

**Name of Institution:** Florida A&M University

**Name of Academic Unit:** School of Architecture & Engineering Technology

## Interim Progress Report

**Bachelor of Architecture** (150 undergraduate credit hours)

### Master of Architecture

Track I: (preprofessional degree in architecture plus 55 graduate credit hours)

Track II: (non-preprofessional degree plus 90 graduate credit hours)

Please provide contact information for the following individuals:

**Program Administrator:** Andrew Chin, Interim Dean

**Chief administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., dean or department chair):** Andrew Chin, Interim Dean

**Provost:** Rodner B. Wright, AIA, Interim Provost

**President of the Institution:** Dr. Elmira Mangum, President

**Individual submitting the Interim Program Report:** Andrew Chin, Interim Dean

**Name of individual to whom questions should be directed:** Andrew Chin, Interim Dean

**Year of the Previous Visit:** 2012

#### Current Term of Accreditation:

“As a result, the professional architecture programs:

Bachelor of Architecture

Master of Architecture

were formally granted six-year terms of accreditation with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in three years to review the following Conditions and the progress that has been made in each area:

I.1.5 Self Assessment Procedures

I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

The accreditation terms are effective January 1, 2012. The programs are scheduled for their next accreditation visit in 2018. The focused evaluation is scheduled for calendar year 2015.

**Submitted to:** The National Architectural Accrediting Board

**Date:** December 9, 2014

NOTES:

1. All sections should be in Ariel 10 pt type. The template indicates what titles or section headings should be in **bold** and what sections should be in *italics*.
2. All reports should be formatted with 1" margins for all edges.
3. Reports should be single-spaced with appropriate spacing between paragraphs.
4. Please use the headers and footers as established in the template.
5. Reports must be submitted in PDF or Word.
6. Reports are limited to 3 MGs.
7. Instructions for submitting supplemental material are appended to that section of the report.

## Table of Contents

1. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met
  - a. Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3
  - b. Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)
2. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
4. Identify & Self Assessment
  - a. History Mission
  - b. Responses to the Five Perspectives
  - c. Long Range Planning
  - d. Program Self Assessment
5. Summary of Responses to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: Only required if Conditions have changed since the previous visit)

1. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met from the 2012 Visiting Team Report  
a. Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3

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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** Professor Chin represented the School of Architecture in the development of the *University Strategic Plan – October 2009* and the *University Restructuring Plan Fall 2011*. The School of Architecture developed a Draft Strategic Plan in the spring of 2010. The plan includes school-wide goals as well as specific goals for the Department of Architecture and for the Department of Landscape Architecture. The plan has not been ratified. There has been no further activity on the development of the School of Architecture Draft Plan since it was developed in May 2010. This is partly due to the university's reorganization of the School of Architecture to eliminate the Landscape Architecture program and to add an ABET accredited Construction program. The School indicated they plan to revise reassess the draft Strategic Plan to reflect these changes and their impact (if any) on the goals of the architecture program.

**2014 Program Response:** On October 8, 2009, the Florida A&M University (FAMU) Leadership Team presented the 2010-2020 Strategic Plan "Vision with Courage." The FAMU Board of Trustees approved it on October 15, 2009. The goal was to ensure that the University continuously accounts for the rapidly changing dynamics of the global economy, with 2050 in its sights. A copy of the plan is available online, see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?AboutFAMU&StrategicPlan>.

In support of the University Plan, the school of Architecture + Engineering Technology (SA+ET) identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement through the "2010-2020 Institutional Work Plan" Excerpt ([see link](#) or folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>), documented its efforts as the school's 2010-2020 Strategic Plan ([see link](#) or folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>) and evaluated its progress through the Florida A&M University: Annual Report 2010-2011 ([see link](#) or folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>). The process engaged the faculty, Committees, Task Forces, students and alumni.

In preparation for the development of a 2015-16 update, the school was engaged in multiple Long-Range Planning activities before and after the 2012 visit. While an exhaustive list and evidence were not provided in the original APR or to the 2012 team, it is provided below.

- In Spring 2010, the SA+ET Faculty reviewed the draft submission of the SA+ET Long-Range Plan (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Summer 2010, the SA+ET plan was reviewed and accepted by the University.
- In Summer 2011, the SA+ET plan was included in the University's 2010-2020 Strategic Plan as part of its Appendix A: Institutional Work Plan Excerpt (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Summer 2011, the SA+ET evaluated its progress toward its goals in the 2010-2011 Strategic Plan Initiatives: Annual Report Form (see <https://db.tt/SeL8Qnmw>)
- In Summer 2011, degree programs were terminated and others incorporated into the School of Architecture as part of the University's reorganization (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Fall 2011, the dean used a Pre-Semester Planning meeting to provide an update to the faculty of the two Divisions. The dean explained that all programs would comply with the existing operational procedures of the school of Architecture and the long-range goals of

each program, while beginning to examine ways in which their strategic plans needed to be modified. At this same time, the Florida Board of Governors was finalizing its own Strategic Plan (see <http://www.flbog.edu/pressroom/strategicplan.php>).

- In Fall 2011, the dean continued the regular meetings with the architecture program director (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Spring 2012 the Florida Board of Governors Strategic Plan Indicators were provided to the school, and the SA+ET Director Meetings began addressing the plan in relation to the recent reorganization.
- In Spring 2012, the dean continued the regular meetings with the architecture program director (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

Following the 2012 visit, the SA+ET completed the Long-Range Planning activities listed below.

- In Spring 2012, the school identified faculty retreat dates for August 13-14 and 20-21 to focus on the evolution of the plan within the context of the Reorganization.
- In Summer 2012, the dean continued the regular meetings with the architecture program director (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Fall 2012, the school appointed its faculty to three Councils – in addition to its traditional standing committees and short term task forces. The Undergraduate Council focused on issues related to the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) and the Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) degree programs. The Graduate Council focused on issues related to the Master of Science in Architectural Studies (MS) and the Master of Architecture (March) degree programs. The SA+ET Faculty Council focused on issues that bridge across the school's Division of Architecture and Division of Engineering Technology (e.g. the school's name and Tenure/ Promotion guidelines, see attachment).
- In Fall 2012, the school continued the regular meetings with the architecture faculty (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&FacultyMeetingNotes>).
- In Spring 2013, the school continued the regular meetings with the architecture faculty (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&FacultyMeetingNotes>).
- In Fall 2013, the school continued the regular meetings with the architecture faculty (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&FacultyMeetingNotes>).
- In Spring 2014, the architecture faculty participated in a SWOT Workshop. The activity had two goals. The first was to identify the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats facing the architecture programs. The second was to establish a foundation for developing measurable goals by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils in Fall 2014 (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).
- In Spring 2014, continued the regular meetings with the architecture faculty (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&FacultyMeetingNotes>).
- In Fall 2014, the Undergraduate and Graduate Council's end of the semester reports provided a review of the Long-Range and measurable objective of the school's degree programs (see attachment).
- In Fall 2014, the school continued the regular meetings with the architecture faculty (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&FacultyMeetingNotes>).

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

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.

- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - 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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The APR indicates the program engages the faculty through the committees, task forces and the Undergraduate and Graduate Council for developing short-term goals and long-range planning activities. The program's full-time faculty meet at least once a month during the academic year. If the School needs additional time for long-range planning or special needs, half-day or full-day workshops are held. In addition, the Dean meets weekly with the architecture program director, however no documentation was provided.

There is anecdotal evidence that the program is advancing towards its mission; however, there was no evidence presented summarizing the evaluation of progress toward the goals. As most of the goals in the strategic plan have five and ten year targets, the lack of data at this point in the accreditation cycle does not impact conformance with this criteria.

A significant number of faculty indicate they are not as engaged in the self-assessment process at the level presented in the APR.

**2014 Program Response:** The FAMU School of Architecture + Engineering Technology (SA+ET) was engaged in multiple Self-Assessment procedures before and after the 2012 visit that help it examine how it is progressing towards its mission and its multi-year objectives. These include the Instructional Programs Assessment (IAP) Plans, the Undergraduate and Graduate Council Reports, the SA+ET Faculty Reports and the Student Evaluations.

Instructional Programs Assessment (IAP) Plans: The Self-Assessment practices are most clearly evident in the SA+ET's 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 Instructional Programs Assessment (IAP) Plans. The annual IAP plans clarify how the undergraduate and graduate programs progress towards the mission of the school and the institution. These learning outcomes integrate several different pedagogic intentions including existing the SA+ET outcomes, State of Florida mandated Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) and National Architectural Accrediting Board performance criteria. Finally, a set of assessment criteria including qualitative and quantitative measures was established. In response, the SA+ET submits an annual assessment report. Additional information on the Office of University Assessment is available online (<http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&About>).

Undergraduate and Graduate Councils: The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils are the primary means for faculty to discuss critical issues, monitor the undergraduate and graduate programs, participate in the school's self-assessment procedures and make recommendations for improvement. The Undergraduate Council focused on issues related to the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) and the Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) degree programs. The Graduate Council focused on issues related to the Master of

Science in Architectural Studies (MS) and the Master of Architecture (March) degree programs (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

The Councils have served as the primary means to engage the architecture faculty in strategic planning and vision building, implement program initiatives and increase participation in design studio reviews. In the last five years, Council recommendations have resulted in significant changes to the SA+ET curriculum, including:

- a reduction in the number of required technology courses
- an increase in the number of elective courses
- the addition of a landscape architecture/ urban design elective requirement
- the addition of a thesis planning class to the thesis sequence
- the restructuring of the computer classes

SA+ET Faculty Reports: Faculty submit an “End of Year Report” each Spring. The report form is posted to the SA+ET website. In the report, faculty document their activities, accomplishments and develop a forward plan for personal development. The document provides the dean with a vehicle to assess progress toward tenure or post tenure development. The documents are provided to the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils as part of the data collection process (see Self Assessment folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

SA+ET Pre-Planning Course Assessment Forms: At the start of a semester, Faculty submit the form – which clarifies the course goals and how they will be demonstrated. At the end of the semester, the completed form is returned to the professor so they can reflect and comments on their original plans. The original and revised versions are provide to the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils as part of the data collection process (see Self Assessment folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

Student Evaluations: The University provides a regular semester course evaluation by students. The computer scored form is later reported to the faculty member and the dean. These evaluations can serve as important tool in monitoring a teacher’s progress (see Self Assessment folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

Student Experience Surveys: In Spring 2013, the school began the process of online surveys. The goal was to establish a convenient means for students to submit comments and suggestions on the school’s ability to meet its goals. For example, it currently serves as a means to measure SA+ET students’ understanding of the IDP program and interaction with their Advisor (see Self Assessment folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

Examples of the Self-Assessment procedures prior to the 2012 visit are listed below. In 2009-10, the.

