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I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The team appreciates the contributions made by members of the university to our visit and wants to particularly acknowledge the hard work of the department chair, the faculty, and staff. Their work in putting together their team room is especially commendable given the timing of the visit at the beginning of the new academic year, the start of the master's program and their recent office relocation. The team also wants to thank the faculty, staff and students for their hospitality and thoughtful participation in the visit.

Overall, the team found that the program is progressing and has come a long way since its initial candidacy visit two years ago. Both the provost and dean expressed their strong interest and support in seeing that the program achieves accreditation. Brian Rex, the department head, is dedicated to the process of creating a NAAB-accredited Master of Architecture program, and the team applauds him for his energy and dedication. Similarly, the energy and dedication of the faculty is strong, and the synergy between faculty and students is very good to see. The commitment that students bring to this new and evolving program is robust; they think it is exciting and are willing participants in its creation. The students like the open studio system where they learn by overhearing other studio discussions and where different levels of students help each other; this creates a healthy sense of student community.

The SDSU outreach program serving towns across South Dakota is exciting—it is not usual for a new program to take this on so early in its development, and their approach of engaging students in the community as learning laboratories is commendable

During the visit the team toured the new Architecture, Mathematics and Engineering Building (AME), which the department will occupy starting summer 2015. It is a rare opportunity for a new program to have a new facility; with it comes great opportunity to nurture the program and serve as an effective tool in recruiting both faculty and students. It can be an exciting venue for events, exhibits, and interactions with the public. It was designed to be a teaching laboratory for the architecture program with exposed building assembly details, and the team hopes that it will be used as conceived in that way to nurture the students’ educational experience, allowing them the opportunity to view how materials and building systems come together in creative ways to form habitable space. The building will be shared with components of the engineering and mathematics departments enhancing the opportunity for interaction/collaboration with other disciples in the shared facilities.

During the visit, the team perceived that there was some confusion between the standard six-year candidacy window and a shorter timeline that the program listed in the APR. Since the program was granted candidacy status effective January 1, 2012, the team wants to clarify that, given the normal timeline, the latest date for a visit for initial accreditation is 2018.

2. Conditions Not or Not Yet Met
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Met</th>
<th>Not Yet Met</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1.2 Social Equity</td>
<td>A.2. Design Thinking Skills</td>
<td>II.4.4 Public Access to APR/VTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.4 Long-Range Planning</td>
<td>A.4 Technical Documentation</td>
<td>II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures</td>
<td>A.5 Investigative Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.1 Human Resources &amp; Human Resource Development: Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>A.8 Ordering System Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.2 Administrative Structure</td>
<td>A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.4 Financial Resources</td>
<td>A.10 Cultural Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3 Faculty Credentials</td>
<td>A.11 Applied Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4.1 Policy Review</td>
<td>B.1 Pre-Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.2 Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.3 Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.4 Site Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.5 Life Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.6 Comprehensive Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.7 Financial Considerations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.8 Environmental Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.9 Structural Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.10 Building Envelope Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.11 Building Service Systems Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.12 Building Materials and Assemblies Integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.1 Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.2 Human Behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.3 Client Role in Architecture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.4 Project Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.5 Practice Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.6 Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.7 Legal Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.8 Ethics and Professional Judgment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.9 Community and Social Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Causes of Concern

A. Leadership/Staff Workload
While the team applauds the department head for his energy and dedication, the amount of work that needs to be accomplished over this next year or more (designing and delivering this year’s curriculum, the move into the new building, the continued work on the new Division of Design, creating and delivering new courses within the new BFA, faculty and staff searches, etc) is more than one individual should handle. While the faculty will be part of these efforts, the team believes that additional help should be found.

B. Misinformation
The team found misinformation about NCARB’s role in the architectural licensure process. The item was found in the APR on page 39, stating: “A professional degree is a requirement for licensure with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB).” When questioned it was noted that students received the information as written in the APR. NCARB does not license. This information needs to be corrected in all information given to students to correctly reflect NCARB’s role in the regulation process.

C. Technology
Technology plays a major role in architecture. A technology plan for computer hardware, software, and output devices needs to be created, especially as the program grows and matures.

D. Student Recruitment
A student recruitment plan should be designed and implemented to grow the program to its stated student numbers. This will be especially critical as the program continues to develop and funding for the department becomes an important element of its ability to mature. A clear academic path for transfer students tailored to each individual would facilitate their recruitment and retention.

