

**Florida International University
School of Architecture**

Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture

Track I (non-baccalaureate: 175 credit hours)¹

Track II (preprofessional degree + min. graduate 60 credits)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
6 April 2011

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

¹ This includes students who enter the program through articulation agreements with Florida community colleges.

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary of Team Findings	1
1. Team Comments	1
2. Conditions Not Met	1
3. Causes of Concern	2
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit	2
II. Compliance with the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation	7
1. Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement	7
2. Educational Outcomes and Curriculum	18
III. Appendices	30
1. Program Information	30
2. Conditions Met with Distinction	54
3. Visiting Team	55
IV. Report Signatures	56
V. Confidential Recommendation and Signatures	57

I. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

- A. The team would like to express its appreciation to the school for the hospitality extended to us, making us feel welcome, and for the thoughtful and thorough preparation of the accreditation materials. It would be remiss to not remark upon the range of student work and the quality of the team room exhibit that enabled us to access and assess both curricular design and student performance.
- B. Since 2008 there has been fundamental improvement in administrative organization and appointments of respected collegial leadership with a new provost Douglas Warzok, recently appointed Brian Schriner, Dean and Adam Drisin, Chair who have worked together during curricular and financial revisions – providing stability and appropriate autonomy for the department while enabling partnerships within the school and college
- C. Fundamental improvement has occurred in the financial footing for the department and college correlated with creative redesign of the curriculum to a continuous seamless M Arch. This has also been a joint effort with landscape architecture and interior design – with leadership from the dean and architecture chair.
- D. Additional teaching lines, administrative staff, and advising staff have greatly enhanced human resources support.
- E. The enriched collaborative teaching model and the addition of new faculty has stimulated the department on many fronts. Collaborative and spirited faculty with excellent research, scholarship and practice accomplishments are committed to student advancement There is a positive student culture and faculty student relationships; a sense of community
- F. Students are increasingly engaged in outreach and academic affairs, and are pluralistic both in terms of who is here and in approach to educational aspirations
- G. There is a missed opportunity for greater trans-disciplinary teaching within the school in courses beyond the foundation level. Interior design and landscape architecture faculty at upper division have potential to teach option studios that each other's students can take or that can be co-taught
- H. The Wolfsonian Institute relationship is positive – becoming a locus of research and exhibitions. This relationship now includes a link with the American Academy in Rome and an FIU faculty fellowship. Also, the Miami Beach facility at the Washington and Lincoln Road location holds promise for community based engagement in keeping with university, college and department mission.

2. Conditions Not Met

- II.1.1.B.2 Accessibility
- II.1.1.B.4 Site Design
- II.1.1.C.1 Collaboration
- II.4.1 Public Information – Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
- II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

3. Causes of Concern

- A. Professional Practice. One professional practice course is the single source for meeting minimum standards of accreditation in a number of key areas. Studies in professional practice could be enriched across the curriculum or within the course to better reflect the mission of the program with respect to diversity and global practice. There are many faculty who are engaged in practice, community and peer service who serve as models – capturing their example in more directly instructive manner is an opportunity.
- B. Degree structure impact. With conversion to the seamless path to an M Arch the program is advised to be alert to recruitment & retention issues. Also, the program may need to more closely monitor evaluation process for those admitted in the 2+4, 4+2 and degree + 105 credit paths. Cohort integration that enriches student community and collaborative learning and teaching may also be inhospitable to student progress in a program where students may require more diverse curricular options.
- C. Monitoring financial stability. Sustained financial support in base budget, auxiliary budget, fees and university strategic enhancements needs to be monitored to assure future financial stability. The balance among these will be particularly important after the new tuition flow matures during conversion to graduate level courses. This should also include enriched financial aid to students and faculty development support.

4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2008)

2004 Condition 6, Human Resources: *The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.*

Previous Team Report (2008): This condition is still unmet although some steps have been taken since the last accreditation visit.

Two of the three faculty members scheduled to be hired at the last visit were engaged --one in history and one in technology (Structures). The hiring of a new Urban Design faculty member put on hold and that position has been reassigned to technology. While two-thirds of the new faculty commitment was fulfilled, enrollment has increased dramatically (132% in the graduate program and 70% in the combined graduate and upper division). Over this period the ratio of design students per full time faculty member has increased from 16:1 to 21:1.

A full time development staff position was filled but the person hired resigned after one year and that position has been moved from the SOA to the Office of the Dean.

Rather than a full-time technology assistant, there are now two part-time technology assistants.

The present administrative assistant will be retiring in a few months and her position will be filled by a secretarial level person.

There has also been a loss of administrative staff due to recent reorganization. We recommend that two administrative assistants (one for the Director and one for the three Chairs) replace the schools loss of administrative support. Contracts for the Chairs should be extended to 12

months. The issue of faculty salary compression should be addressed and mitigated at the college and university levels.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Condition 6 Human Resources, from the 2004 Conditions, has been folded into revised Condition I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development. We find the issues noted here to be rectified and the 2009 definition of the revised condition to be met. The reasons and rationale for that may be found at I.2.1 of this report.

2004 Criterion 11, Administrative Structure: *The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation.*

Previous Team Report (2008): While Florida International University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the Visiting Team determined that this Condition was not met because the Team concluded that the program currently lacks the required level of autonomy.

In 2006-7 the University created the College of Architecture + the Arts. Within this new College, the accredited M. Arch program is one of three programs in the School of Architecture. The School of Architecture in turn, is one of five units in the College of Architecture + the Arts. This College includes the School of Architecture, the School of Art and Art History, the School of Music and the School of Theater, Dance, Speech Communication as well as the Patricia and Philip Frost Art Museum.

The Visiting Team recognizes that the new College of Architecture + the Arts is a work in progress and that many key aspects of its administration are, as the APR notes, in transition. Nonetheless at the time of this visit the creation of the College has resulted in a significant reduction of autonomy for the accredited program. Among the indications of this reduced autonomy the Visiting Team observed are:

- Prior to the creation of the College, the Dean of the School of Architecture committed 100% of his time to administration of the School. After the College was created, only 20% of the Dean's administrative time is devoted to the School. While efforts have been made and are ongoing to augment the Dean's office to better support the School and the M. Arch program, at the time of the visit it was clear that there had been a significant dilution in administrative support for the accredited architecture program.
- The new structure has also resulted in a corresponding reduction in access for the M. Arch to the provost's office and a diminished ability to advocate to the university's chief academic officer on behalf of the accredited program. This reduced direct access is viewed by this Visiting Team as a reduction in autonomy.
- The creation of the College has introduced another level in the promotion and tenure process for those architecture faculty members seeking advancement. Previous to the College, the School's P & T Committee would nominate candidates to the Dean who would in turn advance candidates to the Provost's office for final decision. Under the new structure the recommendation of the School's P & T Committee, is now advanced to a

- second College level P & T Committee than then decides on the recommendations to the Dean.
- Under the College of Architecture + the Arts, the chair of the accredited program of architecture now reports to the Director of the School of Architecture who reports to the Dean of The College. The diminished role of the chair within this arrangement appears to the Visiting Team to be both a dilution of autonomy and a reduction of the attractiveness of the position – a fact that may well adversely impact the program in the future when FIU endeavors to attract talented people to fill vacant administrative positions in the accredited program, much in the same way that FIU is currently experiencing difficulty in filling the position of Director for the Patricia and Philip Frost Art Museum. Some candidates view a structure that removes them from direct reporting to the provost as a diminished position within the university hierarchy.
 - This Visiting Team considers control over the creation and administration of the accredited program's budget to be a key measure of autonomy. During the visit the team learned that the Director of the School and the Chair of the program believe they are lacking this important autonomy.
 - It also appears to the Visiting Team that another comparable professional program within FIU – the professional nursing program - has greater budgetary autonomy than does the program in architecture.

As noted above, the Visiting Team recognizes that the new College of Architecture + the Arts is a work in progress. Many of the issues that lead the Visiting Team to conclude that this Condition is not met may well be resolved as the transition into the College is completed. Nonetheless in February of 2008 at the time of this visit, the team was unconvinced that the M. Arch program possessed sufficient autonomy to insure conformance with the NAAB conditions and to have autonomy equivalent to comparable professional program within the University.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: 2004 Condition 11, Administrative Structure has been revised and is now Criterion I.2.2 Administrative Structure and Governance. We find the issues noted by the previous team to be rectified and the 2009 definition of the revised condition to be met. The reasons and rationale for that may be found below and at I.2.2 of this report.

The president and provost were appointed a year ago, and both have previously worked closely with the newly appointed College of Architecture + The Arts (CARTA) Dean (who was interim for two academic years). They have created an executive shift in leadership at the university and college level that has successfully collaborated with the chair to stabilize the structure and financial aspects of the Department of Architecture.

2004 Criterion 13.14, Accessibility: *Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities*

Previous Team Report (2008): While the Visiting Team found a few references to site accommodation of the needs of the disabled in the required studio work (such as in the garage layout in ARC 4343 *Architectural Design 8*), the Team concluded that this work fell well below the threshold of a demonstration of an ability to design sites for the disabled.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The program has successfully addressed the concerns of the 2008 team. However, the SPC has been revised in the 2009 Conditions to include cognitive and sensory elements. The 2011 team found the new "Accessibility" SPC to be not met because of a lack of evidence of designs for those with cognitive and sensory disabilities. Refer to SPC II.1.1.B.2 of this report.

2004 Criterion 13.19, Environmental Systems: Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope*

Previous Team Report (2008): The required student work in BCN 4561 *Environmental Controls 1* and in BCN 4564 *Environmental Controls 2* demonstrates detailed knowledge of electrical, plumbing, and mechanical systems, but the Visiting Team found no evidence that the requisite knowledge of acoustical systems is acquired by all students in the FIU accredited program.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The deficiencies noted here have been rectified. Refer to SPC II.1.1.B.8 of this report.

2004 Criterion 13.22, Building Service Systems: Understanding of *the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems*

Previous Team Report (2008): The Visiting Team found insufficient evidence in the student work to indicate that an understanding of security systems and communication systems is gained by all students in the accredited program at FIU.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The deficiencies noted here have been rectified. Refer to SPC II.1.1.B.11 of this report.

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

Previous Team Report (2008): While the Visiting Team found that FIU students prepare detailed estimates of the cost of electrical and mechanical systems in BCN 4561 *Environmental Controls 1* and in BCN 4564 *Environmental Controls 2*, this criterion was determined to be unmet because no evidence was found showing that an understanding of the fundamentals of building costs and of life cycle costs was gained by all students in the accredited program in architecture.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The deficiencies noted here have been rectified. Refer to SPC II.1.1.B.7 Financial Considerations of this report.

2004 Criterion 13.26, Technical Documentation: Ability to *make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design*

Previous Team Report (2008): Although the Visiting Team inspected several examples of fine technical documentation in the material it reviewed, evidence of the ability to produce outline specifications for a specific project as required by this criterion was not found.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The deficiencies noted here have been rectified. Refer to SPC II.1.1.A.4 of this report.

2004 Criterion 13.31, Professional Development: Understanding of *the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers*

Previous Team Report (2008): The Visiting Team found anecdotal evidence that students at FIU gained a familiarity with the role of internship in licensure in the required business,

professional practice and ethics sequence (ARC 6993/6280 *Professional Office Practice*, BUL 6810 *Legal Environment of Business*, and Phil/Hum 4000 *Ethical Responsibilities*). Additionally, the required participation in the yearly orientation by the State of Florida IDP Director increased this exposure for some of the students; however, the Visiting Team's meeting with the students revealed that this knowledge was only enjoyed by a small percentage of FIU students and that this familiarity fell below the threshold on the understanding level required by the NAAB.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The deficiencies noted here have been rectified. The content of this condition has been folded into 2009 Condition I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development. Please refer to that section of this report.