- School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.
- School submitted the 2009-10 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture and the graduate Master of Landscape Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2009 architecture classes.
- faculty submitted a 2009-10 Annual Report.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Spring 2010 architecture classes.

In 2010-11, the.

- In School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.

- School submitted the 2010-11 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture and the graduate Master of Landscape Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2010 architecture classes.
- faculty submitted a 2010-11 Annual Report.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Spring 2011 architecture classes.

In 2011-12, the.

- School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.
- School submitted the 2010-11 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture and the graduate Master of Landscape Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2011 architecture classes.
- faculty submitted a 2011-12 Annual Report.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Spring 2012 architecture classes.

Following the 2012 visit, the SA+ET completed the Self-Assessment procedures listed below. The results of these activities and their implementation are also clarified. In 2012-13, the.

- In School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.
- School submitted the 2009-10 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2012 architecture classes.
- faculty submitted a 2012-13 Annual Report.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Spring 2013 architecture classes.
- School developed an Annual Report that summarized its teaching, research and service activities.
- Undergraduate Council submitted an Annual Report.
- Graduate Council submitted an Annual Report.
- Faculty Council submitted an Annual Report.

In 2013-14, the.

- School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.
- School submitted the 2013-14 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2013 architecture classes.
- faculty submitted a 2010-11 Annual Report.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Spring 2014 architecture classes.
- faculty participated in a SWOT Workshop. The activity had two goals. The first was to identify the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats facing the architecture programs. The second was to establish a foundation for developing measurable goal by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils in Fall 2014.
- faculty submitted the schools' NAAB SPC Self-Assessment Form. The Self Assessment Form asked faculty to "Identify the SPC for the class, the assignment that illustrates each SPC and two copies of student work for each assignment you identified." The form is for both design studio and lecture classes and completed by full-time faculty and part-time adjuncts.



- School submitted an Annual Report. The Report provides an inventory of the teaching, research and service activities of faculty and the student and alumni accomplishments.
- students completed SA+ET Student Experience Surveys. The Survey provides a convenient method to measure the objectives of the Spring 2014 classes and the school's academic support system.
- Dean submitted a School/ College Accomplishments report.
- Undergraduate Council submitted an Annual Report.
- Graduate Council submitted an Annual Report.
- Faculty Council submitted an Annual Report.

In 2014-15, the.

- faculty participated in a SWOT Workshop. The activity had two goals. The first was to identify the strengths, weakness, opportunities and threats facing the architecture programs. The second was to establish a foundation for developing measurable goal by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils in Fall 2014.
- faculty submitted the schools' Pre-Planning Course Assessment Form. The Pre-Planning Form asked faculty to "Identify the SPC for the class, the assignment that illustrates each SPC and two copies of student work for each assignment you identified." The form is for both design studio and lecture classes and completed by full-time faculty and part-time adjuncts
- School submitted the Academic Learning Compacts (ALCs) for its undergraduate and graduate classes.
- School submitted the 2010-11 Instructional Programs Assessment Plans for the undergraduate Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Architecture, the graduate Master of Science and Master of Architecture.
- students completed Course Evaluation Forms for Fall 2014 architecture classes.
- students completed SA+ET Student Experience Surveys. The Survey provides a convenient method to measure the objectives of the Spring 2014 classes and the school's academic support system.
- Dean submitted a School/ College Accomplishments report.
- Undergraduate Council submitted a Fall 2014 Report.
- Graduate Council submitted a Fall 2014 Report.
- Faculty Council submitted a Fall 2014 Report.

2.2 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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** This condition is not met as evidenced by the APR, along with supplemental documentation provided to the team, and through conversations with faculty, students and administrators. The School of Architecture is represented as the "program" throughout the APR represents, except on page 48 where it states

"The Dean (Rodner B. Wright) is the chief executive officer and oversees the administration of all degree programs, research, and service programs of the School. The Director of the Architecture Program (Andrew Chin) is responsible for the oversight of faculty academic activity and program development, with the Division of Architecture."

The chair made this observation to the Dean prior to the visit and requested that the architecture program director represent the architecture program during the visit in order to conform to the 2011 NAAB procedures (page 13). NAAB defines these two separate roles in

SECTION 3.2.c.ii.1.c. Name, address, email, and telephone contact information for the following individuals:

- i. Program administrator
- ii. Head of academic unit in which the program will be located

The visit and the VTR reflect the visiting team's assessment of the Division of Architecture within the School of Architecture.

There appears to be an overlapping of roles between the dean and the director in the administration of the program as evidenced by supplemental documentation provided to the team, and through conversations with faculty, students and administrators. While the current structure provides a certain degree of efficiency in operating the program, and while the great efforts of the current administrators are evident and well-recognized, the administrative autonomy of the program does not seem sufficient to affirm the program's ability to meet the Conditions. In fact, better articulation of administrative responsibilities, with more involvement of the faculty, seems needed to better engage the faculty in strategic planning and vision building, improve communication flows with the faculty and the students, implement program initiatives, such as guest presentations, design reviews, and IDP educational programs, as well as addressing more effectively critical aspects such as advisement and recruitment.

**2014 Program Response:** Six months prior to the visit, the school was reorganized as part of the university wide restructuring. On June 30, 2011, the school had 300 students and was 95% architecture majors. As a result of the university wide restructuring, the school gained a division, increased to 450 students and was now 70% architecture majors. At the time of the visit, the dean, the Director of Architecture and the Director of Engineering Technology were in the process of re-evaluating defining the roles of the directors and other administrators.

During the visit, the school was successful in demonstrating how "the current structure provides a certain degree of efficiency". But, the school was not as successful in clarifying the difference in the "roles between the dean and the director in the administration of the program" and the scale at which they operate and their responsibilities. In summary, the dean reports to the Provost, is responsible for the school's budget, supervises the other administrators in the school, is the point of contact for industry and alumni, and guides the school's relationship to the University's vision. The assistant dean of the school reports to the dean, is responsible for the school's teaching, supervises the faculty, is the point of contact for students and parents, and guides the school's relationship to its teaching responsibilities. Therefore, the NAAB Reports are a result of the two working closely together.

In addition, an updated organizational chart clarifies the structure of the school's two Divisions and the Councils. Since the 2012 visit, the Undergraduate and Graduate Council have served as a substantive means to engage the faculty in strategic planning and vision building, implement program initiatives and increase participation in design studio reviews (see Organizational Chart <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

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

**2012 Team Assessment:** This condition is not met as evidenced in interviews and the APR. While students seem to have equitable opportunities to participate in program and institutional governance through the Dean's Student Council, there is no evidence that the faculty have sufficient access to governance. The two councils (for Undergraduate and Graduate Programs respectively) are not sufficiently representative of the architecture program faculty, who can nominate only half of their members. The other half are appointed directly by the Dean. There are no governance documents (faculty handbook) for the program or for the school of which it is part which document the policies and procedures for administering the program described in the APR. In addition, a clear process of decision-making is not evident and the faculty should have more formal opportunities to impact the strategic direction of the program.

**2014 Program Response:** In Fall 2012, a new committee/council structure was implemented to increase faculty governance through three Councils. The Undergraduate Council focused on issues related to the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies (BSAS) and the Bachelor of Architecture (BArch) degree programs. The Graduate Council focused on issues related to the Master of Science in Architectural Studies (MS) and the Master of Architecture (MArch) degree programs. The SA+ET Faculty Council focused on issues that bridge the Division of Architecture and Division of Engineering Technology (see Governance <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

The Undergraduate and Graduate Council have served as the primary means to engage the architecture faculty in strategic planning and vision building, implement program initiatives and increase participation in design studio reviews. In the last five years, Council recommendations have resulted in significant changes to the SA+ET curriculum, including:

- a reduction in the number of required technology courses
- an increase in the number of elective courses
- the addition of a landscape architecture/ urban design elective requirement
- the addition of a thesis planning class to the thesis sequence
- the restructuring of the computer classes

In response to the 2012 Team Assessment statement that "no evidence that the faculty have sufficient access to governance," faculty access to governance is evident in two sources: a faculty member's Assignment of Responsibility (AOR) Form and the SA+ET Committee & Task Force list. The AOR Forms document that 10-15 percent of every faculty member's appointment is reserved to serve on school or university committees. The SA+ET Committee & Task Force list is developed each Fall semester and specifies the service and governance responsibility to the school and the university. All full time tenured faculty serve on the Undergraduate, Graduate or Faculty Council, in addition to other short term Task Forces (see Governance <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

In response to the 2012 Team Assessment statement that "the two councils are not sufficiently representative of the architecture program faculty", 100% of the council members are SA+ET faculty and the dean's appointments are designed to provide diversity to each Council. For example, in Fall 2014, the majority of the faculty appointments to the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils were mostly white male. The Deans appointments were either female or people of color. The Undergraduate and Graduate Council membership also reflects the program areas in which faculty teach (see Governance <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

**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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The requested information was provided with the exception of the following:

- Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
- Percentage that complete the M. Arch 2 year degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.
- Compare the number of faculty promoted each year since last visit, to the institution during the same period.
- Compare the number of faculty receiving tenure to the number at the institution during the same period.

**2014 Program Response:** The program is working with the Office of Institutional Research to provide the required information on a regular basis. The information shown below is now gathered on an annual basis.

