University of Miami
School of Architecture

Visiting Team Report

B. Arch (171 undergraduate credit hours)

M. Arch
Track I: (undergraduate degree + 105 Credit Hours)
Track II: (pre-professional degree + 60 Credit Hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
26 January 2011

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Team Findings

1.   Team Comments & Visit Summary

On behalf of the visiting team, I would like to express our sincere and heartfelt thanks to Dean Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, Assoc. Dean Dennis Hector, Graduate Director Jean-Francois LeJeune, Undergraduate Director Rocco Ceo for their extremely well organized visit, the team room and exhibits our team enjoyed, but more importantly for their honesty and assistance during our visit.

Also on behalf of the visiting team, I would like to extend our most sincere thanks to the University of Miami President Ms. Donna Shalala and University Provost Thomas LeBlanc for their open and frank discussion which allowed the team to better understand the support they provide to the School, how much value this program brings to the institution and how this program fits into the long range plans of the administration.

The visiting team not only had the opportunity to see the wide breadth of educational offerings this program provides to its students but we were also able to engage the students, staff and faculty in discussions about the program and its offerings. The team found the following:
1.   We found a group of individuals, who are passionate, exited, committed and are advocates towards the education of an architect. This was felt all the way from the President's Office to the students at their desk.
2.   We found a faculty that is equally committed to the scholarship, the research and to the advancing of the art and science of architecture and design.
3.   We found a program that is not self-satisfied; instead, one that continuously seeks to improve itself and therefore improve the design community it serves.
4.   We found a program that has a strong family culture; a culture of care, nurturing and mentoring, that permeates all levels from management to students.
5.   We found a program guided by a clear vision and strong focus, which in turn advises the program's leadership in how to embrace the role the program has in this evolving world of ours.
6.   We found a program deep-rooted in community yet still an international model for others to follow.
7.   We found a program that continues to enrich the academic experience of its students by balancing the student's educational experience with the use of both fulltime and adjunct faculty as a means to provide the diversity in skills and knowledge that students need.
8.   We found a program where respect is at its core value, top down as well as bottom up.
9.   We found a program eager to reach out to its alumnus and colleagues keeping both involved in the program through teaching and mentoring opportunities.
10. We found a program where staff is as committed, as passionate and as supportive as its academic peers. We heard countless praises for Mr. Adrian Villaraos (shop), Ms. Gilda Santana (library), Prof. Carmen Santana and Prof. Sonia Chao for their extraordinary leadership and support of the program and their students.
11. We found a program that is a risk taker, improvising and adjusting their academic offerings to enrich the knowledge base of our profession. Their urban interventions and real estate program are two of many examples of this programs innovative venture.
12. We found a program with a nationally recognized architectural stylistic philosophy, and yet the students work is incredibly diverse, fresh and at times innovative.
13. We found a program that provides students a rich education filled with travel opportunities, whether they are studio projects or academic programs abroad.
14. We found a program with an extremely charismatic and insightful leader.

Over all, the team room was well organized; the meetings with the staff, faculty and students were extremely informative and filled with frank discussions. The meeting with the alumnus and local supporters provided a different but yet insightful view towards the program. The staff was courteous and helpful.

Personally, I would like to thank Ms. Maria Padron, for her coordination, assistance and watchful eye through all the preparation efforts the administration and I encountered during the month prior to our visit.

2.   Conditions Not Met

None.

3.   Causes of Concern

A. Building facilities: the team observed that the small scale of the school facilities can limit the long-term potential of the school, with too little flexibility in space for computing facilities, fabrication facilities, studio areas, and review spaces. This can, in turn, diminish the academic experience of the students, as well as limit the School's ability to meet the University's Long Range goals. The program has been an excellent steward of the space that it occupies: compounds of historic mid century modern dormitories have been well adapted to serve as the School of Architecture. The scale and assemblage creates an intimate environment. The team observes that the small scale of the spaces, however, can contribute to overcrowding in some areas and a lack of flexibility to expand their needs in other areas.

B. Academic content and consistency: the team observed that throughout the curriculum the program was able to show at which point on their academic education the conditions were being taught and emphasized.   However, as we analyzed and reviewed the totality of the students work it became apparent that the full implications of these issues on the design process were not fully manifested. Issues of sustainability, programming, life-cycle cost, specifications and design thinking skills were among the ones that the team had concerns about during or evaluation of the work.

C. Studio Culture: the team observed throughout the visit, that this program has developed a cohesive culture of respect, and mentoring among its students, faculty and staff. Indeed, most of the qualities the NAAB and AIAS studio Culture Policy aspire to have, are present.   The School has the required Studio Culture Policy document, but the team was concerned that current students seemed to have limited knowledge of the crafting and evolution of the current Policy and did not recall opportunities to revisit and update the document itself.

D. Long Range Planning: after extensive discussion with the Offices of the President and Provost, the department's administration, the team was able to better understand the University's current long range plan and strategy. It is apparent that the central administration is willing and able to assist the program as they comply with the Long Range Plan. The team, on the other hand, is concerned about the potential impact of the fiscal operational modification the plan outlines and further financial issues created for the department's operational budget. Similar concerns arose to the impact that the facilities may experience as the department complies with the long range plan.

E. Faculty and Students diversity: the team became aware of the current diversity that the faculty presently enjoys and we also became aware of the existing diversity in the student body. As the program begins to comply with the long range plan to elevate the admission standards and be better benchmarked against a set of pre-determined AAU Peer Institutions, the team has some concerns about the programs ability to maintain and enhance diversity among faculty and student body. And in doing so, still provide ample role models for those who want to practice architecture in a traditional mode, the researcher as well as the future academic.

4.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2005 B. Arch); (2008 M. Arch)

1998 Criterion 12.30, Program Preparation: Ability to *assemble a comprehensive program for an architecture project, including an assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and an assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria*

Previous Team Report (2005): While there was evidence that elements of programming occurred often throughout studios, the team did not find significant evidence that students were required to assemble a comprehensive program.

> **2011 Team Assessment:** The team found visible evidence that the program has undertaken extensive efforts to add programming as part of the project requirements throughout the studios and we found significant evidence that student were exposed and required to assemble a comprehensive program and therefore utilize programming as part of their design process. The team found limited documentation of the students own directed or assembled program. The team on the other hand was able to observe during our studio visits, the individual evidence of the students ability to develop their own program. During our visit to several studios we observed several projects teams in the process of developing a program for their current project assignment.

II.   **Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation**

Part One (I): INSTUTIONAL 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 programs have fulfilled these requirements for narrative and evidence

2011 team assessment: The APR received prior to the NAAB visit to the architecture program at the University of Miami provides substantial amounts of information and background for the team to have a fairly in-depth detail and evidence to potentially meet this criterion. During our visit, additional evidence was provided in our meeting with the university's central administration as well as the department. The Office of the President and the Provost provided additional insight into the role the program has within the university's system both academically and as part of the governance and stewardship of the campus as a whole.

As a standalone School with no internal program, unlike other schools throughout the university, the School of Architecture has an efficient governance structure that works hand in hand with the rest of the University. The program has in place additional connections to other programs through the sharing of resources, faculty and research assistance. The school sits on a compound of mid-century modern buildings on the campus and is part of the historical overlay on the main campus. Faculty serves as the "preservation" stewards for the school as well as the institution.

It is also apparent by the tone and statements made by the President and Provost Office that the school of architecture and its faculty is regarded with high esteem by not only the faculty but also general staff.

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 programs have fulfilled these requirements for narrative and evidence

2011 team assessment: The visiting team was able to verify each of the issues identified on pages 8 & 9 of the APR regarding the Learning Culture and Social Equity issues, this was accomplished through meetings, conversations and direct observation of the students, faculty, staff and administration. The presence of an excellent learning and socially equitable community was exceptional. The Dean's leadership was specifically noted in the supportive culture it promotes by a diverse faculty and student body. Governance structures and participation at virtually every level was evident. We found that this administration operates on a "lets figure out how can we can do this" approach in meeting challenges rather than "we can't do it because" approach.

The intimacy of the program has allowed faculty and students to create an environment of respect and commitment towards the education of an architect in a holistic nature. They share with each other, as well as intermingle within the community they serve. The recruitment of candidates is performed by the central admissions unit of the university, the SoA shares information regarding potential students with the administration of the university. They institution as a whole maintains a close watch on the student and faculty diversity balance in order to meet their goals.

The five-year trends indicate a decrease in White populations to 47% and increases in Hispanic to 23%. However, Black and non-Hispanic had slight decreases to 8% and Asian/Pacific Islanders increased to 9% of the student body. The student body has many opportunities to participate in the organizations and structure of the school. Hired this year were two new tenure track faculty of minority heritage.

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.[1] 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 programs have responded to these perspectives.

2011 team assessment: There is ample evidence of scholarship including a significant display of books and other publications by faculty. Some of these publications are the result of the individual faculty's passion and philosophical bend. One of the strongest aspects of the program is the community engagement. In addition to scholarly works, the program created the "Center for

---

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

Urban & Community Design" under the leadership of Prof. Sonia Chao. Its mission is to engage the program and serve as a facilitator to address urban challenges and design opportunities in the region and the international arena. Notable recent examples include urban design charrettes in collaboration with municipalities in Italy and design studios in Mexico, Colombia, and the Caribbean. Within the University, collaborations with the schools of Engineering, Music and Medical (in health care design) as well as participation in the Center For Latin American Studies., and the University Research Council.

In addition, several of the faculty serve as counselors to the Facilities department of the University as their historic preservation consultants in order to preserve and enhance the campus image as a whole. The School also serves the University as custodians of the historical preservation in the university's dealing with the City and State agencies while still being an active participant in the formation of the new university's Master Plan.

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

[X] The programs have responded to these perspectives.

2011 team assessment: Evidence of the programs response to these perspectives was observed by the team not only during studio visits but also throughout faculty and student conversations and interactions. Students, faculty and staff demonstrated an exceptional sense of civic responsibility that uniquely qualifies them to live and work in a global and diverse educational and ultimately professional setting. The program has managed to instill an amazing sense of community and leadership responsibility in the faculty, staff and more importantly the students. Students are also involved in a variety of organizations such as AIAS freedom By Design, USGBC Emerging Green Builders and The Student Body Council. In addition, the students under the leadership of the faculty are involved in real urban design intervention in and around the city. Currently, with the assistance of a grant, they are building a mobile food kitchen for a non-profit organization.