II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

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

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

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

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

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The information was provided in the APR and validated during numerous onsite discussions with faculty and administration.

I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity:

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

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

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

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

[X] The program has demonstrated that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Documents were available on-site that validated the APR content. Many students from all levels of the program attended their session and the conversation confirmed that the culture of the program was one of respect and working rapport. They indicated they had been informed regarding the formal studio culture policy. Students were highly complimentary of the faculty's commitment to working with them and to the advising team for their availability and their communication of the guidelines for curriculum planning. Based upon meetings with the students, faculty and local professionals, the team determined that this was well met.

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

- A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community.** That the faculty, staff, and students in the accredited degree program make unique contributions to the institution in the areas of scholarship, community engagement, service, and teaching.² In addition, the program must describe its commitment to the holistic, practical and liberal arts-based education of architects and to providing opportunities for all members of the learning community to engage in the development of new knowledge.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The Architecture Department benefits from and contributes to vital CARTA, FIU, and urban communities of south Florida. FIU and the Architecture Department serve a growing and diverse student body that is attracted to FIU because of its urban location and academic orientation. As an urban institution, FIU uses its educational resources to explore the complex array of urban concerns. The Architecture Department's academic focus is on conceptually based intellectual endeavor and critical inquiry that they achieve, in part, by engaging the Miami-Dade region as a teaching laboratory.

The mission of the architecture program aligns with the university's. Architecture faculty participates in the academic community through various endeavors including utilizing the special collections at The Wolfsonian Institute. The department receives broad support from university leadership, including seed funding. Faculty in the Architecture Department is active in university governance through participation as elected representatives to the faculty senate and on university committees. They have also been invited to lead campus planning charrettes for the design of public spaces on the campus. The university's second interdisciplinary Solar Decathlon entry in 7 years, drawing upon resources across the university, is led by an architecture faculty member – as was the first entry.

The campus provides a stimulating environment for the students and faculty. The department has been active in extending its academic community into a larger community. The department has linked with the Miami-Dade Public School System and teaches college level architecture courses at an art and design charter high school.

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

² See Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1990.

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The diverse backgrounds and experiences from which the students come enrich the global culture of the school. This culture is valued by the student body and is shown through their enthusiasm for the school. Through the student meeting the team was able to deduce that the students have an optimistic outlook on their education, an obvious respect for one another, and an overarching agreement in the positive movement of the school. Also communicated was a shared respect in their relationships with the faculty and administration.

Since the previous visit, there has been a shift in the advising protocol. With the addition of multiple staff dedicated to the College of Architecture and the Arts, students find the new process to provide ease of access to the resources and information needed, which occurs in a timely manor.

The student organizations, AIAS and Alpha Rho Chi, have a strong foothold in the context of the school and appear to be allowing the students to emerge as effective leaders in the organizations and preparing them for professional leadership positions.

The department has a public lecture series that brings in professionals from the community that convey the ideals of the practice to the students as well as inviting practitioners to sit on juries for the student's critical evaluations. These outside sources provide an important insight to the architecture profession and help with preparing the students to be strong participants in the discipline post-graduation.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Architecture students meet with the faculty IDP coordinator regularly and are provided Intern Development Program guidelines and are encouraged to establish NCARB records. At the student meeting, the overwhelming majority of students acknowledged the significance of IDP as a necessary step to qualify for licensure. From the content of the professional practice course, the content of the IDP manual that indicates important aspects of the professional regulatory environment, and the models of practice that their faculty exhibit, students are well informed regarding this perspective. At present, NCARB does not provide pass/fail rates on the ARE for FIU, due to a NCARB database error.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The architectural profession is changing rapidly and accredited architectural education programs must be responsive to this change in a very proactive manner. A critical success factor for FIU in this respect is the quality and the quantity of faculty who, in addition to teaching and service, practice architecture. The current faculty is energetic, impressionable and inspiring to students. Similarly, they are active among practicing peers, working well with the university and the CARTA administrations, and the Miami community. Faculty architects cross-pollinate the academic setting with practical lessons in the roles and responsibilities of architects as professionals.

Students are exposed to global design issues throughout the coursework sequence through readings and lectures. Opportunity for travel and site visits is well afforded among design studios, which is facilitated by faculty leadership. Students are taught to develop a design process utilizing advanced technology and representation tools that foster their ability to work in a global market.

Sustainable design practices are taught throughout a variety of courses and an optional studio in the upper coursework affords detailed exploration of sustainable design within the built environment. Students begin the design studio sequence in a group setting with landscape architect and interior design students. The studio is coordinated and led by architecture faculty with the support from interdisciplinary faculty. Students have the opportunity to participate in a design studio for the Solar Decathlon project, an international competition in sustainable design-build. The AIAS group is active within the architecture student body to organize student leadership-focuses opportunities and bring connectivity with other student groups, as well as the national AIA and AIAS components. The student body is bright and energetic about their futures as professionals and actively seek direction from the faculty and local design community for insight.

To relay and reinforce the importance of the profession's role to balance client expectations, design responsibility and community need, students must pass a course in Professional Practice as well as design theory. Continued growth of the profession through changing methodologies in practice will demand rigor from FIU faculty and administration to stay competitive in recruiting talented students.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: A strong sense of commitment to civic and social responsibility has made this program one of the strongest and most prominent programs within the FIU system, the South Florida community and the region. Both culture and curriculum clearly demonstrate such commitment.

Faculty and student leadership have consistently delivered and demonstrated a collaborative approach to this commitment. Faculty and student participate in relevant regional issues such as urban redevelopment programs for earthquake stricken areas such as Haiti and Chile, and partnerships with Architecture for Humanity to help study solutions for more effective low income housing within the region.

Several faculty members serve in advisory boards for community redevelopment programs, as well as in national councils such as USGBC and others. Various design studios and seminars provide unique opportunities to engage relevant current environmental challenges, both globally and regional. These learning experiences clearly reflect a consistent leadership throughout that allows them to be one of the most prolific and recognized programs in the state.

These recognitions have been from professional organizations as well as national organizations, such as various AIA awards from the state and local chapters for their community redevelopment programs as well as the selection of their Solar Decathlon submission by the US Department of Energy, as one of twenty selected projects to be showcased in Washington DC.

The most recent acquisition and development for a new Miami Beach DAC LAB facility will allow the department to create more opportunities for engagement and leadership and bridge into potential new partnerships with the Wolfsonian Institute, DASH and the New World Center for the Arts.

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

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: FIU has just published a new five-year strategic plan and the CARTA has initiated strategic planning. The Architecture Department has just completed reaching the benchmarks of its most recent plan and is set to renew and align its strategic plan with FIU and the CARTA with a process that will begin in fall 2011.

1.1.5 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.

[X] The program's processes meet the standards as set by the NAAB.

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The information was provided in the APR and subsequently validated during numerous on-site discussions with faculty and administrators.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

- *Faculty & Staff:*
 - *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions³.*
 - *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty and staff to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate that an IDP Education Coordinator has been appointed within each accredited degree program, trained in the issues of IDP, and has regular communication with students and is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Education Coordinator position description and regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.*
 - *An accredited degree program must demonstrate it is able to provide opportunities for all faculty and staff to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.*
 - *Accredited programs must document the criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources.*

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: In addition to refilling positions opened via departures and a retirement, the Architecture Department has made strategic hires in key areas since the last visit. The net gain is 4 FTE positions that improve student faculty ratios and enrich collaborative teaching in numerous areas. The addition of a new director of advising, a director of recruitment, a development director and two additional advisors has greatly increased the advising and financial support capacity of the CARTA. The architecture students indicated ready access to both faculty and advisors for guidance.

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

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Onsite documentation and discussions with the faculty and chair supplement the APR and validate that this is met. Admissions criteria and review procedures for first time students, transfer students and applicants for the 3.5-year option were provided in hard copy. The faculty are broadly involved in portfolio review; the Florida articulated education programs for architecture among the universities and community colleges, and the registrar's office all fit into the admissions process. Faculty are supportive of the students, spend extra time after classes, and the students indicated a culture of teamwork in working on assignments.

³ A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.

I.2.2 Administrative Structure & Governance:

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

[X] Administrative Structure is adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The structure of the CARTA has been revised since the past visit with clearly delineated responsibility, authority, and autonomy for the Architecture Department. The department chair is a direct report to the dean; primary responsibility for promotion and tenure, faculty development, and curriculum are assured. This was validated via information in the APR and later confirmed during on-site discussions.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: It was clearly demonstrated that through the process of regular department-wide meetings among students faculty and staff, topics regarding program facilities and university-wide issues are discussed. These ensure full representation of all stakeholders to collaboratively reach solutions. Also, faculty are engaged in the CARTA and FIU committees and the faculty senate. The reinvigorated AIAS chapter is poised to more positively contribute to departmental affairs.

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

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

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The facilities are relatively new and support the full range of academic needs from fabrication and computer labs, large lecture, seminar spaces to studios and an open and accessible environment. Beyond this there are \$300K enhancements to digital presentation media and another \$300K to develop a new environmental systems lab. Additionally, FIU has committed \$1 million over a three-year period to refurbish and renovate various aspects of the Paul A. Cejas School of Architecture building.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The change in program from a 4+2 (pre-professional degree+graduate professional degree) to a 6/5-year seamless path leading to a single degree has positively impacted tuition revenue and this has stabilized, and in fact, increased the base funding for the

department. In addition, FIU and the CARTA have provided some additional investments to the base budget for targeted initiatives.

I.2.5 Information Resources: *The accredited program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient access to literature, information, visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.*

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

[X] Information Resources are adequate for the program

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The comprehensive report in the APR was supplemented with onsite visits to the library which included review of GIS facilities, special collections, the main book collection and digital media, and discussion with faculty. Collectively these confirmed that this condition is met. There are a few areas where improvement could be made with enhanced central resources. FIU has a JSTOR subscription which is helpful in providing access to a significant collection of digital materials. However, this can be much enriched in support of the arts and general education for the current curriculum and faculty scholarship by adding ARTSTOR, PROQUEST, and enhanced university resources for cataloguing, improved monograph and electronic journal purchases.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS

I.3.1 Statistical Reports⁴. 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.*

M. Arch

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Statistical reports in the APR were supplemented on-site.

⁴ In all cases, these statistics should be reported in the same format as they are reported in the Annual Report Submission system.

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

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

The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Reports in the APR were supplemented on-site with the 2009 Extension of Term request and related materials as well as the NAAB feedback.

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

In addition, the program must provide evidence through a faculty exhibit⁵ that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part Two. This exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The APR teaching assignment chart, faculty bios, and the on-site faculty exhibition provided the evidence for this finding. In considering the criterion to be well met we focused on background, stability and current research practice and scholarship. All full time faculty are either registered architects and/or PhDs, a rare combination.

⁵ The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent the exhibit is incorporated into the team room, it should not be presented in a manner that interferes with the team's ability to view and evaluate student work.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 4 – POLICY REVIEW

The information required in the three sections described above is to be addressed in the APR. In addition, the program shall provide a number of documents for review by the visiting team. Rather than be appended to the APR, they are to be provided in the team room during the visit. The list is available in Appendix 3.