E. Website
The inability to keep the departmental websites updated and accurate in a timely manner is a challenge that needs to be addressed.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2011)

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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

2014 Team Assessment: The Department of Architecture provided a copy of the studio culture policy in the APR. In discussion with students, it was clear they are aware of the policy and have commented on it. There is a studio representative body that meets twice a month, once with the department head and once among themselves to discuss issues of concern. The students believe their concerns are addressed. In meetings with faculty and with staff, it was clear they believe they are valued and that they value others. Although there is no established policy for shared governance within the department, it was clear from the faculty that discussions and decisions occur as a faculty of the whole due to its small size.

Although the program does not have a specific plan in place, the department head described efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and students, the later primarily through admission of foreign students to the undergraduate and graduate programs. The APR only contains one year of annual reports.

2009 Condition 1.1.3, Response to 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.

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).

Previous Team Report (2012): 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The APR notes Assistant Professor Charles “Chuck” MacBride serves as the department’s professional program coordinator and is the program’s IDP coordinator. MacBride, a registered architect in SD, oversees participation of students in IDP. Introduction to IDP, NCARB, NAAB, AIA, USGBC and the basic regulatory requirements of becoming an architect are covered in ARCH 109 Architecture / First Year experience. Verification of this knowledge was received through discussions and meetings with the students, who credited various sources including the summer internships and lectures from visiting local practitioners.

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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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.

2014 Team Assessment: As noted in the team’s response to Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment, Assistant Professor MacBride serves as the department’s primary program interface with the state’s professional community. MacBride, a registered architect in SD, oversees summer internship opportunity development, actively participates in AIA, and facilitated the establishment of their active AIAS chapter. Meetings with the students and the visiting team focused on the value of participation in AIAS, their attendance at the AIAS Quad Conference in 2013, and connections with local architects made through participation in AIA SD state conventions and AIA Sioux Falls chapter meetings.

During the alumni/guest reception local architects emphasized the value of connections with the department and its students, several of whom are employed full time while others have benefited from summer internships. The school benefits from the “Founders,” a group of four Sioux Falls architecture firms that make substantial 10-year pledges to the department through the SDSU Foundation. Without this seed money, there would be no professional architecture program.
At the time of this visit, the M. Arch. program is at the start of the fourth of seven semesters of study that make up the professional program, having begun professional courses in January 2013 at the undergraduate level. Holistically, the educational experience for students within the department is genuinely grounded in the responsibilities of a professional architect.

The outreach program serves as an excellent vehicle to introduce students to the architect’s world outside the academic setting. Students are engaged in collaborative experiences with their fellow classmates as well as the residents of small, local South Dakota towns on projects within those communities, exposing most if not all of the community to architectural thinking and design-based solutions for the first time. This program of study uniquely responds to meeting the needs of diverse clients and populations, as well as the needs of communities.

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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The department curriculum has a “Green Thread” of courses designated as critical content building a holistic understanding of the environmental impact and opportunities for mitigation available in both the construction process and the day-to-day operation of buildings. The Department of Architecture, along with Biology and Soils Science, has taught an interdisciplinary course, “Introduction to Sustainability,” for the broader campus community, and the department is also a primary sponsor and participant in the annual “Plain Green” conference on sustainable living in South Dakota. The entire architecture student body participated in this conference in 2014.

In addition, the department outreach initiative pairs each incoming class of students with a South Dakota town. As first-year students, they visit, document, and collectively construct a large-scale model. In subsequent years they will build a durable civic space in
the public space of the town and will return yet again to that town in upper-level design studios to design needed institutional buildings. So far there are four classes studying communities, including Mobridge, Huron, Webster, and Millbrook.

Situational leadership skills emerge as a cadre of students learns to build consensus, to be persuasive or to step back, listen and learn when someone else knows better, and to collaborate with collaborators and community. These outreach initiatives have won widespread praise, much publicity for the department and SDSU, and requests from other communities seeking design assistance for specific projects or yet-to-be defined projects.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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

2014 Team Assessment: Based on information in the APR and discussion with the department head, the department has primarily been focused on establishing the undergraduate and professional degree curriculum to obtain initial accreditation. Due to changes within the university on a new budget model and plans on the part of the university to develop a Division of Design within the College of Arts and Sciences, a long-term planning document has not been developed. The architecture department has been more reactive and ad hoc in response to several changes across the university and does not have a process for long-term development. According to the dean and provost, a performance pro forma was developed as the program was conceptualized; however, the program’s performance has not been monitored since the pro forma was developed. The provost noted that the pro forma should be reviewed to validate how the program is developing.

A strategic vision for the Division of Design was created in March 2014. The dean has a deadline of May 2015 to make decisions on the structure and direction of the division.

