National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

2020 Conditions and Procedures

Plan to Correct

for Continuing Accreditation

Updated June 28, 2024

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

NAAB

Plan to Correct

(Procedure 1.5.2, 2020 Procedures)

Institution	**Academy of Art University**
Name of Academic Unit	School of Architecture
Degree(s) *(check all that apply)* **Track(s)** *(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)*	☐ Bachelor of Architecture Track: ☒ Master of Architecture Track: 1 (63 Units) Track: 2 (87 Units) ☐ Doctor of Architecture Track: Track:
Application for Accreditation	**Continuing Accreditation**
Year of Previous Visit	2013
Current Term of Accreditation *(refer to most recent decision letter)*	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	Mark Mueckenheim, Graduate Director
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located *(e.g., dean or department chair)*	N/A
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Eileen Everett, Chief Academic Officer
President of the Institution	Dr. Elisa Stephens, President, Academy of Art University
Individual submitting the APR	Anne Connors, Vice President of Compliance
Name and email address of individual to whom questions should be directed	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.

NAAB

Plan to Correct Form

Conditions Not Met *(List the number and title of each condition)*	**Corrective Action Steps** *(List all steps with descriptions for each condition not met)*	**Timeline** *(List timeline for each step, including anticipated start and completion dates)*
Example ***5.4*** *– Human Resources and Human Resources Development*	***Example*** *Corrective Action Step 1* *Corrective Action Step 2*	***Example*** *Start:* *Completion:*
SC 6 – Building Integration	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. 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. 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 Environmental Controls and Building Systems. While the visiting team found the evidence for integrated design in the two remaining courses, we will	It is our goal to make the changes as soon as possible, however some changes have a longer timeline for execution. Underway - Summer 2023

	make further adjustments to address the concerns, which are as follows:	
	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.	Fall 2023 – Spring 2024
	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.	Fall 2023 – Fall 2024
	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.	Fall 2023 – Fall 2024
	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:	
	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 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	Spring 2024 – Fall 2025

	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.	
	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.	Summer 2022 – Fall 2024 and ongoing
	Updated Plan to Correct – June 2024: **As requested by NAAB in the letter to Mark Mueckenheim dated December 4, 2023, evidence of assessment processes to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the above corrective action steps is provided below.**	
	Item 1) in the plan to correct above has been completed. ARH 810 has been removed from the list of courses with SC6 as a requirement. Since the last NAAB visit, ARH 810 was rebuilt as a first step of the plan to correct. SC6 is now only located in the integrated design studio and its companion courses ARH 619 and 605.	Fall 2023
	<u>Self Assessment Course and Student Rubrics</u>	
	Student Rubrics – ARH 605 and ARH 619	Spring 2024
	Self Assessment of student work by course faculty. With the new 2020 NAAB conditions, once every two years, at the end of the Fall or Spring semester's final grading deadline, we required faculty to fill out a student rubric to evaluate the general student performance in their course. The rubric allows faculty members to assess the Course Learning Outcomes and linked NAAB student performance criteria in	

	conjunction with the student work and give feedback to the leadership team of the school via a matrix per criteria, as well as detailed comments. The outcome of these rubrics is assessed by the school's Department Manager/Archivist, reviewed by the Directors, and discussed in a faculty meeting. However, since we instituted this rubric, we found that the work for faculty was rather cumbersome and the outcome was hard to aggregate. As a result, we changed the rubric to reflect all students in the course instead of collecting a rubric per student. The Student Rubrics and process are also an important tool for us to insure awareness and compliance among our faculty. A student work follow-up meeting for ARH 619 was held on May 28, 2024 (see below). A student work follow up meeting for ARH 605 will be held in September 2024. *Course Rubrics – ARH 605 and ARH 619* Self Assessment of course by course faculty. With the new 2020 NAAB conditions, once per academic year, at the end of the spring semester's final grading deadline, faculty are required to fill out a course rubric for their course. The rubric allows faculty members to assess the Course Learning Outcomes and NAAB criteria in conjunction with the outcome of their course and give feedback to the leadership team of the school in the form of a matrix per criteria, as well as detailed comments. The outcome of these rubrics is aggregated by the school's Department Manager/Archivist, reviewed by the Directors, and discussed in a faculty meeting afterwards. Course follow-up meetings for ARH 605 and 619 will be held in September 2024. Sample completed rubric forms are provided below: Appendix 1 ARH 605 Student Course Rubric-V5-FORM Appendix 2 ARH 605 Course Rubric-V6-FORM In Spring 2024, Studio faculty for ARH 619 completed course and student rubric forms provided below: Appendix 3 ARH 619 Course Rubric-V6-FORM Appendix 4 ARH 619 Student Course Rubric-V6-FORM Once the Spring 2024 semester ended, ARH Studio faculty held self-assessment meetings for ARH 605 and ARH 619.	Follow up Meeting in May 2024 (Some follow up Meetings in Fall 2024) (Follow up Meetings in Fall 2024) Spring 2024