- Qualifications of students admitted in the fiscal year prior to the last visit.
  - The average SAT/ ACT scores of the 2012 Freshmen were 945/ 19.
  - The average SAT/ ACT scores of the 2013 Freshmen were 950/ 20.
- Percentage that complete the M. Arch 2 year degree program within 150% of the normal time to completion for each academic year since the previous visit.
  - 100 % of 2011 B.Arch students completed the degree program within 150%.
  - 80 % of 2011 M.Arch students completed the degree program within 150%.

- Compare the number of faculty promoted each year since last visit, to the institution during the same period.  
     In 2013, eighteen (18) FAMU faculty were granted promotion.  
     In 2013, one (1) architecture faculty were granted promotion.
- Compare the number of faculty receiving tenure to the number at the institution during the same period.  
     In 2013, ten (10) FAMU faculty were granted tenure.  
     In 2013, zero (0) architecture faculty were granted tenure.

**b. Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)**

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

**2012 Team Assessment:** Evidence indicates that both the B. Arch and M. Arch programs exhibit numerous examples of documentation that attempt to demonstrate the ability to comply with accessibility design skills in both site and building space documents. However, M. Arch course ARC 6359: Design 6.2 does not indicate an ability to comply with this criterion, whereas drawings / diagrammatic exhibits posted under ARC 4342: Design 4.2 are also not sufficiently in compliance with this criterion, due to either the small scale of the drawings (not visibly clear); they lack proper annotation /labeling of specific areas; or there are incorrect layouts relative to current ADA accessibility requirements. This evaluation applies to both interior restroom areas as well as exterior site design areas. As such, this SPC is NOT MET for the M. Arch program, but MET for the B. Arch program.

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils initiated a process for continuous evaluation and improve our ability to illustrate SPC B.2 Accessibility. In Spring 2013, the assistant dean and guest critics from other schools reviewed the ARC 4342 and ARC 6359 final presentations and agreed that the criteria were not well met. In Fall 2013, the Councils reviewed the existing SPC Matrix and determined that the two courses (ARC 4342 and ARC 6359) were the correct courses to address the SPC. In Spring 2014, the students in ARC 4342 and ARC 6359 completed Student Experience Surveys that examined courses ability to address its responsibilities. In response, it was agreed that the courses should use a two-part approach to address the SPC. While the classes will continue to address the SPC as one of many SPCs in a typical design project, the class will also have a separate exercise that is focused on only this single SPC. The goal is to implement the exercise with its single objective, measure student success with external examiners and then provide the results to the Council for future changes. The change will be implemented in ARC 4342 and ARC 6359 (see folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

B.6 Comprehensive Design (B. Arch and M. Arch): 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.4. Technical Documentation	B.3. Sustainability
A.5. Investigative Skills	B.4. Site Design
A.8. Ordering Systems	B.7. Environmental Systems
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture	B.9. Structural Systems

### B.5. Life Safety

**2012 Team Assessment:** This criterion is not met in the B. Arch Program. The team did not find sufficient evidence that the other SPC were integrated in the design projects completed by undergraduates. This was especially the case for A.4. Technical Documentation, A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture, B.2. Accessibility, B.4. Site Design, B.8. Environmental Systems, and B.9. Structures.

The team did find more of the SPC integrated in the graduate design programs, however this criterion is also not met in the graduate programs, especially because both B.2. Accessibility and A.4. Technical Documentation were absent from most projects.

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the school recognized that it needed to critically examination the “capstone” experience in both the B.Arch and M.Arch programs. The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils determined that the first step needed was to talk to other programs and learn from their experiences. In Spring 2013, a series of Skype interviews were scheduled with Brian Kelly at the University of Maryland, Keelan Kaiser at Judson University, David Brown at the University of Illinois at Chicago and others. From those conversations, the Councils recommended a changes to the B.Arch and M.Arch process.

Prior to the Skype conversations, all of the B.6 Comprehensive Design criteria were met in a single one-semester studio. Following the conversation, the Councils recommended that 50% of the criteria would be met in studio and 50% of the criteria would be met in a parallel lecture class. The change was implemented in Spring 2014 and the school hosted reviewers from Auburn University (Auburn, AL), SCAD (Savannah, GA) and FIU (Miami, FL). While the SA+ET faculty and guest critics agreed that there was improvement, we will continue to review the process after the Spring 2015 semester to make a final judgement (see Comprehensive folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

B.7 Financial Considerations (B. Arch and M. Arch): 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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** The criterion is not met. ARC 5286 addresses the costs associated with starting and running an architecture firm, but do not deal with fundamental building costs, acquisition costs nor construction estimating.

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils initiated a process for continuous evaluation and improve our ability to illustrate SPC B.7 Financial Considerations. In Spring 2013, the assistant dean and guest critics from these schools reviewed the ARC 5286 student work. They agreed that the criteria were not clearly met. In Fall 2013, the Councils reviewed the existing SPC Matrix and confirmed that ARC 5286 is the best courses to address the SPC. In Spring 2014, the students in ARC 5286 completed Student Experience Surveys and indicated that Financial Considerations were not significantly addressed. In response, the course will now use a two-part approach to address the SPC. While the classes will continue to address Financial Considerations as one of many SPCs in their final project, the class will also have a separate exercise that is only focused on this single SPC. To assist in the completion of the exercise, the school provided the students with access to RMeansOnline (<http://www.rsmeansonline.com/>). The students were given accounts and an assignment that focused on financial considerations (see Financial Considerations folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

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.

**2012 Team Assessment:** Public Information has not been satisfied. The NAAB statement is incorrect in the school of Architecture Handbook and in the FAMU Catalogue.

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the Public Information has been revised. The NAAB statement was updated in the Student Handbook (see page 8 of [http://www.famu.edu/Architecture/Student Handbook-11-15-12.pdf](http://www.famu.edu/Architecture/Student%20Handbook-11-15-12.pdf)), in the FAMU Catalogue and on the school website (see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&Accreditation>).

## 2. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern from the Most Recent Visiting Team Report

### Studio Contact Hours in B. Arch Distance Learning Program

#### A. Studio Contact Hours in the B. Arch Distance Learning Program

Although non-traditional scheduling within the B. Arch program provides an opportunity for students to manage the time commitment of attending college, there is concern that certain policies associated with this program – including the contact hours for the design studio - may not provide parity with the traditional track for this program, particularly within the design studio experience. (I.1.1)

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the architecture faculty discussed the concern. The faculty determined that the contact hours will remain unchanged for two reasons (1) the high quality of work and (2) the changing economy. While the VTR Report identified various areas of improvement, the Visting team indicated that the work showed “consistently higher quality than that of other students.” Therefore, it was determined that adjusting the contact hours were not a critical issue (at this time) since the work was successful.

Also, before and after the 2012 visit, the State of Florida economy went through significant shifts. As a result, there was a significant reduction in interest in an academic plan for working interns. Interns were no longer thinking about advancement, when they questioned whether or not to stay in the discipline. At the same time, the school planned the development of a Master of Science that provided a concentration in facilities management – which has proven to be of higher interest to 4-year degree graduates. At this time, the school has focused its energy on building the M.S. program and strengthening the traditional B.Arch path. But, the issue will remain an annual topic on the Undergraduate Council agenda for future review and consideration.

### Degree Parity in B. Arch Distance Learning Program

#### B. Degree Parity in the B. Arch Distance Learning Program

The students that take advantage of the non-traditional scheduling within the B. Arch program may not be receiving the appropriate academic credential relative to their level of achievement, as the work of these students appears to be of a consistently higher quality than that of other students. (II.2.2)

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the architecture faculty discussed the concern. While the VTR Report identified various areas of improvement, the Visting Team indicated that the work showed “consistently higher quality than that of other students.” Therefore, the faculty determined that receiving the appropriate academic credential was not a critical issue (at this time) since the work was successful. But, the issue will remain an annual topic on the Undergraduate Council agenda for future review and consideration.

#### Inconsistent Student Advising

C. Inconsistent Student Advising

There appears to be inconsistency in the delivery of student advising, especially as it relates to changes in the evolution of the curriculum. (I.1.3.B)

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the school administration discussed the concern with the architecture programs academic advisors. The existing process was reviewed and a Student Experience Survey was developed. The survey indicates that more than 85% of the FAMU SA+ET meet wth their Advisor every semester - prior to registration (see Survey <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>). In Spring 2015, the Council will receive a three-year summary of survey results and determine what changes might be needed.

#### Inconsistent Communication about IDP to M. Arch Students

D. Inconsistent Communication about IDP to M. Arch Students

There is evidence that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed, but their role, position description, and their current training status has not been defined to adequately demonstrate that information about the IDP program is being disseminated to the students. Although the IDP Education Coordinator hosts an annual presentation to the IDP process in the freshman orientation class, the team has no documentation that the same information is presented to the M. Arch 3.5 master students at the beginning of their architectural education. (I.1.3.C)

**2014 Program Response:** Following the 2012 visit, the school administration discussed the concern with the IDP Education Coordinator. Since then, their has been (1) increased training, (2) increased studio presentations and (3) increased school wide IDP events. In summer 2012, summer 2013 and summer 2014, the IDP Coordinator attended the training workshops at the AIA National Meetings. In addition, the Coordinator expanded his studio presentations from solely graduate students to include freshmen classes and fourth year studio meetings. As a final step, the school hosted an IDP Workshop presentation by Nick Serfass, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP on NFall 2013. Nick works for the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) as the Assistant Director, Intern Development Program. To monitor the effectiveness of the strategies, a Student Experience Survey was developed. The survey indicates that more than 85% of the FAMU SA+ET students are familiar with the IDP program. In addition, more than 75% of the FAMU SA+ET students can identify the IDP Coordinator (see Survey <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>). In Spring 2015, the Council will receive a three-year summary of survey results and determine what changes might be needed.

#### Financial Resources



E. Financial Resources

Recognizing the financial system within which the university, the school, and the programs function, additional reductions in financial resources may impact the programs' abilities to fulfill their missions particularly in relation to continuing to provide a high quality professional architectural education to this uniquely diverse student body. The school and the university have continued to multiply their efforts to sustain the operations of the programs, but no sufficient evidence was found that future resources could be considered adequate.