According to the provost, the university’s goal is to obtain accreditation for all programs that can be accredited, and the dean’s goal is to increase collaboration between disciplines. The Department of Architecture is certainly within those goals, and the dean started several planning groups around the discussion of creating a Division of Design in
which architecture participates. Architecture itself, however, is more focused on obtaining NAAB accreditation.

Because the program is in its infancy, a long-range plan as envisioned by the NAAB has not been developed. The planning that has occurred started with engaging an outside consultant. Department head Brian Rex has overseen and managed the development of the program since he was hired in 2010. Four additional faculty have now been added, and the entire group, including Rex, shares duties as a faculty of the whole on curricular issues.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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).

2014 Team Assessment: The APR lists plans to administer a pretest/posttest to incoming and outgoing students, archive graduating student portfolios, conduct exit interviews with students, and form an advisory group of local architecture firms as a source of feedback. At this point in time, none of these plans has been implemented. The department also needs to be clear what the university’s program review processes are.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): 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.

2014 Team Assessment: While the program APR described processes that the Department of Architecture established for academic assessment, the team feels the rigor of the assessment strategies does not meet the intended results of the curriculum review criterion. The team does recognize the DoArch is in its infancy and that an effective curriculum review process is an ongoing endeavor. The team expects future teams will have the opportunity to see the results of a rethinking of the intent of this criterion, as well as how the criterion is to be met. In addition, the academic assessment procedures described did not indicate that licensed architects were included as required by this criterion.

2009 Condition 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)

Previous Team Report (2012): 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.

2014 Team Assessment: The program web site clearly explains the role of the NAAB and the importance of accreditation to one interested in the profession of architecture. On the “NAAB Professional Accreditation” tab of the department web site, the following statement can be found and the links provided are active:
“The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation including the Student Performance Criteria can also be found at http://www.naab.org/. Specifically, you can find and download the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, as well as the 2012 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, at the NAAB Documents page.”

2009 Condition 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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The APR notes on page 133 of 136 that access to Career Development Information can be found at http://catalog.sdstate.edu. However, the required information could not readily be located at that URL.
2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): At the time of this visit, this criterion is not yet applicable.

2014 Team Assessment: These materials could not be found in the library using the library’s catalog search or in the department office. In addition, these materials are not available to the public on the DoArch website.

2009 Condition 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.

Previous Team Report (2012): At the time of this visit, this criterion is not yet applicable. However, the program could still provide a link to the NCARB website where ARE test results for other programs are noted.

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion is not yet applicable as the school has not graduated its first cohort of students from the Master of Architecture program.

2009 II.1.1. Student Performance Criteria (Realms A, B and C)


2014 Team Assessment: Since its initial candidacy visit in September 2012, the leadership of the Department of Architecture has worked diligently to develop the curriculum for the new Master of Architecture program while simultaneously developing the curriculum for the DoArch’s nonaccredited undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies. Being a program that was started “from scratch” at South Dakota State University, both curriculums are equally important as full accreditation edges closer. The September 2012 VTR found all Student Performance Criteria in Realm A to be “Not Yet Met”; however, the program has now achieved “Met” status in approximately one-half of requisite SPC. There was no student evidence presented because courses that the program listed as achieving the Realm B or Realm C SPC have not yet been taught. It is the expectation of this team that as the program evolves and moves closer to its initial accreditation visit, all of the SPC in Realms A, B, and C will be fully implemented and objective decisions can be obtained by future NAAB visiting teams.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

I.1.1 History and Mission:

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

2014 Team Assessment: The program APR clearly described the history of South Dakota State University, as well as its mission as the state's land grant university. SDSU, founded in 1881 as Dakota Agricultural College, resides in Brookings, SD, and attracts students from the state, southwestern Minnesota, western Iowa, and northern Nebraska. Brookings is located midway along the state's eastern border with Minnesota and one hour north of Sioux Falls, the state's largest city. Brookings and SDSU were started simultaneously and have grown together as supportive partners boasting 24,000 residents and 12,000 students. SDSU experienced a much muted mid-20th-century boom, and only in the past 15 years has it grown from a small land grant school to a Research I University.

The program APR also clearly described the issues and resulting decisions that form the brief history of the Department of Architecture at SDSU. Initially conceived in 2007 by President David Chicoine, the desire to develop an accredited program in architecture came to fruition with the hiring of its first faculty/department head, Brian Rex, in 2010. The program received its first candidacy visit in September 2012 and was granted initial candidacy status by the NAAB, effective January 1, 2012. Since that time the Department of Architecture has found its permanent home in the SDSU College of Arts & Sciences, has a faculty of five FTEs, one adjunct instructor, an enrollment of 104 students (93 undergraduate students, and 11 graduate students in the proposed NAAB-accredited Master of Architecture), and is set to have classes in its new building (the AME Building – Architecture, Mathematics and Engineering) in the fall of 2015. The Department of Architecture is highly regarded by the SDSU administration and is considered an integral component of the university.