C. **Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment**. 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 programs have responded to these perspectives.

2011 team assessment: The APR as prepared by the School reported on the appointment of the program's new IDP Liaison, Alan Shulman, who was previously involved with the AIAS Chapter. During the team visit and discussion with Alan Shulman he reported he had attended the IDP conference held in Chicago last year and upon return to the University he had met with the Dean and began to formulate the school new strategy to enhance the programs past involvement with the profession as a whole. He began his efforts by meeting with every class to explain the IDP process to the students and its relationship to the registration board for the jurisdiction from which they wish to obtain licensure. His appointment is an effort by the School to have a more pro-active role in the IDP process and encourage students to enroll at an earlier stage of their education. One of the larger commentaries we received from the students involved the financial

burden that enrolling in the IDP program created for them. Therefore, Alan is making a pro-active effort to educate the students and find sponsorship that will pay for the enrollment of students in the IDP program and find opportunities for them to gain IDP credits through internship opportunities with alumni and professional contacts.

During meetings with students we were able to confirm that all had been educated about the IDP process; some students had decided to enrolled in IDP; and all of them were aware that they needed to do this and could enroll while still in school.

Based on the students comments the team believed all understood the licensing process and how the Licensing Boards was the regulatory agency at hand.

D. **Architectural Education and the Profession**. 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 programs have responded to these perspectives.

2011 team assessment: The architecture program at the University of Miami sits at a unique crossroads in blending the architectural educational core values with the professional requirements to practice at a global perspective. Their distinct urban core and philosophical bend coupled with commitment to sustaining historical precedents in their educational foundation provides the students a distinctive perspective. Their involvement with both theoretical projects and actual innervations within their immediate region and the globe is fertile ground for growth. As stated on the APR, the team found that the program views their professional responsibility for social and environmental impact of one of its core responsibilities as well as one of the school's philosophies. This attitude is well represented by their Center for Urban, Community Design's community based projects, which allow the student to experience the role, and impact architects have in their community. Their outreach studio explorations in Cuba, Venezuela and Columbia are examples of the program's outward outreach efforts.

Further validation comes from ARC 223, Architecture and the Environment, as an example of how allied disciplines are intertwine in classroom teachings, with participants from the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science and the College of Arts and Sciences. The students are exposed to the additional role that architects have experienced through their experimentation and exposure to construction through the Design/Build studio and the BIM-based studio taught by Professor Armando Montero.

E. **Architectural Education and the Public Good**. 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 programs have responded to these perspectives.

2011 team assessment: Through its many outreach studio courses and commitment to urbanism and place, the faculty and students are actively engaged in a range of civic contributions. A specific, long-term example of this commitment by the program and the

university is demonstrated by the support of its Center for Community and Urban Design. Additionally, faculty scholarship has resulted in significant publications related to regional, national and international communities.

I.1.4 Long-Range Planning: An accredited degree program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement within the context of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and, where appropriate, the five perspectives. In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely and from multiple sources to inform its future planning and strategic decision making.

[X] The programs have fulfilled these requirements for reporting and evidence

> **2011 team assessment:** The APR provided prior the NAAB visit to the architecture program at the University of Miami provided substantial amounts of information and background for the team to have an in-depth detailed evaluation and ability to gather the necessary evidence to meet this criterion.

> Additional information was gathered through our visit with central administration in discussing the University of Miami own long-range plans. During our visits with Mr. Lamar Noriega, Director of Development, Ms. Ana Santana, Assoc. Dean and Academic Service Director and Ms. Isa Garcia, Finance officer, the team was able to ascertain through their explanations, illustrations, notes, and additional data to validate the long-rage plan for the program. In additional discussions with the dean, program directors and provost it was ascertained the program is undergoing additional analysis. This analysis will outline a school strategy for compliance with the new fiscal mandates and the developments of new initiatives in order to meet the University of Miami new long range plans, as they want to reposition their institution among the top 20 AAU peer institutions. The University has developed a list of institutions that they wish to be benchmarked against. The Architecture school will benchmark programs such as Notre Dame, Cornell, and Syracuse.

> As a whole, the University's administrative leadership has a commitment to a clearly defined strategic plan, with long-range planning and clear benchmarks. The School of Architecture has aligned its goals within this plan.

I.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 programs have fulfilled these requirements for reporting and evidence

2011 team assessment: Self assessment is described in detail in the APR, especially pages 23 and 24. The Dean's rapid response to the Team's inquiries with ample documentation indicate that the School is energetic in understanding its place, success and failures, strengths and weaknesses in relation to peer cohorts and others.

The team found that the department's administration is undergoing a series of self-evolution programs including the integration of the library resources with the IT sequence, the introduction of a fabrication lab into their shop, the increase of research and its impact to academic teaching loads, a re-evaluation of the potential additional certificates program. This faculty is currently developing a strategy for the next decade. The progressive nature of the program's leadership is a plus for the health of this department.

Part One (I): Section 2 – Resources

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

▪ *Faculty & Staff:*
  o *An accredited degree program must have appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes full and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. Programs are required to document personnel policies which may include but are not limited to faculty and staff position descriptions[2].*
  o *Accredited programs must document the policies they have in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives.*
  o *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.*
  o *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.*
  o *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.*
  o *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 appropriate (or adequate) for the programs

2011 team assessment: The team deduced through observations and physical documentation of adequate human resources. In addition, the team was able to validate human resource development opportunities are available both for staff and faculty. The program is fortunate to have low teacher/student ratios, the result of the physical building limiting the studio sizes, a condition that the dean and the program administration are utilizing as a means to allow the faculty to engage in other scholarly ventures besides teaching. Furthermore, a tremendous civic responsibility to the long-term success of the students and their professional aspirations was demonstrated through the exceptional example that is being set by the faculty and staff through their notable research and publications displayed in the faculty exhibition.

Some of the evidence found is as follows:
• *Appropriate human resources*: APR/Part 1/1.3.3 Faculty Credentials, pp. 99-118; APR/Part Four/Section 2; APR/Part 4/Appendix I;
• *documentation of (EEO/AA) and other diversity initiatives:*
  APT/Part 1/ p. 27-28;
  http://www6.miami.edu/UMH/CDA/UMH_Main/0,1770,2607-1;52041-2;31380-3,00.html?pf=1
  http://www6.miami.edu/UMH/CDA/UMH_Main/0,1770,2607-1;52041-2;487-3,00.html
  http://www6.miami.edu/faculty-senate/FacultyManual.pdf
  http://www.miami.edu/index.php/hr/employee_handbooks_policies/policies_and_procedures/
• *IDP Education Coordinator requirements:* Meeting with IDP Coordinator, Allan Shulman; meeting with student government; meeting with student body.
• *faculty and staff professional development:* APT/Part 1/ p. 28; Meeting with staff; meeting with faculty
• *Criteria used for determining rank, reappointment, tenure and promotion as well as eligibility requirements for professional development resources*

---

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

APR/Part 1/ p. 29; APR/Part 4/Appendix I; http://www6.miami.edu/faculty-senate/FacultyManual.pdf

- *Students:*
  - o *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.*
  - o *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 appropriate (or adequate) for the programs

2011 team assessment: The team verified processes for admissions policies and procedures outlined on pages 41-43 in the APR through meetings with the administration and staff responsible for the admissions policies and procedures within the department. Detailed accounts and records of procedures and working relationships demonstrated excellence with students. Their activities are inclusive and not limited to admissions, transfers, financial aid and course placement evaluations for each student on the program. Any additional issues that may arise with the students are sent to the University's own counseling and admissions teams.

Student achievement is evident in the academic standards of admission at the university and at the school level review committees. The university as a whole has a very select cap of two thousand students for entering freshmen and the School of Architecture receives approximately 150 applicants for an entry class of 50 depending on the academic year. The University has a rigorous SAT and GPA requirement and has allowed the School of Architecture to include a portfolio review to assure quality admissions.

The school provides excellent student support counseling and enrichment programs through exhibitions, lecture series, regional and international travel programs. Each is an integral component of the student experience. On-campus and school organizations are extensive and are encouraged. The team was able to validate through discussion with the staff, students and faculty the facts illustrated in the charts on pages 42-46 of the APR delineating how the school supports students to regional and national conferences. In addition, the Peer Counseling program is also very effective in support of the learning environment, which is very interactive with clear and open access of the students to the faculty, staff and administration. Students are provided opportunities to participate in the scholarly research of the faculty through individual efforts and through the Center for Community and Urban Design.

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 appropriate for the programs

2011 team assessment: At first glance the organizational structure for the School of Architecture appears to be a bit more complicated than it is in reality. This seemingly small program is imbedded into a larger academic institution as the University of Miami; a well crafted organizational model. The Dean, Associate Deans, and its key Directors lead a well organized "family styled" group of program leaders that are passionate about their profession, the philosophical direction the program has

embarked, and the opportunity the program has provided to create a sound foundation for a young and eager students in their quest to become professionals.

The administration of this program relies on the fact that they are small but use this point as advantageous. They are constantly engaged in discussion on meeting their needs, the needs of the students and the needs of the University. The organization's environment operates in an open and transparent manner with complete support and dedication from the faculty and staff. The team found the SoA staff as passionate and committed to the education of the students as faculty.

- **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 appropriate for the programs

2011 team assessment: The team was able to verify the outline of various levels of governance within the university and the school as outlined on pages 47-52 of the APR. SoA is one of twelve academic schools and colleges within the University of Miami, which has a clear and comprehensive set of governance policies. The School of Architecture has a clearly defined organizational and governance structure with easily identifiable position and committee responsibilities for each academic degree, study abroad certificate programs and special research programs.

The APR appendix documents provide extensive insight into the Strategic Plans, Studio Culture Policy Evaluation Forms Criteria for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment. The team also reviewed official web sites and additional information provided by the administration and staff. Students and faculty have an appropriate role in governance.

Our team repeatedly heard from the staff, faculty and students about the transparency of leadership. In more than one occasion we were made aware of how easily one could reach the Dean and have issues discussed and resolved in a "can do" fashion.

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 programs

2011 team assessment: This is one aspect of the NAAB criteria that the team had some reservation and concerns.

