianCraig@ferris.edu)

#### **N-VTM (Institution-requested)**

Bruce Seasick, FAIA, OAA  
Phillips|Sekanick Architects, Inc.  
142, E. Market St., Warren, OH, 44481  
C 330-717-3905  
O 330-395-9518  
[bruce@phillips-sekanick.com](mailto:bruce@phillips-sekanick.com)



V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D.  
Team Chair



Judy Johnson, AIA  
Team Member



Michael Merino, RA/NCARB  
Team Member



Noor Ul Ain  
Team Member



Brian Craig, AIA  
Non-Voting Team Member



Bruce Sekanick, FAIA, OAA  
Non-Voting Team Member

**Confidential Recommendation – Continuing Accreditation**

Upon consideration of the terms of accreditation in Section 3 of the *2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* and an assessment of compliance with the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, the team unanimously recommends to the NAAB Board:

Institution: **Kent State University  
College of Architecture and Environmental Design  
Architecture Program**

Degree Title: **M. Arch [Bachelor of Science in Architecture + 44 graduate credits]**

---

The team recommends:

☒ Eight-year term of accreditation

(choose one of the following)

☒ The team finds that deficiencies, if any, are minor, the intent to correct them is ensured;  
OR

☐ The team finds that major deficiencies are present in at least three areas listed in Section 3.4.b of the *2015 Procedures for Accreditation*, and the intent to correct them is ensured or in progress;

OR

☐ The team finds that the following SPC (list by number and title) has/have been identified as not met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit, and the intent to correct them is ensured or in progress;

---

The team recommends:

☐ Four-year term of accreditation

(choose one of the following)

☐ The team finds that major deficiencies are present in at least three areas listed in Section 3.4.b of the *2015 Procedures for Accreditation*, and may also have been present at the time of the previous visit, and the intent to correct them is not ensured or in progress;

OR

☐ The team finds that the following SPC (list by number and title) has/have been identified as not met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit, and the intent to correct them is not ensured or in progress;

---

The team recommends:

☐ Two-year probationary term of accreditation

The team finds that the deficiencies are severe enough to have eroded the quality of the program and that the intent or capability to correct these deficiencies is not evident;

(choose one of the following)

☐ The team finds that insufficient progress was made during a two-year probationary term to warrant a four-year term;

OR

☐ The team finds substantial and uncorrectable noncompliance with the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* during any site visit;

---

The team recommends:

☐ Revocation of accreditation

Respectfully Submitted,




Ethel Goodstein-Murphree, Ph.D.  
Team Chair



Judy Johnson, AIA  
Team Member



Michael Merino, RA/NCARB  
Team Member



Noor Ul Ain  
Team Member