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

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Links were provided for on-line access and hard-copy originals were provided for a majority of the policies.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Meetings with student representatives and the all-school meeting provided ample evidence of student abilities to listen and speak effectively. Ample course materials from history and theory courses, writing in studio components, graduate seminar, and masters project reports show that this condition is met.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is ample evidence from a range of courses from studios to graduate seminar to master's project.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is ample evidence that a range of courses from foundation graphics, the digital media courses, to the work of all studios including the master's project indicate that this condition is well met. In addition to hand drawn graphics, Maya, BIM and other digital programs are used extensively at all levels of the program.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Technical graphic documentation of structures, environmental systems, building envelope systems and basic design is evidenced in virtually all studios above foundation and formative entry level basic design. Materials and Methods 2, Comprehensive Studio and Integrated Building Systems extend this graphic representation to outline specifications, and detailed model construction of both precedent projects and design proposals. This criterion is well met.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This is met through multiple areas of the curriculum including studios, history and theory, and technology and construction.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The groundwork laid in the foundation and formative studios is augmented in upper division required studios. This is supported by content in the environmental systems courses.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC was well met through a wide-ranging series of required courses including foundation studios, history and theory courses, comprehensive studio and the master's project.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC was well met in the sequence of foundation pre-professional studios for incoming freshmen, and in the formative studios for incoming graduate students.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This condition is well met through the three required history courses, the two required theory courses and the research accomplished as a component of the graduate seminar in preparation for the culminating master's project. Readings and assignments in each reinforce these topics across the curriculum timeline.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This is largely met via theory one and two, and graduate seminar, along with related work in several required studios that undertake projects in diverse locations within and beyond the boundaries of the US.

- A.11. Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found evidence of applied research in Materials and Methods 2 precedent analysis, graduate seminar thesis program development and the maters project.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: The team finds that student achievement in the SPCs of this realm is quite positive, and the expected learning outcomes overall have been met.

Realm B: Integrated Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Architects are called upon to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to their services. Additionally they must appreciate their role in the implementation of design decisions, and their impact of such decisions on the environment. Students learning aspirations include:

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence was provided in course syllabi and related exercises papers and projects for a wide range of required courses including required coordinated studios, required option studios, the comprehensive design studio, graduate seminar and masters project.

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The team found evidence of careful and thorough attention to mobility disabilities and correlated design results. However, the team was not able to locate evidence in the required courses that met the expected level of “ability” to design for sensory and cognitive disabilities.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Sustainability issues are introduced and mastered in a range of courses including environmental systems, the sustainability studio GD9, and aspects of integrated building systems.

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is ample evidence in many courses that response to fundamentals of solar climatic topographic and spatial characteristics of site is mastered at the level of ‘ability.’ However, the team was not able to locate evidence in the required courses that met the expected level of “ability” to respond to soil, vegetation and watershed.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC is met in Comprehensive Design, Integrated Building Systems, and Environmental Systems courses.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC is primarily met through comprehensive design studio and the co-requisite integrated building systems course. In particular the integrated technical documentation in drawing is outstanding.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There are elements in comprehensive design, integrated building systems and professional practice that address this SPC.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is ample evidence that this SPC is met through the two environmental systems courses and integrated building systems course.

B. 9. Structural Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems.

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The required three-course structures sequence provides a solid grounding for meeting this SPC. Many assignments are integrated with studio projects and there is a high degree of integration of structural development integrated into comprehensive studio and graduate design 6.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The required three course building materials and systems sequence culminates in integrated building systems. This sequence provides a solid grounding for meeting this SPC. Many assignments are integrated with studio projects and there is a high degree of building envelope development integrated into comprehensive studio.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is ample evidence that this SPC is met through the two environmental systems courses, the integrated building systems course, and comprehensive design.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The required three course building materials and systems sequence culminates in integrated building systems. This sequence provides a solid grounding for meeting this SPC. Many assignments are integrated with studio projects and there is a high degree of building materials and assemblies development integrated into comprehensive studio.

<p>Realm B. General Team Commentary: The team finds that student achievement in the SPCs of this realm is very high throughout, and the expected learning outcomes overall have been met.</p>
--

Realm C: Leadership and Practice:

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

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

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: There is evidence that students work in collaborative teams in a number of courses. However, there is no required course that entails collaborative work with students of other disciplines through the completion of design projects. A few studios, such as the solar decathlon studio, involve students from multiple disciplines, but this is not an experience that all students share or have.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This is met in studio exercises, graduate seminar and the two-course theory sequence.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC and SPCs C.4-C.8 are met in the professional practice course.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC and SPCs C.4-C.8 are met in the professional practice course.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC and SPCs C.4-C.8 are met in the professional practice course.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: This SPC and SPCs C.4-C.8 are met in the professional practice course.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: In addition to professional practice, a range of codes and legal responsibilities are identified in comprehensive design, graduate seminar and the maters projects.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: In addition to professional practice, ethical issues are introduced in a number of courses where evidence is located, among them theory one and two.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Commitment to community and social responsibility is evidenced in a significant number of required studios. This approach is a core value of the department and university.

<p>Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team finds that student achievement in the SPCs of this realm is quite positive, and the expected learning outcomes overall have been met.</p>
--

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The letter from SACS president Belle Wheelan, Ph.D., dated Jan 7, 2011 indicates the next review is scheduled for 2020.

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Sample curricula are converted into a course credit matrix that shows the proportion of courses for the accredited degree.

II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The faculty has worked assiduously to review and revise the curriculum. A significant increment in coordinated content and collaborative teaching has been developed at virtually all levels of the curriculum.

PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Detailed documentation regarding admissions criteria and evaluation were made available during the visit, supplementing the brief commentary in the APR. This included guidelines for portfolio development and a section on articulated curricula in the Florida university and community college systems. Admission portfolios are reviewed by faculty. Many of the SAT, GPA, and articulated course transfer credits are handled by advising and the registrar.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment. The full text is not included in all catalogs and promotional media. The required text now includes a statement regarding the next accreditation visit as well as core text.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

In order to assist parents, students, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must make the following documents available to all students, parents and faculty:

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation (edition currently in effect)

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: These are provided via digital links on the website and in hard-copy in the department office.

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

In order to assist students, parents, and others as they seek to develop an understanding of the larger context for architecture education and the career pathways available to graduates of accredited degree programs, the program must make the following resources available to all students, parents, staff, and faculty:

www.ARCHCareers.org

The NCARB Handbook for Interns and Architects

Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture

The Emerging Professional's Companion

www.NCARB.org

www.aia.org

www.aiaa.org

www.acsa-arch.org

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: Substantial material is included in the IDP materials and the student handbook.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

All Annual Reports, including the narrative

All NAAB responses to the Annual Report

The final decision letter from the NAAB

The most recent APR

The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

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

[X] Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: The content of the various reports, responses, prior visiting team report are included in the online version of the APR which is available on the website under accreditation.

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Visiting Team Assessment: NCARB last tracked university pass rates in 2008. At that time, FIU was not included among NCARB's data. An e-mail dated 3/24/11 from Spencer Lepler, Manager of ARE Ethics and Audit, at NCARB confirmed that data for FIU are not available.

III. Appendices:

1. Program Information

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

A. History and Mission of the Institution

Florida International University, Miami's public research university, is one of America's most dynamic institutions of higher learning. Since opening in 1972, FIU has achieved many benchmarks of excellence that have taken other universities more than a century to reach. FIU, a member institution of the State University System of Florida, was established by the Florida Legislature in 1965. Classes began in September 1972, with 5,667 students enrolled in upper division and graduate programs – the largest opening day enrollment in the history of American higher education. In 1984, FIU received authority to begin offering degree programs at the doctoral level, and in 1994, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classified FIU as a Doctoral I University. In 2005, FIU was classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a Research University/High Research Activity. Modesto A. Maidique was FIU's fourth president. Appointed in 1986, the former Harvard Business School professor and high-tech entrepreneur built upon the sound foundation laid by his predecessors – Charles E. Perry, FIU's first president appointed in July 1969; Harold B. Crosby, who succeeded in June 1976; and Gregory B. Wolfe, named the third president in February 1979. On August 28, 2009, Mark B. Rosenberg became Florida International University's fifth president. Rosenberg is former chancellor of the State University System of Florida and the first FIU faculty member to ascend to the presidency of the university. "Today we begin a new era that speaks to the times we are in," said Rosenberg to thousands who gathered at the U.S Century Bank Arena, on the Modesto A. Maidique Campus in West Miami-Dade County. "In this new era, we must put our students at the center of who we are, engage our community like never before and reinforce our partnerships with key institutions in South Florida." These words, from Dr. Rosenberg's installation speech, capture the essence of what will be the future of FIU: "We are here today to celebrate this magnificent institution. We are here today because we care. We are here today because of our hungry heart for FIU. We are here today because of our commitment to the life of the 21st century mind - our commitment to learning, to entrepreneurship, research, innovation, and to creativity. We are here today because we know we can work better together to prevent and solve problems using the blessings of our knowledge and passion. We are here today because there is more to be done. In this New Era, students will be at the center, research and creative activity will be the driver, engagement and partnerships will be the mode."

FIU has nationally and internationally renowned faculty known for their outstanding teaching and cutting-edge research, students from throughout the U.S. and more than 130 foreign countries and alumni who have risen to prominence in every field. These alumni are a testament to the University's academic excellence. The University is a member of Phi Beta Kappa, the nation's oldest and most distinguished academic honor society.

Florida International University offers more than 200 baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degree programs in 21 colleges and schools:

- College of Arts and Sciences
 - School of Environment and Society
 - School of Integrated Life Sciences

- School of International and Public Affairs
- College of Architecture + The Arts
 - School of Architecture
 - School of Music
- College of Business Administration
 - Alvah H. Chapman Jr. Graduate School of Business
 - School of Accounting
- College of Education
- College of Engineering and Computing
 - School of Computing and Information Sciences
- College of Nursing and Health Sciences
- Dr. Robert R. Stempel College of Public Health and Social Work
 - School of Social Work
- The Honors College
 - School of Hospitality and Tourism Management
 - School of Journalism and Mass Communication
 - College of Law
 - Herbert Wertheim College of Medicine
 - University College

FIU has more than 42,000 students, 1,100 full-time faculty, and 115,000 alumni, making it the largest university in South Florida and placing it among the nation's largest colleges and universities. The University has two campuses – The Modesto A. Maidique Campus in western Miami-Dade County and the Biscayne Bay Campus in northeast Miami-Dade County – and an educational facility at the Pines Educational Center in nearby Broward County. Additionally, numerous programs are offered at off-campus locations and online. *U.S. News & World Report* has ranked FIU among the top 100 public national universities in its annual survey of “America’s Best Colleges.” FIU has been recognized as one of the top 10 public commuter universities in the nation by *Money*. *Kiplinger’s Personal Finance Magazine* ranked FIU as the country’s 18th best value in public higher education. Research is a major component of our mission. The purpose of the Division of Research is to improve the quality of life in our region, the state and the larger international community through research. We are particularly interested in environmental quality, energy, health, water quality, sustainable communities, economic development, security and safety. Multidisciplinary teams, information technology and international culture are major themes in our research.

FIU is one of the nation’s major research universities and we expend approximately \$100 million annually on research. Our research is funded by more than 200 public and private organizations, and in terms of dollar value, our largest sponsor is the Federal Government with funding from 41 different Federal agencies. The University has many specialized research facilities including a new nano scale research and fabrication laboratory. We also conduct many studies “off site” throughout the United States and the world. Undergraduate and graduate students participate actively in all of our research endeavors. FIU exports its discoveries for public benefit through publications, formal technology transfer agreements, public testimony and evidence-based advocacy.

Ninety-five percent of the university’s full-time faculty hold doctorates or the highest degree attainable in their field.

The University is ranked as a Research University in the High Research Activity category of the Carnegie Foundation’s prestigious classification system. FIU emphasizes research as a major component of its mission.