The small scale of the school facilities limits the long-term potential of the school, with too little flexibility in space for computing facilities, fabrication facilities, studio areas, and review spaces. This can, in turn, diminish the academic experience of the students, as well as limit the School's ability to meet the University's Long Range goals. The program has been an excellent steward of the occupied space: a compound of historic mid-century modern dormitories that have been well adapted to serve as the School of Architecture: the scale and assemblage creates an intimate environment. The team observed that the small scale of the space, however, contributed to overcrowding in some areas and a lack of flexibility to expand their needs in other areas.

The school has learned to maximize the use of the space; facilities have improved since the last NAAB visit, and the 2005 opening of the Jorge M. Perez Architecture Center. The Center has provided

classroom, auditorium, and gallery space therefore, significantly improving the program's space needs and enhancing the academic experience of the students. Even during our visit when the team had to occupy three key studio and gallery areas, the school adapted to the temporary disruption, but as the day ended, it was a disruption.

If the school wants to improve its national rankings to meet the University of Miami new peer benchmarking with top AAU identified programs, more attention to physical resources will be an important investment and a challenge.

The team was delighted to see how the leadership of the school was a good steward of its historic buildings, but accessibility issues continue to be a concern. During our visit with the President Shalala, Provost LeBlanc and Dean Plater-Zyberk it became apparent that they are all aware of the issue and have a strategy to deal with this matter.

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 programs

2011 team assessment: The University of Miami is a private institution and as such has extensive responsibilities to deliver the facilities and resources required to conduct the professional degree programs of the School of Architecture. The team had in-depth discussions with Ms. Isa Garcia the program's Financial Officer and attain an understanding of the school's budget, expenditures and long range fiscal strategies. We were also able to verify the financial information provided on pages 57-60 on the APR inclusive of the recent changes in funding distribution. The total funding of the school is approximately seven million dollars per year. Over 95% of the undergraduates are significantly supported with scholarships that average 38% of their tuition. Until the past fiscal year the school retained virtually all of the graduate tuition funds. However, in order to meet the new financial climate the University finds itself in, a new funding model mandates the university to retain 30% of the graduate tuition in all programs throughout the institution. The dean has secured a two-year implementation plan from the provost to reduce the immediate impact of the new policy and a new challenge to expand the graduate programs to generate additional revenue. According to our discussions with the Provost, this is a transitional issue and is typical of most private institutions in today's fiscal environment.

Section 1.2.3 Physical Resources of the VTR addresses the issues of facilities, however, specific critical needs for space at the woodshop, and the need for a fabrication labs, additional integration between the information technology and studio and review spaces must be managed. Because of their awareness to this challenge the program is undergoing a new capital development campaign. The university has identified a ten million dollar development goal established for the School of Architecture. A fulltime development person has been assigned to the school through the central office of the foundation.

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 appropriate (or adequate) for the programs

2011 team assessment: The team determined the program has more than adequate informational resources available to students, faculty and staff. However, the library and computing facilities' location in

historic buildings provide some challenges to spatial arrangements and future growth. Presently the library occupies the first level of building 48 and the IT resources occupy the second floor of the same building. In conversations with Ms. Gilda Santana, Director of the Architecture Library and Ruddy Cornielle, Manager for IT Resources, both advocated the need for a seamless integration of programs resources. They are aware that as a new digitally based informational model becomes standard their two independent (departments) institutions should be combined into a single entity. Students have a limited collection of documents and images at the School branch while the remaining body of the collection is maintained at the Richter Library.   Students have access to supplemental technology programs and training sessions. In addition, students expressed a desire for greater FT faculty with computing expertise and for increased digital fabrication technologies and equipment. The library resources are excellent and very professional. The efforts by IT leadership to have both software and hardware available to the students are remarkable and well planned, many improvements have happened over the past five years.

It is the team's opinion that Ms. Santana is a jewel within the program because of her vision, passion and commitment to create a library that truly meets the unique needs of the architecture student. Her vision will allow the program to truly integrate the traditional resources found in a library with the new digital technology and expand the access to these resources for students and faculty as a whole. She is an invaluable asset for this program.

PART I: SECTION 3 –REPORTS
I.3.1 Statistical Reports[3]. 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.*

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

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

2011 team assessment: The team observed that APR provided the required statistical data regarding the demographics for the students and faculty portion of the program. The data for both full-time and adjunct faculty demonstrated a solid range of diversity, although the percentage of female faculty seemed low in comparison to the rest of the university and additionally to the percentage of female students in the school. The need for a well-balanced set of role models and a female faculty composition that is well reflective of student demographics are two needs understood by administration and the dean.

The required Statistical Reports are located on pages 67-69 in the APR. The student body is consistent with the profile of the university and the regional context in which the institution serves. The school has a diverse student population with males at 53% and females at 47%. Racial diversity identified as white 50%, Hispanic 16%, Black 4%, Asian 16% and other 14%. There are strategic efforts to increase diversity in the faculty in terms of gender and race who will also provide additional support as role models.

---

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

The recent promotions and tenure of the faculty has allowed the program to keep pace with the rest of the institution. Most recent hires represent a wide range of racial and gender diversity. The program currently has engaged in a working agreement with a predominately African American university to provide them with access to talented young faculty therefore gaining additional diversity but also mentoring other and allowing them to become new faculty members.

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.*

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

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

2011 team assessment: The program provided data in their APR and follow-up discussions over content took place with Dean Plater-Zyberk, Associate Dean Dennis Hector, Graduate Program Director Jean-François LeJeune and Undergraduate Director Rocco Ceo.

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

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

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

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

2011 team assessment: The APR and the faculty exhibits presented the team a well-documented array of material to attest to the program's compliance with the identified criteria. Faculty credentials and achievements documented in the Matrix of Faculty Credentials, for FT and PT faculty for the academic

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

year 2008 – 2009 illustrate a well-rounded and sound faculty who are qualified to educate the students in the arts and sciences of architecture. This chart lists in detail each individual's expertise, research, recent experience, and courses taught. There appears to be a healthy mix of courses and distributions between FT and PT faculty and courses. This balance of FT and PT faculty is a great asset and one of the program's strengths the team discovered. The Dean and staff are able to recycle the PT faculty through a multiyear system. This allows increased exposure to local and invited practice-based educators in addition to allowing faculty to stay fresh and diverse in their offerings.

The breadth and diversity of faculty achievement and competence is more than evident. The faculty exhibition demonstrated coherent and energetic faculty research and related achievements; and displayed a wide selection of recent books and publications produced by faculty in addition to an actual built-project. While not all published during the last 2 years prior to this visit, since 2009, 20 publications have taken place and at least a dozen more since 2005. Additionally, the on-going research, practice oriented faculty demonstrates this programs does not suffer from a complacent or stagnated faculty. The ability of the administration and the dean to allow its faculty to pursue both research and practice is an asset for this program as a whole.

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 were responsive to the requirements of Appendix 3

2011 team assessment: The APR identified many of the policies requested in Appendix 3 and were reviewed before the accreditation visit.

Such policies included:

- Studio Culture Policy

- Self-Assessment Policies and Objectives

- Forms for evaluation located in the Team Room

- Personnel Policies described in the APR, discussed in meetings with the faculty and administration, and additional information, such as description of special hiring initiatives to increase diversity, were brought to the Team Room

- Statistical data on Student-to-Faculty ratios

- The facilities data reflecting square feet per student and per faculty member was discussed and the school has initiated programs to increase the spaces currently provided

- Admissions requirements were provided in the Team Room

- Advising Policies, including policies for evaluation of students admitted from other programs were the subject of lengthy conversations with the Dean and Associate Dean. These are continually under review and improvement to address the varied background of the applicants and the different programs offered by the school.

- Discussion occurred over policies on academic integrity for students in the APR and during our meeting with the staff and faculty

- Policies for integration of digital media in architecture curriculum and policies on library and information resources are undergoing. These plans include the integration and development of both these media and their usage by the student.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria: The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between individual criteria.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation:
Architects must have the ability to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This ability includes facility with the wider range of media used to think about architecture including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making. Students' learning aspirations include:

- Being broadly educated.
- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.
- Communicating graphically in a range of media.
- Recognizing the assessment of evidence.
- Comprehending people, place, and context.
- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team was able to find sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

Evidence found primarily in ARC 203 and 305, subsequent evidence in ARC 267, ARC 268, and ARC 301. Examples of evidence demonstrated in projects such as, the Miami Museum Park and the Richter library expansion, an excellent execution of mixed media graphic representation. In addition, student work in primary courses reflects the program's ability to understand and execute layering of complex information, ideas and architectural relationships to theoretical, social and environmental contexts.

At the graduate program level, the team found the illustrative evidence in ARC 500 and ARC 699, subsequent evidence in ARC 504, ARC 567 and ARC 568. The team also observed exceptional achievement in assessing and understanding the context of societal needs in graduate studio/thesis work. The graduate students sensitivity to a variety of urban conditions and their ability to communicate them in the written content, graphically and verbally was exceptional.

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.**
B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence of ARC 101, ARC 102, ARC 203, ARC 204, ARC 305 and ARC 306 provided sufficient evident of the students ability to face a problem and develop the appropriate strategy, come to a series of alternatives that consider different points of views, test alternatives and generate well reason solutions.

At the graduate level the ARC 501, ARC 502, ARC 503, ARC 504 and ARC 601 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team was able to find sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

Primary evidence outlined in the undergraduate studio courses ARC 204 and ARC 306, as well as the work from the required drawing and computing courses ARC 111, ARC 112, and ARC 213 respectively.

Evidence demonstrated in the graduate studio courses ARC 501. Additional support for this is evident in the exhibited work from studio courses ARC 502 and ARC 504, as well as upper level studio options V and VI, ARC 610 Thesis, as well as ARC 511 and ARC 513, Media I Drawing and Media II Computing.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

The drawings shown in the Team Room were well presented. Graphic representation whether it was manual or technical was clear. The models shown corresponded well to the drawings presented and illustrated the topography of the site, the scale and materials intended and how the various components fit together. Undergraduate material selection and assembly were evident in sections prepared for projects for ARC 306 (Design VI) and ARC 230, which was a thorough study of building materials.

At the graduate levels, documented evidence was located in ARC 504 (Design IV).

