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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The visiting team would like to start its report by acknowledging the effort and gracious hospitality of the South Dakota State University, its College of Arts & Sciences, and Department of Architecture (known as DoArch). The thoroughness of the program’s preparation for this visit by the NAAB was matched only by the courtesy and graciousness of the individuals with which this team had the pleasure to interact. Everyone involved, starting with Brian Rex, the head of the Department of Architecture, was most professional, helpful, and friendly.

Team room – The material assembled by the program of architecture for review by this visiting team was well-organized, complete, and clearly presented. The team room was both a readily understandable presentation of the required material and a comfortable milieu for the Team to use for its work. The attention shown to these preparatory steps by the program of architecture made the tasks of the visiting team much easier to accomplish.

Leadership – The visiting team found that the nascent program in architecture at SDSU has benefited significantly from engaged and committed senior university leadership. It is commendable for a start-up architecture program to receive the level of support and enthusiasm demonstrated by the president and provost in generating the vision and fostering community support that has played a vital role in bringing this program to its current level of development.

It is readily apparent to the team that Brian Rex has worked tirelessly to advance the program since joining the faculty in 2010.

Faculty – Enthusiasm and energy for this new program on the part of the faculty is clearly evident to the team. It is also well received and largely appreciated by the students. The team expects that the recent hires will continue to advance this positive trend. The team also anticipates that there will be continued development and augmentation of the faculty cohort.

Students – The students in the DoArch demonstrate genuine initiative, energy, and commitment to their program and to the study of architecture. They have embraced architecture and architectural education with a passion and excitement that has created the basis for both a successful professional program in architecture at SDSU and future meaningful and proactive student engagement in many aspects of the DoArch.

Physical Facilities – The team found that there has been admirable advance in the physical space made available to the program since its inception. The new facilities in Dupuy Hall, where the program will be housed as of September 2012, are a significant upgrade over the original premises for the program. Even more important is the university’s commitment to providing modern, state-of-the-art space and facilities in the AME building, which, if the schedule is maintained, will be the 2015 home for the program.

Community Engagement – As noted under Section I.1.3.E, the visiting team was heartened to see that the current leadership of the program is committed to craft and community. DoArch has a staged aspiration to be a program uniquely responsive to the context of South Dakota, the northern Great Plains, and its peoples.
3. **Conditions Not Yet Met**

There are multiple conditions of accreditation, which necessarily cannot be met by a program at this stage of potential accreditation. The visiting team would like to highlight the following key areas of deficiency in order to aid program development and focus.

I.1.2 Learning Culture  
I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives  
C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment  
D. Architectural Education and the Profession  
E. Architectural Education and the Public Good  
I.1.4 Long-Range Planning  
I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures  
I.4 Policy Review  
II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria  
All of the Student Performance Criteria (Realms A, B, and C) are “not yet met”  
II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development  
II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures  
II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

4. **Causes of Concern**

**A. Planning**  
The team was somewhat surprised that the requisite planning for a new professional program in architecture seems to be languishing in multiple areas behind the rest of the development of the DoArch.

**B. Stability of Physical Resources**  
The SDSU is to be commended for its ability and success in advancing a significant project like the AME building in these difficult economic times, and simultaneously stabilizing the program through the improved location of DoArch to the Drill Hall. In the team’s opinion, however, it would be seriously detrimental to the success of the program if the facility were to be relocated before completion of the AME building. Maintaining a stable location will assist in student retention and recruitment, faculty recruitment, development of the program’s sense of community that the institution and the program aspire to, and the requisite focus by DoArch on its pedagogy and student performance in this critical time as it continues to develop.

**C. Technology**  
In candor, the visiting team was surprised that a program aspiring to success in a 21st-century global profession did not have a technology plan and adequate output hardware.

**D. Workshop Staff and Training**  
The Department of Architecture’s program has a self-identified focus on the ability of students to engage in craft and making as the basis for the production of architecture. To that end, a well-functioning workshop and training program for students is integral to the success of the program. At this stage, the visiting team found insufficient evidence that the DoArch had developed policies, safety training, and a workshop orientation program to ensure that the program’s stated pedagogical goals are met while student safety is maintained, and commensurate with the university’s expectations.