Assuming the program continues its systematic forward progression, the typical NAAB schedule as outlined in the 2012 Procedures for Accreditation would make the program eligible for initial application for accreditation no later than 2018.

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 demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment. [X] The program has not demonstrated that it provides a culturally rich environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work.

2014 Team Assessment: The Department of Architecture provided a copy of the studio culture policy in the APR. In discussion with students it was clear that the students are aware of the policy and have commented on it. A studio representative body meets twice a month, once with the department head and once among themselves to discuss issues of concern. The students believe that their concerns are addressed. In meetings with faculty and with staff, it was clear that they believe they are valued and that they value others. Although there is no established policy for shared governance within the department, it was clear from the faculty that discussions and decisions occur as a faculty of the whole because of its small size.

Although the program does not have a specific plan in place, the department head described efforts to increase the diversity of its faculty and students, the later primarily through admission of foreign students to the undergraduate and graduate programs. The APR only contains one year of annual reports.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: The academic community is very supportive of the Department of Architecture and the M. Arch program. Meetings with the president, provost, dean of the arts and sciences college in which the department resides, and the university’s foundation executives resulted in resounding support and praise for this, the newest professional program at the university and in the state. The department’s community outreach programs engage South Dakota communities, which have graciously opened up as “learning by doing” laboratories for the program.

Recent collaboration with other studio-based disciplines—graphic design, interior design, landscape architecture, and fine arts—has advanced to the point of a study to determine the benefits of a new Division of Design to include these five disciplines within the College of Arts and Sciences. Meetings with the administration show strong support for this collaboration, noting the

---

1 See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.
synergistic opportunities afforded by grouping these disciplines. Finally, the department will be housed in the new AME building beginning next June, and cooperative shop and yard space is planned for architecture, engineering, and construction management students.

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.**

**2014 Team Assessment:** Meetings with students in the studio setting, during a plenary session, as well as a lunch meeting with AIAS and SAB (Student Advisory Board) representatives demonstrated the existence of clear, enthusiastic, and active communication among the students, students-faculty, students-administration, and students-AIA South Dakota and AIA Sioux Falls.

The department has a very successful outreach initiative, which pairs each incoming class of students with a South Dakota town. As first-year students, they visit, document, and collectively construct a large-scale model. In subsequent years they will build a durable civic space in the town’s public space and will return yet again to that town in upper-level design studios to design needed institutional buildings. So far there are four classes studying communities, including Mobridge (3 years), Huron (2 years), and Webster and Millbrook (both 1 year). Towns contact the department to seek help from this outreach program and welcome the students into their communities, which serve as learning-by-doing laboratories. With a $105,000 grant from the Pre-Cast Concrete Institute of Chicago and Gage Brothers (contractors) of Sioux Falls, a third-year studio, using pre-cast concrete construction, builds a public space yearly in four different communities over a four-year period.

Situational leadership skills emerge as students learn to build consensus, to be persuasive or to step back, listen and learn when someone else knows better, and to collaborate ideas to collaborators and community. These outreach initiatives have won wide-spread praise, much publicity for the department and SDSU and requests from other communities seeking design assistance for specific projects or yet to be defined projects.

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 responsive to this perspective.**

**2014 Team Assessment:** The APR notes Assistant Professor Charles “Chuck” MacBride serves as the department’s professional program coordinator and is the program’s IDP coordinator. MacBride, a registered architect in SD, oversees participation of students in IDP. Introduction to IDP, NCARB, NAAB, AIA, USGBC and the basic regulatory requirements of becoming an architect are covered in ARCH 109 Architecture / First Year experience. Verification of this knowledge was received through discussions and meetings with the students who credited various non-class sources including the summer internships and lectures from visiting local practitioners.
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 responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: As noted in the team’s response to Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment, Assistant Professor MacBride serves as the department’s primary program interface with the state’s professional community. MacBride is a registered architect in SD, oversees development of summer internship opportunities, actively participates in AIA, and facilitated the establishment of their active AIAS chapter. Meetings with the students emphasized the value of participation in AIAS, their attendance at the AIAS Quad Conference in 2013, and connections with local architects made through participation in AIA SD state conventions and AIA Sioux Falls chapter meetings.

A reception with local architects emphasized the value of connections with the department and its students, several of whom are employed full time while others have benefited from summer internships.