However, we found limited evidence of the preparation of traditional outline specifications; it was present on some projects. But the team found that others of the same studio could be better documented in future exhibits for a NAAB Accreditation visit.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate ability level and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team found that structured studio courses demonstrated student ability in each stage of a sequence of project assignments. The majority of the students demonstrated the ability to gather, record, assess, apply and comparatively evaluate a wide range of relevant information, including historical, environmental, and technical information to the study of building precedents site, and ADA requirements. The team had to work its way through all of the primary exhibits as well as the backup exhibits to put a holistic assessment of the student's skills.

Some of the primary sources of evidence located in ARC 203 Coastal Architecture (binder – syllabus, numerous student-assignment work samples and exhibition – work samples), ARC 305 Richter Library Addition (binder- syllabus, work samples and gallery-work samples) at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, we found that ARC 502 Evidence found in binder – syllabus, student research samples; exhibition – work samples. (Projects: The Frontier Street and the Reconstruction of the Malécon) and ARC 699 Architectural Thesis Preparation (binder - syllabus, readings, assignments, final presentations) were illustrative of the foundation for this criteria.

Better documentation of exhibits is a criterion the team identified for a future NAAB Accreditation visit.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

Criterion met in the beginning areas of the curriculum of both the Undergraduate and Graduate programs, and is in alignment with the theory courses in the curriculum.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate ability level and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team observed that the undergraduate curriculum met this criterion in ARC 101-102 (Design) and ARC 121 (Art and Culture) and in each of the design sequences from ARC 203-04, ARC 305-06 and Design VII-Design X. The aspects of the criteria for graduate curriculum covered in ARC 501 and ARC 699 (thesis prep) in addition to studios ARC 502-504 as well as Design V-VI and ARC 610 (thesis) are sufficient.

The school's strong emphasis on the understanding of the use of precedents (both historical and contemporary) as a primary initial exploration tool for all architectural intervention and part of a sound education is demonstrated in all course materials and design projects.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the students understanding of ordering system as it applies to design and thus comply with identified criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence of ARC 101, ARC 102, ARC 203, ARC 204, ARC 305 and ARC 306 provided sufficient evidence of students ability to face a problem and develop the appropriate strategy, come to a series of alternates that consider different points of views, test alternatives and generate well reason solutions.

At the graduate level the ARC 501, ARC 502, ARC 503, ARC 504 and ARC 601 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team identified sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the students understanding of historical traditions and culture as it applies to design and therefore comply with this criterion.
The team was able to validate from the exhibits that, in addition to providing global context and understanding in the design required history courses, the School shows commendable positive engagement with many areas of global culture including areas such as Italy, Africa, China, the Caribbean and Latin American. Not only learning about each, but also participating in developing design intervention with local communities in outreach programs in Haiti, Colombia, and elsewhere.

In addition to its ongoing studies of the Classical tradition, local vernacular traditions of Southern Florida inform technical (passive environmental control), material and cultural studies in design studio investigations. Recent upper-level design studio projects in Berlin, Nigeria, Santo Domingo and Cuba, provide students with a broad perspective of societal needs across the globe. The recent summer Open City Studio program has enabled students to work and travel in Japan, South Africa and Sweden. This area is a notable strength of the school.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team identified sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the students understanding of historical traditions and culture as it applies to design and therefore comply with this criterion.

 The team found creative evidence of the understanding of cultural diversity within the undergraduate program in the Hometown Map project of ARC 101. This creates an understanding of cultural heritage and diversity relative to the student body through architectural design exercises. Within the graduate program, achieved understanding in history and theory courses, primarily ARC 568, exemplified in very diverse range of historical architecture.

In the undergraduate curriculum, the team found that ARC 101 Architecture Design (binder-syllabus, lecture samples and exhibition – work samples) provided a large foundation to meet this criteria and limited additional evidence was found in ARC 102 (research precedents, etc.). At the graduate level ARC 568 History of Architecture 1650-present (binder - syllabus, readings, assignments) and ARC 500 Theory of Architecture and the Environment (binder - syllabus, quizzes/exams, assignments) provided the remainder of the evidence.

A.11.   **Applied Research: *Understanding* the role of applied research in determining function, form, and systems and their impact on human conditions and behavior.**
B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the students understanding of applied research as it developed and applies to the design process and therefore comply with this criterion

The team found the exams, papers and case studies met this criterion in ARC 122, Architecture and Behavior, as well as in ARC 223, Architecture and the Environment. In the graduate curriculum, students have exposure to a range of techniques related to applied research in one of their earliest required courses, ARC 500/Theory, and at the end of the curriculum in ARC 699, thesis prep.

Throughout the entire curriculum, each project assignments required a wide range of applied research techniques in order to develop the student's solutions in a commendable way. Research as a tool is essential in this program.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: Overall the students on this program are exposed to a holistic and seamless integrated curriculum. They are exposed and required to engage all of these criteria as part of their design process in such a fashion that the students are been provided with a strong foundation. This foundation is been challenged from the first semester all the way to the last allowing the students to enhance their individual strengths as well as mature in order to meet the complexities they are been presented.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team identified sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence of ARC 101, ARC 102, ARC 203, ARC 204, ARC 305 and ARC 306 provided sufficient evident of the students ability to face a problem and develop the appropriate strategy, come to a series of alternates that consider different points of views, test alternatives and generate well reason solutions.

At the graduate level the ARC 501, ARC 502, ARC 503, ARC 504 and ARC 601 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion

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**.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team reached consensus after an extensive review of the documents found sufficient evidence through the multiple examples of studio coursework to comply with this criterion.

The projects shown in the team room demonstrated accessibility being considered from the early design courses. Checklists accompanied some of the projects exhibited and listed the requirements for accessibility from point of origin to point of destination as well as requirements for corridors, doors, restrooms, etc. The use of the checklist in all projects exhibited showed a distinct commitment by the program staff to meet this aspect of the design process.

While both drawings and models for the projects exhibited in the (Arc 102) and 204 (Design IV) and Arc 504 (Design IV) demonstrated some ability and consideration to design for the physically impaired; the projects as a whole illustrated some persistent inconsistencies in the application of this criteria and therefore to design for the wide range of physically impaired. There was little evidence that other types of disabilities outside of the wheelchair bound user were integrated into the design.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a high skill level and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team found evidence of a high degree of cleverness and tremendous consideration taken by students in the development of their design solutions. This conclusion is based on the exhibited projects, ARC 223 and ARC 500, Theory of Architecture and Environment, which enabled students to demonstrate the ways that sustainable design in architectural design efforts relates to and shapes its environment and the final building form. This course should be commended for demonstrating that sustainability issues are more than checklists of building requirements and technical solutions. Additional evidence found in ARC 501, Architecture Design I that employed USGBC LEED criteria as part of the program requirement for the studio. In addition, students partaking of a course in which they are required to take the USGBC LEED Associate exam as part of their final examination.

ARC 223, Architecture and the Environment, had a clear emphasis on sustainable design techniques for both buildings and sites, which the design studio reinforced in ARC 203. Embedded issues of sustainability are throughout the curriculum, at both a theoretical and practical level. On one hand, sensitivity to climate is consistently emphasized in the program and yet, the full breath of sustainable design was found at times to not be embedded into the final solution. The impact of sustainable design was times not well illustrated.

Better documentation of exhibits is a criterion the team identified for a future NAAB Accreditation visit.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate ability for site design and therefore comply with this criterion.
The team found evidence of the ability to respond to site characteristics. In the undergraduate program this condition was best met in ARC 306, Architectural Design; Comprehensive Studio, which

should be commended for its ability to introduce site design from both conceptual and practical vantage points. In the graduate program, demonstrated evidence of this ability demonstrated in ARC 503, Architecture Design Studio III.

Additional evidence found in ARC 306: Architectural Design, Comprehensive Studio: (Seaplane Terminal on Watson Island) and ARC 503: Architecture Design Studio III, (RISD Architectural Mill); ARC 501: Architecture Design I.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a high skill level and therefore comply with this criterion.

The drawings shown in the team room demonstrated that students had an understanding of the basic principles of life-safety and the application on a design project. Life Safety and Accessibility projects for Course 203 (Design III) showed a clear capacity toward the implementation of life safety/egress and accessibility codes. In particular, Brillhart Studio provided an effective study that required students to modify a set of drawings to bring them into compliance with Life Safety and egress requirements. Stairs shown on the drawings indicated an understanding that the size of the egress stairs and corridors had a direct relationship to the amount of occupants in the building; doors opened in the egress direction and there were with no obstacles in the path of travel.

In Course 305 (Design V), an extension to the Ritcher Library, the students met the challenge to develop designs that are accessible and code compliant with regards to life safety, as did the RISD Mill project (Arc 502) and the Malecon project (Arc 503) in the in the Masters program.

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

A.2. Design Thinking Skills	**B.2. Accessibility**
A.4. Technical Documentation	**B.3. Sustainability**
A.5. Investigative Skills	**B.4. Site Design**
A.8. Ordering Systems	**B.5. Life Safety**
A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture	**B.7. Environmental Systems**
	B.9.Structural Systems

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of ability and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence of Arc 305 provided sufficient evidence of the students ability to face an architectural challenge and develop the appropriate strategy, come to a series of alternates that consider different points of views, test alternatives and generate well reason solutions. It is also apparent to the team that special consideration must be placed on the students' abilities when it comes to dealing with accessibility issues as well as life safety issues in order to create a constant benchmark throughout the solutions.

At the graduate level the ARC 504 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate an understanding of the fundamental issues in project financing and therefore comply with this criterion
.
The issues of understanding financial considerations addressed in the undergraduate curriculum in ARC 306 and the graduate curriculum in ARC 504. Both concepts are addressed in the studio where comprehensive design is handled, the focus in the comprehensive design studio is regarded as initial program definition, design, and construction cost estimates. This criterion is expanded from previous NAAB conditions and will need to be adjusted to be more comprehensive.

The team also observed limited and inconsistent documentation of life cycle cost and operational cost aspects on some of the projects. This is an area where documentation that is more detailed can best serve the program in future NAAB Accreditation Visits.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team was able to find sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the students have an understanding of the environmental systems available for their design and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team found very clear evidence of an understanding of the principles in environmental systems design in both ARC 362 and ARC 363. The team found adequate evidence of an understanding of the principles in environmental systems design in ARC 562 and ARC 563.