With more than 117,500 alumni, Golden Panthers constitute the fastest growing university alumni group in Miami-Dade County. FIU confers approximately half of all degrees now awarded by universities in Miami-Dade County.

FIU is the youngest university to have been awarded a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, the nation's oldest and most distinguished academic honor society. FIU recently ranked among the best values in public higher education in the country, according to *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* magazine's 2006 survey, "100 Best Values in Public Colleges." FIU ranked among the top 50 nationally for in-state students and among the top 100 nationally for out-of-state and international students. FIU recently ranked 3rd in granting bachelors' degrees to minorities and 9th in granting master degrees to minorities (among the top 100 degree producing colleges and universities),

U.S. News & World Report ranks FIU's undergraduate international business programs 7th in the nation and their graduate programs among the top 20. The university has also been named one of the "10 Cool Colleges for Entrepreneurs" by *Fortune Small Business* magazine. Our Executive MBA program was recently ranked #1 in Florida by the *Financial Times*.

The University's 2006 operating budget was \$586 million. FIU has more than 4,800 employees. The University has an economic impact of more than \$1.7 billion on the South Florida economy.

In recent years, FIU has emerged as one of South Florida's major cultural assets, offering programs to both students and the local community. Several of its programs are nationally renowned for their excellence.

The Patricia & Phillip Frost Art Museum will celebrate the grand opening of its new facility on the University Park campus in 2008.

The Wolfsonian-FIU museum, located in Miami Beach, promotes the collection, preservation and understanding of decorative art and design from the period 1885-1945.

The Department of Theatre produces a wide variety of live student performances, and the School of Music presents an annual fall series of concerts that showcase talent in a variety of genres. The festival features FIU musicians as well as distinguished visiting performers.

Under the direction of the Creative Writing Program, the Writers on the Bay lecture series presents noted authors and poets.

The School of Hospitality and Tourism Management helps present the annual South Beach Wine & Food Festival, one of the major culinary events in the nation.

Florida International University is an urban, multi-campus, research university serving South Florida, the state, the nation and the international community. It fulfills its mission by imparting knowledge through excellent teaching, promoting public service, discovering new knowledge, solving problems through research, and fostering creativity.

As an institution of higher learning, Florida International University is committed to:
Freedom of thought and expression;
Excellence in teaching and in the pursuit, generation, dissemination, and application of knowledge;
Respect for the dignity of the individual;
Respect for the environment;

Honesty, integrity, and truth;
Diversity and strategic operational and service excellence.

Vision:

A leading student-centered urban public research university that is locally and globally engaged.

Operational Statement:

As an anchor public institution in South Florida, FIU is committed to providing quality learning, state-of-the-art research and creative activity, and problem-solving engagement.

FIU Strategic Themes:

With the installment of a Mark B. Rosenberg as FIU's fifth president on August 29, 2009, FIU entered a new phase. President Rosenberg has already begun the development of a new strategic plan. The Arts and Design have been central to the strategic planning process and will likely be foundational in his new strategic plan. The extant strategic plan (developed by former president Modesto Maidique) involved six themes to achieve strategic advantages in higher education. Given rapid globalization in the 21st century, FIU's strategic themes involved engagement at both the local and global level.

Florida International University was originally chartered with a mission to promote international understanding. We responded to this mission by appointing faculty who have professional expertise in fields that are international in content and application and who have professional experience abroad. We also encourage our students to pursue a bilingual/biliterate competency and study-abroad experience. These efforts have led to a distinguished international reputation, particularly in international business and the study of the Latin American and Caribbean region. Our efforts in the international sphere are supported by our geographic location; the cultural and ethnic diversity of the South Florida community; the continued globalization of the Florida and national economies; and the State's desire to be a global leader in economic development in the 21st century. These conditions provide a unique opportunity for FIU to be a major connecting point between nations and their citizens.

South Florida is a fragile blend of the ocean, Everglades, and urban areas. Continued development of the area provides a unique opportunity for environmental education and research. Understanding our natural and man-made environments and the relationships between them is necessary for the continued vitality of both. Population growth and exploitation of natural resources and the environment have created local and global environmental problems that must be addressed to ensure a sustainable environment and development.

Environmental knowledge relies on the humanities to help clarify our values and attitudes toward our environment, the basic and applied sciences which teach us how environmental processes work and how we can influence these processes, and planning and management disciplines to develop and implement effective and efficient improvement efforts. Applying our understanding of the dynamics of these systems can provide models that will assist in addressing both local and global environmental issues.

FIU's future is strongly tied to the economic health and development of the state of Florida and the South Florida community. The opportunity to partner with the local community to provide the research and innovation required to address social and economic problems and to enhance economic development is critical to the University's future. Our greatest contribution to economic development is our graduates, who constitute a major portion of the region's educated workforce. However, the University's role in economic development extends beyond the local community to include the global

community. The State of Florida has a vision of “being a global leader in knowledge-based jobs, leading edge technology, and competitive enterprises in traditional and new businesses” (*Partnering to Shape Florida’s Economic Future: 2001-2006*). FIU has a major determining role to play in helping the state achieve this vision and enhancing the economy of the local community by providing expertise in management, law, economics, commerce, science, and especially in new technologies, such as information and biomedical technologies, which are critical to South Florida.

Primary care, prevention of disease, rehabilitation, public health, and environmental health are concerns of every community. FIU has established a role as a provider of health professionals – nurses, physical therapists, biologists – and researchers dedicated to addressing the health needs of the local community. In recognition of the increasing multidisciplinary nature of health care, FIU encourages multidisciplinary instructional and research activities. The University intends to continue its engagement with the health care needs of the community and to expand its engagement as the needs of the community grow and evolve. Our involvement in these efforts will help meet the needs of the local community and provide us with the experience needed to develop health care services and techniques that have application beyond the local community.

South Florida and FIU have diverse populations that create opportunities to understand and appreciate different artistic and cultural traditions and modes of artistic expression, recognize the interplay of culture and artistic expression, and celebrate diversity. FIU’s two museums, The Patricia & Phillip Frost Art Museum and The Wolfsonian-FIU, and outstanding programs in Music, Art, Theatre, Design, and Film offer students unique academic and professional experiences. These facilities and programs enrich campus life, enhance community involvement, and support our quest for excellence. FIU will continue its leadership in these areas and provide learning opportunities to meet the needs of diverse populations. As part of University’s strategic planning process, the new President created The Arts Committee. The dean serves as co-chair of this important committee.

Formal education is and will continue to be a major element of FIU's engagement with its constituent communities, particularly the South Florida community. Graduates are encouraged to pursue a bilingual/biliterate competency and to experience study abroad programs. Opportunities for the future lie beyond the traditional undergraduate and graduate education models. Changes in the economy and career patterns will result in situations in which individuals renewing/developing career skills. This shift will create a need for new or additional programs in adult learning, continuing professional education, and technology-based education as well as self-improvement programs. Meeting these needs will require the increased use of distance learning technology as a means of enhancing access to educational opportunities. Moreover, the need for traditional students to become better integrated into their communities will increase the demand for experiential and service-learning programs.

FIU’s Student body reflects the vibrant diversity of South Florida

Who we serve:

60% Hispanic
17% White Non-Hispanic
12% Black
04% Asian or Pacific Islander
07% other minority groups

B. History and Mission of the Program

Mission: *Adopted by faculty vote April, 2007.*

As part of FIU, a “top public research university,” the Architecture department is dedicated to educating future generations of ethical professionals, creative designers and informed citizens.

Vision:

We believe architecture to be a conceptually based intellectual endeavor and a form of critical inquiry that addresses the physical environment from the scale of the city to the scale of furniture.

The department is committed to producing conceptual thinkers and skilled makers who are versed in the techniques and knowledge of the discipline and who are cognizant of, and enlightened by the constellation of humanist ideas and societal values that inspire and engender the production and reception of architecture. To realize these objectives, design is taught as a critical, speculative and creative endeavor embracing both the humanities and the sciences.

To achieve our mission and vision, our decisions and actions are informed by the following core values and beliefs:

Diversity

Serving a diverse student body with a variety of academic backgrounds, experiences and interests by creating an open atmosphere of inquiry and exchange that engages the varied cultural and academic experiences of faculty and students.

Design as Critical Thinking

Presenting architecture as a reflective and conceptually based discipline. We encourage students to form thoughtful and imaginative solutions to the challenges confronting urban society here and abroad and to cultivate intellectual curiosity and life-long learning.

Knowledge and Skill-Based Learning

Exploring the diverse areas of knowledge and the technical skills that play a critical role in thoughtful formation of the constructed environment which are essential for successful design practices.

Commitment to Innovation

Celebrating the power of innovation and experimentation and our discipline's commitment to imagine and construct beautiful, healthful and responsible environments.

Appreciation for the Constructed and the Natural Environments

Fostering sensitivity and appreciation for the constructed and natural environments of South Florida. The Architecture department values the unique opportunities and challenges for creative exploration and problem-solving afforded by South Florida's rich sub-tropical ecologies, urban contexts, multicultural and multilingual populace.

Culture of Connectivity

Promoting connections between the Architecture department and members of the design community in local, national and international, academic, professional and lay contexts. In particular, we seek to engage our colleagues in the college and the school, local practitioners in design education and to develop cooperative links with schools of design in North America, Latin America and Europe.

Ethos of Trans-Disciplinarity

Engaging adjacent disciplines within the School of Architecture to create an atmosphere of trans-disciplinary cooperation in order to collaboratively address the complex spatial, social and environmental challenges of contemporary practice.

Program - History

Founding: A product of a 25-year history of growth and reorganization, Florida International University's School of Architecture originated in 1973 as part of the School of Technology's Department of Construction. From 1973 to 1982, the department included programs in Architectural Technology, Landscape Architecture, and Urban Studies, Interior Design, Fashion and Apparel Studies, Construction Management, Civil Engineering Technology, and Construction Engineering Technology.

College of Engineering: In 1986, the School of Technology was transformed into the College of Engineering & Applied Science. Subsequent reorganization of the College subdivided the construction department into two programs: (1) Construction, consisting of a Bachelor of Science in Construction Management, and a Master of Science in Construction; and (2) School of Design, offering a Bachelor of Science in Interior Design, a Bachelor of Science in Architectural Technology Studies, a Bachelor of Science in Apparel Studies, and a Master of Landscape Architecture degree. In 1991, a reevaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the Construction Department resulted in a program reorganization. The construction department became an independent unit within the College of Engineering, and the School of Design retained the three professions of Architectural Studies, Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, but eliminated the Apparel Studies program. The Landscape Architecture Program, the first program within the School of Design to seek professional accreditation, was accredited by Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board (LAAB) in 1993.

Largely through the lobbying efforts of students, the Florida Board of Regents approved the creation of the professional graduate program in architecture 1996. Application for initial accreditation from The National Architectural Accrediting Board was made in 1997 and granted

Accreditation (1999): In January 1999, for an initial three-year term. This precipitated the creation of the School of Architecture as an independent academic unit with programs in Architecture, landscape architecture and interior design. Its founding dean was William G. McMinn, FAIA. The accredited architecture program went through its first re-accreditation in March 2002.

New Building: The first home of the School of Architecture was the existing Viertes Haus building on the University Park Campus. At the request of the School of Architecture and its students, the University Administration and the State of Florida Board of Regents, the Florida State Legislature approved funding for a new building to house the School of Architecture. The University held an international design competition and Bernard Tschumi's submission, developed in conjunction with Miami Architects Bruno-Elias and Associates, was selected for the Paul L. Cejas School of Architecture Building. In January 2003, the School of Architecture occupied its new \$15.5 million signature structure. The new building and the focus on improving quality inspired several significant changes in the School's curricular structure. The school implemented a completely new interdisciplinary lower division. Together in the first four semesters, architecture students along with those in interior design and landscape architecture follow a 60-credit hour foundation curriculum developed to introduce core aspects interdisciplinary curricula of design shared by all three professions. The ongoing review of curriculum content resulting from this interdisciplinary focus has produced new rigor within the lower division curriculum along with improved efficiencies in faculty assignments.