	The ARH 605 Studio Faculty met on May 11, 2024. The assessment and rebuild meeting for ARH 605 Environmental Controls & Building Systems included a discussion of course effectiveness and content in preparation for plans to rebuild the course incorporating NAAB conditions Not Met. The meeting was a follow up to previous studio faculty meetings since the last NAAB visit. The meeting kicked off the rebuild of ARH 605 and ARH 613 starting in Fall 2024. The faculty reviewed student work (see Appendix 5 ARH 605 Student Work Samples) from the spring 2024 semester and the results of that assessment, and identification of improvements that need to be made were compiled (see Appendix 6 ARH 605 Meeting 051124 Summary).	
	The ARH 619 Studio Faculty met on May 28, 2024. The assessment of student work meeting focused on ARH 619 Integrated Studio. In addition to the assessment of student work, grade expectations, low pass high pass, and norming session were discussed. In these faculty meetings, all graduate studios are assessed. They occur every semester before the grading deadline. In the May 28, 2024 meeting, the faculty focused on the integrated studio which is the focus of SC6. The faculty reviewed student work (see Appendix 7 ARH 619 Student Work Samples) from the spring 2024 semester and the results of that assessment, and identification of improvements that need to be made were compiled (see Appendix 8 ARH 619 Meeting 052824 Summary).	Spring 2024
	In addition to the assessment processes for ARH 605 and ARH 619 outlined above, the following assessment processes are in place for all ARH courses: 1) Each course has multiple assignments throughout the fifteen weeks of the semester, which factor into the grading of each student's performance in the courses over time. Assignments are tied to specific student abilities, achievements, and outcomes, which are in turn tied to the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs). 2) Each course follows a grading matrix and a Grade Book housed in the Learning Management System (LMS); these matrixes have been established in Department Action Team (DAT) meetings with faculty and are frequently reviewed. The faculty has a choice to use the grade book as a fine grading matrix to grade every single micro step of an	All assessment processes are currently in place.

	assignment, or grade more holistically per assignment throughout the semester. The grading per assignment is tracked by Grade Book so that the student work is assessed throughout the semester and reflected in the final grade. 3) The Grade Book maps topics/gradable events to weighted categories (e.g., Assignments 35%, Midterm Presentation 25%, etc.) in the grading breakdown submitted to the Curriculum Department for each course. It provides a running calculation for both faculty and students and, at key points in the semester, presents a visualization of the relative weights of the categories and students' performance in each. Prior to submitting official grades, faculty have the ability to make manual adjustments to calculations to account for factors such as extra effort, improvement, etc. 4) In the LMS, faculty can track student progress through the module content by selecting a student name on the Outline. Green checks indicate which pages and videos the student has, or has not, viewed. The student's grades for items in that module are also displayed. 5) Midterm reviews with the participation of other faculty members, directors, and outside guest comprising of local (as well as international - for online only) architects and academics, are a well-established culture for all our studio courses and thesis. 6) Apart from single assignment grades tracked through Grade Book, students are graded four times per semester: three Progress Grades at fixed intervals and a final grade. 7) Final studio reviews are held in an open forum, onsite, through a three-day exhibition two weeks before the end of each Spring and Fall semester, and online, through a joint ConceptBoard. In both cases, all final presentation work is visible to the entire school. Since 2023 Concept Board has been integrated into the onsite presentations and all onsite work is also posted on the joint concept board. Directors and faculty review the exhibitions informally and formally once per academic semester as part of the DAT meeting after the Course Rubric evaluation. This has become a major self assessment	