The team was able to observe at all levels of the program how students were involved in a variety of design strategies towards the use of natural light, natural ventilation when possible, proper site and sitting of their project to take advantage of the regional solar orientations as well as the acoustical

implications of the building form and materials selected. The overall feeling of the team was positive since their attitude was evident through the entire undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team was able to find sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the student's capacity to use structural system as key form giving elements in their design and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the studio sequence of ARC 204, ARC 305 and ARC 306 provided sufficient evident of the students understanding on how structural system behave, integrate and inform the design solution. In addition more evidence of the student's awareness and understanding was discovered throughout the earlier studios within the curriculum and outside of the structural engineering courses.

At the graduate level the ARC 503 and ARC 504 have the same level of evidence to meet this criterion. In some of the exhibited project the students began to illustrate how joints are integral to the experience of the building as well as using the structure as an ordering element.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate level the technology sequence of ARC 231, and ARC 261, as well as the ARC 204, ARC 305 and ARC 306 provided sufficient evidence of the students understanding on how building envelopes are linked to the building beyond just a façade articulation for image and branding sake. The students' work demonstrated a clear appreciation and exploration on the development of the skin of a building. At the graduate level, similar evidence was perceived in all five studio courses.

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**

B. Arch
[X] Met
M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

At the undergraduate program, these are met in the ARC 362 and ARC 363 series and are covered in the graduate courses in ARC 562 and ARC 563, which have a strong engineering orientation. The projects exhibited also provided the team an opportunity to observe the students integration into the overall project solutions.
Again, the team also observed limited and inconsistent documentation of this integration in some of the project exhibits. Better documentation of exhibits is a criterion the team identified for a future NAAB Accreditation visit.

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**.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team room displayed a variety of projects that demonstrated the students understanding of the characteristics of construction materials and products selected for their projects.
The undergraduate program Course ARC 230 (formerly 261), teaches properties of building materials, assemblies, detailing and building codes as evidenced by the sample tests for this course were provided. Tests for ARC 530 at the graduate level cover and expand on the same topics.

Studio Arch 204 (Design IV) reflects the understanding of these concepts in the design studio, and the presentation for the Re-Ligare Institute shows a creative use of structural steel in its design solution, a response to its surrounding context and a successful response to basic architectural concepts.

Realm B. General Team Commentary: Overall the students on this program are exposed to a holistic and seamless integrated curriculum in which these sets of criteria are well presented and explored through the entire academic program. The students begin to evaluate the technical aspect of the building sequence since the early studios and each level builds upon each other. One of the most critical deficiencies lays on the inconsistent documentation of some of these elements in the design process rather than the application of them. Also it was apparent to the team that at times the exploration of the design concept allowed the technical aspect of the projects to take a second chair in the resolution of the problem, thus making the team have to search through the complete set of exhibits to clearly get a better picture.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the multiple examples of studio coursework to demonstrate the student's ability to work in group projects as well as in a collaborative fashion therefore complying with this criterion.

Starting with the first year, in both degree paths, through their final semester there are a variety of team assignments required within the curriculum. While the team was observing the studios, we were able to see how the project assignment was parceled into smaller groups then individual project developments allowed.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

In the undergraduate curriculum, a complete course, ARC 122, Architecture and Behavior thoroughly addresses this topic area, and in a thorough way in the students programmatic analysis in the first year projects in the design studios which the team visited. The team while visiting a fifth year studio pin up that focused on the formation of informal settlements observed evidence found in courses ARC 102, ARC 122, and subsequent evidence. Students in this studio demonstrated a keen sensitivity to human behavioral relationships within the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

This topic is covered in a range of ways in the graduate program, both theoretical and in the design studio, in ARC 500 and in the first year design studio. Evidence found in courses ARC 500, and ARC 501 with subsequent evidence found in ARC 610 and through team observation of current graduate level thesis studios.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team identified sufficient evidence throughout the examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

In conversation with faculty and students, we were able to discover that students are aware of the role that architects play in their community and in the development of a project. The program's association and development of the Master in Urban Development exposes the students to lectures, visiting faculty and other professions that provides them with the role models to better grasp this criteria and its impact into their professional development.

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

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team had to search for in depth documentation for this criteria and additional evidence found in the undergraduate course ARC 452 Mgmt Prof Practice and the graduate program course ARC 652 Mgmt Prof Practice demonstrates this point. We look forward to the integration of this and for it to be more easily identified as part of the studio experience. This is an area where more detailed documentation could better serve the program in future NAAB Accreditation Visits

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team had to search for in-depth documentation for this criteria and additional evidence for this can be found in the undergraduate course ARC 452 Mgmt Prof Practice and the graduate program course ARC 652 Mgmt Prof Practice. We look forward to its integration and therefore more easily identifiable as part of the studio experience. The courses offered to cover the basics of professional practice with extended requirements for the graduate students through longer term papers concerning professional practice issues with greater expectations of content and depth. This is an area where more detailed documentation could better serve the program in future NAAB Accreditation Visits

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**.

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout the examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team had to search for in-depth documentation of this criteria and additional evidence of this is found in the undergraduate course ARC 452 Mgmt Prof Practice and the graduate program course ARC 652 Mgmt Prof Practice. We look forward to when it is more integrated and easily identifiable as part of the studio experience. It should be noted, that an understanding of leadership skills is pervasive throughout many of the School's program offerings and is an essential characteristic and cornerstone of the School's identity.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

Conversations with students reflected knowledge that licensure carried a responsibility to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public. Projects shown in the team room depicted zoning analysis and annotations of codes and regulations that were applicable to the project.

The syllabus and student work sample for ARC 452 were evidence that undergraduate students were aware of professional service contracts, ordinances, the need to comply with historic preservation and accessibility laws, and the general practice of architecture. The course used as its text the AIA Handbook for Professional Practice.

ARC 652, for graduate students, is an overview of the professional practice of architecture, from a business, ethical and legal points of view. It explains the requirements of Florida Chapter 481 outlining

the requirements for applicants for licensure as registered architects and the administrative code rules 61G1 that describe the administrative code that regulates day-to-day practice. This was evident in the syllabus for the class and the final student assignments displayed in the Team Room.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

The team had to search for in-depth documentation of this criteria and additional evidence of this is located in the undergraduate course ARC 452 Mgmt Prof Practice and the graduate program course ARC 652 Mgmt Prof Practice. The courses offered cover the basics of professional ethics and professional judgment with extended requirements for the graduate students through longer term papers concerning professional ethic issues with greater expectations of content and depth.

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.**

B. Arch
[X] Met

M. Arch
[X] Met

2011 team assessment: The team found sufficient evidence throughout examples of studio projects as well as the required coursework to demonstrate a level of understanding and therefore comply with this criterion.

Evidence found primarily in courses ARC 452, and subsequent evidence found through team observation of several studios to improve the quality of life for local and global neighbors. Specifically students researching underdeveloped urban environments in preparation for travel abroad to South America displayed exemplary sensitivity to the greater public interest with respect for historic resources and quality of life.
At the graduate level, evidence found primarily in courses ARC 652 and subsequent evidence found through team observation of several studios to improve the quality of life for local and global communities.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: The team was able to identify and validate that the essence of this realm was been met and that more informal information was been communicated to the students through the school active participation in real time community based projects. This allowed the students to appreciate the value architects and architecture brings to a community, and the expectations the community has in the architect. Since most of the curriculum projects and philosophical bend has been in having a focused on the leadership and role of the architect has in the community and in the creation of livable communities, this program meets this portion of the NAAB criteria's with high marks.

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

The University of Miami has been accredited since 1926. This requirement is documented as met on page 125 of the APR with a letter of reaffirmation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools dated January 9th, 2008. There are only three qualifying conditions that were request from the university for additional clarification and information.

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

B. Arch:
The B. Arch program gives ample opportunities for students to take courses outside of the professional degree program. The required 12 credit hours minor sends a clear message to students that coursework beyond the professional degree program is valuable. The transfer evaluation process verifies that students have adequate courses in the liberal arts and general education.

M. Arch:
By definition, the 31/2 year M. Arch. program benefits from a student cohort with diverse academic backgrounds. The admissions process for advance standing in the M. Arch. program tracks general education courses.

It should be noted that the School has changed the nomenclature of its non-architecture post-professional degree to a M.S., so that there is no confusion that the M. Arch. Degree is the NAAB accredited professional 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

The team found this criterion well met. The administration has a clear strategic plan and faculty governance is a valued part of the decision making process. The School holds regular faculty meetings involving faculty, staff and students, who develop a collective vision. The team has found clear evidence describing the programs plan for evaluation of the NAAB accredited programs as well as a clearly defined plan for execution and modification of said plan. Further, through evaluation of the curriculum and

observations during the site visit it is apparent that the faculty includes invited professionals in studio juries and on the board of advisors. The program clearly approaches its curriculum development with the advancement of the discipline and current issues in mind. The team found it exceptional that the program is able to accomplish these endeavors with a continued respect and appreciation for our classical architectural heritage.

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 prepatory 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

The team observed very clear evidence of the evaluation of preparatory/pre-professional education through discussions with administration, staff and faculty, in addition to admissions materials presented in accordance with FERPA requirements. The program provides students with a very clear assessment process prior to their enrollment in the School, which includes a visual process diagram.   The graduate program director explained the process very concisely, presenting numerous examples. Discussions with admissions officer explained the process of admission to the B. Arch program and advanced standing into the M. Arch program.

The leadership of the program painstaking evaluation process for transferring students and for those seeking advance status is well define and this process is constantly been evaluated to insure the accuracy and validity of the process. The staff and the faculty are aware of the impact and need to place the candidate students at the correct level to provide them with the appropriate education, so multiple levels of check and balance have been created and are in place. The evaluation committee rotates its membership to insure fresh set of eyes and to provide a new element of clarity into their process.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees
In order to promote an understanding of the accredited professional degree by prospective students, parents, and the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, *Appendix 5.*

[X] Met

Both catalogues included in Part Four, Section 4 of the APR, for Bachelors of Architecture and for the Masters programs, included the exact language found in the 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation contained in Appendix 5 of the 2009 Conditions. They carefully explained the composition of the degrees, credits required, and application information, including the need for and format for providing a portfolio.

The catalogue provided in the Team Room included the same information and in addition provided a listing of the Full Time Faculty and their academic credentials; as well as a fact sheet on the geographic and ethnic composition of the student body.