The school benefits from the “Founders,” a group of four Sioux Falls architecture firms that each make substantial 10-year pledges to the department through the SDSU Foundation. Without this seed money there would be no professional architecture program.

At the time of this visit the M. Arch program is at the start of the fourth of seven semesters of study that make up the professional program, having begun professional courses in January 2013 at the undergraduate level. Holistically, the educational experience for students within the department is genuinely grounded in the responsibilities of a professional architect.

The outreach program serves as an excellent vehicle to introduce students to the architect’s world outside the academic setting. Students are engaged in collaborative experiences with their fellow classmates as well as the residents of small, local South Dakota towns on projects within those communities, exposing many in the community to architectural thinking and design-based solutions for the first time. This program of study uniquely responds to meeting the needs of diverse clients and populations, as well as the needs of communities.

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 responsive to this perspective.

2014 Team Assessment: This condition is met with distinction. The department curriculum has a “Green Thread” of courses designated as critical content, building a holistic understanding of the environmental impact and opportunities for mitigation available in both the construction process and the day-to-day operation of buildings. The
department, along with the biology and soils science departments, has taught an interdisciplinary course, "Introduction to Sustainability," for the broader campus community, and the department is also a primary sponsor and participant in the annual "Plain Green" conference on sustainable living in South Dakota. The entire architecture student body participated in this conference in September 2014.

In addition, as described above, the department outreach initiative pairs each incoming class of students with a South Dakota town. First-year students visit, document, and collectively construct a large-scale model. In subsequent years they will build a durable civic space in the public space of the town and will return yet again to that town in upper-level design studios to design institutional buildings. So far, there are four classes studying communities, including Mobridge, Huron, Webster, and Millbrook.

Situational leadership skills emerge as a cadre of students learns to build consensus, to be persuasive or to step back, listen and learn when someone else knows better, and to collaborate. These outreach initiatives have won wide-spread praise, much publicity for the department and SDSU, and requests from other communities seeking design assistance for specific projects or yet-to-be-defined projects.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: Based on information in the APR and discussion with the department chair, the department has primarily been focused on establishing the undergraduate and professional degree curriculum to obtain initial accreditation. Due to changes within the university on a new budget model and plans on the part of the university to develop a Division of Design within the College of Arts and Sciences, a long-term planning document has not been developed. The Department of Architecture has been more reactive and ad hoc in response to several changes across the university and does not have a process for long-term development. According to the dean and provost, a performance pro forma was developed as the program was conceptualized; however, the program’s performance has not been monitored since the pro forma was developed. The provost noted that it should be reviewed again to validate how the program is developing.

A strategic vision for the Division of Design was created in March 2014. The dean has a deadline of May 2015 to make decisions on the structure and direction of the division.

According to the provost, the university’s goal is to obtain accreditation for all programs that can be accredited, and the dean’s goal is to increase collaboration between disciplines. The Department of Architecture is certainly within those goals, and the dean started several planning groups around the discussion of creating a Division of Design, in which architecture participates. Architecture itself however is more focused on obtaining NAAB accreditation.

Because the program is in its infancy, a long-range planning process as envisioned by the NAAB has not been developed. The planning that has occurred started with engaging an outside consultant. Department head Brian Rex has overseen and managed the development of the program since he was hired in 2010. Four additional faculty have now been added, and the entire group, including Rex, shares duties as a faculty of the whole on curricular issues.
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.

2014 Team Assessment: The APR lists plans to administer a pretest/posttest to incoming and outgoing students, archive graduating student portfolios, do exit interviews with students, and form an advisory group of local architecture firms as sources of feedback. At this point in time, none of these plans has been implemented. The department also needs to be clear about the university's program review processes.
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\(^2\).
  - 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 inadequate for the program

**2014 Team Assessment:** The Department of Architecture provided a staffing plan in the APR through fall 2016 that appears appropriate to the program’s development. In discussions with the department head, the department is having problems hiring new tenure-track faculty. One of the positions proposed for fall 2014 was not filled, and the search will need to be reopened this year. Because enrollments were not as robust as anticipated, this has not impacted classes offered, but the issue of attracting new faculty is a concern for the department. The new student services coordinator position has not yet been filled. These two positions, along with hiring a shop steward, another tenure-track faculty member, and a full-time instructor are planned for and needed to complete the faculty and staff plan by fall 2016.

The APR mentioned that the university has a Course Designation Value table that outlines course instruction method, contact hours, workload units, and scale of course offerings. Although the team did not see the policy, conversations with the faculty confirmed that the department was following it. Assistant Professor Charles McBride is the IDP Coordinator. The program provided a draft copy of the department’s tenure and promotion guidelines.