**E. Maintenance of a Robust Student Body**  
In order to maintain a robust and growing student body, the DoArch needs to be particularly mindful of student retention and new student recruitment in today’s extremely competitive environment.
F. Student Counseling and Advising
The team observed that the program is still evolving an effective program for counseling and advising students. Anecdotal evidence available to the team indicates that counseling and advising are currently done on an individual and ad hoc basis, without a structured and sound academic framework that adheres to best practices and SDSU policies. While this is understandable, given the nascent state of the program, nonetheless, more established processes will be vital to student success in the DoArch.

G. Student Funding
As noted in the APR, and as evidenced during the visit, the team believes that additional funding sources will need to be identified and procured in order to secure and establish student scholarships and travel opportunities, both of which are requisite to ensuring and subsequently maintaining program competitiveness and viability.

H. Establishment of Effective Time Management
The visiting team heard sufficient anecdotal evidence that the program is still evolving a studio policy and program culture that recognizes both student and faculty workloads and output expectations. In particular, alignment and coordination of course deadlines can positively contribute to the student experience and learning outcomes. Sufficient attention to aligning these multiple deadlines and time commitments is currently lacking, resulting in a diminution of the student educational experience.

I. Web Site
An important tool for a contemporary architecture program is its web site. It serves as a portal to prospective students, their families, and the community, as well as an essential information conduit for a well-functioning architecture program. The team found the DoArch web site deficient and lacking in multiple areas. The team believes the current state of the web site is a significant missed opportunity.

5. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit
This category is not applicable, as there has been no previous NAAB visit.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation
(Note, every assessment should be accompanied by a brief narrative. In the case of SPCs being met, the
team is encouraged to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was
found. Likewise, if the assessment of the condition or SPC is negative, please include a narrative that
indicates the reasoning behind the team’s assessment.)

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that
history, mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context. Programs that exist within a larger
educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that history,
mission, and culture is expressed in contemporary context.

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

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR provides a history of South Dakota State University, background on
the impetus imparted by President David Chicoine in 2007 to pursue an accredited program in
architecture education, and the efforts of the SDSU Foundation to secure support of the program. The
foundation’s efforts culminated in the sponsorship agreement among four established architecture firms in
Sioux Falls, the formation of the Architecture Founder’s Group, and the hiring of department head Brian
Rex in 2010.

The program’s mission statement is evolving as faculty is added and the curriculum develops.

The visiting team found indications that the program is beginning to be successful in building working
relationships of mutual benefit with other units of the university. The most notable to date, as the APR
noted, is the close and collegial relationship that exists with the Department of Construction and Industrial
Management. A wider engagement across the campus, particularly among the design-related programs
currently housed outside of the College of Arts & Sciences, is advocated by the central administration. In
November 2010 the Department of Architecture circulated a Proposal for a Combined First Year
Curriculum. This memo discussed the potential advantages of a shared first-year design course offering
with the Department of Interior Design of the College of Education and Consumer Affairs. The following
year, the provost established an interdisciplinary task force, called the Faculty of Design, as a first step to
explore this recommendation and other opportunities for greater synergy. DoArch is an active participant
on this task force.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:
• Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful
learning environment that encourages the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing,
engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body,
administration, and staff in all learning environments both traditional and non-traditional.
Further, the program must demonstrate that it encourages students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers, and it addresses health-related issues, such as time management.

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

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

[X] The program has not demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

**2012 Team Assessment:** There is a clear mutual respect for the students, faculty, and staff within DoArch. The studio space provides and encourages a learning environment that supports creativity, collaboration, sharing of resources and knowledge, and engagement of the student body. Though the program is still in development, the team observed a positive studio culture. The studio space is seen as a privilege to the students, and rules for the space have been posted and are being self-monitored by the students.