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

Evidence was found by the team on the schools website via the links page which easily navigates to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures.

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

[X] Met

Evidence was found by the team on the schools website on the links page which easily navigates to all of the Career Development Resources

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

With the exception of the current APR that is available on request, all of this information was found on the web site.

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] Met

Evidence was found by the team on the schools website on the links page which easily navigates to the schools ARE pass rates through the NCARB website.

III.   Appendices:

Appendix 1. Program Information

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

A.   History and Mission of the Institution (I.1.1)

When George Merrick dreamt of a great tropical city, he dreamt also of a great university. Merrick described in the promotional material of Coral Gables, a city of tropical splendor whose Edenic gardens would inspire the highest social order. A campaign brochure of 1926 entitled, "An investment in Humanity and Prosperity," placed the University in that garden, describing the institution of learning and culture where its "entire aim will be to develop original thought and the personal powers of each student." The new university, on 160 acres donated by Merrick, was to be composed of 12 schools and colleges including a College of Liberal and Applied Arts which would "endeavor to develop the painter, the sculptor and the architect in the finest medium for self expression in the world," but at the same time making the "work practical and economically valuable." Merrick believed the University of Miami would be the meeting point of the Americas, "where the foundation may be laid for everlasting peace on the Western Hemisphere: where commerce will receive its greatest impulse."

On February 4, 1926 George Merrick addressed the citizens assembled for the corner-stone laying ceremony at the University of Miami Solomon G. Merrick Building honoring Merrick's father, a Congregationalist minister. George Merrick distinguished between the "ephemeral insignificance" of commercial institutions and the "permanently real . . . things of the intellect and spirit that alone spell the true life of a land." He compared the founding of his father's alma mater Yale with the pioneer spirit now active in Miami and read from a poem he'd written to honor his father's "courage in hardship" in which each verse concludes with the phrase "When those groves begin to bear."

Merrick expected that his beloved grove of academe would soon yield the fruit of 5000 students and a prosperous institution. He predicted that the founding of the University of Miami would be a "tame and easy struggle." What he could not foresee was the devastating hurricane of September 17, 1926. Marjory Stoneman Douglas, an early faculty member in the department of English described, in her epochal work The Everglades: River of Grass, the destruction and tragedy of that fateful night. She observed that after all was washed away, "What was left were such foundations of buildings or ideas as had been well and truly laid (1987, report of 1947, 340)." Certainly the University was one such idea. Although construction halted on the campus, the University found new headquarters on Anastasia Avenue in Coral Gables and opened its doors to 560 students in that first class of October 1926.

When the University moved back to the campus in 1946 with 2000 students and fresh funds to house and educates the returning veterans of World War II, the Solomon G. Merrick building was completed in what the 1951 chronicler called "the brilliant airy effects of functional modern." Marion Manley, Florida's first woman architect, worked on the campus master plan with Robert Law Reed. Together they designed what was recognized as the first "modern" campus in the United States—and was well published in national and international periodicals. The 2010 University of Georgia Press publication, "Marion Manley, Miami's First Woman Architect", by faculty members Carie Penabad and Catherine Lynn has amply demonstrated the importance of the work by Marion Manley,

who was also responsible for a number of the campus buildings including the present facilities of the School of Architecture.

In the fall of 2009, the University of Miami enrolled 14,784 students in 113 undergraduate and 106 master's, 53 doctoral and 4 professional areas of study in 12 colleges and schools: Architecture, Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Communication, Education, Engineering, Graduate, Law, Medicine, Marine and Atmospheric Science, Music, Nursing, along with the Division of Continuing Studies. While much has changed, the University remains an independent, nonsectarian, non-profit institution, and has retained Merrick's original commitment to its role in the Americas and the Caribbean. The original campus has grown to 260 acres with a master plan by Cooper Robertson underway and buildings in design by architects such as Michael Graves. Additional campuses include the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science on Virginia Key; the Miller School of Medicine west of downtown Miami; and two south Miami-Dade research facilities. Although the struggle has never been "tame and easy," Merrick's groves have been fruitful.

While the institution's founding was inauspiciously confronted by the 1926 hurricane followed by the 1929 bust, today the University of Miami is flourishing, ranked 47th by U.S. News & World Report (2010) among U.S. universities, many of them more than a century older, and 62nd among universities in expenditure of federal funds for research and development. The University is accredited by the Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools (SACS), renewing a ten-year accreditation as of 2009.

In August 2010, The Princeton Review commended the University of Miami for 'outstanding academics' and rated the university 'number one in 'Race/Class Interaction.' The University has significant minority representation among students and faculty, and as originally intended extends its influence into the Caribbean and Latin America with a variety of academic and outreach programs. The January 2010 earthquake in Haiti elicited a university-wide response of service, from the medical heroics of the Miller School of Medicine to the international science and engineering symposium organized by University geologists, to the country-wide charrette for Haiti organized by the School of Architecture with Haitian planners in preparation for the March 2010 UN Donors Forum.

The University's mission and goals are described in its strategic plan, "Defining the Future, Our Strategic Plan," produced in a campus-wide participatory process under the leadership of President Donna Shalala. The essential goal of the Plan is for the University to develop the characteristics of an AAU university. The complete document is included in Appendix A, of this report. Its opening mission statement is as follows:

The University of Miami's mission is to educate and nurture students, to create knowledge, and to provide service to our community and beyond. Committed to excellence and proud of the diversity of our University family, we strive to develop future leaders of our nation and the world.

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

John Llewellyn Skinner initiated the first program in architecture at the University of Miami in 1927-28. Skinner was a graduate in architecture from the University of Toronto and Harvard. After winning Harvard's Nelson Robinson Traveling Fellowship, Skinner went to the American Academy in Rome. He left his position as head of the department of architecture at Georgia Tech to join Phineas Paist, the noted Philadelphia architect, and Denman Fink, an artist whose work was in the collections of the National Academy and the Art Institute of Chicago, in the founding of the architecture program at the University

of Miami. Fink was also known for the appealing drawings and paintings of the buildings he and Paist imagined for Coral Gables, including the University of Miami's Merrick Building. As George Merrick's uncle, Fink was integral to the emerging architecture of Coral Gables that fused building traditions from Central and Latin American colonial architecture. The student work of the young program was shown in the third and fourth annual exhibitions of the Architectural League of Greater Miami in 1931 and 1932. The watercolors are similar to the Beaux-Arts esquisse work common to the period, since many Schools including Miami utilized the competition problems issued by the Society of Beaux-Arts Architects in New York. The studies of local buildings by early students Jewell Harden and Bonnie Munroe revealed an interest in the vernacular, notable in a period when most academic architecture focused on the formal design of prominent buildings. Another feature distinguishing the new program was the presence of female students.

By the mid-1930's a number of factors caused the University to reduce its scale of operation and the architecture program was one of the first affected. The architecture program re-emerged in 1950 as the department of architectural engineering. Professor Jan Hochstim entered that program and graduated in 1954. He provides a valued present day link to the history of architecture at the University of Miami.

By 1966, after further studies at the University of Illinois, Professor Hochstim joined the faculty under the leadership of James Elliott Branch. Branch brought a number of faculty from Illinois, and they shaped a focus for the five-year metropolitan centers in the United States are served by several. The MArch program, on the other hand, shares the Bay Area with the MArch programs at UC Berkeley and the Academy of Art University.

Bachelor of Architecture program which they described as "a sequence of courses in architectural design, structural design, construction, building materials, city planning, building equipment, office practice, and the humanities (Bulletin 1965, 249)." The program would lead "to the development of architects, who as enlightened individuals, responsible citizens, and resourceful professional men, will serve their society in attaining a worthy architecture (Bulletin 1965, 249)." Although the courses have broadened and the society of men has opened to become almost 50% women, the essential goal of contributing to a better world remains at the heart of the program today. The Bachelor of Architecture program has been accredited since 1972. The Master of Architecture program has been accredited since 1995.

In 1983, under President Foote, and following the initiative of department head John Steffian, the department became the School of Architecture. Dean Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk was a new faculty member at the opening days of the School and with Adjunct Professor Andres Duany in 1989 founded the School's first graduate program, a post-professional curriculum in Suburb and Town Design, now the Master of Urban Design. The School continues to promote the idea of architecture as a civic art central to an active citizenry first articulated by its founding faculty. The first internationally recognized publication of the school "The New City 1" was published in 1991 and marked the debut of a growing series of books and publications featuring the faculty's work and the school's programs and initiatives.

Many of the current faculty members were hired by Dean Thomas Regan who launched a master plan for the school by Aldo Rossi in the late 1980's. The school expanded among existing campus buildings, in 2005 completing a new facility, the Jorge M. Perez Architecture Center, designed by Leon Krier with Merrill, Pastor, Colgan, and Ferguson Glasgow Shuster and Soto.

In the late 1980s the School started its acclaimed Visiting Critic program with many young national and international architects, who have since become major figures in

architecture internationally. In the 1990's, Yale University Professor Vincent Scully and Catherine Lynn joined the faculty, teaching a series of spring courses followed by hundreds of students and the community at large. The1996 publication of "Between Two Towers", a compendium of student and faculty work, describes a dynamic moment in the School's recent history upon which its current spirit builds. The Visiting Critics program has recently been revived: Michael Graves has been a visiting critic a number of semesters, and Prof. Alex Wall (Karlsruhe University) led a studio on global warming in Miami in the spring of 2009; Terry Riley, former curator of architecture at MOMA and recent director of the Miami Art Museum taught last spring.

In 1990, following two years in Venice, the School of Architecture opened its renowned Rome Program which has run continuously since its inauguration. The program has grown to include two semesters of undergraduate studies and two graduate semesters, and two years ago moved into its own facilities near the Vatican.

In 2008, evolving from the six-year long Knight Program in Community Building, the School initiated under the leadership of Dr. Chuck Bohl the new Master of Real Estate +Urbanism which has quickly grown and works in collaboration with the School of Business and Law. Students in the first year of the program qualified in the first four groups of the 2008-2009 Hines Competition for a new neighborhood in Denver along with teams from MIT and the University of Pennsylvania.