	forum for the studio section of the school, where student work, outcome and achievement is evaluated holistically for the whole graduate school. 8) Faculty are required to review elaborate and detailed course archives of each individual student at the time of the final grading of the course, to ensure that the entire student output over the semester is holistically assessed in line with the Course Learning Outcomes. The Course Learning Outcomes are mapped to the NAAB Student Criteria and reviewing the course archive is part of the final grading procedure for our faculty. 9) The office of Institutional Effectiveness publishes all grading outcomes in Tableau where it is frequently reviewed by the directors and coordinators. If any large holistic issues are identified, the outcome is shared with faculty in the semester preparation meeting before the start of each semester. For more specific issues, targeted DAT meetings are scheduled between the directors, course faculty, and/or course authors. 10) Students give detailed feedback in course and faculty evaluations; the Faculty Coaching and Assessment department aggregates the feedback and shares the outcome with Directors in the first quarter of each semester. Course content complaints and potential faculty deficiencies become quickly evident to the directors through these summaries. 11) The overall culture of the school allows students and faculty to raise questions and issue complaints about content and instruction issues openly. 12) Where deficiencies in the course content or the instruction become evident, meetings with faculty and/or course authors are initiated to discuss how to amend the course to evolve it further. 13) With faculty deficiencies, directors can involve the Faculty Coaching and Assessment department to help faculty members improve their teaching skills. 14) Whenever a student is failing or underperforming in a studio class, progress grades, grade comments, and the student	

	archives are reviewed by directors who also initiate a meeting with the faculty member and/or student if necessary. 15) ARH 690 - Thesis Preparation Midpoint, and ARH 810 - Master of Architecture Thesis, are evaluated as described above. In addition, the final review of ARH 690 which is also the Midpoint Review of the program, and the final Thesis Review in ARH 810 both have a formalized review process in the LMS, where each student archive and portfolio is evaluated towards the Program Learning Outcomes of the school using a Program Learning Outcome rubric written by the Director. A committee of at least one Director, Coordinators, Thesis and Studio Faculty are present in these reviews. The outcome of the formal review process is recorded in the LMS. The data of Midpoint and Thesis Review outcomes is aggregated by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, published in Tableau, and frequently reviewed by Directors and Coordinators using a three-year cycle of assessment reports and again during a formal program review. The assessment report and program review are designed to identify programmatic strengths and areas for improvement by evaluating the overall student achievement of the department's program learning outcomes (PLOs). Exceeds/Meets and Does Not Meet ratings represent the combined totals of the Midpoint or Final Reviews, which are reported separately. At the end of each semester the review committees consider the observed strengths and weaknesses in student work and send their narrative feedback to the Assessment department via the LMS. The academic directors and their faculty analyze the assessment results and narrative feedback to develop an assessment report outlining strengths and areas for improvement in student work. In addition, they develop action plans to improve achievement of outcomes where students are not meeting university-wide standards. 16) Final Midpoint and Thesis reviews are held in an open forum, onsite, through public presentations in the last week of each Spring and Fall semester, and online, through two joint ConceptBoards (one for each type of	

	review). In both cases, all final presentation work is visible to the entire school. Directors and faculty review these exhibitions informally and formally once per academic semester as part of the DAT meeting after the Course Rubric evaluation. 17) The faculty committees of Midpoint and Thesis Reviews are also a forum to discuss successes and deficiencies in student performance at the end of the curriculum. This happens on a small scale directly with particular student outcomes in focus, but also with a broad and holistic view that allows us to make decisions for potential curriculum changes with significant participation by design-relevant faculty. Each Final Thesis Review has a 40 minute review time followed by a 20 minute (per student) deliberation period giving ample time for the very fruitful discussions that become the basis for reflections and corrections throughout our curriculum. **The extensive self assessment measures we have in place will support the successful implementation of the plan to correct. In addition, we will also review the processes and outcomes in specifically scheduled ongoing meetings with all involved faculty. In these meetings, we will review student work outcomes; compare the work to previous semesters before the implementation of the plan; hear faculty feedback and concerns; and review student feedback.**	
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

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY. CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY™

ARH- 605 Student Course Rubric
(Continued)

Semester and Year

Please filll in how you would rate the overall performance of your students in regards to the Course Goals and Objectives and the NAAB Student Performance Criteria

	Strongly Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet
SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment— Students work shows that the student understands the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.			X	
SC.3 Regulatory Context— How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.			X	
SC.4 Technical Knowledge— Students work shows that the student understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design,economics, and performance objectives of projects.		X		
SC.6 Building Integration— How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.		X		