Although the team observed these positive indications, the team also noted that evidence as required in the Conditions for Accreditation for this criterion has not been provided. Specifically, the program has a written studio culture policy; however, the policy

- has not included student input through its development
- has not yet been shared with the students
- has no plan for its implementation or periodic review for measurable assessment and effectiveness

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The team found that the information provided in the APR on social equity was substantiated by the visit and that the program provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

Within the student body, there is sufficient gender diversity in the program, particularly in first year, to provide an equitable environment. The faculty demonstrates similar gender diversity with 40 percent of its current members female.

The program draws the majority of its students from South Dakota and southwestern Minnesota, a region of the country where the population is over 90 percent non-Hispanic white. Despite the homogeneous nature of the area from which it admits its students, the DoArch has attracted a greater percentage of African-American and Hispanic students than many of the other academic units at SDSU. This success,
coupled with the presence of several international students in the program, represents a laudable effort toward providing a diverse student body (again, within the inherent limitations of the underlying population of the state and geographic region the program serves).

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

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The academic community strongly supports the DoArch, as expressed in several meetings the team had with SDSU central administration representatives. The program curriculum is valued by the university, which includes community outreach within the first year studio project, and beyond. There appear to be many untapped opportunities for the program, however, with the other design-focused programs on campus. As noted in I.1.1 History and Mission, notions of shared design curriculum and resources are being discussed; if this initiative comes to fruition, the resulting symbiosis would further enrich the program.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The student voice and presence are enthusiastic and active. The students currently enrolled in the program are aware of their professional setting and opportunities to be leaders in the field of architecture.

The department has an AIAS chapter, and members are actively pursuing involvement at both the local and regional level. The Department of Architecture currently supports the chapter by providing national dues and reaching out to the local AIA chapter in Sioux Falls as an advisory role. With the assistance of the department, the chapter is currently constructing a float for the local (and festive) Hobo Parade, has completed a T-shirt design competition, is preparing a campus-wide igloo competition, is organizing a spring Beaux Ball, and is actively preparing to travel to the regional AIAS Quad Conference later this fall.

The Student Advisory Board (SAB) is a grassroots effort of student governance in the department of architecture. Each year of the program has student-appointed representation on the SAB. This student organization receives nominal financial support through the department and provides student-led initiatives such as a lecture series (with additional support from the department), portfolio and résumé workshops, and future film series. The representatives meet on a three-
week cycle as a board, with the faculty and with the architecture student body to discuss issues of concern that may have risen and upcoming events. As a means of keeping this student governance separated from the AIAS chapter, the AIAS leaders are not permitted to serve as SAB representatives.

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

[X] The program is not responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The APR notes that the faculty member responsible for preparing students for internship and licensure has been hired. This indicates a commitment to satisfying this NAAB perspective. Further, the program’s proposed professional curriculum has clearly identified a four-course sequence of professional practice courses that will be used as the primary vehicle to prepare students for internship and licensure. These courses will begin to be taught in professional semester 5 (the second term of academic year 2013-2014).

Until these courses have been offered, however, this perspective cannot be considered adequately addressed. Although the APR states that a portion of ARCH109 (Introduction to Architectural Studies) has been used to introduce the basic concepts of the regulation, current SDSU students the team met on this visit are almost universally unaware of the existence of the Intern Development Program.

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

[X] The program is not responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: As the APR notes, the commencement of instruction in the professional courses in 2013 will provide the program with the opportunity to demonstrate its responsiveness to this perspective. While a meaningful response to this perspective will wait until then, there are early indications that the program intends to regularly interact with the profession in multiple ways that will help expose its students to many aspects of the professional community. As the history of the program in the APR indicates, the professional community of South Dakota was an important advocate for and direct supporter of the creation of this program. The sponsorship agreement between the Foundation and the four founding firms calls for regular involvement of these firms in multiple aspects of the program. The second faculty member the program hired is a licensed architect who has been active with the local professional community since arriving in South Dakota. These actions constitute a good beginning to a meaningful engagement with practicing architects and exposure of students to modern architecture practice.