Controlled Admissions: The new building and the focus on improving quality inspired several significant changes in the school's curricular structure. The school implemented a completely new interdisciplinary pre-graduate curriculum. Together in the first four semesters, architecture, interior design and landscape architecture students follow a foundation curriculum that introduces core design aspects that form the basis of each discipline's professional degree. The interdisciplinary focus has produced both new rigor and breadth along with improved efficiencies in faculty assignments. In order to ensure "cold desks" in the new building (where every student has an individual workspace), the school developed a controlled admissions and enrollment policy. This replaced the open admissions policy and beginning in 2003 dramatically reduced enrollment from 330 lower division students in Fall 2000 to under 100 in Fall 2009. As a result of a managed admissions process, the average GPA of our entering freshman (FTIC) class has escalated from 2.3 in 2001 to 3.6 in 2009. In 2010 the Architecture Department had 350 applicants for 60 FTIC seats.

With reorganization and the creation of the College of Architecture + The Arts (CARTA) in AY 2006-07, the accredited program became one of seven units in the college. The administrative structure of the college consists of a dean and two associate deans. The College administration is supported by a staff and a student advising office. The seven academic units in CARTA are; the departments of Architecture, Interior Design and Landscape Architecture which together form the School of Architecture, the School of Music, the Department of Art and Art History, the Department of Theatre, and the Department of Communication Arts.

Administration (2007): In response to the 2008 Visiting Team Report(VTR) that the college reorganization created too many administrative layers between the chair of the Architecture department and the Provost, the position of school director was eliminated. As per the VTR's suggestion, the chair now reports directly to the dean who in turn reports to the provost.

Administration Growth: Since the 2008 visit, the department has seen a significant increase in dedicated staff positions. The department now has its own full-time office manager, a fabrication shop manager, a digital lab manager, and a part-time IT manager. Additionally, a number of part-time assistants work in the office. The Department is greatly assisted by a full-time advising office in the college that dedicates 80% of its time to advising our design students.

Undergraduate Selectivity: Between 2002 and 2010 the program has witnessed dramatic increases in both the quality and quantity of its applicants. The Architecture department has retention and graduation rates that are above the university average. The 6 year graduation rate for FTICs in architecture was 58.3% while the university rate was 46.8%. The 6 year retention rate for FTICs in architecture was 56.9% while the university rate was 56.1%.

Curricular Revisions: The qualitative transformation of the student demographics led to thorough curriculum assessments in 2003 and in 2008. The 2003 assessment led to curricular modifications in 2004 as a response to the new admissions policy and to create a more coherent path of study. The 2008 assessment led to a curricular modification that allowed incoming freshman to take advantage of a seamless five or six year path towards the M. Arch without the conferral of a non-professional Bachelor degree. This change increased departmental revenue dramatically, allowing the department to offer significantly more value-added components to its students. Additionally, the modification allows students to choose between taking their course of study in either five or six years. This option allows students to take advantage of either un-programmed summers in the six-year M. Arch path (thus facilitating summer internships, travel and work opportunities)

or they can accelerated their path to graduation(with summer study)by taking the course of study in the five-year M. Arch path. Additional responses to the 2008 NAAB review included hiring a faculty member with expertise in environmental technology, constructing a cutting edge Environmental Technology and Structural Technology teaching lab and revising many of the Technology course in the curriculum.

The Wolfsonian-FIU: The new college, particularly the Architecture department, takes advantage of our special relationship with The Wolfsonian-FIU and its significant collection of decorative and propaganda arts, donated to the University in 1998. This donation comprises the largest gift ever given to a university in the history of the State of Florida. As a major museum, library and research center devoted to the study of decorative complexes, industrial design and propaganda arts from 1875 to 1945, it is an invaluable resource for architectural design research. Finally, The Wolfsonian-FIU has become an increasingly important resource and teaching laboratory for both the undergraduate and graduate curricula. In 2010, the Wolfsonian Museum in conjunction with the department inaugurated the Wolfsonian-FIU Scholar program. Made possible by support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, visiting scholars come to Miami to engage in research at the Wolfsonian and as part of their duties, teach a graduate seminar. The first Scholar is Professor Dennis Doordan from University of Notre Dame who will co-teach a graduate seminar titled Material and Visual Studies of Modernity during the fall 2010 semester.

Advisory Board:

In AY 2006-07 the Architecture department established an advisory board. Consisting of 12 professionals, the board is tasked with advisement and assistance in fund-raising, developing and implementing strategic initiatives, program promotion and in identifying and responding to local, regional and national trends in the discipline. Additionally, the board connects the department, the faculty and the students to many of the professional offices in the region.

Genoa Program:

In Spring 2005, the Architecture department initiated a semester-long study-abroad program in Genoa, Italy. Located in a dedicated facility and taught by full-time faculty, this 13-15 credit hour semester is now an integrated and highly popular semester abroad option for our students. Currently about 35% of our students attend the Genoa program.

Cejas Eminent Scholars:

Thanks to a \$1,000,000 gift from Ambassador Paul L. Cejas, and a \$750,000 state match, the school has been able to create the Paul L. Cejas Eminent Scholar program. Initiated in 2006, this gift allows the Architecture department to bring internationally recognized visiting faculty, practitioners and scholars to work with our students. To date, the Cejas Architectural Scholars have taught graduate level advanced seminars as part of the accredited graduate degree program.

Solar House Collaboration:

FIU was selected to be one of twenty universities to participate in the 2011 Department of Energy's Solar Decathlon. Collaborative efforts between the Architecture Department, the Departments of Interior Design and Landscape Architecture and the College of Engineering and Computing and the College of Journalism will lead to the design and fabrication of the FIU Solar House in 2011. Our 2005 entry garnered a first place award in energy balance, a first place award in people's choice and an overall 13th place in the 2005 National Solar Decathlon.

Cejas Faculty Grant:

Inaugurated in 2007-08, the Paul L. Cejas Faculty Initiative Endowment is expected to fund approximately \$30,000 annually towards faculty projects, research, scholarship and travel via a competitive School of Architecture faculty initiative application process.

The Present Situation:

The program has aggressively capitalized upon its youthful and entrepreneurial spirit and is building a national reputation for excellence. During this period, there has been an almost constant series of modifications in the college, the school, and in the department. The most recent transformations have been helpful and productive and have enabled demonstrable improvements in our fiscal situation, in our facilities, administrative structure, staff resources and in our ability to offer excellent academic advising and student services.

Central to University Mission:

The “Arts” and “Design” have rapidly become important aspects in President Mark Rosenberg’s new strategic planning for FIU. In the first year of his new administration, the role of Arts and Design – as one of four foundational themes of the new strategic plan - have become central components in every facet of the strategic discussion. At FIU, Design and the Arts are not seen as disciplines on the margins of university life, but rather as models of excellence with content, teaching methods, scholarship and research that are critical and central to the University’s core mission. “Design thinking” is increasingly being recognized as a third area of knowledge at many universities (joining the Sciences and the Humanities). The University administration’s history of supporting the Design disciplines and the integration of them into the core vision of the University serve as a model for other universities.

Transdisciplinarity:

The University administration and our colleagues across the campus recognize the Architecture department’s contributions to the University community through our transdisciplinary teaching, cross-disciplinary grants uniting our faculty with those from other colleges and schools, through the department’s community engagement and outreach work and through the faculty’s substantial university service. Our faculty (adjunct and fulltime) have been recognized by the university with awards and honors for excellence in teaching and scholarship. Most recently, one of our senior faculty was awarded the competitive and prestigious Provost’s Fellowship for the 2010-11 academic year. Additionally, each semester the department teaches courses that are part of the University Core Curriculum (required for all FIU students) thus allowing the department to reach out to almost a thousand non-Architecture majors each year. Within the College of Architecture and The Arts, we have fostered a cross-disciplinary ethos amongst the six units and the department by offering numerous team taught courses that unite faculty from various other disciplines and departments with our faculty. These cross-disciplinary courses have focused on the intersection of Art and contemporary Architecture, Film and Architecture, and the historical and contemporary relationship between space and performance.

Synergies and Collaborations:

The department has built strong collaborative relationships with the Wolfsonian-FIU Museum in Miami Beach, the Wolfsonian Museum in Genoa, the Patricia and Phillip Frost Museum at FIU and the Miami Art Museum. We regularly work with these institutions as teaching and research venues for many of our courses. A number of departmental annual and bi-annual happenings have become prominent events within the life of University and the city. Events include the “Walk on Water” day, the annual Cejas Scholar Lecture, the Miami + Beach Bienal as well as the Celebrate Architecture exhibition cosponsored with the Miami AIA. Additionally, the department has worked to bring together Miami’s government officials and the profession during various events, such as the 2009

breakfast forum in which the department hosted city of Miami and Miami-Dade County officials and mayors and city council members to hear AIA president Marvin Malecha discuss why Design matters to government. Additionally, the department has used the advanced design studios as community outreach and civic engagement vehicles. Recent examples include the department's teaming up with The Miami-Dade Expressway Authority(MDX) on the proposal of a light-rail master-plan for Miami (2009), creating design proposals for live/work housing for Miami's arts community (2010). The proposal was funded through a Hagen Family Foundation grant. Additionally, the department has continually received grant funding to teach the advanced placement architectural courses at Design & Architecture Senior High School (DASH); Miami-Dade County Public School System's design and art magnet high school. This school was recently ranked the 5th best magnet school in the nation by *US News and World Report*. These are a small sampling of our recent initiatives that have benefitted the university.

The department's mission and vision statement highlights the significance of professional training and knowledge and the importance of situating that knowledge and disciplinary specific skills and training in relation to a broader constellation of humanist ideas and societal values that enlighten and engender the production and reception of architecture". Additionally, the mission statement notes that architecture is "taught as a critical endeavor that embraces both the humanities and the sciences." Professional curricula focus upon the discipline with coursework that covers five thematic areas of disciplinary knowledge; design, history/theory, building technology & sustainability, digital technology, and professional and business practices. Additionally, the professional curricula incorporate a broad and liberal education with course work covering four thematic areas; written and verbal communication composed of courses focusing on writing, verbal communication and rhetoric; environmental contexts composed of courses focusing on global issues and societal values as well as the physical sciences; cultural contexts with courses focusing on ethics and the humanities; and finally creative contexts composed of courses focusing on the fine arts and on art history. Students are permitted to choose from numerous courses within these four categories. The goal is to develop a holistic and broadly constructed knowledge base in which to situate the discipline of architecture.

Program Description:

FIU Architecture is dedicated to the education of future generations of ethical professionals, creative designers and informed citizens. We believe architecture to be a conceptually based intellectual endeavor and a form of critical inquiry addressing the physical environment from the scale of the city to the scale of furniture. The goal of the professional practice with emphasis placed upon five thematic areas: architectural design, history/theory, building technologies, digital technology, and professional business practice.

We are committed to educating students to form independent design judgments grounded in intellectual inquiry and the general pursuit of knowledge. Our graduates are versed in the professional knowledge and technical skills required of the discipline and are conceptual thinkers who are cognizant of, and enlightened by the constellation of humanist ideas and societal values that inspire and engender the production and reception of architecture. To realize these objectives, design is taught as a critical, speculative and creative endeavor.