Strongly Exceeds (A+, A, A-)	Exceeds (B+, B, B-)	Meets (C+, C)	Does not Meet (C- and lower)
The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that strongly exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.	The Student work does not show an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY. CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY™

ARH- 605 Student Course Rubric

Semester and Year

Spring 2024

Please filll in how you would rate the overall performance of your students in regards to the Course Goals and Objectives and the NAAB Student Performance Criteria

Faculty Names

Paul Hallowell

Course Goals and Objectives -	Strongly Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet
CG-1 Articulate the importance of related professional disciplines in the process of design	X			
CG-2 Evaluate and select appropriate mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and acoustical systems for a building		X		
CG-3 Create a documentation of existing conditions in form of diagrams and plan material and analyze these contextual circumstances in order to make informed design decisions throughout the semester.			X	
CG-4 Relate systems into building design and construction		X		
CG-5 Make an educated design decision based on their understanding of the inter-connectedness of climate, building shape, occupant comfort, thermal envelope, conditioning systems, lighting systems, acoustics, and whole building energy consumption			X	

Strongly Exceeds (A+, A, A-)	Exceeds (B+, B, B-)	Meets (C+, C)	Does not Meet (C- and lower)
The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that strongly exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.	The Student work does not show an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.

Semester and Year

Spring 2024

ARH- 605 Course Rubric- Course Learning Outcomes Self-Assessment

Faculty Name (s): Paul Hallowell

Course Learning Outcomes	Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.
CLO-1: Articulate the importance of related professional disciplines in the process of design.	10
CLO-2: Evaluate and select appropriate mechanical, electrical, plumbing, and acoustical systems for a building.	8
CLO-3: Relate systems into building design and construction.	9
CLO-4: Make an educated design decision based on their understanding of the inter-connectedness of climate, building shape, occupant comfort, thermal envelope, conditioning systems, lighting systems, acoustics, and whole building energy consumption.	7

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements or ways to better meet these goals and objectives):

I recommend tuning some of the course content more towards modern technology, systems, or practice (a couple examples would be VRF systems for mechanical or LED for lighting), and less on historical or specialized systems (such as steam heating or incandescent lighting).

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.3- Ecological Knowledge and Responsibiltiy

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.3 - Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility -
How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities.

Program Criteria PC.3- Ecologicaly Knowledge and Responsibility

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

PC.3 - Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility - The program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments	8
enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological in their work and advocacy activities.	6
advanced building performance in their (student's) work and advocacy activities.	8
adaptation, and resilience principlesn their work and advocacy activities.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

I think adding additional discussion of where energy comes from for a specific region or project site, how that energy is produced, and potential discussion of historical designs (pre-electric) would help to enhance the understanding of relationship between the building and environment.

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.1- Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Enviornment

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—
How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—The program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.	7

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

As a companion course to the ARH 619 integrated studio, this course focuses mainly on smaller scales such as specific buildings. I don't believe I would recommend adding too much more content on cities, regions, or even countries as this would seem to move beyond the scope of a building's environmental controls.

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.3 Regulatory Context

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—The program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety	7
land use	7
current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States	7
the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.	7

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

I believe the fundamental principals of these elements are discussed but recommend the course remain focused on a specific area/site for local laws and regulations as these can vary fairly drastically across state and country lines.

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.4 Technical Knowledge

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—The program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems		8
	technologies	8
	assemblies of building construction	8
	the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

Similar to my overall recommendation, I think the course content should be tuned to focus more on modern or emerging technology, systems, and practices. As a mechanical example, more focus on heat pumps, VRF systems, ground source systems, etc. and when to apply each type based on size, scale, and type of project could help to provide a better understanding. Discussion of potential costs of systems (while continuously variable) from a comparative view point would also help enhance when one system would be preferred over another (mechanical, lighting, envelope, etc). We discussed this in the faculty meetings and I believe this will be part of the course updates in the efforts regarding the NAAB plan to correct.

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.6 Building Integration

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.6 Building Integration—The program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies	8
structural systems	9
environmental control systems	8
life safety systems	7
and the measurable outcomes of building performance.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

There is a strong focus on indoor/outdoor space and passive systems which I still believe is important. However, additional focus and discussion on where that demarcation is in the envelope design would be beneficial for understanding everything from envelope types, impacts on system sizes, access and security, and general building performance. This was also a strong focus of our discussions in the faculty meetings, and I believe this will be part of the course updates in the efforts regarding the NAAB plan to correct.