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

[X] The program is not responsive to this perspective.

2012 Team Assessment: The program has established “community” as one of its two major areas of emphasis (along with “craft”) and is anticipating that this focus will infuse much of the studio work of the professional courses of the curriculum. As an indication of this desire to see its students become engaged citizens, in ARCH109, the first-year students are introduced to a small South Dakota town they will visit, map, and study: Mobridge was visited in 2011 and Huron is scheduled for 2012. Over the course of their architecture education at SDSU, students will continue to be regularly involved with the community they studied first year. Early in the professional sequence it is planned that the class will return to this community to undertake a building project, and the design assignment for the Whole Building Studio1 (ARCH551) will be located in this community.

In addition, several of the required courses including Arch 411 (Site, Surroundings, and City), Arch 671 (Professional Practice 3: Stewardship), and some of the Topics in Architecture offerings (ARCH 492 et al.) appear to offer opportunities to respond positively to this NAAB perspective.

While there has been insufficient course work in the program for its output to be judged responsive to this perspective, the team was encouraged to find multiple indications that preparing students to be active, engaged, and ethical citizens will be a focus of architecture education at SDSU in the future.

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

[X] The program’s processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2012 Team Assessment: Although aspects of the development of the architecture program are included in the APR, comprehensive long-range planning for the program is still in development, and therefore remains to be completed. In addition to curriculum development, areas that will need attention in planning include:

- budget
- library acquisitions
- facilities
- staffing
- workshop policies
- technology
- web site development
- student recruitment

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

- How the program is progressing toward its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- **Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.**

- **Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:**
  - Solicitation of faculty, students’, and graduates’ views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.

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

[X] The program’s processes do not meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The program has not yet implemented the processes and procedures necessary for regular and effective self-assessment of the program's progress toward meeting its multi-year objectives. The team left the visit with the understanding that the establishment of these self-assessment procedures will occur in conjunction with the development of the components of the program’s long-range plan (see team comments under I. 1.4 above).
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2012 Team Assessment: At present, the program is adequately staffed for both academics and administration. The APR contains an initial staffing timeline (page 39) that includes staffing of four faculty members and two staff members for the year 2012–13. Five faculty and one staff member have been hired, although the descriptions of some of these positions have been modified, as per faculty availability. Further hiring will commence in November 2012, for the 2013–14 academic year. In order to serve the program’s intended student population, hires consistent with the timeline will need to continue to be made.

As the program continues to grow to 100 percent program delivery, additional administrative and academic staff will be required to meet the demands of a full program. This includes particularly workshop and digital technical support staff, which current SDSU students universally describe as lacking.

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

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

---

2 A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the Team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
2012 Team Assessment: A summary of student admissions policies and procedures is included in the APR (page 29). Unfortunately, the program’s admissions policies do not appear to be included on the its web site.

The program demonstrates a positive and supportive learning environment for students. This includes: mentorship done regularly if on an ad hoc basis, and support for student involvement in self-governance; as well as work-study opportunities with the program. The program has actively worked with students to create an AIAS chapter, which contributes positively to student life at the school, as well. These activities have included student travel to the AIAS conference in Detroit in March 2012, supported by the program and the university.

Further ambitious future study abroad opportunities such as a joint trip to China with the University of Nebraska, a trip to Rome in the summer of 2013, and similar travel to Montreal in summer of 2014 are all under preliminary discussion.

The team notes, however, that regional travel and study abroad opportunities are not embedded in the program curriculum, but are planned on a year-to-year basis, and financing for these efforts currently lies primarily with the students.

Individual and collective learning opportunities for students also include a lecture series envisioned to grow in the future.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The program is housed in the College of Arts & Sciences at South Dakota State University and reports to the provost through the dean of the college. While more direct access to the university’s chief academic officer would be preferred, there are a number of key indications that the program has a level of administrative autonomy sufficient to enable it to meet NAAB’s conditions of accreditation. The program drafts its own budget (that, in turn, is approved by the dean), has direct control of a portion of the funds available for faculty and student enrichment, is responsible for student counseling, writes its own promotion and advancement policies (consistent with college and university standards), and substantially controls the development and content of its curriculum.