Our faculty are recognized for excellence in teaching, creative work and research and have earned international acclaim for their architectural design work, their prolific scholarship and for excellence and innovation in architectural education. Our graduate and undergraduate students come to us with a variety of academic backgrounds, experiences and interests but always with a passion for the study of architecture and a

desire to use their creative abilities to improve our world and to make it both sustainable and more beautiful.

Ideally situated in one of the most extraordinary and fertile urban laboratories for the study of architecture, Miami and the South Florida region provide limitless possibilities for faculty and students to explore global and regional challenges and apply innovative approaches and new technologies to those challenges. Miami also offers our students the opportunity to study numerous new and cutting-edge works of architecture by many of the world's leading designers.

Master of Architecture:

The Master of Architecture prepares students for professional careers in the discipline of architecture. The intensive course of study is organized into five thematic areas; design, history/theory, building technology, digital technology, and professional practice. The degree has three paths; each designed to address the different backgrounds and educational needs of our applicants. The degree path consists of a course of study that is comprehensive and rigorous and that prepares graduates to be creative leaders, and skilled innovators in all aspects of the profession. The Master of Architecture degree is accredited by the National Architecture Accrediting Board (NAAB).

Six and Five-Year Seamless Path (for freshman applicants):

is a professional degree program for applicants who have completed high school and who wish to begin architectural study as a freshman. This path provides a course of study leading from undergraduate freshman year to the conferral of the Professional Master of Architecture degree (M. Arch). The six and five year path is comprised of 73 credit hours of pregraduate coursework taken over the first two years of study and is seamlessly followed by 102 credit hours of graduate coursework (taken in either four or three years). Transition to graduate study occurs without the conferral of an undergraduate degree and no bachelor degree is awarded at any point.

Students who have completed an AA in Architectural Studies may apply for transfer admission into the third year of this path as junior year transfer students. The seamless path provides students with a strong professional education in the discipline of architecture along with an expansive general education. Emphasis in this path is placed upon six thematic areas; general education studies, architectural design studies, architectural history & theory, building technologies and digital technologies, and professional & Business practices. The fully integrated pre-graduate and graduate course of study covers the comprehensive knowledge and skills required for a professional career in the discipline of architecture. Students are eligible to spend a semester studying in Genoa, Italy.

Three-Year Path:

The three-year path is a professional degree program for applicants with no background in architecture; the applicant would possess a four-year undergraduate bachelor's degree in any area. The path consists of 105 credit hours and is usually completed in three-years. The course of study consists of six semesters of design studio coursework followed by a semester long master's project. Supporting courses in history/educational experience is for students to develop synthetic thought and design processes using creative problem solving and critical thinking. FIU Architecture prepares students for theory, building technology, digital technology, professional and business practices as well as cross-disciplinary electives complete the course of study. Students are eligible to spend their sixth semester studying in Genoa, Italy.

Two-Year Path:

The two-year path is a professional degree program for applicants who already possess a pre-professional four-year undergraduate degree in architecture. Students continue their architectural education by following a course of 60 credit hours that is usually completed in two years. The course of study consists of three semesters of design studio coursework followed by a semester long master's project. Supporting courses in history / theory, building technology, digital technology, professional and business practices as well as cross-disciplinary electives complete the course of study. Students are eligible to spend their third semester studying in Genoa, Italy.

Master of Arts in Architecture:

The Master of Arts in Architecture is an advanced post-professional degree for those already holding an accredited professional design degree (the five year B. Arch or the M. Arch degree) and who are interested in continuing their education through advanced research, study and teaching. The Master of Arts in Architecture degree currently offers three tracks, each corresponding to a specialized area of study. All three tracks follow a 36 credit hour course of study over roughly one academic year.

Advanced Design Studies - Miami based One-Year Track:

This course of study allows students to pursue advanced design studies, research and teaching. The program deploys the design studio as the primary instrument for extending the base of knowledge with particular emphasis on contemporary design practices and pedagogy. The program uses the city of Miami, the region and its tropical and sub-tropical context as a design laboratory. Architecture faculty work closely with the advanced design studies students around topics of mutual interest. Areas of focused study and research may include; design, history/theory, design pedagogy, digital technologies, urban design, building technologies, and professional practice.

Advanced Design Studies – Genoa, Italy based One-Year Track:

Genoa remains one of the few cities in Italy that maintains both an extraordinary range of historically significant works of architecture, as well as an ever-increasing wealth of contemporary architectural works by many of the most significant architects of the 20th and 21st centuries. The course of study centers on the design studio as the primary instrument for synthetically extending knowledge with particular emphasis on contemporary architectural design in historic urban contexts. The program uses the city of Genoa and the Italian peninsula as a laboratory. The program begins with an intensive summer orientation at our Miami campus with study continuing during the fall and spring semesters at the facility in Genoa, Italy.

Urban Development - Miami based One-Year Track:

This course of study extends the knowledge base of the professions of Architecture, Interior Design and Landscape Architecture with a particular emphasis upon the built environment, urban development, real estate and business administration. The program of study is intended for mid-career professionals, as well as recent graduates who wish to return to the academy for a postprofessional focus on urban development, corporate finance and legal practices. Students take 18 credits in the Architecture department and 18 credits in the College of Business with many courses offered evenings and weekends.

Study Abroad In Italy:

Central to the academic experience is the opportunity to participate in our architectural study abroad program. Located in Genoa, Italy, and ideally situated in the historic center of the city, the department's architectural study abroad center occupies a newly renovated former convent dating from the 13th century. During the semester, students in Genoa are afforded the opportunity to study those artistic and architectural spaces and artifacts that have long been acknowledged for their exceptional and enduring value to Western design culture. Students are taught by FIU faculty and Italian guest faculty and

take a full course load while studying in Genoa. Central to the academic experience are numerous faculty-led academic fieldtrips to Rome, Florence, Milan, Torino, Pisa and Venice.

C. Long-Range Planning

The department has a strategic plan that has guided its evolution over the last five years. The plan was developed by the chair in 2005 with input from the faculty through departmental strategic planning sessions, faculty retreats and ongoing discussion. Most of the short-term goals have been fulfilled. Many of the long-term goals will be accomplished by 2011.

The Department held two faculty retreats in the past three years focusing on:

- Curricular review and program response to changes in the NAAB's Conditions
- Curricular review in relation to 2008 NAAB VTR
- Departmental strategic plan in relation to college strategic planning
- Departmental strategic plan in relation to ongoing University strategic planning
- Development of departmental SWOC planning document
- NAAB's five perspectives in relation to curricular and strategic planning

Departmental planning documents (SWOC, Strategic Plan, Mission & Vision Statement) are incorporated into the college's planning process and were also submitted for the university's planning process.

The Strategic Plan has ten core areas:

1. **Curriculum Development** Developing meaningful degree programs and courses.
2. **Program Enhancement** Developing high quality programs, activities and events that enrich academic life and the reputation of the program, school and University.
3. **Academic Standards** Recognizing and promoting quality in admissions, enrollment management and evaluation processes throughout the program.
4. **Student Development** Offering opportunities for personal and professional growth.
5. **Research/Creative Activity** Extending faculty expertise and promoting a broad definition of research
6. **Faculty Development** Offering opportunities for personal and professional growth.
7. **Information Technology** Integrating digital technologies into the educational mission of the program.
8. **Outreach and Service** Connecting the value of design education at FIU to the city and the architectural profession.
9. **Development** Creating a sound endowment program with active alumni, professional and collateral participation.

- 10. Communication** Building relationships with state, regional and local professional groups to promote the program and foster internship and mentorship programs.

Each core area has long-term and short-term goals that together create a roadmap for the implementation of the strategic plan.

Architecture Program Strategic Goals:

Short term (1-3 years) Long term(3-10 years)

1. Curriculum Development

Developing meaningful programs and courses.

Short-term goals:

Clarify and revise the respective curricula for all architecture degrees in response to NAAB changes, and changing professional landscape. Assess and strengthen consistency and curricular transferability in design, technology, history/theory, taking into account faculty expertise and program needs. Develop a non-studio based bachelor degree. Integrate the Genoa program as an essential component of all curricula.

Long-term goals:

Develop a more central and integrative digital technologies curriculum (cad-cam, BIM, software transition). Establish a digital technologies output lab (cadcam, laser cutter, CNC, 3d printer). Establish permanent downtown studio/classroom facility. Develop post professional degree in Architecture. Develop innovations in studio-based teaching. Strengthen intellectual rigor across program.

2. Program Enhancement

Developing high-quality programs, activities and events that enrich academic life in the program.

Short-term goals:

Continue to offer diverse lectures, field trips, programs and exhibitions. Clarify the range of our activities; do less and do it better. Provide an off campus experience to 50% of students.

Long-term goals:

Maximize the impact of all programs. Consider a required off-campus experience for all Students.

3. Academic Standards

Promoting quality in admissions and enrollment management throughout the Architecture Program.

Short-term goals:

Institute portfolio for freshman entrance. Institute more rigorous progression requirements and tracking. Institute procedures to ensure that curricula are followed. Develop targeted program admissions literature. Develop semester post-mortem for non-studio courses. Institute faculty interviews as an optional aspect of admissions. Institute an internal database system to allow timely communications with applicant pool.

Long-term goal:

Establish and sustain an ideal admissions yield for the program.

4. Student Development

Offering opportunities for personal and educational growth.

Short-term goals:

Involve faculty in the advising process. Create an automated system of notification for registration advising. Develop a formal mentoring program. Strengthen the portfolio design / graphic design course components. Institute a "for credit" apprenticeship /mentorship program.

Long-term goals:

Place career development resources in reading room. Install a career services /placement officer.

5. Research/creative activity

Extending faculty expertise and promoting a broad definition of research.

Short-term goals:

Develop a School of Architecture (SOA) research agenda. Increase faculty research / creative activity and participation at national / international conferences. Recognize and reward a variety of faculty accomplishments. Establish an SOA ad hoc committee to identify and prioritize research agenda.

Long-term goals:

Seek publication of faculty work in single volume Support a faculty research studio

6. Faculty Development

Offering opportunities for personal and professional growth.

Short-term goals:

Continue to maintain high standards in faculty recruiting and promotion. Increase faculty funding for development travel and research. Clarify the workload statement. Develop a consistent mentoring system

Long-term goals:

Develop a faculty exchange program with firms and other academic programs. Develop a rotation system that allows for a paid semester of research every six years.

7. Information Technology

Integrating digital technologies fully into the educational mission and curricular structure of the program.

Short-term goals:

Continue to provide outstanding service and support to students. Increase the copy hardware in the studios. Provide wireless technology in the building. Provide an additional digital teaching lab. Provide a laser cutter, CNC 3 axis mill. Develop an image bank of student work and SOA activities. Implement a laptop program for all students.

Long-term goals:

Provide a 3d printer and convert the shop into a digital output shop Develop a centralized digital imagery center for all faculty & students Develop additional digital technologies courses (tooling theories, CNC milling, advanced digital theories)

8. Outreach and service

Connecting the value of design education to the region, the city and the profession.

Short-term goals: Communicate the accomplishments of the program in outreach and service. Offer more architecture curricula at DASH. Fully integrate the missions of the Downtown studios, metropolitan center projects, solar decathlon into the program. Seek and secure funding for a permanent downtown studio (focus on urbanism, smart growth, environmental issues and sustainability) Liaison with the Italian consulate and Italian chamber of commerce to bring the Italian and the Miami design communities together. Work with local and regional Not for Profits on community projects & moderate income

housing initiatives. Promote faculty and student accomplishments through professional organizations, museums and collaterals.

Long-term goals:

Develop initiatives in pre-Arch/career discovery, Develop continuing education and web based courses.