Semester and Year

Spring 2024

ARH- 619 Course Rubric- Course Learning Outcomes Self-Assessment

Faculty Name (s): 7

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

Course Learning Outcomes -	
CLO-1: Apply conceptual architectural thinking to a building proposal addressing site, program, circulation, life safety, sustainability, structure and building systems.	7
CLO-2: Complete a comprehensive design applying constraints from existing site conditions.	7
CLO-3: Conduct relevant project research pertaining to building type and program	8
CLO-4: Verify planning and building codes for a given project type.	8
CLO-5: Management and community/social responsibility.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements or ways to better meet these goals and objectives):

7

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.2- Design

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.2-Design - The program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

Program Criteria PC.2- Design

PC-2A: The course instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment	8
PC-2B: The course and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.3- Ecological Knowledge and Responsibiltiy

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.3 - Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility -
How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities.

Program Criteria PC.3- Ecologicaly Knowledge and Responsibility

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

PC.3 - Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility - The program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments	9
enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological in their work and advocacy activities.	8
advanced building performance in their (student's) work and advocacy activities.	7
adaptation, and resilience principlesn their work and advocacy activities.	8

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

8

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.5- Research and Innovation

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.5 - Research and Innovation—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field.

Program Criteria PC.5- Research and Innovation

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

PC.5 - Research and Innovation—The program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field.	Ther

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.6- Leadership and Collaboration

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

Program Criteria PC.6- Leadership and Collaboration

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration—The program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams	Simil
diverse stakeholder constituents	I
dynamic physical and social contexts	As a
learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems.	I

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

NAAB
Self-Assessment
Program Criteria PC.7: Learning and Teaching Culture

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.

Program Criteria PC.7- Learning and Teaching Culture

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture—The program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages **optimism** among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.	I
respect among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.	10
sharing among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.	9
engagement among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.	9
innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.1- Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Enviornment

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—
How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—The program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.3 Regulatory Context

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—The program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety	9
land use	9
current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States	8
the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

8

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.4 Technical Knowledge

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—The program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems		9
	technologies	9
	assemblies of building construction	10
	the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

10

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.5 Design Synthesis

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.5 Design Synthesis—The program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements	9
regulatory requirements	9
site conditions, and accessible design	9
consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

9

Self-Assessment Form
Student Criteria SC.6 Building Integration

Course#:
Year & Semester:
Instructor Name:

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

Please rate from 1-10, with 1 being the lowest and 10 being the highest.

SC.6 Building Integration—The program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies	9
structural systems	10
environmental control systems	10
life safety systems	9
and the measurable outcomes of building performance.	9

Comments (Please list any concerns,ideas, comments or suggestions for changes or improvements for ways to better meet this criteria.):

Paul Hallowell

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY. CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY™

ARH- 619 Student Course Rubric

(Continued)

Semester and Year
spring 2024

Please filll in how you would rate the overall performance of your students in regards to the Course Goals and Objectives and the NAAB Student Performance Criteria

	Strongly Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet
SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment— Students work shows that the student understands the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.		X		
SC.3 Regulatory Context— How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.		X		
SC.4 Technical Knowledge— Students work shows that the student understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria architects use to assess those technologies against the design,economics, and performance objectives of projects.		X		
SC.5 Design Synthesis— How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.		X		
SC.6 Building Integration— How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.		X		

Strongly Exceeds (A+, A, A-)	Exceeds (B+, B, B-)	Meets (C+, C)	Does not Meet (C- and lower)
The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that strongly exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.	The Student work does not show an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY. CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY™

ARH- 619 Student Course Rubric

Semester and Year

SP 2024

Please filll in how you would rate the overall performance of your students in regards to the Course Goals and Objectives and the NAAB Student Performance Criteria

Faculty Names Eric Reeder

Course Goals and Objectives -	Strongly Exceeds	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet
CG-1 Apply conceptual architectural thinking to a building proposal addressing site, program, circulation, life safety, sustainability, structure and building systems.		X		
CG-2 Complete a comprehensive design applying constraints from existing site conditions.		X		
CG-3 Conduct relevant project research pertaining to building type and program.		X		
CG-4 Verify planning and building codes for a given project type.		X		

Strongly Exceeds (A+, A, A-)	Exceeds (B+, B, B-)	Meets (C+, C)	Does not Meet (C- and lower)
The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that strongly exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that exceeds the standard level.	The Student work shows an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.	The Student work does not show an understanding in this area or discipline that meets the standard level.