The team notes that fifteen academic units comprise the College of Arts & Sciences so there are an atypically large number of academic units reporting directly to a single dean, and the program will benefit from strong and consistent advocacy so as to avoid any danger of becoming buried among the multiple competing interests within the college.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: The APR (page 33) briefly describes the administrative and reporting structure of the DoArch within the College of Arts & Sciences, which in turn reports directly to the provost.
At this time, and based upon the limited documentation available to the team, the involvement of faculty in DoArch governance is unknown. Observation and anecdotal evidence suggest, however, that current faculty are actively involved in curriculum development in an ad hoc manner. It is anticipated that more formal DoArch governance processes and policies will develop in the coming years.

Students in DoArch are engaged in self-governance through two organizations: the Student Advisory Board (SAB) and their chapter of the AIAS. The representatives on the SAB regularly (on a three-week rotational basis) meet with the larger student body, as well as DoArch faculty and administration to discuss and review academic and curriculum issues. The SAB representatives have also met with the DoArch’s professional Advisory Board.

In addition to DoArch governance opportunities, students are also eligible to participate in the pan-university student organization, the Student Association.

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

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of the visit, the team found the current and long-range plans for the current and future facilities to be adequate for a professional program in architecture. First the team would like to summarize the current facilities available to the program.

Current Facilities:

The department has recently shifted from Solberg Hall to larger and more appropriate space located within the Depuy Military Hall Drill Floor (Room 105). This space is to be used by the DoArch as a temporary facility for the next three years (final semester spring 2015). A plan is in place for how the space will be reconfigured as appropriate to accommodate the expected increase of incoming students to the program. The Drill Hall has been fitted out with appropriate furniture, finishes, electric power distribution, and critique space. Printing accommodations that are viewed as being a critical need by the students are under development in an area of Depuy Hall adjacent to the studio space. Once the card reader system is installed, this space will be available to architecture students 24 hours a day. The team notes from the plan that as student desk space expands with enrollment growth over the next three years, identified critique and seminar space correspondingly decreases.

The temporary location of the architecture woodshop, which must be relocated because of demolition for the future facility (see below), has yet to be identified.

The current faculty and staff offices are located within the Barn (Room 108). These spaces have been fitted out with appropriate furniture and finishes for administration purposes. Additionally, a new (albeit limited) computer facility (8 workstations) has been provided in this area for the sole use of architecture students. The computer workstations are available to students during office hours only. As noted previously, the visiting team was surprised that a program aspiring to success in a 21st-century global profession did not have a technology plan and adequate output hardware.

A space with greater privacy for advising students is required as the program continues to grow.
Through the collaboration with the Construction Management School and Engineering programs, the architecture students have access to and take full advantage of the numerous metal shops available on campus.

There is adequate space throughout the campus for general lecture classes and seminar courses. At the time of the visit, a dedicated seminar space for the specific use of the architecture program had not yet been identified.

A joint collaboration effort between design programs on campus has initiated a new Imaging Center. Starting in the spring of 2013, the university will begin the implementation of the new printing facility. Space has been put aside in a building near Drill Hall in a location convenient for the architecture program. The equipment is being purchased with university funding to provide students in visual arts, architecture, interior design, and landscape architecture access to large-format printing and scanning, and possibly 3D printing capabilities. The addition of this facility will significantly enhance the success of the professional program of architecture.