- **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.

---

\(^2\) A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
[X] Human Resources (Students) are adequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The APR listed clear admissions requirements for both tracks in the professional degree M. Arch. program. The team room included sample professional degree admission files of students who were accepted and are attending the first year of the M. Arch program. While some scoring sheets were provided, there was no indication of the cutoff point of those accepted or any not accepted. The program does provide lectures and travel for students outside the classroom. Discussions with students indicate that the university provides financial aid packages that cover tuition and architecture discipline fees. Some students take advantage of minors and other programs across campus.

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 inadequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: According to department head Brian Rex, the architecture reporting structure has changed over the last several years. Currently the department chair reports to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. A new Division of Design is being created within the college, and the reporting structures and policies have not been developed. The dean stated that this is an interim structure and that he has set May 2015 as the deadline for deciding these policies.

- 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

2014 Team Assessment: As a very young program, faculty makes discussions as a committee of the whole and has input on the curriculum. Through an elected studio representative, the students believe they have input as well.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The department offers a 4+2 curriculum consisting of the undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies and the Master of Architecture. At the time of the team visit there were approximately 93 students in the BS program and approximately 11 students in the M Arch. They share space in several buildings on campus. DePuy Hall (7,578 SF) is the primary instructional space for studios, modeling, and storage. Departmental offices formerly grouped in the “Barn” (Room 108) were repurposed temporarily for the NAAB visiting team room, and the offices were moved to available surplus space in the Health Sciences Building. Various other spaces in other buildings provide classroom and shop space. Reprographics and printing (including 3-D printers) are available at the
campus Imaging Center, operated as a central facility for all university students. Although the program is not housed in one building, the present physical facilities and reprographic and shop equipment are adequate for the program.

The team toured the new Architecture, Mathematics and Engineering (AME) Building currently under construction with completion expected later this year. The department expects to move into its new facilities after the spring 2015 school term. It will be the sole occupant of the 13,400 SF third (top) floor with 700 SF of model shop and workshop classroom on the first floor. In addition the department will share another 8,600 SF with engineering departments, including digital fabrication room, wood shop, masonry and concrete shop, layout and assembly area, control room / tool room, metal shop, high bay space, and fabrication and assembly area. Current and new shop equipment will complete the facility. Beginning fall 2015 the AME will provide excellent physical resources for the program, able to accommodate the planned future full student complement of 156 undergrads and 30 graduates.

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 inadequate for the program

2014 Team Assessment: The financial information presented in the APR was very confusing and did not adequately address the information required. The university had started a new responsibility-based budget model that was two months old at the time of the team visit. In discussions with the president, the dean, and the provost, as well as the CEO of the SDSU Foundation, it was confirmed that contributions from donors were required for instituting a new degree program at SDSU, that pledges and contributions from several architecture firms and private individuals were necessary to initiate the program, and that income from student tuition and discipline-based fees would over time replace donor contributions and generate the funds necessary to operate the department. The goal is to reach a 2016 enrollment of no more than 200 students in the undergraduate and graduate programs together. Enrollment has not grown as quickly as anticipated but neither have expenses, and donor funds should be available for several years past 2016. A review and potential revision of the pro forma would be helpful in determining adequacy of financial resources.

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

2014 Team Assessment: Since the 2012 acquisition of the Cava collection, a private architecture collection of nearly 2,000 volumes, the university’s central Briggs Library has completely integrated the Cava books into the existing collection of the interior design and landscape architecture programs. The combined collection, along with steady purchasing of new books, bolsters the numbers to nearly 4,000 volumes. In addition the library houses a good basic collection of some 59 periodical titles (both current and back issues), some in hardcopy and others available through a digital subscription service, Magazines for Libraries. Current titles satisfy more than 30 titles of AASL’s list of core titles for architecture. While there is no formal plan in place to systematically grow the collection, the team has been advised that the department liaison to the library submits a list of materials needed to address the
ongoing development of the program. The library staff member responsible for the architecture collection connects directly with the students through three ARCH courses, one each in years one, two, and three of the program to instruct students in their use of the informational resources on hand and research methodology to facilitate their course work.
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 & gender) of all students enrolled in the accredited degree program(s).
    - Demographics compared to those recorded at the time of the previous visit.
    - Demographics compared to those of the student population for the institution overall.
  - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the visit.
    - Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the upcoming visit compared to those admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - Time to graduation.
    - Percentage of matriculating students who complete the accredited degree program within the “normal time to completion” for each academic year since the previous visit.
    - Percentage that complete the accredited degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.