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY. CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY

Appendix 5

ARH 605 Student Work Samples

https://mediacenter.academyart.edu/share/8yDy4H1ZY4/kale

Assessment and Rebuild Meeting - ARH 605 Environmental Controls & Building Systems

May 11, 2024, 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

Course Assessment Review and Rebuild Discussion ARH 605/440 (including rebuild of ARH 613)

Participants:	
Mark Mueckenheim	Graduate Director School of Architecture
Paul Hallowell	Faculty ARH 605/ARH 440
Eric Lum	Faculty ARH 605/ARH 440
Eric Reeder	Studio Faculty ARH 619 M.Arch Integrated Studio
Charles Green	Faculty ARH 450 B.Arch Integrated Studio
Elizabeth Cohn-Martin	Faculty ARH 430/ARH 440 and Technical Advisor Sustainability

This meeting was a meeting as a follow up group meeting of singular discussions that we had since the last NAAB visit. This meeting will kick off the rebuild of ARH 605 (Environmental Controls & Building Systems) and ARH 613 (Sustainable Design) starting in Fall 2024. As a result of this meeting an outline will be written by the course authors Eric Lum, Paul Hallowell (ARH 605) and Elisabeth Cohn-Martin (ARH 613).

Agenda

- NAAB required self-assessment
- NAAB SC-6 Not met condition
- Assessment of the course in its current state.
- Faculty Feedback on how we can achieve measurable outcomes and integrate them in the studio
- Studio Faculty and Director's review of the course
- Strategy for a rebuild of ARH 605 and how we achieve the not met condition in the rebuild

Assessment

Implemented Assessment:

- Review of Course through Course Rubric (separate review by course instructor).
- Review of Student work through Student Rubric (separate review by course instructor).
- Review of Course through rebuild discussion and strategy meeting – this meeting.

- What is a measurable outcome, how do we understand this criterion? How does NAAB understand this criterion? In the past, we (the school of architecture) understood the "measurable outcome" as an empirical (design, research) driven measurement rather than a digitally (software) driven measurement. However, the visiting team in the last Grad NAAB visit understood the criterion as a purely software driven method and was missing visuals and evidence of this criterion in our student work.

- While it doesn't necessarily align with the design philosophy of the school, moving forward, it becomes necessary to implement the NAAB requirement as a software driven analysis in the integrated studio and prove a measurable outcome of this analysis in the student designs through clear evidence. The rebuild needs to be tailored in a way that students gain the ability to produce this evidence.

- Question: how measurable outcomes influence student design, direct strategy to meet criteria
- Rebuilding process is slower in an online program but rebuilds are initiated in the plan to correct.
- Assessment of course learning outcomes through curriculum discussion
- Assessment of course and studio goals
- Assessment of NAAB criteria

Results of Assessment:

• The ARH 619 integrated studio is a heavy loaded studio with a lot of requirements, it's paired with ARH 605 as a companion course which is the mechanical systems course students do a lot of diagramming in that course. And it it's meant to complement the studio work. The course provides the data component and all the analysis work for the studio, the students are doing this in ARH 605, and it closely complements the integrated studio they are linked together. The aspect of the design is so diminished due to the technical requirements that it becomes necessary to reduce the scope of the ARH 619 so that the students can actually focus on something to design.

• Students are required to work with the ARH 619 studio instructor, but also with professional “technical advisors” throughout the semester. They work with a structural engineer, a sustainability advisor, an MEP advisor, and a landscape advisor, periodically throughout the semester. ARH 605 builds the foundation for this work.

• ARH 605 might need to work as a “vertical class” with undergrad for onsite as we need to offer this class for international students onsite and this is a small cohort. We need to take this into account to fulfill undergrad and grad requirements and the different specifics of both studios attached to these companion classes. (ARH 605/ARH 440). There are workshops with engineers that run in both classes which both classes benefit from.

• The goal of the integrated studio is to focus more on the depth of the resolution, the integration. The design happens more in the materialization and the detailing, the integration, and ARH 605 is there to facilitate this integration.

• The idea of iteration to prove the measurability and integration over time becomes crucial in the rebuild. Daylighting could be an example. Start with a preliminary study, continue with a more detailed study in a further developed design and then show a finished design with a closing study. Basically, an assignment that measurements get revisited over time and so that changes in the design are tracked and measurable outcomes are documented for NAAB.