Finally, the school does not seem to have in place an aggressive strategy for development to tap private funding, as a potential increase in faculty grants alone cannot be seen as sufficient to address the current budget deficiencies.

**2014 Program Response:** In spite of the economic downturn, the SA+ET budget has remained stable since the 2012 visit. The school's greatest financial achievements are its ability to secured grant funding and provide assistantships/ scholarships to its graduate students. The plan to secure private funding begins with increased documentation and communication to the alumni. As a result, the school has initiated a Facebook page, Twitter account, Instagram page and WordPress blog that archive the school's accomplishment. In addition, the school has developed two new publications - an annual report and a portfolio of student work. The value of increased communication will be critical as the school celebrates its 40-year anniversary in Fall 2015 and Spring 2016.

3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program

Such as

- Faculty retirement/succession planning: The School has not been informed of any plans for retirement.
- Administration changes: Following the 2012 Team Visit, Dean Rodner B. Wright, AIA was asked to serve as the interim provost and vice president for Academic Affairs. Andrew Chin, who served as assistant dean of Architecture Programs, was asked to serve as the interim dean of the School of Architecture. Chin asked Valerie Goodwin, AIA to serve as the Interim Director of Professional programs in Architecture.

The School's interim assignments are scheduled to end in February 2015. In Fall 2014, FAMU announced that Marcella David, who previously served as a law and international studies professor and as an associated dean at the University of Iowa's College of Law, will begin as provost of FAMU in February 2015 ([see link](#)) At that time, Wright will return to the School and Chin will return to his assistant dean responsibilities.

- Changes in enrollment: The enrollment in FAMU SA+ET 4 year architecture program has decreased 5-10 each year, for the last 3 years. The change is a result of multiple issues (1) the State of Florida economy, (2) minority student access to financial aid, (3) enrollment patterns at the university and (4) national trends in architecture student enrollment. As indicated the NAAB 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013 Reports on Accreditation in Architecture Education, enrollment in architecture eprograms has decreased in the last three years
  - 2011 - 27,852 students in NAAB programs
  - 2011 - 27,478 students (decreased by a net of 374, or 1.1%)
  - 2012 - 26,850 students (decreased by a net of 627, or 2.3%)
  - 2013 - 25,958 students (decreased by a net of 892, or 3.3%)

- New opportunities for collaboration: TheFAMU SA+ET has initiated a unique partnership with the FAMU School of Business and Industry. The two schools commitment to offering Facilities Management (FM) studies at the undergraduate and graduate level is accredited by the International Facilities Management Association ([see IFMA website](#)). At the School of Architecture + Engineering Technology, students may pursue a Master of Science with a concentration in Facilities Management. The M.S. program builds on a student's 4 year architecture degree with unique courses from the FAMU School of Business, the FAMU School of the Environment and the FAMU College of Education.
- Significant changes in educational approach or philosophy: The school has not made any changes to its educational approach or philosophy and continues its unique commitment to the state, the university and the profession. For the State of Florida, the school partners with community colleges across North and Central Florida and serves students that cannot start at a traditional 4-year institution. For Florida A&M University, the school is the leading producer of STEM bachelor degree graduates. For the profession, the school is the number two producer of African-Americans with a Bachelors degree in architecture and the number three producer of African-Americans with a Master degree in architecture (see Diverse Issues in Higher Education, <http://diverseeducation.com/top100/>)
- Changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building, cancelled new building): Following the 2012 NAAB Visit, the most significant improvement has been the opening of a Digital Fabrication Lab. Students in the professional program have free and unlimited access to a 5-Axis CNC router (Thermwood), two 3-D printers (MakerBot), two laser cutters (Epilogue), a plotter and large format scanners (see Resources <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

#### 4. Identity & Self Assessment

##### a. History Mission

*[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]*

*The report must include the following:*

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

##### *Institution: History*

Florida A&M University was founded on October 3, 1887 as the State Normal College for Colored Students. At the time, it was the second post-secondary institution in the state. Four years later, the school was given a share of the funds allocated to states for agricultural and mechanical education, was moved to its present location, and its name was changed to the State Normal and Industrial College for Colored Students. In 1905, management of the school was transferred from the Board of Education to the Board of Control, officially designating the school as an institution of higher education. The name was changed again in 1909 to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes. The following year, with an enrollment of 317 students, the college awarded its first degrees.

By 1944, Florida A & M had constructed 48 buildings, accumulated 396 acres of land, had 812 students and 122 staff members, and had received accreditation from several state agencies. Five years later, the school had obtained an Army ROTC unit, and student enrollment had grown to more than 2,000. In 1951, the institution's name was changed from Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes to Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College. And in 1953, by legislative action, the college was renamed Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU).

The University experienced its most rapid growth during the years 1950-68. The hospital was completed, 23 buildings were erected, staff increased by more than 500, the quarter system was implemented, and it became the first Negro institution to become a member in the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Enrollment increased to more than 3,500. In 1971, FAMU was recognized as a full partner in the nine-university Florida State University System.

In the 1980's, the University grew to 12 schools and colleges including a School of Graduate Studies, Research, and Continuing Education. A major building program was undertaken including the new \$5.3 million School of Architecture. Since 1986, the University has completed over \$100 million in new construction. In 1984 the University was granted the authority to offer its first Doctor of Philosophy degree and awarded its first Ph.D. (in pharmaceutical sciences) in 1989.

Under the administration of the eighth President, Dr. Frederick S. Humphries, student enrollment reached its all-time high, climbing from 5,100 in 1985 to 9,551 in 1992-93 and approximately 12,000 in 1998-99. The University's national ranking in enrolling National Achievement finalists moved from fourth place in 1989 to first place (in 1992, 1995, and 1997) and second place (1993 and 1994), surpassing institutions such as Harvard, Yale and Stanford. During the celebration of its 110th Anniversary, Florida A & M University's accomplishments were recognized nationally, and it was selected the 1997-98 College of the Year by Time Magazine-Princeton Review. After the resignation of President Humphries in 2002, the FAMU Board of Trustees named Henry Lewis III, Pharm.D, Dean of the College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, interim president. In May of that year, the Board selected alumnus Fred Gainous, Ed.D. to be the ninth president. During his tenure, Dr. Gainous initiated the implementation of the new University operating system, and he pushed the University to over \$100 million in research dollars. On December 14, 2004, the Florida A&M University Board of Trustees made history by appointing Dr. Castell Vaughn Bryant as interim president. Dr. Bryant, an alumna, was the first woman to lead the University in its 117 years of existence.

On July 2, 2007, Dr. James H. Ammons, became the tenth president of Florida A&M University. Prior to his appointment, he served as Chancellor of North Carolina Central University (NCCU) from 2001 through 2006 and as provost and vice president for Academic Affairs at FAMU. Since Dr. Ammons' arrival at the University, he has built a top-notch, strong leadership team. In addition, he secured accreditation from the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education in which the board voted to reaffirm the College's accreditation status through June 30, 2010. Under his leadership, FAMU also received its first unqualified audit in three years from the Auditor General's Office; and the University enrolled students for the first time in a new doctorate program in physical therapy.

In Spring 2011, the Florida A&M University board of trustees approved a major restructuring plan. The Restructuring Plan outlines how FAMU will use its resources to implement its strategic plan, "2020 Vision With Courage." The multi-layered proposal was developed over two years and involved focus groups made up of all segments of the campus community.

Also in 2011, FAMU was selected as one of The Princeton Review's "311 Green Colleges: 2011 Edition." The university was the only historically black college or university (HBCU) to make the list, which focused solely on colleges that have demonstrated a strong commitment to sustainability in their academic offerings, campus infrastructure, activities and career preparation. Later that year, FAMU was named one of the best colleges in the Southeast by the Princeton Review. It is one of 134 institutions The Princeton Review recommends in its "Best in the Southeast" section of its website feature, "2012 Best Colleges: Region by Region."

**2014 Program Response:** In On July 16, 2012, Florida A&M University's Board of Trustees appointed provost Larry Robinson as interim president and permitted the resignation of James H. Ammons to become effective that day.

In 2014, FAMU was recognized among the 2014 U.S. News & World Report's "Best National Universities." The U.S. News & World Report lists FAMU as the top public historically black college or university in the nation for 2015. It is also listed among The Princeton Review's "Best in the Southeast" colleges and is one of the top picks for providing a high quality education at an affordable price in Florida, according to The College Database (2013).

In 2014, Dr. Elmira Mangum, former Cornell University administrator, was chosen to serve as the university's 11th president.

*Institution: Mission*

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) is an 1890 land-grant institution dedicated to the advancement of knowledge, resolution of complex issues and the empowerment of citizens and communities. The University provides a student-centered environment consistent with its core values. The faculty is committed to educating students at the undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and professional levels, preparing graduates to apply their knowledge, critical thinking skills and creativity in their service to society. FAMU's distinction as a doctoral/research institution will continue to provide mechanisms to address emerging issues through local and global partnerships. Expanding upon the University's land-grant status, it will enhance the lives of constituents through innovative research, engaging cooperative extension, and public service.

While the University continues its historic mission of educating African Americans, FAMU embraces persons of all races, ethnic origins and nationalities as life-long members of the university community.

Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University holds the following values essential to the achievement of the university's mission:

- \* Scholarship
- \* Excellence
- \* Openness
- \* Fiscal Responsibility
- \* Accountability
- \* Collaboration
- \* Diversity
- \* Service
- \* Fairness
- \* Courage
- \* Integrity
- \* Respect
- \* Collegiality
- \* Freedom
- \* Ethics
- \* Shared Governance

*Program: History*

In 1973 the State University System completed A Study of Florida's Future Need for Architects which concluded that the state would need more than twice the number of professional architects the two schools then existing in Florida could produce. Since the Board of Regents had no control over the private University of Miami and the program at the University of Florida was considered too large to expand further, a new school of architecture at one of the other eight universities was proposed. At the same time, the 1974 version of Florida's Plan for Equalizing Educational Opportunity in Public Higher Education was completed. This document, along with the Federal Equalizing Educational Plan of 1974, called for increasing the number of black students in the eight state universities, which were traditionally white schools, and for increasing the number of non-black students at the historically black Florida A & M University. The establishment of a professional school that traditionally attracts very few other-than-white males provided a solution to both the desegregation of FAMU and the need to educate more architects to

practice in the state. Consequently, the School of Architecture (SOA) at Florida A & M University (FAMU) was opened in September 1975 under the leadership of Dean Richard Chalmers from SUNY Buffalo.