The same year, the School, building on the focus of many faculty members' practice and research, initiated the 15-credits Certificate in Historic Preservation, which is open to undergraduate and graduate students and practitioners. The faculty is exploring the possibility of a full-fledged degree in historic preservation, with an emphasis on the Caribbean and Latin America and the preservation-restoration of 20th century concrete structures. In addition, other areas of elective focus are being considered for intensification as certificate programs.

In 2009, under the new Graduate Studies Director, Professor, Jean Francois Lejeune, a review of the graduate architecture program produced curriculum adjustments to the M. Arch., and the revamping of the Master in Suburb and Town Design, renamed as the Master of Urban Design, to reflect increased focus on retrofitting urbanism in downtowns, older neighborhoods and recent suburbs, as well as studying the issue of informal urbanism in Latin America, Africa, and other parts of the world. The first group of M.U.D. students started the first semester at the Rome Center in Italy in July 2010.

Today the School of Architecture's mission, focused on community building and on the city as a work of art and architecture, unifies a faculty of diverse origin and capacity, in a common mission. Several faculty members are prominent in the work of the New Urbanism, promoting the reintegration of building with environmental, economic, and social concerns, and upholding the ideal that the building, like the citizen, is the foundation of community. These principles form a foundation and a common mission for the programs of the University of Miami School of Architecture:

School of Architecture Mission Statement

> *The University of Miami School of Architecture's mission is founded in the faculty commitment to community and its focus on the city as a work of art and architecture. The School affirms the essential need to design environmentally responsible buildings that promote social integration and economic sustainability, and support life comfortably without reliance upon extravagant use of land and energy which adversely affect our ecosystems.*

The School prepares students for professional leadership and lifelong learning in architecture, urbanism and related fields. The faculty preserves and develops knowledge for the profession through research and practice. Faculty and students share knowledge locally and internationally through community service. They promote building and community design goals of environmental responsibility, social equity and economic sustainability.

Faculty and students draw upon the body of knowledge of architecture through exploration of the history of the profession: from traditional building methods, materials, form, and organization, to the nature and context of current practice. Students are introduced to the present-day profession within the context of a 5,000 year legacy of building, and are to call upon that history for practical application. Faculty and students study the legacy of building and seek new discoveries in the work of the past by documenting current-day buildings and landscapes.

The diversity of faculty interests and experience offers broad opportunities for students, not only in selection of various studios, sites and experiences, but in the exploration of architectural languages, from classical to advanced contemporary practices and design-build, without prejudice. It is not unusual within core and upper-level studios for critics to be confronted with student work of very diverse solutions and methods. The School prides itself on its ability to expose the students to a variety of positions, at the same time preparing them for professional development with a large range of national and international offices. The School faculty believes that this form of contemporary eclecticism is a healthy reflection of the multiplicity of values and approaches in contemporary globalized practice. This is confirmed by feedback from employers who repeatedly participate in the School's Career Fair.

The faculty affirms the essential need to design environmentally responsible buildings that promote social integration and economic sustainability and that function independently, operate effectively, and support life comfortably without reliance upon extravagant use of land and power supplies that adversely affect ecosystems. We acknowledge our responsibility to contribute to the world by making it more beautiful and to reveal beauty in its most humble circumstances. We share the perspective that most buildings are fabric buildings – defining the public spaces of community - and that the instances of monuments are special opportunities to speak for and about culture. We seek to collaborate with allied professionals in the design of public space and infrastructure that link the community.

Sharing with our national colleagues the goal to build a better professional community, the School of Architecture itself strives to be a model of that community. The School functions as a family; the faculty recognize that students may be new to architecture but experienced in other areas, with individual character, insight, and the ability to make significant contributions to the advancement of knowledge. We dedicate ourselves, through engagement with history, structure, material, and form in design, to participate in a diversity of cultures and life experiences, so that we might emerge with the wisdom we need to build a better world.

C.   **Long-Range Planning (I.1.4)**

School goals for continuing improvement are articulated in the School's Strategic Plan, part of the University's Strategic Plan compiled in 2007. Following the Provost's suggested outline, the School of Architecture's Plan has short and longterm action goals, presented below in outline form. A separate document establishing the cost of each goal was also formulated as a fundraising list for the School. The School of Architecture

Strategic Plan was revised in the spring of 2010 to reflect accomplishments and new goals emerging three years after the original Plan. Both the 2007 Strategic Plan and the 2010 Strategic Plan are in the Appendix, and the 2010 Plan is included at the end of this section.

Over the years, a series of planning documents have reflected long standing principles and values that animate the School of Architecture's faculty. With its primary mission of dedication to students, scholarly advancement and engagement with community, the School of Architecture's culture emerges from the tenet established two decades ago, that the larger context of environment and community must always play a role in the design of buildings and landscape.

The faculty envisions a school committed to professional knowledge founded in history, and to the education of future professionals skilled in research and analysis as well as design. The School is a work in progress, with a faculty constantly evaluating values and methods, responsive to the needs of the profession, and aware of its position relative to other architecture programs.

The collegial ambience of the School of Architecture enables continuous improvement to be a goal shared by all faculty members. This goal is engaged in a variety of forums ranging from frequent informal discussions about pedagogy, advancements in the profession, and research endeavors that take place in the School courtyard, to regular faculty meetings that address specific topics for action, to meetings with professionals and advisory groups such as the Visiting Committee that provide perspectives from outside academia.

The dean's office seeks to provide data to support these discussions from a variety of sources. These include the University's data set collated by the Office of Institutional Research, derived from institutional records and surveys of students, faculty and staff; the NAAB published statistics; the NCARB A.R.E. pass rates; the ACSA publications and conferences; and a variety of efforts made by the dean's office and by individual faculty members seeking comparative information from peer institutions. Faculty and staff maintain communication and exchange information with their counterparts in other institutions.

The NAAB five perspectives on architectural education play an important role in the School's long range planning. While much of the Strategic Plan regards measureable improvements, and the five perspectives may not be all obvious in these goals, the perspectives nevertheless have been guiding the advancement of curriculum, pedagogy and extracurricular opportunities for the students in recent years

- Architectural Education and the Academic Community: The architecture programs and faculty have been developing and maintaining connections with other disciplines in the University for many years, to the benefit of both students and faculty, and the Strategic Plan calls increased collaboration with other programs in the University.

- Architectural Education and Students: Curriculum adjustments have advanced beyond that called for in the Strategic Plan, with changes in the core courses of the professional programs as well as the addition of other opportunities such as the six areas of focus in design studios and elective courses, including health care design and tropical coastal design, enabling students to prepare for the short and long term professional context.

- Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment: while the Strategic Plan does not speak directly to this topic, curriculum and faculty changes of recent years are providing an ever greater emphasis on practice and the regulatory environment, including the identification of a new IDP coordinator, Allan Shulman, with the intention of developing a new IDP plan for the School following recent changes in the national program.

- Architectural Education and the Profession: here also, an ongoing faculty discussion about course and studio topics related to preparation for professional leadership, especially in regard to the professional's role as advocate, has produced classroom engagements with topics of critical need such as global warming, and new types of client groups such as non-profit developer Habitat for Humanity and others.

- Architecture Education and the Public Good: The dedication to architecture as a civic art has long been a tenet of the school's pedagogy in the core theory courses as well as in the studio. Nevertheless, new courses and topical adjustments in the core curriculum are embedding social and environmental concerns in the core student experience, as well as in elective and extra-curricular opportunities such as the Center for Community and Urban Design (CUCD) projects and the recent AIAS engagement with Freedom by Design. The M.Arch. thesis encourages research and projects exploring current topics of sustainability, infrastructure and informal urbanism.

FIVE YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN - REVISED SPRING 2010

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE MISSION STATEMENT

- Prepare students for professional engagement and lifelong learning in architecture, urbanism and related fields
- Preserve and develop knowledge for the profession, through research and practice.
- Share knowledge with the community, locally and internationally.
- Promote building and community design goals of environmental responsibility, social equity and economic sustainability.

BACKGROUND

The School of Architecture is rooted in the founding of the new community that created the University in 1926. Coral Gables emerged as a new town during the City Beautiful era of the twentieth century, a high point in the history of architecture and city making. The idealism of the founders, including the architects of the city's plan and first buildings, who were also the first faculty of the university's architecture program, continues to inspire the School's faculty and programs. The belief that architecture is a civic art, an act central to building community and always part of a larger context, is the foundation for our curriculum, for the faculty's scholarly work, and for the school's outreach to both regional and national audiences.

The study of architecture at the University of Miami has evolved from an undergraduate major to an accredited professional degree program (1967), to the establishment of the School of Architecture (1983), to the multiple programs and national reputation of today. We present a variety of topics to a range of students from high school summercampers to under-graduate and graduate professional degree seekers, to mid-career community builders.

2007 STRATEGIC PLAN

The Jorge M. Perez Architecture Center's opening five years ago has provided impetus for professional program curriculum improvements and for the establishment of new programs. These were among the School's 2007 Strategic Plan goals. Most of the 2007 goals – those not requiring major funding – have been achieved:

- established four new programs: B. Arch/MBA; BSAE/M.Arch; MRED+U (Real Estate Development and Urbanism); Certificate in Historic Preservation;
- improved undergraduate graduation rate from 59% (2007) to 73% (2009)
- improved quality of entering graduates: average GRE up 34 points since last year.
- increased financial aid for graduate students
- instituted annual semester in Rome for graduate students (undergraduate program 20 years old)
- increased faculty recognition (4 books published with national and international presses in 2009)
- improved Fabrication Lab facilities with dust collector and new machinery including laser cutter
- re-designed School website and recruiting materials

2010 STRATEGIC PLAN

The School's 2010 goals are organized as a framework for the approaching campaign, under the topics of curriculum, students, faculty and staff, facilities and other support.

