

*2020 Conditions  
and Procedures*  
**Plan to Correct**  
for Continuing  
Accreditation

Academy of Art University  
School of Architecture

M.Arch Track 1 (63 Units)

M.Arch Track 2 (87 Units)

Visit Dates: 04/18-20/2022

© 2021 by the National Architectural  
Accrediting Board. All Rights Reserved.

**NAAB**

National  
Architectural  
Accrediting  
Board, Inc.



## Plan to Correct

(Procedure 1.5.2, 2020 Procedures)

<b>Institution</b>	<b><u>Academy of Art University</u></b>
<b>Name of Academic Unit</b>	School of Architecture
<b>Degree(s)</b> <i>(check all that apply)</i> <b>Track(s)</b> <i>(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:    150 semester undergraduate credit hours  Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours  Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Bachelor of Architecture</u> Track: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Master of Architecture</u> Track: 1 (63 Units) Track: 2 (87 Units) <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Doctor of Architecture</u> Track: Track:
<b>Application for Accreditation</b>	<b>Continuing Accreditation</b>
<b>Year of Previous Visit</b>	2013
<b>Current Term of Accreditation</b> <i>(refer to most recent decision letter)</i>	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
<b>Program Administrator</b>	Mark Mueckenheim, Graduate Director
<b>Chief Administrator</b> for the academic unit in which the program is located <i>(e.g., dean or department chair)</i>	N/A
<b>Chief Academic Officer of the Institution</b>	Eileen Everett, Chief Academic Officer
<b>President of the Institution</b>	Dr. Elisa Stephens, President, Academy of Art University
<b>Individual submitting the APR</b>	Anne Connors, Vice President of Compliance
<b>Name and email address of individual to whom questions should be directed</b>	Mark Mueckenheim mmueckenheim@academyart.edu



## **INSTRUCTIONS AND TEMPLATE GUIDELINES**

During an accreditation visit, the exit interview with the visiting team will include a list of any unmet conditions. A draft visiting team report is sent to the program within 30 days after the visit for corrections of errors of fact. When a visiting team report identifies 'unmet Conditions', the program is required to submit a Plan to Correct.

The program's Visiting Team Report and Plan to Correct will be provided to the Board to determine accreditation status and the term of accreditation. The Plan to Correct identifies the specific actions the program will take to correct the conditions not met within a specific timeframe, thereby assuring the Board that changes will be made in a timely manner.

### **Instructions**

1. Type all responses in the designated text areas. Add additional rows as needed to include all conditions not met.
2. Reports must be submitted as a single PDF following the template format.

### **Deadline and Submission**

Plan to Correct submissions are due 60 days after the last day of the visit. If the board finds the initial plan to be insufficient, a revised Plan to Correct is due by September 15 of the same year to [accreditation@naab.org](mailto:accreditation@naab.org).



**Plan to Correct Form**

<b>Conditions Not Met</b> <i>(List the number and title of each condition)</i>	<b>Corrective Action Steps</b> <i>(List all steps with descriptions for each condition not met)</i>	<b>Timeline</b> <i>(List timeline for each step, including anticipated start and completion dates)</i>
<b>Example</b> 5.4 – Human Resources and Human Resources Development	<b>Example</b> Corrective Action Step 1 Corrective Action Step 2	<b>Example</b> Start: Completion:
SC 6 – Building Integration	<p>We were surprised to not meet this condition. The way we approached fulfilling this condition was modeled after our B.Arch program (with increased rigor to fit a graduate level degree), which underwent a successful NAAB visit resulting in this condition receiving a commendation. The difference between the undergraduate and graduate condition was that we added our Master of Architecture Thesis ARH 810 course to the courses showing the evidence for SC 6 (in addition to our Integrated Studio ARH 619 and its companion course ARH 605 (Environmental Controls and Building Systems)). The inconsistency that the visiting team saw in the student work stems from this decision. Inconsistencies were only mentioned in regards to ARH 810 but not the other two courses. The quote that was included in the visiting team report for this criterion was an internal communication from a self assessment sheet. While this quote reflects the critical nature of our internal discussions, it is feedback from a single faculty member in regards to ARH 810 and is in no way a representation of a comprehensive assessment of the performance criteria in the course or the performance criteria as a whole.</p> <p>We acknowledge that our Thesis project is quite comprehensive and has many areas that fulfill the criteria of an integrated design project but lacks some of the detail. One of these details is the “measurable outcomes of building performance” that was mentioned as lacking by the visiting team.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.) Our first corrective action is therefore to remove SC 6 – Building Integration from ARH 810 and ARH 690, so that this NAAB criterion now lies solely with the Integrated Design Studio ARH 619 and its companion course ARH 605</li> </ol>	<p>It is our goal to make the changes as soon as possible, however some changes have a longer timeline for execution.</p> <p>Underway - Summer 2023</p>