Future Facilities:

The new Architecture, Mathematics, and Engineering (AME) building, with an estimated $17 million budget, will be the home for the Department of Architecture starting in the summer of 2015. At such time, the Department of Architecture will move into approximately 20,000 square feet of space located on the third floor provides dedicated shop space, studio space, faculty and staff offices, seminar rooms, printing facilities, and critique space adequate for program needs at anticipated full enrollment. Subject to anticipated State Board of Regents approval at their December 2012 meeting, construction and demolition for the AME building will begin during the summer of 2013. The AME building funding for the project is nearly completed.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: Through the generosity of the four Sioux Falls architecture firms that constitute the Architecture Founder’s Group, the initial start-up costs of the architecture program have been committed through a six-year donor agreement, and are sufficient for underwriting the foundation of the program, in terms of initial expenditures. The Architecture Founder’s Group has committed a total of $2.0 million over the first six years of the program, through full build-out in 2016. The SDSU Foundation has additionally pledged $680,000 toward program costs.

The program is anticipated to be self-supporting by 2016, and be fully staffed with five full-time faculty, two to four adjunct faculty (one FTE), four FTEs in support staff, and the department head. The student cohort at full build-out will include 156 students in the BS (Architectural Studies) program, and 30 students in the M.Arch. program. Beyond the timeframe of the start-up donation of $2.0 million, the program is projected to be self-supporting through the additional revenues that include tuition capture (80%) and a student discipline fee.

As the program notes in the APR, however, further fund-raising efforts necessary to augment support of student scholarships, paid internships, and travel abroad opportunities will be needed for the success of the program.

I.2.5 Information Resources: The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.
Further, the accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resources professionals who provide information services that teach and develop research and evaluative skills, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of this visit, the information resources provided for the program are adequate to support the current faculty, staff, and students enrolled in the program.

Earlier this year through department start-up funding, the university purchased a significant personal architecture library from architect and architectural historian Mr. John Cava of Portland, OR. This addition bolsters the collection that currently supports the Interior Design and Landscape Architecture programs to approximately 4,000 volumes, creating a sound foundation for the information resources necessary for an accredited professional degree in architecture.

Additionally, a significant number of periodicals are available for access through digital reference. However, only a handful of current hard-copy periodicals are available. As the program continues to grow and move forward, it is imperative that a greater number and broader range of content of the periodicals section be improved.

The visiting team noted that there is no plan currently in place for the systematic and focused growth of the program’s library acquisitions.

Through ARCH109, the program has engaged library staff for specific instruction on research methods, and library resources available to the students. The library staff provides two class lectures during the semester focusing on the content of architectural studies. In addition, all university freshmen are provided with a library orientation.
PART I: SECTION 3 – REPORTS

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

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

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

M. Arch
[X] Statistical reports were not provided

2012 Team Assessment: The program will begin furnishing annual and statistical reports at the end of year one of candidacy.

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

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

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused

---

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda, should also be included.

M. Arch

[X] Annual Reports and NAAB Responses were not provided

2012 Team Assessment: The program will begin furnishing annual and statistical reports at the end of year one of candidacy.

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

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

M. Arch

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

2012 Team Assessment: The APR contained information on the knowledge and experience of the program’s five faculty members. In addition, at this visit, the program provided a faculty exhibit. Together this information provided sufficient evidence that the faculty has the range of experience and knowledge necessary for the SDSU program in architecture at this early stage of its development.

---

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

[X] The policy documents in the team room did not meet the requirements of Appendix 3

2012 Team Assessment: The policy documents available to the team were:
- Studio Culture Policy (in the APR – Section 1.1.2, page 16)
- Admissions Requirements (in the APR, summarized on page 29)

The policy documents not available to the team during this visit were:
- Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives
- Personnel Policies
- Student-to-Faculty ratios for all components of the curriculum
- Square feet per student for space designated for studio-based learning
- Square feet per faculty member for space designated for support of all faculty activities and responsibilities
- Advising policies
- Policies on use and integration of digital media in architecture curriculum
- Policies on academic integrity for students
- Policies on library and information resources collection development
- A description of the information literacy program and how it is integrated with the curriculum.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

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

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

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 3, in ARCH 492 (Topics in Architecture); professional semester 5, in ARCH 592 (Topics in Architecture); professional semester 7, in ARCH 692 (Topics in Architecture).

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.