9. Development

Creating a sound endowment with active alumni, professional and collateral organization participation.

Short-term goals:

Develop SOA alumni newsletter and publication marketing platforms (analog and digital). Increase alumni support.

Long-term goals:

Secure funding for supporting digital shop. Plan an alumni campaign. Develop a brochure on planned giving Seek funding from 5 major regional corporate sources (LBA, Rinker, Turner). Grow the endowment to 5 million dollars by 2015. Grow the endowment to 10 million dollars by 2020.

10. Communication

Communication within and beyond the SOA community. Building relationships with state, regional and local professional/ governmental parties to promote the program and to foster internships, development, and partnerships.

Short-term goals:

Create a new school website Increase sponsored studios and short-term partnerships Communicate with targeted stake holders on a semester basis Involve more local professionals in the program Develop a career/network day Seek venues for publicizing the work of faculty and students Invite "targeted" national/international leaders to reviews/lectures

Long-term goals:

Develop targeted long-term partnerships with local and regional corporate and professional parties. Develop targeted long-term partnerships with local and regional governmental agencies.

D. Self-Assessment

Self-assessment occurs continually and in various forms. The department annually assesses the program, the faculty, and courses and involves all stakeholders including students, faculty, administration, staff, alumni and professionals. Institutionally mandated planning and assessment procedures serve as an important component of self-assessment. These include annual program outcome assessment, annual student learning outcome assessment, annual faculty and administrator performance reviews, as well as course and faculty assessment. Additionally, the chair and the faculty continually assess program progress relative to the strategic plan.

Each year the program has external reviewers (licensed professionals and visiting critics) use a Student Learning Outcome Evaluation Form to evaluate student work by means of a five-point matrix. Reviewers are asked to determine if the work exceeds expectations, meets expectations or needs improvement relative to the five learning outcomes. The following student learning outcomes are evaluated:

- Knowledge Acquisition

- Communication Skills
- Critical Thinking
- Formal Resolution
- Technical Application
- Presentation Completeness
- Creative Expression

Evaluations are collected each year and data are compared against previous year's data. The program responds to the results with appropriate levels of modification. In Spring 2010, evaluators determined:

- 100% of student work met or exceeded expectations in "Knowledge Acquisition"
- 85.7% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Communication Skills"
- 100% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Critical Thinking"
- 100% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Formal Resolution"
- 100% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Technical Application"
- 100% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Presentation Completeness"
- 85.7% of the work met or exceeded expectations in "Creative Expression"

Comparative data for all years are kept by the department and will be made available to the visiting team.

Scheduled meetings of the departmental faculty, called by the chair, are held on a monthly basis throughout the year to discuss issues of departmental operation, organization and performance, governance issues as well as curricular and budgetary matters.

Faculty retreats are held when needed and are used as a mechanism for self-assessment. We have held departmental retreats in 2008 and 2010 and the college held a retreat in 2010.

The department developed a comprehensive review of our strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges during the 2010 retreat (see I.1.4 SWOC) This document was used in the development of the college's SWOC analysis.

The department holds a full-day "post-mortem" self-assessment at the conclusion of each semester. The purpose is to collectively assess the work of all design studios in relation to our curricular expectations, and in relation to the NAAB-determined student performance criteria (SPC). These meetings are led in the fall by the chair and in the Spring by an invited guest from either the profession or academe. A secondary objective is a discussion and assessment of the program's progress-as evidenced in student work-in relation to the broader national perspective. Recent consultants have included Peter McKeith, Associate Dean Washington University, Peter Magyar, Director, Florida Atlantic University, Terry Riley, Director, Miami Art Museum and Marvin Malecha, AIA President.

Student evaluations of faculty and courses are an important assessment tool and are conducted each semester for every course. These evaluations contribute to the comprehensive assessment of program quality and serve as part of the chair's annual summative evaluation of faculty. These are kept on file by the department. Evaluations of each course and faculty are kept on file by the department and will be made available to the Visiting Team.

Assessment by professionals in the community on design juries and alumni participation in final presentations provide another opportunity to measure the continual improvement of the program. Visitors to the school routinely complete a comparative written appraisal of student performance using a standardized assessment instrument (see Student Learning Outcomes above).

Continual assessment also occurs through an ongoing dialogue with student leadership, through evaluations from graduating students, current students and through alumni surveys, as well as through surveys of design professionals. Together, these formal and informal assessments provide opportunities for various stakeholders to address successes and deficiencies in the program.

Regularly scheduled meetings between school administration, student groups and elected student leaders further our ability to measure the performance of the program and help to identify strategies for improvement.

Several standing committees serve to evaluate and enhance the quality of the program. The Curriculum Committee evaluates all proposals for curricular change and is the liaison with college and university committees.

A departmental Academic Standards Committee is involved in self-assessment of student standards.

The school's administrative leaderships, comprising the three (3) departmental chairs, the coordinator of lower division meet weekly. This group meets with advising staff to assess and respond to advising, progression and admissions issues.

Stream coordinators typically organize and review more limited topics within their respective curricular divisions, and typically become the Architecture program's liaison with the adjunct faculty teaching in their respective divisions.

The department deploys numerous processes and instruments for evaluating faculty and staff including:

- Mandatory annual reports by faculty
- Annual evaluation of all faculty by the department chair
- Third-year evaluation of tenure-track faculty by department chair and senior faculty
- Periodic review of adjunct faculty

As part of its strategic planning initiative the chair and the faculty engage in a "*Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Challenges*" (SWOC) analysis. The most recent version was created in December 2009 by the faculty and administration during their retreat. The SWOC exercise analyzed the department in terms of its students, its faculty and its educational programs.

Departmental Strengths:

Students

- Diversity
- Student design talent
- Retention rate and graduation rate
- Entering student quality
- Strong placement in top 5 post-professional programs (Ivy league)

Faculty

- Dedicated and exceptional full-time faculty
- Experienced, talented and motivated adjunct faculty
- Collegiality and a culture of respect

Educational Programs

- High demand
- Clarity of mission and vision
- Excellent facilities

- Use of local contexts (natural, urban and cultural)
- Well developed procedures for planning, assessment and evaluation
- Commitment to progressive technology
- Transdisciplinary pre-graduate foundation
- Strong relationships with the profession
- Strong study abroad program
- DASH partnership

Departmental Weaknesses:

Students

- Student's academic preparedness
- Too regional in background
- Too many external demands on their time
- Writing and verbal abilities

Faculty

- Too few Fulltime faculty
- Salary compression
- Minimal faculty research support

Educational Programs

- Inadequate funding / scholarship support for students
- Small endowment
- Undersized support staff and administration
- A history of constant transformation and restructuring
- Lack of presence in Downtown Miami and Design District
- No In-house library resources (reading room)
- Inadequate IDP & career advising

Departmental Opportunities:

Students

- Extra-regional recruitment
- Leadership participation in national organizations (AIAS, AIA, ACSA, Etc)

Faculty

- Untapped regional funding for research support
- Additional department/industry partnerships
- Create department/government partnerships

Educational Programs

- Deepen our collaboration with DASH
- Broaden our relationships with regional design firms
- Strengthen our partnership with UNIGE
- Build stronger relationships with local and national industry
- Take better advantage of the context (tropics/sub-tropics as a unique context for research, teaching and practice)
- Establish permanent Downtown center
- Strengthen our community outreach and public service
- Create a vibrant design/build and fabrication culture

Departmental Challenges:

- Cyclical economy of the construction industry (boom & bust) affects all aspects of the department

Students

- Cohort management

Faculty

- Lack of funding to fully address salary compression

Educational Programs

- Meeting the differentiated culture, requirements and objectives of a professional architectural education while meeting the SACS, University and Florida BOG requirements
- Possible delays in implementing the new funding model
- Too many demands on limited resources and infrastructure
- Context of institutional transformation, instability and volatility
- Potential for new Miami-based private and public accredited programs

Summative Program Strengths:

As the only accredited graduate public program in South Florida, FIU Architecture is a high quality academic program, with a strong commitment to the integration of teaching, research/creative activity, and service. In the last six years, the program has been on a clear upward trajectory, within striking distance of national recognition as a top 25 program. This recognition could be assured with a small investment related to improving the national visibility of the program, its faculty and students.

Demand for admission is up across all programs and paths with graduate applications having increased by 175% over six years.

The fiscal situation of the department looks extremely promising due to a new entrepreneurial financial model that increases graduate tuition revenue for the department. The department has already begun to reinvest this revenue into the program through technology purchases, additional faculty, funded student travel and other value added components (see below for details).

Architectural education at FIU is based upon a passionate commitment to the teaching mission, with low student faculty ratios and high contact hours. With the exception of first year, studio sizes range from 11 to 13. First year students also have immediate access and exposure to full-time faculty.

In response to what has been a looming national funding crisis for higher education, the program moved to a new fiscal and enrollment model in 2008. This model increases graduate revenue generation and decreases undergraduate revenue generation for the department. This was accomplished by modifying one of our M. Arch paths from a 4+2 path to a seamless path that can be done in either five or six years. The new seamless path no longer includes the awarding of an undergraduate degree. This new fiscal and enrollment model allows a greater percentage of the coursework to be offered at the graduate level, thus generating significantly higher revenue for the department. The revised model consists of 59% graduate coursework versus 32% in the former model. In 2008 (at the time of the modification), graduate tuition revenue per credit hour was calculated at \$272 per credit hour and was subsidized by the state at a rate of \$14,665 per FTE. Undergraduate tuition revenue per credit hour was calculated at \$110 per credit hour and was subsidized by the state at a rate of \$5,905 per FTE. In short, this modification resulted in minimal curriculum content change but created truly significant increases in the program's revenue generation (an increase of \$1,033,078 for year-two of the new revenue model). The revenue increases are split-in a revenue sharing plan-between the program (used for value-added components) and the University (detailed information on the increased revenue is in I.2.4 Financial Resources).

At a moment when most architecture programs and most universities are witnessing a decrease in their base budgets, our program has seen a considerable increase – and will

continue to see that increase grow over the next three years - due to the program's proactive and entrepreneurial planning.

The department has a high quality faculty dedicated to teaching and the academic mission of lifelong learning. Seventy-three percent of the full-time faculty have degrees from the highest ranked American architecture programs.

The School of Architecture unites professional accredited programs in Architecture, Interior Design and Landscape Architecture. In the freshman and sophomore years of all three programs, students are taught together and fundamental design is approached as a transdisciplinary endeavor. Students learn to appreciate not just their own discipline, but at the initial stages of their education, they are taught to value both the commonalities and the overlap between the three disciplines. Finally they are taught to appreciate the unique characteristics and values of each design discipline. This pedagogical model sets them up for career paths that acknowledge the increasingly significant role of collaborative practices and interdisciplinary teamwork.

Within a research university, the Architecture department demonstrates a broad interpretation of research and creative activity. Design is viewed as a form of "applied research" which can be of benefit to society. Faculty design work and creative activity have received national and international recognition. The faculty has research areas related to environmental issues and sustainability, supported by over \$700,000 in grants and over \$2,000,000 in pending grants in projects on sustainability, environmental and structural design visualization, urban design, design history and theory, housing, outreach and community engagement.

The department attracts the highest quality of undergraduate (FTIC) students on campus. Demand for the program is high with over 350 applicants for 65 seats in the 2010 freshman class. Retention and graduation rates remain above University averages.

The department remains one of the most diverse accredited programs in the nation with over 80% of our graduate architecture students self-identifying as minority, and over 82% of our pre-graduate architecture students self-identifying as minority. NAAB reports national averages in 2009 at 36% for undergraduate architecture students and 20% for graduate architecture students. Likewise, faculty diversity at 44% non-white/minority is well above the 2009 NAAB reported national average of 22%.