The original plan for the School was to offer a four-plus-two program structure, providing a four-year pre-professional Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies and a two-year professional Master of Architecture. The School was to maximize articulation with the pre-architecture curricula at designated community colleges. The development of the graduate program emphases was done with an effort not to duplicate options offered at the University of Florida. The options chosen were to reflect the emerging needs of the architecture profession and to provide an atmosphere of innovation in the new school.

In 1983 the Board of Regents (BOR) approved the School's request to offer a non-professional Master of Science degree, which allows concentration and special study for students who already have a professional degree or for those who do not seek one. At the same time, approval was given to offer the five-year professional Bachelor of Architecture and the Master of Architecture option for students with prior degrees in other fields. These three programs—all suggested by accreditation teams—allow the School to serve the needs of a broad range of students, to utilize its resources more effectively, and to promote both the professional and research interests of the graduate faculty.

In 1981, the Institute for Building Sciences was approved by the BOR, and a faculty member was appointed part-time to direct this umbrella organization for conducting sponsored research and community service projects. As more faculty became involved with sponsored projects, the need for a full-time director grew. In 1985, a search was conducted, and Professor Thomas Martineau was hired as the first full-time IBS Director. Under his leadership, the Institute earned its first \$1 million in research funded by federal, state, local, and private sources. In 1991, Professor Thomas Pugh, a faculty member and researcher, was appointed as Interim Director; in 1994, he was appointed as Director. Under his leadership, the Institute has continued to grow and excel and has now topped \$4 million in funded projects.

In 1985 founding Dean Richard Chalmers resigned, and Professor Enn Ots was appointed as Acting Dean. He served in that position until 1988. In 1986 the eight-semester FAMU/USF (University of South Florida) Master of Architecture Cooperative Program was opened to students who had undergraduate degrees in other fields. (This program received its own accreditation in 1992 and shortly thereafter became independent from the FAMU School of Architecture.) During the same year, the FAMU B.Arch. program received its first accreditation.

Professor Roy F. Knight was appointed Dean in 1988 as the School looked toward the '90s and its 15th birthday. Both professional programs were re-accredited in 1990 and again in 1995 with full five-year terms of accreditation. Professor Knight served as Dean until 1996 when he resigned, and Professor Rodner B. Wright was appointed as Dean.

In 1992 the School applied for and received federal funding through Title III grants to enhance its previously unfunded student retention endeavors. In 1997 the second five-year cycle of Title III funding was renewed. That fall, students were admitted to the new Master of Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.) program, and an Interim Director, Professor Glenn Smith, was appointed. The two professional architecture programs received full re-accreditation in 2000. The turn of the century also brought other "firsts" for the School: the first M.L.A. degrees were awarded, a summer program for high school students (CoFA: Connecting to Florida Architecture) was initiated, and the first School newsletter (SOA News) was published.

The following year (2001) saw the State's abolishment of the Board of Regents. The Board had been the governing unit of the State University System. A Board of Trustees, appointed for each university by the governor, replaced the Board of Regents.

That same year (2002), the SOA coordinated the first organized alumni activity—an exhibition of alumni work that celebrated 25 years of graduates. An evening and weekend study opportunity was initiated for

architecture interns with pre-professional degrees to help them complete their B.Arch. degrees. Rehabilitation of the building and the addition of new space was completed in April 2002.

The year 2003 brought the appointment of Dr. Arleen Pabón as Interim Associate Dean and Associate Professor Andrew Chin as Director of Professional Architecture Programs. The first Alumni Reunion was held during Homecoming Week, and the School participated in its first Tallahassee CANstruction event. A major redesign of a fully featured website was deployed, including an electronic, password-protected “office” for internal use. In early 2005, Pabón stepped down from the position and the position was not filled. In 2005, the Master of Landscape Architecture Program assembled and met with its first Advisory Council. The initial accreditation visit was held later that year. In August, the Program was advised of its full six-year accreditation. Similarly in July 2006, the School of Architecture hosted a NAAB accreditation visit and was later advised of its full six-year term of accreditation to both the B.Arch and M.Arch programs.

The years 2007 thru 2009 were years of addition and subtraction at the SOA. While the School was able to hire numerous full time young faculty and adjuncts, the SOA had numerous retirements. While there was a significant loss of institutional memory, the staff reduction has resulted in a more efficient and productive academic unit. The University’s Restructuring Plan, implemented in Fall 2011, had a significant impact on the SOA. The Landscape Architecture program was identified for elimination. The Construction Technology, Electrical Engineering Technology and Civil Engineering Technology programs were reassigned, from the College of Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture (CESTA) to the School of Architecture. As a result, the School of Architecture was reorganized into two Divisions: the Division of Architecture and the Division of Engineering Technology. The SOA sees the change as an opportunity to initiate new graduate programs, access new research partnerships and provide new opportunities for the SOA students and faculty.

**2014 Program Response:** in Spring 2012, the School hosted a NAAB visit and was formally granted six-year terms of accreditation for the B.Arch and M.Arch programs, with the stipulation that a focused evaluation be scheduled in three years. In Fall 2012, Dean Rodner B. Wright, AIA was asked to serve as the interim provost and vice president for Academic Affairs. Andrew Chin, who served as assistant dean of Architecture Programs, was asked to serve as the interim dean of the School of Architecture. In Spring 2014, the name of the school was officially changed to the School of Architecture and Engineering Technology (SA+ET).

#### *Program: Mission*

The School adopted the following Mission statement on March 15, 2005:

*The mission of the School of Architecture (SOA) is to provide an enlightened and enriched academic, intellectual, moral, cultural, ethical, technologically advanced, and student-centered environment conducive to the development of highly qualified individuals who are prepared and capable of serving as leaders and contributors within the fields of Architecture and Landscape Architecture in an ever-evolving society. The School aspires to seek and support a faculty and staff of distinction dedicated to providing outstanding academic education at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional school levels, with a particular emphasis on integrity, creativity, and ethical conduct. The SOA is committed to motivational teaching, imaginative research, and meaningful community service. The SOA is also committed to cultural diversity by means of its course offerings, special programs, and recruitment efforts.*

#### *21st Century Architectural Education*

The SA+ET mission statement reflects the core principles of the program while being relevant to a 21st century architectural education. The University’s “historic mission of educating African Americans” and the SOA’s “committed to cultural diversity” illustrate an unmatched dedication to non-traditional students. As a Historically Black College/ University (HBCU) with a national reputation, the University draws African American students from across the country. The result is a freshman design studio that

typically has more than 40 African American students interested in architecture. The opportunity to serve minorities, who are not equitably present in the profession, enhances the diversity of the discipline.

But, our unique diversity is a result of crafting multiple access points into the pre-architecture, B.Arch and M.Arch programs. The multiple access points are described below:

- Our community college pre-architecture articulation agreements provide access to students that have completed a AA degree. These are typically non-African American students, which helps to diversify the racial composition of the SOA. It also provides access (regardless of race or gender) to students who need an affordable option in North Florida.
- The multiple access points into the Master of Architecture degree increases the diversity of students in the graduate program. The 2 year curriculum, the 55 graduate credit track, typically attracts students who did their 4 year degree at FAMU. The 3.5 year curriculum, the non-architecture bachelor degree + 90 graduate credit track, attracts students who did not consider architecture as a career choice in high school. This path contributes graduate students who did not attend a Historically Black College/ University (HBCU).
- The B.Arch program's non-traditional (evening/ weekend) schedule diversifies the age and experience level of students in the B.Arch program. Because the B.Arch program provides two classes each semester as evening/ weekend courses, students have the option to keep their positions as full time interns and complete their classes as a part time student over a two year period. This typically results in the enrollment of students above the traditional age. The opportunity to have part-time students in the program that are working in firms, both increases a B.Arch student's exposure to practice and their ability to finance higher education.

#### *Benefits To The Institution*

The SA+ET is well meshed with the mission and goals of its larger institutional setting, Florida A&M University. Our specific architectural mission is an extension of the fundamental university mission: furthering the education of African American students and residents of the State of Florida. Therefore, at the most fundamental level, the FAMU SA+ET benefits from and contributes to its institutional context in a cooperative manner. SA+ET students, faculty, and administrators are collectively and individually involved in making positive contributions to the University.

The SA+ET Administration's benefit to the University includes often serving as the Chair for University wide committees. For example, Dean Wright served as the Chair for the Organization Analysis Task Force. The Task Force included more than 36 faculty and administrators from across the University. In addition, the Dean serves on various personnel action hearings.

The faculty's contributions range from representing the University at academic conferences (identified in *Faculty Resumes*, Part 4 Section 2) to serving on University committees. The University-wide committees include, but are not limited to: Tenure and Promotion, Sabbatical and Professional Leave, Curriculum, Library, Graduate School, Search. Other faculty contributions to the University are shown below:

- Holding elected positions on the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Senate Steering.
- Service on the University re-accreditation committees.
- The generation of approximately \$20,223 in indirect-cost income to the Division Sponsored Research.
- Enhancement of the University image by conducting highly visible downtown revitalization studios and charrettes in Tallahassee, FL; Havana, FL; Jacksonville, FL; Daytona Beach, FL; Birmingham, AL and Nassau, Bahamas.

- Enhancement of the University image by hosting a public lecture series guests and symposium discussions.

A sample list of SA+ET student contributions to the University is shown below:

- Election to positions in the FAMU Student Government Association.
- Participation in intercollegiate athletics and various intramural sports. During the 2011 academic year, architecture students can be found on the football team as a starting safety (John Ojo), as the catcher on the baseball team (Ryan Sheplak), on the track (Robert Bogle), on the cheerleading squad (Sade Hooks), wrestling (Martavis Frazier) and on the softball team (Amanda Reyes). Reyes was named to the 2010 Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC) Commissioner's All-Academic Team.
- Participation in the famous FAMU Marching 100 Band.
- Participation in fraternities, sororities, and other student organizations.