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 4, in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1); professional semester 5, in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 1, in ARCH 321 (Digital Drawing & Notation); professional semester 2, in ARCH 421 (Building Information Technologies).
A.4. Technical Documentation: Ability to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 4, in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1); professional semester 5, in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 4, in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1); professional semester 5, in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 2, in ARCH 451 (Architecture Studio II) and in professional semester 3, in ARCH 452 (Architecture Studio III). The team finds it admirable that during the second year of the pre-professional program many of the students are being exposed to these design skills in courses such as ARCH 251 (Design Practice III) and ARCH 252 (Design Practice IV).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 2, in ARCH 451 (Architecture Studio II) and in professional semester 3, in ARCH 452 (Architecture Studio III). The team finds it admirable that during the first year of the pre-professional program students are being exposed to these design skills in courses such as ARCH 151 (Design Practice I).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met
2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 4, in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1); professional semester 5, in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 1, in ARCH 341 (Building History III) and in professional semester 2, in ARCH 441 (Sites, Surroundings, & City).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 1, in ARCH 341 (Building History III); professional semester 2, in ARCH 441 (Sites, Surroundings, & City).


M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course to be offered in the professional semester 3, in ARCH 492 (Topics in Architecture); professional semester 5, in ARCH 592 (Topics in Architecture); professional semester 7, in ARCH 692 (Topics in Architecture).

Realm A. General Team Commentary: At the time of the visit, the team cannot assess the content of this realm as none of the courses have yet been taught. It is believed that this student performance criteria will be met through the courses outlined in the curriculum; however many of the course descriptions and content have yet to be developed.
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

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

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met
2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills
A.4. Technical Documentation
A.5. Investigative Skills
A.8. Ordering Systems
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture

B.2. Accessibility
B.3. Sustainability
B.4. Site Design
B.5. Life Safety
B.7. Environmental Systems
B.9. Structural Systems

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 5 in ARCH 572 (Architectural Practice II: Economics).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).
B. 9. Structural Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 631 (Building Technology 1), and in professional semester 6 in ARCH 632 (Building Technology 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 631 (Building Technology 1), and in professional semester 6 in ARCH 632 (Building Technology 2).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criteria in the coursework to be offered in the professional semester 4 in ARCH 551 (Whole Building Studio 1), and in professional semester 5 in ARCH 552 (Whole Building Studio 2).

Realm B. General Team Commentary: At the time of the visit, the team cannot assess the content of this realm as none of the courses have yet been taught. It is believed that this student performance criteria will be met through the courses outlined in the curriculum, however many of the course descriptions and content have yet to be developed.
Realm C: Leadership and Practice:
Architects need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public. This includes collaboration, business, and leadership skills. Student learning aspirations include:

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

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 5 in Arch552 (Whole Building Studio).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 4 in Arch571 (Architectural Practice I – Regulation), in professional semester 5 in Arch571 (Architectural Practice II – Economics), and in professional semester 6 in Arch671 (Architectural Practice III – Stewardship).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 7 in Arch672 (Architectural Practice IV – Management).

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

M. Arch
[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 7 in Arch672 (Architectural Practice IV – Management).
C. 5. Practice Management: Understanding of the basic principles of architectural practice management such as financial management and business planning, time management, risk management, mediation and arbitration, and recognizing trends that affect practice.

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 4 in Arch571 (Architectural Practice I – Regulation) and in professional semester 5 in Arch571 (Architectural Practice II – Economics).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in professional semester 6 in Arch671 (Architectural Practice III – Stewardship) and in professional semester 7 in Arch672 (Architectural Practice IV – Management).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 4 in Arch571 (Architectural Practice I – Regulation).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program intends to satisfy this student performance criterion in the course work to be offered in the professional semester 6 in Arch671 (Architectural Practice III – Stewardship).

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

M. Arch [X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of this visit the program did not indicate in which future professional courses it intends to satisfy this student performance criterion.
Realm C. General Team Commentary: The program intends to rely primarily on its four-course professional practice sequence that begins in professional semester 5 to address the architect’s need to manage, advocate, and act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: South Dakota State University is accredited through the Higher Learning Commission.