	<p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Controls and Building Systems.</p> <p>While the visiting team found the evidence for integrated design in the two remaining courses, we will make further adjustments to address the concerns, which are as follows:</p> <p>2.) Our second corrective action is to enhance the “measurable outcomes of building performance” evidence in ARH 605 by adding two analytical components: Solar Analysis and Wind Analysis and measures of how these criteria can be comparatively assessed through building performance measures (inclusion of different types of sunscreens for example). With this, there will be direct evidence of students’ ability to demonstrate how building performance measurement influences design decisions.</p> <p>3.) Our third corrective action will cover the Integrated Design Studio itself. In a new course build update, we will add two comparative analyses: First, a comparison of construction methods (different materials of the structural system) and second, the comparison of building systems (sustainable vs. conventional). With this, there will be direct evidence of students’ ability to demonstrate how building performance measurement influences design decisions.</p> <p>4.) Our fourth corrective action will add a measurable facade option analysis (daylighting, shading, ...) to ARH 619, linking to the evidence in the companion course ARH 605.</p> <p>In making these changes, we feel that our studio sequence needs to change as well, as we need to introduce some of the integrated design questions earlier in the curriculum. We are therefore rebuilding our complete studio sequence, which is as follows:</p> <p>5.) Our fifth corrective measure is to institute a new studio into the sequence, placed before the integrated design studio ARH 619. Currently the two advanced studios (ARH 609 and ARH 608) that come</p>	<p>Fall 2023 – Spring 2024</p> <p>Fall 2023 – Fall 2024</p> <p>Fall 2023 – Fall 2024</p> <p>Spring 2024 – Fall 2025</p>
--	--	---



	<p>before the integrated studio practice architectural design on a relatively abstract level and large scale. Therefore, there is a bit of a gap between the advanced studios and the final integrated studio. We will rebuild the studio sequence by removing ARH 609 and replace it with a new housing studio that moves closer towards a larger scale, and therefore a higher level of detail. This new studio will incorporate more integrated issues that center on the topic of multifamily housing and mixed use buildings (which include a large housing component). We feel that this shift addresses the enhancement of current student skills and more detail comprehension. The change will allow for a greater understanding in the integrated design studio ARH 619 and lead to a stronger level of evidence in student performance criteria. This measure is substantial and requires a ground up rebuild of some of our core studios, which is a large undertaking as our online courses are written like textbooks with up to 50,000 words. This explains the longer timeline for this measure.</p> <p>6.) Our sixth and final measure is the enhancement of basic skills by adding course material to the early studios in our curriculum that better prepare students for the more advanced studios leading up to the integrated design studio. This measure began right after the NAAB visit and the initial team response. The measure is geared to enhance the abilities of our students further and introduce integrated aspects in architectural design earlier in the curriculum.</p>	<p>Summer 2022 – Fall 2024 and ongoing</p>
5.7 – Financial Resources	This condition was addressed in our July 25, 2022 optional response to NAAB, and NAAB’s November 28, 2022 decision letter states, “The program provided sufficient information to meet the requirements of this Condition. The program provided evidence of having secured necessary institutional support and financial resources, and of having the intention to do so in the near future.”	N/A