The SA+ET's largest lecture hall is provided to the University for its General Education Classes. Similarly, FAMU departments and organizations often reserved the SA+ET north atrium to host receptions and other special events. The SA+ET computer lab, library, and construction lab are available to students from across the campus. The sharing of space increases community cohesion, enhances the educational experience of the students, and enhances the atmosphere for faculty and staff.

*Benefits derived to the program from the Institution*

FAMU provides a valuable context for a comprehensive professional education. The University has a broad range of academic programs and is widely recognized as a leader among Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU).\* As one of 14 colleges and schools on the FAMU campus, the school of Architecture draws from the resources of the University and operates within the rules and requirements of the State of Florida Board of Governors to ensure continued academic excellence and fairness in the treatment of students, faculty, and staff. Various FAMU programs and offices directly benefit the SA+ET.

A sample list of benefits is shown below:

- The University provided a renovated building that is dedicated to the architecture program. The building houses the SA+ET studios, classrooms, faculty offices, administration, a construction lab, computer labs, and the SA+ET library.
- The University provides sabbatical and leave to SA+ET faculty to further their individual research activities. A sample list is available in *Human Resource & Human Resource Development/ Sabbatical or Developmental Leave*, Part I Section 2.1.
- The Presidential Scholarship Office provides scholarships to first-time-in-college students and community college transfer students.
- The Registrar's Office provides in-state fee status/waivers to Caribbean and Latin American undergraduate and graduate students.
- The Office of Graduate Studies provides Graduate Teaching Assistantships (GTA), Graduate Research Assistantships (GRA), and fee waivers to the SA+ET students. A budget summary is available in *Financial Resources/ Budget Detail: Graduate Financial Aid*, Part 1 Section 2.4.



- The Office of Civil Rights provides funds for SA+ET scholarships that are awarded to undergraduate students, as described in *Financial Resources/ Comparative Report: SA+ET Budget History*, Part 1 Section 2.4.
- The Office of Title III Programs has provided enhancements that included the computer labs' software and hardware, the wireless network, and additional enhancements to the building. For graduate students, the Title III Office provided additional assistantships, fee waivers, and travel stipends, as described in *Financial Resources/ Comparative Report: SA+ET Budget History*, Part 1 Section 2.4.
- The Office of International Education and Development (OIED) have provided assistance for student and faculty study trips to the Caribbean.
- The Student Government Association (SGA) provides the SA+ET students with a voice in the management of policies of the University.
- The Honors Program provides challenges to the more academically motivated and scholastically capable students.

#### *Holistic development*

The SA+ET course of study encourages holistic development through the liberal arts requirements of the four-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture Studies. While it is not the professional degree, it serves as the common ground for the B.Arch and two year M.Arch program. The liberal arts presence in the FAMU SA+ET Bachelor of Science is listed below:

- \* The State of Florida General Education Sequence requires a minimum level of communication, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences and humanities courses.  
More detailed information about the General Education Sequence is online, see [http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?catalog&AcademicAffairs#The\\_General\\_Education\\_Sequence](http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?catalog&AcademicAffairs#The_General_Education_Sequence)
- \* More than 33% of the 4 year Bachelor of Science degree is composed on non architecture classes.
- \* Upper Division students are required to complete 4 NON ARC Electives (and only 1 ARC Elective).

While the SA+ET programs do not require an intern experience, the SA+ET provides numerous experiences for students to be engaged with practicum-based learning. Examples are provided below:

- \* Professor Valerie Goodwin's Design 3.2 studio worked with the Florida Institute of Rehabilitation Education (FIRE) and developed proposal for their potential expansion.
- \* Professor Huffman's Design 5.1 studio worked with the City of Daytona Beach and developed a Master Plan for their Midtown District (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Huffman's Design 5.1 studio worked with Innovation Park, a local Intergovernmental agency and developed a mixed Use Master Plan (Fall 2011).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with the City of Tallahassee Fire Department in developing a 9/11 Memorial (Fall 2011).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with the Leon County Homeless Shelter (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with Carrabelle War Museum (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Wells-Bowie's Design 4.1 studio worked with the City of Tallahassee and developed a Civil Rights Memorial proposal (Fall 2011).
- \* Professors Alfano and Miller and the AIAS students worked with the Florida State University's College of Medicine, the Gadsden County School Board and the Gadsden County Health Department to develop a 4,000 square feet state-of-the-art Health and Wellness Service and Training Center at Havana Middle School (Spring 2011).

\* Professor La Grasse's Design 1.2 studio worked with the School of Arts & Sciences to design a greenhouse and outdoor classroom (Spring 2010).

\* Professor Miller's Design 3.1 studio worked with a Gadsden County, FL in developing a "Green" Elementary School project (Spring 2011).

**b. Responses to the Five Perspectives**

*[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]*

*The report must include the following:*

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

**2014 Program Response:** The School of Architecture and Engineering Technology (SA+ET) engagement of the five perspectives has not changed since the last visit. While the specific names of professional guests and faculty actions have evolved, we continue to operate with the same relationship to the ACSA, students, practitioners and society. (see Perspectives <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>).

NAAB recognizes five constituencies of any School of Architecture: Educators (ACSA), Students (AIAS), Registration boards (NCARB), Professional practitioners (AIA) and Society. The FAMU SA+ET's response to these five NAAB Perspectives takes into special consideration the missions and identities of FAMU and its SA+ET, described in *History Mission*, Part 1 Section 1.1.

*Perspective 01: Architectural Education and the Academic Context*

*Relationship to University:* As stated earlier, the school of Architecture mission, students, faculty and facilities are meshed with the larger institutional setting. The SA+ET:

- \* students participate in student government, student organizations, fraternities, sororities and university athletic programs.
- \* faculty participate in research and service activities that enhance the University's image and reputation.
- \* classrooms, labs and atrium spaces are used by other academic programs and student organizations.

*Interaction with other programs:* The SA+ET benefits from the other educational institutions in Tallahassee, a network of community colleges, and the academic programs and offices on the FAMU campus. For example, Florida A & M University, Florida State University (FSU) and Tallahassee Community College (TCC) participate in a cooperative program that lets students take classes at the other institutions. By introducing FSU and TCC students to the SA+ET, the cooperative agreement assists in the recruitment of B.S.Arch. and M.Arch. students.

In the last six years, the school has maintained an effective articulation agreement with TCC and five other community colleges in north and central Florida. Each spring, the Undergraduate Advisor connects with the Colleges and to update each other on their academic programs. The current colleges include:

- Tallahassee Community College, Tallahassee
- Valencia College (formerly Valencia Community College, Orlando)
- Florida State College at Jacksonville (formerly Florida Community College at Jacksonville)
- Gulf Coast State College (formerly Gulf Coast Community College, Panama City)
- Northwest Florida State College (formerly Okaloosa-Walton Community College, Niceville)

The SA+ET's relationship with other academic programs is evident in the general education curriculum requirement, joint teaching efforts, and research activities. Like most universities, the freshmen and sophomore SA+ET curriculum is almost 50% non-architecture credits. We also require that four senior electives be non-architecture classes.

The closest external departmental relationship was with the landscape architecture program. The Master of Landscape Architecture (M.L.A.) faculty have taught elective courses in the SA+ET undergraduate and graduate architecture programs. Similarly, the architecture program has provided courses to the M.L.A. program. A sample list of joint teaching and research activities with other educational institutions is shown below.

- Our community college pre-architecture articulation agreements provide access to students that have completed an AA degree. These are typically non-African American students, which helps to diversify the racial composition of the SA+ET. It also provides access (regardless of race or gender) to students who need an affordable option in North Florida.
- The School of Architecture sponsored the Jerome Ringo lecture component of the FAMU Environmental Sciences Institute's "Focus on the Environment" series (Spring 2010).
- Professors Alfano and Miller worked with the Florida State University's College of Medicine, the Gadsden County School Board and the Gadsden County Health Department to develop a 4,000 square foot state-of-the-art Health and Wellness Service and Training Center at Havana Middle School (Spring 2011).
- Professor LaGrasse's Design 1.2 studio worked with the School of Arts & Sciences to design a greenhouse and outdoor classroom (Spring 2010).
- Professor Miller's Design 3.1 studio worked with a Gadsden County, FL in developing a "Green" Elementary School project (Spring 2011).
- Professor Pugh worked with FAMU Campus Library Office and developed web based wayfinding tools (Summer 2011).
- Professor Pugh worked with FAMU/FSU College of Engineering, Mechanical Engineering students during their one-semester externship. Pugh helped them develop a PC-based ventilation model to simulate the effect of increased air changes on indoor air quality (date).
- Professor White served as a Visiting Studio Instructor for the Drury University Architecture Center in Volos, Greece (2011).
- Professor White taught as faculty in 8 FSU Study Abroad centers (1996-2011).
- Professor White gave a paper in the FSU Symposium on Composing. "Making Buildings" (2011).

#### *Perspective 02: Architecture Education and the Students*

FAMU School of Architecture students have many avenues for personal student growth, development and leadership as a result of a diverse student body, nurturing support, leadership preparation and participation in SA+ET governance.

**A Diverse Student Body:** The SA+ET is a racially and culturally diverse program that attracts students from across the state of Florida and from across the country. Our diversity is a result of three enrollment factors: (1) African-American students in search of an accredited HBCU architecture program, (2)

community college students looking for an articulation agreement, and (3) older professional program students who are looking for a professional degree opportunity in north Florida. In addition, the SA+ET has a unique international presence as a result of the University's Caribbean/Latin American Scholarship. The University provides "Residency for Tuition" status to students from Caribbean and Latin American countries. In Fall 2011, the SA+ET will have more almost 15 students from the College of the Bahamas in Nassau, Bahamas and the University of Technology in Kingston, Jamaica.