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: Architectural Studies in the DoArch occur in the non-professional Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies, and in the professional Master of Architecture programs. The credit hours associated with each program are as follows:

B.Sc.(Arch. Studies)
Required courses with other than architectural content  30 credit hours
Elective courses with other than architectural content  15 credit hours
Total   45 credit hours

Master of Architecture
Required courses with architectural content  91 credit hours
Elective courses with architectural content  9  credit hours
Total  100 credit hours

It should be noted that the M.Arch. curriculum includes electives that incorporate SPC, which initially calls into question the nature of these courses as elective, as they incorporate required SPC delivery. Upon inspection and inquiry into these courses, however, it was determined that, as all of these electives equally incorporate the same SPC, these courses do count toward fulfillment of both required SPC and the elective count.

As these courses have yet to be delivered, however, it will be incumbent upon future visiting teams to ensure that the delivery of these courses meets both the required SPC as well as are elective in nature.

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

[X] Not Yet Met
2012 Team Assessment: The APR (page 60) briefly describes the iterative process for curriculum development, based upon an initial consultant’s report that was used to gain State Board of Regents approval. However, processes for evaluating and modifying the program are not yet in evidence.
PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The APR (page 61) describes the DoArch’s process for evaluation of students entering the M. Arch. degree program through two streams:
- Completion of the first two-and-a-half years of the Bachelor of Science (Architectural Studies) program
- Completion of a four-year Bachelor of Science degree program
PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

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

[X] Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program web site states the appropriate language under the “NAAB Professional Accreditation” tab. The program does explicitly state that it is not yet accredited and has a timetable for its completion. A plan is in place to keep the web site up to date to keep students and prospective students informed of the program’s candidacy in a timely manner.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: The program web site clearly explains who the NAAB is and why accreditation is important to the profession of architecture. However, under the “NAAB Professional Accreditation” tab of the department web site, the link to the NAAB documents page is not active.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: This information is currently not available on the program’s web site nor is it easily accessible to current and prospective students.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
In order to promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program is required to make the following documents available to the public:
- All Annual Reports, including the narrative
- All NAAB responses to the Annual Report
- The final decision letter from the NAAB
The most recent APR
The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of this visit, this criterion is not yet applicable.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2012 Team Assessment: At the time of this visit, this criterion is not yet applicable. However, the program could still provide a link to the NCARB web site where ARE test results for other programs are noted.
III. Appendices:
1. Program Information

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

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

Reference South Dakota State University, APR, pp 5-8.

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

Reference South Dakota State University, APR, pp. 8-13.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference South Dakota State University, APR, pp. 25.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference South Dakota State University, APR, pp. 25-26.
2. Conditions Met with Distinction

At this stage of the program’s development, the visiting team recognized that the following conditions appear to be met with distinction.

I.1.3 Response to the Five Perspectives
B. Architectural Education and the Students
I.2.4 Financial Resources
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the Profession
Michael Stanton, FAIA, LEED® AP
Stanton Architecture
555 De Haro Street
Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94107
(415) 865-9600
(415) 235-5530 mobile
(415) 865-9608 fax
mstanton@stantonarchitecture.com

Representing the Academy
Loraine Fowlow, MRAIC
Associate Professor
University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. N.W.
Calgary, AB T2N 1N4
Canada
(403) 819-6361 mobile
(403) 284-4399 fax
lfowlow@ucalgary.ca

Representing the NAAB
Ryan McEnroe, AIA, Assoc. ASLA, LEED® AP
3146 19th Street, NW
Apt. B
Washington, DC 20010
(480) 244-9402 mobile
ryanmcenroe@hotmail.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Stanton, FAIA, LEED®AP
Team Chair
Representing the Profession

Loraine Fowlow, MRAIC
Team member
Representing the Academy

Ryan McEnroe, AIA, Assoc., ASLA, LEED®AP
Team member
Representing the NAAB