• Work level in the course needs to be maintained and cannot be increased so that students are not overloaded. Busy work needs to be eliminated and assignments can be reduced quantitively, but as SC6 is an ability criterion it cannot be reduced in terms of quality.

• Evidence needs to be produced and has to be very clear for a visiting NAAB team to be accessible, easy to understand, and assessed.

• Discussion about different software packages what to use and which software packages would be the best to introduce to students. Different pros and cons were mentioned for several packages and their relation and implementation into different CAD packages (Rhino/REVIT). In the end the group of faculty members settled on Climate Studio which integrates into Rhino. However, there is also an agreement that the software package needs to be introduced before ARH 605 so that the students will not be overloaded during their final semesters.

• Discussion about the class Outline, what areas of will be added and what will be kept. The question is also about the systems and the size of systems with the size of the buildings the students design and what type of integration makes sense.

• How much would we integrate sustainability aspects into the Environmental Controls & Building Systems course and the integrated studio. How would this link to the topic in the studio as a contemporary issue.

• While the rigor and depth of the content might differ, Undergrad and Grad courses should have same structure.

Identification of Improvements:

• Scope of building should be smaller so that there is enough time for students to get to fulfill the NAAB requirements for this integrated studio in the short timeframe of a semester.

• Plan to correct studio alignment should improve the student work. Prior studios are still too abstract and don't introduce the drawing detail necessary for this integrated studio. The ARH 609 rebuild (housing studio) and its focus on human scale and detailed drawing that is currently in process, should help this.

• Iterative assignments should be focus of the rebuild. They should align with the assignments of ARH 619.

• Climate Studio should be introduced to ARH 605

• Climate Studio should be taught in ARH 613 a rebuild/course update should be started for ARH 613.

• Integration of sustainability aspects in the course (either ARH 619 or ARH 605).

Next Steps:

- Climate Studio License for Faculty and Students (bought Summer 2024)

- Initiate rewrite of ARH 605 Spring 2024
- New Course Outline ARH 605 Summer 2024
- Rewrite/Rebuild of ARH 605

- Initiate rewrite of ARH 619 Spring/Summer 2024
- New Course Outline ARH 619 Fall 2024
- Rewrite of ARH 619 Spring 2025

- Rebuild/Update of ARH 613 to introduce Climate Studio before ARH 605

ACADEMY of ART UNIVERSITY®
DEFY THE ORDINARY, CREATE THE EXTRAORDINARY

Appendix 7

ARH 619 Student Work Samples

https://mediacenter.academyart.edu/share/uehYTFyO7t/pasipha

Assessment of Student Work - ARH 619 Integrated Studio

May 28, 2024, 10:00 am - 2:00 pm

Graduate Studio Self-Assessment End of Semester Student Work Outcome

Participants:	
Mark Mueckenheim	Grad. Director Studio Faculty ARH 608 M.Arch Advanced Studio II OS
Eric Reeder	Studio Faculty ARH 619 M.Arch Advanced Integrated Studio III
Aurgho Jyoti	Studio Faculty ARH 608 M.Arch Advanced Studio II OL
Ashley August	New Studio Faculty ARH 609 M.Arch Advanced Studio I OS
Antoine van Erp	New Studio Faculty ARH 609 M.Arch Advanced Studio I OL
Clifford (Chip) Minnick	Studio Faculty ARH 653 M.Arch Foundational Studio II OS
Kate Bilyk	New Studio Faculty ARH 653 M.Arch Foundational Studio II OL
Adam Barrett Miller	New Studio Faculty ARH 650 M.Arch Foundational Studio I OL
Ivy Hume	New Thesis Faculty ARH School of Architecture Coordinator

This semester many of the faculty members were new to the school, for over half of them it was their first semester with us, therefore the meeting was much less interactive then in semesters before. While they are all highly distinguished architects, all new faculty members who taught online were also new to online teaching. The meeting was therefore also more to introduce and explain our standards to our new faculty. It was therefore much different than prior assessment meetings.

Agenda

- NAAB required self-assessment, plan to correct.
- NAAB SC-6 Not met condition student work review in ARH 619
- Grading Norming Session on high-pass and low-pass grades for the Spring 2024 semester.
- Faculty Feedback on obstacles throughout the semester.
- Studio Faculty and Director's review of the joint studio Concept Board.
- Grading Discussion for the studio.
- Discussion deliverable standards for the studios.
- Student architectural comprehension and representation abilities, and their skills needed to move on in the studio sequence.