**Nurturing Support:** The SA+ET's academic advisement process and small classes support a student-centered experience. The full time Advisement Coordinator, Ronald Lumpkin, oversees the SA+ET's advisement process and coordinates the work of the Lower Division Advisor (Jonathon Audu), the Upper Division Advisor (himself) and the Professional program advisor (Andrew Chin). Each semester, the Advisor meets with his students to review their progress and recommend a class schedule for the next semester. Additional information on the SA+ET Advisement process is available online, see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Architecture&AcademicAdvising>.

The freshman-through-graduate classes at the SA+ET are kept relatively small and allow for personal attention. Undergraduate studios rarely exceed 16 students, and the required lecture courses are typically 25 to 40 students. At the graduate level, lecture courses typically have 15 to 25 students.

**Leadership Preparation:** The SA+ET curricula and organizations provide many opportunities for students to develop leadership skills. The most obvious is the design studio sequence where students are required to present their work and discuss the rationale for making certain design decisions. Freshmen through graduate level design studio student routinely present their work. The school supports five national architecture student-oriented organizations: American Institute of Architects Students (AIAS), National Organization of Minority Architects/Students (NOMAS), Alpha Rho Chi (APX) professional architecture fraternity, Tau Sigma Delta (IE) honor society, and the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). The organizations hold regular meetings and sponsor School and community service activities, fund-raising events, social affairs, etc. Each organization strives to provide events that allow the architecture students' voices and interests to be heard and develop.

**Participation in SA+ET Governance:** A Student's participation in the governance of the SA+ET contributes to their professional development and provides a service to the school. Within each studio, a representative to the dean's Council is selected. The Council meets with the dean once a month to discuss topics, asks questions, and makes suggestions.

#### *Perspective 03: Architecture Education and Registration*

**Communication:** Students are initially presented with information about internship and licensure in the required freshmen Orientation to Architecture course. More diverse practice issues are later discussed in greater detail in the required Professional Practice I and Professional Practice II classes, see *Course Descriptions*, Part 4 Section 1.

In addition to the required classes, the SA+ET hosts an annual presentation on the IDP process by the SA+ET IDP Coordinator, Mike Alfano. In 2010, the SA+ET hosted an additional lecture by Martin Smith. Martin is the manager of the Intern Development Program at NCARB.

**Diversity:** A unique accomplishment of the school is evident in data provided by the Center for the Study of Practice at the University of Cincinnati. The Center's Directory of African-American Architects (<http://blackarch.uc.edu/>) documents the licensure of African-Americans in the 50 U.S. jurisdictions and their territories. Of the Center's 90 licensed African-American architects in Florida, 23 (or 25%) are FAMU SA+ET alumni or faculty, as listed below: \* Adams, Joyce; Jacksonville, FL

- \* Akinyemi, Akin S.; Tallahassee, FL
- \* Arthur, Modupe; Orlando, FL
- \* Bates, Daya Irene; Winter Park, FL
- \* Brito, Maximiano; Orlando, FL

- \* Brokaw, Crystal J.; Altamonte Springs, FL
- \* Bush, Jeffrey C.; Orlando, FL
- \* Cox, Reginald A.; Delray Beach, FL
- \* Goodwin, Jr. Robert; Tallahassee, FL
- \* Goodwin, Valerie Scruggs; Tallahassee, FL
- \* Harris, Orlando Antonio; Miami, FL
- \* Hawkins, Kenneth; Orlando, FL
- \* Johnson, Timothy Leander; Orlando, FL
- \* Muhammad, Rabbani Abu Rashid; Tallahassee, FL
- \* Olopade; Solomon; Jacksonville, FL
- \* Rhodes, Ruffin A.; Orlando FL
- \* Rosier, Wayne; St. Petersburg, FL
- \* Smith, Sidney Michael; Tampa, FL
- \* Tait; Ralph E.; Fort Lauderdale, FL
- \* Udenze; Roland N.; Jacksonville, FL
- \* Williams, Donald Michael; Orlando, FL
- \* Williams, Karen E.; Orlando, FL
- \* Wright, Rodner B.; Tallahassee, FL; MS

*Perspective 04: Architecture Education and the Profession*

Like most architecture programs, the SA+ET makes it a regular practice to invite architects in traditional and alternative career roles to design studio juries and class lectures. For example, the following Tallahassee professionals have participated in juries and lectures:

- \* Akineyeme, Akin
- \* Aaron, Shirey
- \* Emo, Warren, AIA
- \* Gilchrist, David
- \* Grey, Keith
- \* Griesback, Mark
- \* Gutierrez, Rolando J.
- \* Hadar, Brian
- \* Hartsfield, Kenneth
- \* Heath, Shawn, Esq.
- \* Hilburn, Rick
- \* Hodges, Patrick, ASLA
- \* Hoy, Patrick E., AIA
- \* Huffman, Linda
- \* Innes, Brad
- \* Ivan Johnson, AIA
- \* Kevin Sassong, AIA
- \* Manacci, David, Esq
- \* Rubio, Elvie
- \* Stone, Peter
- \* Stark, Monty
- \* Welch, Andy
- \* Wing, Mike

Similarly, local artist(s) have also participated in class lectures: Linda Davis (Dance) Judy Rushin (Painter), David Kirby (Poet), Terri Lindbloom (Artist), and Barbara Hamby (Poet, Novelist). When the guests provide class lectures, it is typically in a freshman (Orientation to Architecture) or professional program class (Professional Practice I or II, see *Course Descriptions*, Part 4 Section1. The guests often focus on the types of discussions listed below:

- \* The role of the architect as leader and coordinator of a team of related disciplines;
- \* The numerous and diverse careers and roles that can be assumed with a professional degree;

\* The existence of, and the need for resolving, conflicts between the architect's responsibility to the client and the public vs. the demands of creative endeavor;

\* The need for continued education and research over a lifetime of professional work The role of the architect as leader and coordinator of a team of related disciplines;

As a supplement to the class guests, the school incorporates multiple strategies for maintaining a relationship with the profession. The strategies include the following:

\* The SA+ET provides funds to help students attend conferences and regional meetings. The officers of the student organizations— AIAS, NOMA and Alpha Rho Chi—typically attend the annual meeting for the respective organization.

\* The SA+ET provides a public lecture series that includes local, regional and nationally recognized practitioners, described in *Human Resources and Human Resource Development/Visiting Lectures and Critics*, Part 1 Section 2.1.

\* The SA+ET hosted Building Code seminars, in Fall 2008 and Fall 2009, as a joint effort with AIA Tallahassee.

\* The SA+ET hosted a pair of spring symposium events that connected the SA+ET with the local AIA and critical professional issues. The 2010 discussion focused on Service Learning and the 2011 discussion focused on Green Schools. The symposiums were joint effort with AIA Tallahassee and local USGBC chapter. The 2012 discussion will focus on “ Green Architecture and Public Health.”

\* The SA+ET provides the B.Arch class on a non-traditional schedule that allows interns to complete the courses while they maintain full time employment outside of Tallahassee. Almost 25% of the students in the B.Arch. program are in this category. To support their access to licensure, the SA+ET schedules their classes once a month and uses online resources to broadcast class lectures. While these non-traditional students have been re-energized by the youth and enthusiasm of the younger, full-time students, the older students have raised the professionalism of the traditional, younger students.

\* The SA+ET's Master of Architecture design studio has maintained a close relationship with the Jacksonville Chapter of the AIA, for almost 20 years. The Chapter identifies a local problem that is incorporated into the urban design or the comprehensive building studio. The Chapter often sponsors the travel of the students, provides an award for the most outstanding project and juries the midterm and final projects.

\* As indicated in the *Faculty Resumes*, Part 4 Section 2, the SA+ET faculty serve on various professional and community boards and organizations.

#### *Perspective 05: Architecture Education and Society*

The FAMU SA+ET has an important role to play, along with other disciplines, in the mitigation of the region's social and environmental challenges. Therefore, the SA+ET has involved its students and faculty in projects addressing the needs of towns and cities across north Florida. The involvement has come in the form of design studios, service projects, funded research, and design charrettes.

\* The SA+ET student organizations regularly participate in service projects for the local community. Most recently, the AIAS has worked with the Tallahassee AIA to raise funds for the Food Bank through bi-annual CANstruction activities.

\* The B.Arch and M.Arch Urban Design studios regularly focus on problems of a multifaceted nature at the urban scale.

- \* Professor Valerie Goodwin's Design 3.2 Studio worked with the Florida Institute of Rehabilitation Education (FIRE) and developed proposal for their potential expansion.
- \* Professor Huffman's Design 5.1 Studio worked with the City of Daytona Beach and developed a Master Plan for their Midtown District (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Huffman's Design 5.1 Studio worked with Innovation Park, a local Intergovernmental agency and developed a mixed Use Master Plan (Fall 2011).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with the City of Tallahassee Fire Department in developing a 9/11 Memorial (Fall 2011).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with the Leon County Homeless Shelter (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Ots' Design 3.1 studio worked with Carrabelle War Museum (Fall 2010).
- \* Professor Wells-Bowie's Design 4.1 studio worked with the City of Tallahassee and developed a Civil Rights Memorial proposal (Fall 2011).

#### Student Learning and Development

The FAMU SA+ET provides multiple opportunities for student learning and development within the context of the five perspectives. Regarding *Perspective 01: the Academic Context*, SA+ET students interact with other units on the FAMU campus and other educational institutions in the city.

Regarding *Perspective 02: Architecture Education and the Students*, SA+ET students have many avenues for personal student growth, development and leadership as a result of a diverse student body, nurturing support, leadership preparation and participation in SA+ET governance. Regarding *Perspective 03: Architecture Education and Registration*, SA+ET students have formal and informal opportunities to learn about and ask questions about registration. Regarding *Perspective 04: Architecture Education and the Profession*, SA+ET students interact with architects in traditional and alternative career roles during design studio juries and class lectures. Regarding *Perspective 05: Architecture Education and Society*, SA+ET students have multiple opportunities to understand the role of architects and society.

#### *The Five Perspectives and Long-term Planning*

The SA+ET Long Term Plan is based on the Florida A&M University 2010-2020 Strategic Plan. The 2010-2020 Strategic Plan has four Initiatives that reflect the role of the five perspectives in the SA+ET's long term planning. For each Strategic Initiative, the SA+ET has identified performance measure(s) that reflect the five perspectives.