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

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

2014 Team Assessment: The program APR provided statistical information sufficient to meet the requirements of 1.3.1 Statistical Reports. Some information was noted as not available; however, the team determined the missing information was minor in significance and/or importance relative to the overall information that was provided.

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.

3 In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.
The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2014 Team Assessment: The program APR provided the required Annual Statistical Report for 2013. The previous visit VTR indicated the Condition to be “Not Yet Met”; therefore, the Annual Report included would be the first opportunity for the program to respond to meeting this Condition. The NAAB Response was not in the APR; however, the team requested and received this document directly from the NAAB.

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

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

[X] Faculty credentials did not demonstrate the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement.

2014 Team Assessment: The program provided a faculty exhibit in the university library of the work of one tenured faculty member, two tenure-track faculty, two instructors, and one adjunct faculty member. The current faculty appears to be at the appropriate rank and teaching course work within their expertise, but the majority are only starting their professional career. Additional full-time faculty are needed to provide the range of knowledge and experience necessary for student achievement throughout the entire program as it adds the graduate level coursework.

\(^4\) 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

2014 Team Assessment: The Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix 3, requires the following documents be provided in the team room for review, but only those with check marks (✓) were available. Several documents were found in the APR with references to others through various links on the SDSU and/or the DoArch web sites. Several links were followed without success.

- Studio Culture Policy ✓
- Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives
- Personnel Policies including:
  - Position descriptions for all faculty and staff
  - Rank, Tenure, & Promotion
  - Reappointment
  - EEO/AA ✓
  - Diversity (including special hiring initiatives)
  - Faculty Development, including but not limited to research, scholarship, creative activity, or sabbatical.
- Student-to-Faculty ratios for all components of the curriculum (i.e., studio, classroom/lecture, seminar)
- 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
- Admissions Requirements ✓
- Advising Policies; including policies for evaluation of students admitted from preparatory or pre-professional programs where SPC are expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs ✓
- Policies on use and integration of digital media in architecture curriculum
- Policies on academic integrity for students (e.g., cheating and plagiarism) ✓
- 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.

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of students’ ability to read and write in course work assignments required in Arch 492, Topics in Architecture. During meetings the team found the students to be attentive and articulate in their communication skills.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of Visual Communication Skills in course work assignments required in Arch 321, Digital Drawing and Notation as well as in the exhibits representing 300 and 400 level design studio work.
A.4. Technical Documentation: *Ability* to make technically clear drawings, write outline specifications, and prepare models illustrating and identifying the assembly of materials, systems, and components appropriate for a building design.

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found student evidence of basic principles in Arch 451 Architectural Studio II.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The team found evidence of student ability in the use of precedence in their documentation of research (course lectures and readings) and design work in Architectural Studio II Arch 451 and Architectural Studio III Arch 452.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.
A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: *Understanding* of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

[X] Not Yet Met

**2014 Team Assessment:** While the team found evidence of European and US modern architecture, there was no student evidence pertaining to the breadth and depth of the requirements of other international settings.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

**2014 Team Assessment:** The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.


[X] Met

**2014 Team Assessment:** The team found evidence that this criterion was met in Arch 492, Topics in Architecture

---

**Realm A. General Team Commentary:** Since its initial candidacy visit in September 2012, the leadership of the Department of Architecture has worked diligently to develop the curriculum for the new Master of Architecture program while simultaneously developing the curriculum for the department’s non-accredited undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies. Being a program that was started “from scratch” at SDSU, both curriculums are equally important as full accreditation edges closer. The September 2012 VTR found all Student Performance Criteria in Realm A to be “Not Yet Met”; however, the program has now achieved “Met” status in approximately one-half of requisite SPCs. It is the expectation of this team that as the program evolves and moves closer to its initial accreditation visit, all of the SPC in Realms A, B and C will be fully implemented and objective decisions can be obtained by future NAAB visiting teams.
Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.
B. 5. Life Safety: Ability to apply the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress.

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills  B.2. Accessibility
A.5. Investigative Skills  B.4. Site Design
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture  B.7. Environmental Systems
B.9. Structural Systems

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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.
2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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.

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: There was no student evidence presented because courses that the program listed as achieving the Realm B SPC have not yet been taught.

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

- Knowing societal and professional responsibilities
- Comprehending the business of building.
- Collaborating and negotiating with clients and consultants in the design process.
- Discerning the diverse roles of architects and those in related disciplines.
- Integrating community service into the practice of architecture.
C. 1. Collaboration: Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary teams to successfully complete design projects.