In a spectrum of interpretation and application that ranges from the poetic to the pragmatic, the faculty share a strong appreciation for the tectonics of building. Believing that technical and structural considerations are a major source of ideas, spatial character, expression and meaning, this is demonstrated in teaching methods, faculty creative work and scholarship and in the student work. In the last three years, the program has introduced five new courses that focus exclusively on various aspects of sustainability. The comprehensive design studio sequence has partnered with the Miami Chapter of the Construction Specifications Institute (CSI) to give our students access to the very best and most up to date information in building technologies. Under the leadership of Professor Vassigh, the program is one of the first to deploy cutting edge structural visualization software as a teaching tool in our structures courses and comprehensive design studios. Students have access to the latest in digital fabrication, CNC milling, three dimensional printing and rapid prototyping hardware. In 2010, the program inaugurated the Environmental Technology and Structures Laboratory (ETSL), which is a teaching and learning lab. The department is currently partnering with Johnson Controls to outfit the lab with the latest environmental controls monitoring and testing equipment and software.

Our Fall semester Comprehensive Design Studio and its concurrent Integrated Building Systems course, were reconceived in 2008 to better address NAAB requirements. Together they allow students the opportunity to develop a building to high degree of resolution with particular attention paid to integrating technical issues into the design process. As evidence of this strength, our students have achieved success in building technology and sustainable design focused competitions including the 2010 USGBC competition in which our students won first, second and third place.

In 2005, The Architecture Department established a program in Genoa, Italy with its first cohort of seven students. We now boast one of the highest rates of participation in study abroad on campus with over 30% of our 2010 fourth year class attending the Genoa Program. Study abroad has become an important component of the program's curricula. Architecture students are afforded the opportunity to consider the artifacts and works of art, architecture, landscape design and urbanism that have for centuries been acknowledged for their exceptional and enduring value to Western culture. Students in Genoa take a full complement of courses including Design, History, Theory, Cultural Studies and Language. The FIU Center is located in the historic center of the city in a renovated 13th century monastic complex ideally situated next to the University of Genoa's School of Architecture (UNIGE). The program frequently hosts faculty and students from the University of Genoa's School of Architecture for mini-semesters in Miami. Through various forms of collaboration, the two schools have developed a strong partnership that has led to joint faculty research projects, collaboration on thesis advising, and sharing of resources.

63% of the fulltime faculty maintain professional licensure/registration. This compares favorably to the 34% that NAAB reported as the 2009 national average.

Using the South Florida region as a laboratory, Design is a form of applied research, of direct benefit to the citizens of S. Florida. The department demonstrates how community outreach can integrate service, teaching, research and creative activity, while promoting economic development. Recent funded examples of outreach studio include:

- Housing the Arts in Miami Studio 2010
- Chilean post-earthquake Reconstruction Studio 2010
- Solar Decathlon Sustainability Studio 2010
- USGBC New Orleans Housing Competition 2010
- MDX Light Rail Masterplanning Studio 2009
- FIU Alumni Center Studio 2009
- Miami River Mitigation Study Studio 2009
- Honors College Building Studio 2008
- Havana Waterfront Studio 2007
- Brownsville Subsidized Housing Studio 2007

In 2009, DASH was ranked as the 15th best high school and the 2nd best magnet school in the nation by *US News and World Report*. The Architecture department has been central to DASH's architecture curriculum through an ongoing \$49,000 annual grant that supports the teaching of college level architecture coursework to DASH students. Through this grant, the department has been able to offer coursework to junior and senior students at DASH since 2005.

During the past three years, the department has held at least two major symposia each year. Our HTC colloquia - sponsored in part by the Graham Foundation - provides a semiannual forum (Fall and Spring) for new research in architectural history, theory and criticism. Since 2008, the department held two additional public symposia. The first

focused on digital design. Moderated by Jeffery Kipnis, participants included leading designers, theoreticians and polemicists of the new digital design and fabrication movements. The text of the symposia along with critical essays will be published in 2011. The second, titled "Engaging the Urban" focused on emergent works of civic modernism in Miami and included an extensive exhibition of these architectural projects. The exhibition along with critical essays will be published in 2011.

The department has built a strong collaborative relationship with the African & Diaspora Studies department. In the past three years, we have partnered to bring African architects to FIU as part of our public lecture series. We have brought to FIU, exhibitions that focus on African architecture and urbanism and have sponsored and hosted a gallery talk on the socially conscience design work in East Africa by Donna Cohen & Claude Armstrong.

2. Conditions Met with Distinction

- I.1.2 Learning culture and social equity
- I.1.3.A Architectural education and students
- I.3.3 Faculty Credentials
- II.1.A.3 Visual communication
- II.1.A.4 Technical documentation
- II.1.A.9 Historical Traditions and Global Culture
- II.1.B.6 Comprehensive design
- II.1.B.8 Environmental systems
- II.1.B.9 Structural systems
- II.1.B.12 Building materials and assemblies integration

2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the ACSA
Gregory S. Palermo, FAIA
Interim Chair, Department of Architecture
College of Design, Room 156
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-3093
(515) 294-7163
(515) 294-1440 fax
gpalermo@iastate.edu

Representing the AIA
Krista Phillips, AIA NCARB
Principal/ Alaska State IDP Coordinator
RIM Architects
645 G Street, Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501
(907) 258-7777
(907) 279-8195 fax
kphillips@rim-ak.com

Representing the AIAS
Jessica A. Hester
607 S. Lahoma Avenue
Norman, OK 73701
(405) 943-7206
(405) 317-5706 mobile
jahester@ou.edu

Non-voting member
Patricia Bosch
Design Principal & Design Director
Perkins & Will
806 Douglas Road, Suite 300
Coral Gables, FL 33134
(305) 569-1378
pat.bosch@perkinswill.com

Representing the NCARB
Robert E. Armitage
State Board of Architects
Landscape, Architecture and Interior Design
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 773-0958
r-armitage@msn.com

Non-voting member
Stephen Schreiber, Professor and Program Director
Fine Arts Center, Room 457
Department of Art, Architecture, and Art History
University of Massachusetts
151 Presidents Drive, Office 1
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003-9330
(413) 577-1575
(413) 545-3929 fax
schreiber@art.umass.edu

Program Response to the Final Draft Visiting Team Report



Cassandra Pair,
Accreditation Manager
National Architectural Accrediting Board
1735 New York Avenue
Washington, DC 20006

May 23, 2011

Cassandra,

I have reviewed the Draft VTR in its entirety. We would like to thank the Visiting Team for their diligence and hard work during their visit and in the production of this report. We find it thorough, accurate and complete. There are two criteria that we ask the team to review since the findings are - in our view - based in factual error. These two criteria are II.4.1 Public Information and II.4.5 Pass Rate.

Our two corrections of fact are outlined in narrative form on the attached document. We have additionally attached supporting exhibits in order to provide the NAAB with demonstrable verification of our claim regarding criterion II.4.1. We look forward to NAAB's response.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Adam M. Drisin". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Adam M. Drisin
Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
College of Architecture + The Arts

School of Architecture

Modesto A. Maidique Campus, Miami, FL 33199 • Tel: 305-348-3181 • TDD via FRS 800-955-8771 • Fax: 305-348-6716
Equal Opportunity/Access Employer and Institution

Error of Fact: II.4.1 PUBLIC INFORMATION:

During the visit, the NAAB team was given access to current as well as historical recruitment and marketing material. The material included:

1. **Exhibit A:** The Architecture Department's current recruitment/marketing brochure which was created and **published in 2009 and has been continually in use since July 2009**
2. **Exhibit B:** The College of Architecture + The Arts' (consisting of departments of architecture, art & art history, communication arts, interior design, landscape architecture, music, theatre) previous descriptive/promotional brochure. This was created and published in 2009 and **was used during AY 2008-09 and AY 2009-10 but was not used after March 2009 due to degree nomenclature changes in numerous departments.**
3. **Exhibit C:** The 2009 Prospectus produced in June 2009 for all design programs in the College (architecture, interior design, landscape architecture). The Prospectus summarized school-wide news and accomplishments between 2006 and 2008. This document was produced and distributed to a small group of donors in July 2009 and **was never used or intended to be used** for recruitment or marketing purposes for applicants or potential applicants.

The team was supplied with all the above documents which constitute all current and historical material produced by the department and college since the previous accreditation visit in AY 2007-08. Exhibit's 2 and 3 were produced and used **before NAAB's 2010 Conditions went into effect** and thus cannot reasonably be expected to have used NAAB's revised language. **Exhibit #1** which includes the revised NAAB language was the only one used **after July, 2010**. Historical promotional materials containing the earlier NAAB language (#2, #3 above) were neither used, nor distributed by the department for recruitment purposes after the revised NAAB language went into effect.

Copies of the historical (#2,#3) and current material (#1) were placed in the team room for the informational purposes of fully presenting all promotional and recruitment material produced by the department since the previous NAAB visit in AY 2007-08. This includes material that was guided by the previous conditions and the revised 2009 Conditions.

We respectfully suggest that the historical material (#2, #3) may have erroneously been misinterpreted by the team as being current promotional material. This is not the case.

In short, both our website and the promotional/recruiting material (#1 above) contain the correct accreditation language in its entirety and note the date of the program accreditation visit as required in the "2010 Conditions". They have done so since the "2009 Conditions" went into effect on April 1, 2010. As such, we respectfully suggest that it was an error of fact that led to the determination of "Not met".

Should the NAAB require evidence that the change in language was done before the “2009 Conditions” went into effect, I would be happy to submit the dated invoice from the printer as well as the dated email to our webmaster with instructions to revise the accreditation language on our website.

Error of Fact: II.4.5 PASS RATE

The NAAB notes in the “2009 Conditions for Accreditation” that

“Annually the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards publishes pass rates for each section of the Architectural Registration Exam by institution....Therefore programs are required to make this information available...”

Criterion II.4.5 is predicated upon an understanding whereby the NCARB gathers, tracks, and publishes ARE pass rates. Programs do not and cannot have direct access to this information since graduates taking the exam supply information to NCARB and not directly to the program. In short, it is NCARB’s responsibility and obligation – as noted in criterion II.4.5 - to make the pass rate data available to accredited programs. II.4.5 clearly indicates that an accredited program’s responsibilities are limited to “making this information available”. This is only achievable if NCARB has and supplies such information. In the case of FIU and a number of other schools, NCARB failed to capture pass rate data due to an error internal to their organization. The NCARB was informed of the problem in 2010 and again in 2011. The program was informed by the NCARB that the problem was being caused by an error with their consultant’s software (Prometrics) and that the problem would be corrected. The program shared our written communications with the Visiting Team.

We respectfully suggest that there can be no basis for holding the program accountable for not “making information available” when the program is tasked only with making NCARB’s information available which we do. The program does in fact have a link on its website to the NCARB website that contains pass rates. We do not believe it reasonable to hold the program liable for a failing in the NCARB’s website or the data gathering abilities of the NCARB’s consultant (Prometrics).

While, we recognize the dilemma faced by the Visiting Team in responding to this particular criterion, we respectfully submit that the only fair and equitable solution would be to find this condition “Met” while noting the circumstances. The program believes it implausible that it would be held liable for NCARB’s failure to collect, supply and publish pass rate information on their website. To be clear, the Program is required by NAAB to “make the information available”, which we have complied with by linking our website to the NCARB website’s pass rate database. That NCARB has failed to upload data on FIU, should not be held against the program. And thus we consider the finding of “Not Met” for this criterion – given the circumstances – both wrongfully punitive and an error of fact.