- Perspective 01: *Academic Context* is reflected twice in FAMU's Strategic Initiative 3: Develop, enhance, and retain appropriate fiscal, human, technological, research, and physical resources to achieve the University's mission. The SA+ET performance measures are to "Increase faculty participation at conferences, seminars and training sessions for professional development by 10% in 5 years" and "Maintain faculty participation in sabbatical program and professional development."
- Perspective 02: *Architecture Education and the Students* is reflected twice in FAMU's Strategic Initiative 2: Enable excellence in University processes and procedures. The SA+ET performance measures are to "Implement six (6) meetings of the SA+ET Administration with student representatives each year" and to "Implement two (2) School wide meetings of the SA+ET Administration with all students each year."

- Perspective 04: *Architecture Education and the Profession* is reflected twice in FAMU's Strategic Initiative 1: Create a 21st century living and learning collegiate community. The SA+ET performance measures are to "Increase the exposure of graduating students to licensed professionals by 25% in 5 years" and to "Increase the exposure of graduating students to licensed professionals by 25% in 5 years."
- Perspective 05: *Architecture Education and Society* is reflected twice in FAMU's Strategic Initiative 5: Enhance and sustain an academic and social environment that promotes internationalism, diversity, and inclusiveness. The SA+ET performance measures are to "Become the top producer in Florida of African Americans with a professional degree in architecture, in the next five years" and "Maintain the diversity of the SA+ET student body."

### c. Long Range Planning

In Fall 2008, President James H. Ammons appointed a university-wide committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the 2004-05 to 2013-14 Strategic Plan. On October 8, 2009, FAMU presented the 2010-2020 Strategic Plan "Vision with Courage." The FAMU Board of Trustees approved it on October 15, 2009. The goal was to ensure that the University continuously accounts for the rapidly changing dynamics of the global economy, with 2050 in its sights. A copy of the plan is available online, see <http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?AboutFAMU&StrategicPlan>.

In Spring 2010, the SA+ET submitted its Long Range Planning document. The SA+ET response clarifies which Initiatives and objectives will be the focus of the SA+ET. The SA+ET identified performance measures for each Initiative. A copy of the SA+ET response is posted to the FAMU SA+ET website, see <http://www.famu.edu/Architecture/NAAB/Appendix/SA+ETLongRangePlan.pdf>

The decision-making process for the School of Architecture for both short-term goals and longrange planning engages the faculty through the SA+ET Committees, Task Forces and the Undergraduate and Graduate Council. The school's full-time faculty meet at least once a month during the academic year. If the school needs additional time for long-range planning or special needs, half-day or full-day workshops are held. In addition, the dean meets weekly with the Program Directors.

The School of Architecture self-assessment process is composed of four parts and by four parties.

- The University's Office of Assessment requires each program to identify, evaluate and reflect on its Academic Learning Compacts.
- The dean asks each faculty member to complete a year-end report.
- The SA+ET Undergraduate and Graduate Councils focus on short-term concerns and strategies for improvement.
- The SA+ET students complete course evaluations for each required and elective class.

*Academic Learning Compacts:* In 2004, the University initiated a systematic review of each academic program's self-assessment standards and procedures. To facilitate this review, the University established the Office of Assessment, a division of the Office of the Provost, and appointed Dr. Uche Ohia as Director. In May 2005 the school of Architecture reviewed and revised its assessment standards and developed a detailed assessment plan. These plans were completed in July 2005 and submitted to the University's Office of Assessment for final approval.

Next, a set of learning outcomes were developed that included specific, measurable, learning objectives. These new learning outcomes integrate several different pedagogic intentions including existing the SA+ET outcomes, State of Florida mandated Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) and National



Architectural Accrediting Board performance criteria. Finally, a set of assessment criteria including qualitative and quantitative measures was established. In response, the SA+ET submits an annual assessment report. Additional information on the Office of University Assessment is available online (<http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&About>). (See old report Appendix A and B.)

*Dean Review:* The SA+ET Dean asks each faculty member to complete a year-end report each Spring. The report form is posted to the SA+ET website. Faculty use the report to document their activities, accomplishments and develop a forward plan for development. The document provides the dean with a vehicle to assess progress toward tenure or post tenure development.

*SA+ET Councils:* The SA+ET Undergraduate and Graduate Councils are the primary means for faculty to discuss critical issues, assess the undergraduate and graduate programs and make recommendations for improvement. In the last five years, Council recommendations have resulted in significant changes to the SA+ET curriculum, including:

- A reduction in the number of required technology courses
- An increase in the number of elective courses
- A landscape architecture/ urban design elective requirement
- The restructuring of the computer skills classes

*Student Evaluations:* The University provides a regular semester course evaluation by students. The computer scored form is later reported to the faculty member and the dean. These evaluations can serve as important tool in monitoring a teacher's progress. (See previous reports sub-section 3.6.2.2 and Appendix H for more on course evaluations.)

*[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]*

*The report must include the following:*

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

**2014 Program Response:** The School of Architecture and Engineering Technology (SA+ET) Long Range planning is described in greater detail at the beginning of this document. The narrative clarifies that the school was engaged in multiple Long-Range Planning activities before and after the 2012 visit. While an exhaustive list and evidence were not provided in the original APR or to the 2012 team, it is provided on pages 4 and 5 of this document.

#### **d. Program Self Assessment**

*[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]*

*The report must include the following:*

- *Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted*

**2014 Program Response:** The School of Architecture + Engineering Technology (SA+ET) was engaged in multiple Self-Assessment procedures before and after the 2012 visit that help it examine how it is progressing towards its mission and its multi-year objectives. These include the Instructional Programs Assessment (IAP) Plans, the Undergraduate and Graduate Council Reports, the SA+ET Faculty Reports and the Student Evaluations. While an exhaustive list and evidence were not provided in the original APR or to the 2012 team, it is provided on pages 6, 7, 8 and 9 of this document.

The School of Architecture self-assessment process is composed of four parts and by four parties.

- The University's Office of Assessment requires each program to identify, evaluate and reflect on its Academic Learning Compacts.

- The dean asks each faculty member to complete a year-end report.
- The SA+ET Undergraduate and Graduate Councils focus on short-term concerns and strategies for improvement.
- The SA+ET students complete course evaluations for each required and elective class.

*Academic Learning Compacts:* In 2004, the University initiated a systematic review of each academic program's self-assessment standards and procedures. To facilitate this review, the University established the Office of Assessment, a division of the Office of the Provost, and appointed Dr. Uche Ohia as Director. In May 2005 the school of Architecture reviewed and revised its assessment standards and developed a detailed assessment plan. These plans were completed in July 2005 and submitted to the University's Office of Assessment for final approval.

Next, a set of learning outcomes were developed that included specific, measurable, learning objectives. These new learning outcomes integrate several different pedagogic intentions including existing the SA+ET outcomes, State of Florida mandated Academic Learning Compacts (ALC) and National Architectural Accrediting Board performance criteria. Finally, a set of assessment criteria including qualitative and quantitative measures was established. In response, the SA+ET submits an annual assessment report. Additional information on the Office of University Assessment is available online (<http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?Assessment&About>). (See old report Appendix A and B.)

*Dean Review:* The SA+ET Dean asks each faculty member to complete a year-end report each Spring. The report form is posted to the SA+ET website. Faculty use the report to document their activities, accomplishments and develop a forward plan for development. The document provides the dean with a vehicle to assess progress toward tenure or post tenure development.

*SA+ET Councils:* The SA+ET Undergraduate and Graduate Councils are the primary means for faculty to discuss critical issues, assess the undergraduate and graduate programs and make recommendations for improvement. In the last five years, Council recommendations have resulted in significant changes to the SA+ET curriculum, including:

- A reduction in the number of required technology courses
- An increase in the number of elective courses
- A landscape architecture/ urban design elective requirement
- The restructuring of the computer skills classes

*Student Evaluations:* The University provides a regular semester course evaluation by students. The computer scored form is later reported to the faculty member and the dean. These evaluations can serve as important tool in monitoring a teacher's progress. (See previous reports sub-section 3.6.2.2 and Appendix H for more on course evaluations.)

**5. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: This section is not required for programs submitting reports in 2013.)**

## Supplemental Material

*Instruction: Include the following as a list of individual URLs or provide instructions for accessing a web-based portal for review of the following*

*Please do not attach files to the interim report, rather identify URLs to websites or servers, or other mainstream technology currently employed by your program to capture and host files.*

1. Provide evidence that supports or demonstrates changes to the curriculum in response to not-met SPC (II.1).

For changes to the curriculum, new/revised syllabi and student work see the Google Drive folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>

2. Provide evidence or supporting documentation/narrative that demonstrates changes in other aspects of the program made in response to other not-met Conditions (I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4)

For evidence, see the Google Drive folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>

3. Provide information regarding changes in leadership or faculty membership. Identify the desired contribution to the program. (i.e. narrative biography or one-page CV)

For evidence, see the Google Drive folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>

4. Provide additional information that may be of interest to the team at the next accreditation visit.

*Additional information regarding the types of files that may be submitted in support of the program's responses in Sections 2-5:*

1. *Syllabi or course descriptions. These shall be presented in Word or Adobe PDF*
2. *Student work*
  - a. *Studio work shall be presented in digital form either 2D (PDF) or 3D (BIM) files. Reviewers must be able to review the files using zoom or pan techniques in order to review details. Further, the program is responsible for ensuring that the files can be reviewed in the same software used to create them. Instructors' comments and grades shall be visible or available. Students' identities may be removed in order to comply with FERPA.*
  - b. *Classroom work shall be presented in digital form (PDF) after grading. Instructors' comments and grades shall be visible. Students' identities may be removed in order to comply with FERPA.*
  - c. *Presentations or other oral projects shall be presented with both video clips of the presentation and copies of presentation materials (i.e. PowerPoint slides in PDF). Please limit video segments to 1 minute each.*

Please, see the evidence in the Google Drive folder <http://goo.gl/Zc5V98>