Assessment

Implemented Assessment:

- Review of Course through Course Rubric (separate review by course instructor).
- Review of Student work through Student Rubric (separate review by course instructor).
- Review of Student work through End of Semester Faculty – this meeting.

- Question: how do measurable outcomes influence student design direct assessment of criteria
Might not be possible in this assessment as courses are not yet rebuild
- Rebuilding process is slower in an online program but rebuilds are initiated in the plan to correct.
- General review of student work
- Review of high-pass and low-pass
- Assessment of course learning outcomes through student work review
- Assessment of curriculum goals
- Assessment of NAAB criteria

Results of Assessment:

• Heavy loaded studio with a lot of requirements, it's paired with ARH 605 as a companion course which is the mechanical systems course students do a lot of diagramming in that course. And it it's meant to complement. The course provides the data component and all the analysis work for the studio, the students are doing this in ARH 605, and it closely complements the integrated studio they are linked together.

• Students are required to work with the studio instructor, but also with professional advisors. They work with a structural engineer, a sustainability advisor, an MEP advisor, and a landscape advisor, periodically throughout the semester.

• Clarification to the faculty of general drawing standards, expectations, and general studio standards.

• This semester the group of students we evaluated were particularly weak.

• Extra credit exercise was a test run that we evaluated as an example of a compartmentalized assignment and that some students took on successfully.

• While the outcome of the studio is good and technically competent, the representation in the studio is still too weak, better representation will also lead towards better integration.

• Getting students out of the mindset from module to module – if students are stuck in this thinking, these are students who often fail. Lack of iteration is an issue in modern education in this generation of architecture students. Students tend to not touch the work again once they complete it the process is too linear.

• Analysis is done in this studio and companion class. It needs to be more apparent how it influences the design. This was a criticsm by the NAAB team and this should be a focus of the rebuild of ARH 619 and ARH 605.

• Some nice, elaborated drawings that took multiple weeks for students to develop.

• The questions is, how we can retain high architectural quality while exercising the analysis requirements from NAAB within the short timeframe of a semester.

• The representation level in this last studio should improve, the media and process classes need to be updated or rebuilt.

• Detailed review of low-pass and high-pass work:

High Pass:	Andreea Muresan
	Farshad Beheshti
	Blake Douglas
	Rivka Fried
Low Pass:	Batya Dickman
	James Fulmer
	Gabriel Lagouros

Some of the high pass work, are relatively unassuming projects design wise but they are technically very solid.
In the discussion some of the high pass work is showing evidence of how measurable outcomes influence the student design.

Some of the low pass work discussed in the meeting ended up failing.
The passing low pass work in the class is listed above.

Identification of Improvements:

• Scope of building should be smaller so that there is enough time for students to get to fulfill the NAAB requirements for this integrated studio in the short timeframe of a semester.

• Assignments should be more compartmentalized. The Extra credit exercise test run that we evaluated was successful and should be expanded.

• Students need to start developing wall section and details after the midterm in this studio.

• Key to elaborated/integrated drawings in the online system are several steps, this takes time, assignments need a multi-step process.

• Adding to an assignment in an “Upload and Update” fashion is a model that successfully worked for ARH 653 and might also improve other studios.

• To improve the representation level in this last studio, the media and process classes (ARH 651/ARH 653/ ARH 620/ ARH 659) need to be updated or rebuilt.

• Plan to correct studio alignment should improve the student work. Prior studios are still too abstract and don’t introduce the drawing detail necessary for this integrated studio. The ARH 609 rebuild (housing studio) and its focus on human scale and detailed drawing that is currently in process, should help this.

Next Steps:

- Smaller Building for ARH 619 for more focus
- Further assignment updates that have been ongoing since last fall
- More compartmentalization

- Initiate rewrite of ARH 619 Spring/Summer 2024
- New Course Outline ARH 619 Fall 2024
- Rewrite of ARH 619 Spring 2025

- Initiate rewrite of ARH 605 Spring 2024
- New Course Outline ARH 605 Summer 2024
- Rewrite/Rebuild of ARH 605

- Rebuild/Update of all classes in the Media and Process section to improve representation in all studios and ARH 619 initiate in Fall 2024.