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

C. 6. Leadership: Understanding of the techniques and skills architects use to work collaboratively in the building design and construction process and on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.
[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program indicates that this SPC will be covered in courses that have not yet been taught.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: There was no student evidence presented because courses that the program listed as achieving the Realm B SPCs have not yet been taught.
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

2014 Team Assessment: SDSU received notice of its continuing accreditation status by the Higher Learning Commission, a Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, dated April 29, 2010. A copy of the continuing accreditation notice was included in the APR.

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] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: NAAB requires a minimum of 45 semester credits in general (non-architecture) studies. A review of the undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies provided in the APR indicates that there are only 44 credits in general education, as Arch 109, while qualifying for the university’s requirements for general education, does not meet NAAB’s requirement because it covers architecture material and general education courses are those that do not have architectural content. A review of the planned BFA in Architecture starting fall 2015 also may not meet the general education requirements.

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

2014 Team Assessment: While the program APR described processes that the Department of Architecture established for academic assessment, the team feels the rigor of the assessment strategies does not meet the intended results of the curriculum review criterion. The team does recognize that the department is in its infancy and that an effective curriculum review process is an ongoing endeavor. The team expects future teams will have the opportunity to see the results of a rethinking of the intent of this criterion, as well as how the criterion is to be met. In addition, the academic assessment procedures described did not indicate that licensed architects were included as required by this criterion.
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

2014 Team Assessment: The program has outlined the specific requirements that are needed for a student with a Bachelor of Science or a Bachelor of Arts in other disciplines or from another university, which is their Path B 3 ½ year M. Arch. There were four student files in the team room from outside of the university. The file indicated how many credit hours within the 3-year program were waived depending on the transcript; only one of the four students chose to attend the 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

2014 Team Assessment: The appropriate language on NAAB-accredited degrees can be found under the “NAAB Professional Accreditation” tab on the department web site. Direction to this information via this tab is found whether one enters the web site through the undergraduate portal for the BS Architectural Studies (a non-professional degree) or graduate portal the M Architecture (the professional degree). This information also describes the process and timetable for accreditation.

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

[X] Met

2014 Team Assessment: The program web site clearly explains the role of the NAAB and the importance of accreditation to one interested in the profession of architecture. On the “NAAB Professional Accreditation” tab of the department web site, the following statement can be found and the links provided are active:

“The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation including the Student Performance Criteria can also be found at http://www.naab.org/. Specifically, you can find and download the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, as well as the 2012 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, at the NAAB Documents page.”

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

[X] Not Yet Met

2014 Team Assessment: The APR notes on page 133 that access to Career Development Information can be found at http://catalog.sdstate.edu. However, the required information could not readily be located at that URL.
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

2014 Team Assessment: These materials could not be found in the library using the library’s catalog search or in the department office. In addition these materials are not available to the public on the DoArch website.

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

2014 Team Assessment: This criterion is not yet applicable because the school has not graduated its first cohort of students from the Master of Architecture program.
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.

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

Reference South Dakota State University APR, pp.

C. Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)

Reference South Dakota State University APR, pp.

D. Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

Reference South Dakota State University APR, pp.
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**

I.1.3 E Response to the Five Perspectives: Architectural Education and the Public Good.

The DoArch’s Mission Statement emphasizes a small-scale “hands-on” curriculum of “learning by doing,” the making of buildings, places and practices. Although this is a new program, just in its 5th year of existence, it was evident to the visiting team this program aspires to achieve a regional empathy of common good as the backbone of its academic, social, cultural and economic connection to South Dakota peoples and communities. By directly connecting to the region and the entire state, the program promotes the symbiotic relationships between public service, being a good citizen, and being a good architect.
3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the Academy
Barbara A. Sestak, AIA, Dean
School of Fine & Performing Arts
Portland State University
PO Box 751
Portland, OR 97207-0751
(503) 725-3340
(503) 725-3351
sestakb@pdx.edu

Representing the Profession
Ronald J. Battaglia, FAIA
Flynn Battaglia Architects, PC
617 Main Street, Suite S401
Buffalo, NY 14203-1400
(716) 854-2424
(716) 854-2428 fax
rbattaglia@flynnbattaglia.com

Representing the NAAB
C. William Bevins, FAIA
6001 Fox Crossing Drive
Charlotte, NC 28216
(704) 650-5621
CBevins@carolina.rr.com
IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Barbara A. Sestak, AIA
Team Chair

Representing the Academy

Ronald J. Battaglia, FAIA
Team member

Representing the Profession

C. William Bevins, FAIA
Team member

Representing the NAAB