Curriculum:

The recent curriculum improvement and expansion continues at a steady rate within the vision that has earned the School its international reputation. The changing context of professional practice and program accreditation serve as a guide to evolution, as does the faculty's ongoing discussions of the best way to fulfill our mission

- **Revise professional curriculum** (B.Arch., M.Arch.) to generate a semester by semester checklist of knowledge and skills, and to reflect new accreditation criteria. (budget neutral, underway)
- **Reposition Master of Town and Suburb Design** as **Master of Urban Design** with revised curriculum to reflect evolving economic and development conditions in the U.S. and around the world (budget neutral, underway)
- **Review Master of Architecture in Research** to expand opportunities for cross disciplinary studies and research in architecture, urban design, real estate development and with other University departments (budget neutral, underway)
- **Develop new certificate programs** by consolidating curriculum offerings in seven areas of faculty expertise, to assist in student recruitment and to promote faculty recognition: (budget neutral, underway)
  - o historic preservation (certificate program established)
  - o health care design
  - o new urbanism
  - o real estate development
  - o mid-century modern architecture
  - o classical architecture
  - o sub-tropical and tropical design
- **Develop courses to study architecture and urban design** for university students outside School of Architecture. (budget neutral, underway)

- **Explore off-site B.Arch. transfer program** in Orlando and Nassau; preliminary investigation shows significant revenue could be generated in these underserved market locations. (budget neutral, underway)
- **Explore establishment of a Ph.D. Urban Design** to extend School's research capacity and reputation; growing inquiries about advanced study and research in School's focus areas, and this year's presence of several dissertation level Ph.D. candidates from other institutions, have increased faculty interest in providing a doctoral program. (budget neutral study; program funding sources to be explored, also).

Students:
Student quality has been increasing, with the School's SAT average among the top in the University. Competing with aspirational peer schools for students requires constant improvement in programs and facilities as well as in opportunities for experience and increased financial aid opportunities.

- **Increase quantity and quality** of applicants and enrollment in M.Arch, MUD and MRED+U programs (depends on additional scholarship funding)
- **Increase recruitment of graduate students from abroad** through increased promotion of programs internationally and development of new exchange and collaboration programs (budget neutral)
- **Increase improvement** trajectory for all programs: increase test score averages (depends on additional scholarship funding)
- **Institute a fifth year** teaching assistantship for best B.Arch. students (budget neutral)
- **Increase scholarships** for upper level undergraduates and graduate students, in particular to assist in final semester (campaign goal $1million)
- **Establish Rome scholarship** to enable more students to participate in semester program abroad (campaign goal $500,000.00)

Faculty and Staff:
After several years of attending to curriculum improvements and additions, it is clear that the School's next strategic focus must be on faculty resources, in particular with regard to quantity and topical distribution of full-time faculty, and to teaching load as it relates to expectations for research.

- **Add three new full-time faculty positions;** current ratio of full to part-time faculty is inadequate particularly in undergraduate core classes. (including decrease in part-time faculty, this requires annual budget increase of $250,000.00, to be derived from
- $5.5 million campaign goal for faculty chairs)
- **Reduce full-time teaching loads** to reflect that of peer schools; for faculty producing scholarly work, a reduction from 18 credits/year to 15 (or 12 in the case of the historians) will require additional full-time faculty to maintain overall credit hours (annual budget increase to be determined, to be derived from campaign goal for faculty chairs)
- **Add two distinguished part-time visiting studio faculty positions** for undergraduate/graduate upper-level studios (annual budget increase to be determined, to be derived from campaign goal for faculty chairs)
- **Add staff writer/publications coordinator** to manage increasing need for communications, symposium assistance, recruitment material and website. ($80,000.00 addition to School budget, $1.5 million endowment)
- **Seek dedicated funding for the Center for Urban and Community Design (CUCD)** to support a staff position ($50,000.00 annually, requires a $1 million endowment)

Facilities and other support:

The future of the School's facilities revolves around the preservation and restoration of the historic Marion Manley buildings (Bldgs. 48 & 49), part of the University's preservation goals. Minimally renovated in 1983, these buildings require major attention to ensure their longevity and their continuing usefulness for the School's programs. Three program areas they will never be able to accommodate remain as pressing needs: unified studio space for the undergraduate and graduate core design studios; a larger fabrication lab to accommodate new hi-tech fabrication machinery; and library facilities to enable the transfer of the architecture collection from Richter, and its growth from 40,000 to 100,000 volumes.

- Complete **master plan for School facilities**, including new library and consolidated studio space for first and second year students ($50,000.00 School plant funds)
- Design, fund and **build 12,000SF new studio space** ($4.5 million: $0.5 million in hand,
- $4 million campaign goal)
- Design, fund and **restore Buildings 48 and 49**, including additions for handicapped access and current building code requirements ($10 million - $500,000.00 grants, $9.5M philanthropy and University)
- Add **fabrication and prototyping equipment** to Fabrication Lab ($50,000.00 – special programs revenues)
- **Convene second fall MRED+U Council** meeting in conjunction with the School of Business Administration's MBA-Real Estate Council and create University–wide Real Estate Programs Board including the Law School LLM Program in Real Property Development (School budget)
- Pursue the establishment of a **University-wide Real Estate Center** to pursue multiple fundraising objectives (jointly with School of Business Administration)
- Add **software and online database subscriptions and library holdings** to support courses and research for program in real estate development and urbanism, new urbanism and preservation ($50,000.00 campaign goal)
- Seek dedicated funding to establish **annual sponsored capstone charrette** for MRED+U and MUD students ($25,000.00 annually, requires a $500,000 endowment)
- **Initiate Continuing Education Units (CEU's)** for travel study and computer courses (revenue generator)

D.   Self-Assessment (I.1.5)

The School has several regular self-assessment processes in place: semester faculty evaluations, annual faculty reviews, the Strategic Plan, annual response to NAAB team Findings, the Visiting Committee, the SACS annual assessments and ten-year self-study, and student and professional focus group meetings.

Regular and on-going discussions and review of academic programs are conducted through the monthly meetings of the School of Architecture faculty who constitute the Curriculum Committee for the undergraduate and graduate programs, in the weekly meetings of the program administrators with the dean (A-team), and through annual and sometimes semiannual faculty retreats. Faculty and administration also participate in smaller curriculum discussion groups that address specific change proposals.

This section explains all of these, and describes current self-assessment progress and future direction.

Semester Faculty Evaluations

The responsibility for course evaluations each semester, once the responsibility of individual schools and colleges of the University, is now centrally administered online through the University Testing Center. A faculty committee of the university was charged with re-examination of the survey techniques at other institutions and the development of evaluations tailored to each school and program. The School of Architecture semester faculty evaluation has tabulated multiple-choice responses and a section for written suggestions and comments. The new online system allows students to log on during a specified time period and protects student identity by replacing previously hand written comments with electronic responses. The results of the evaluations are available to the students online. The success of this system needs further study. Since its implementation, participation has flagged with the percentage of participation ranging from a high of 80% to a low of less than 50%. The University is discussing ways to increase participation without mandating it as a requirement.

The Testing Center tabulates and returns the summary of the quantitative analysis and printed comments to the individual faculty and dean several weeks after final grades have been submitted. The School of Architecture plots each numerical response average against a school average so that faculty can determine individual performance in relation to the school median and mean. These comparisons are sent to each faculty member.

The Board of Trustees has mandated that these evaluations be used by the deans in annual reviews of faculty for merit raises and in reappointment and tenure reviews. Additionally, the program directors review evaluations to inform teaching assignments. The Faculty Senate continues to monitor the effectiveness of the evaluation process. Evaluation forms are included in the Appendix.

Annual Faculty Review

The University Faculty Manual mandates "a systematic annual evaluation of every faculty member, tenured and untenured." Each school and college is advised to develop a system appropriate to the discipline. At the School of Architecture all faculty are reviewed by the dean. Faculty complete an annual self-reporting form which, along with teaching evaluations, is reviewed by the dean in consultation with each faculty member. A Scholarly and Creative Activity Committee comprised of three tenured faculty, reviews faculty research and reports to the dean. The dean then forwards her recommendations to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

In the case of candidates for re-appointment, tenure and promotion, individual faculty contributions in teaching, scholarship and research are examined by the appropriate group of colleagues. The Faculty Manual mandates that the "file of a candidate for re-appointment, promotion and tenure shall contain an assessment of teaching performance," which is based on "classroom visitation, and a summary and interpretation of student evaluations." Teams of two voting faculty members conduct reviews of the classroom teaching of tenure-track candidates. When an associate professor is to be voted on for promotion, a similar review is conducted by full professors. The candidate's research and service record is also reviewed. Between three to five outside (extra-institutional) confidential review letters are sought by the dean for each candidate. Finally, a vigorous and open discussion is held on the candidate's record and contribution to teaching, research, and service. The dean then forwards the results of this discussion and the separate faculty vote along with her assessment of the candidate to the Provost and President. The Faculty Manual states that the Provost then forwards a decision regarding "recommendation for the award of tenure to the Board of Trustees or a tenure decision by the Board of Trustees, which is the final authority for the award of tenure."

Until this year, the dean has chaired the promotion, tenure and reappointment committee for the School. This past year, the faculty search committee suggested that henceforth a three person committee manage the process, bringing the results of the faculty deliberations to the dean. The new process is under discussion with the Dean of Faculty Affairs.

Annual Strategic Plan

Based on on-going faculty meetings and School Council discussions, and on matters covered in the School's annual retreat, the School's administration generates a review of external and internal conditions that affect the future of the school and the profession, and sets forward an action plan as part of the University's Strategic Plan, which is in Appendix A. The School of Architecture Strategic Plan undergoes an annual review by the University administration as part of the University Strategic Plan that requires the approval of the Board of Trustees. The current Strategic Plan of the School of Architecture is included in the Appendix D.

Under the new administration in 2007, the School developed a new Strategic Plan in an extensive process of participation. The Plan is updated regularly, including as part of the retreat at the opening of the fall semester. The retreat includes the Faculty Council as well as all adjunct and part-time faculty, staff, and representatives of the student organizations. Recent discussions have focused on curricular issues for the development of new masters programs, teaching seminars for new faculty, programming and master plan reviews for expanding the School of Architecture, new facilities for our Rome Program, outreach efforts to Haiti, and this fall, a discussion of drawing courses. The most recent update of the Strategic Plan was produced in the spring of 2010.

Visiting Committee

The University requires each academic unit to form a Visiting Committee of distinguished visitors chaired by a University Trustee and composed of Trustees, architecture professionals, industry and civic leaders. The Visiting Committee reviews materials prepared in advance, spending a working session at the school with administrators, faculty, and students, and deliberating on recommendations delivered to the Provost and President, and reported to the Board of Trustees. The current Visiting Committee comprises industry related professionals who have assisted in providing a bridge between education and practice. Several recent Visiting Committee suggestions are in the process of development in the School, including an area of focus in tropical and sub-tropical architecture and urbanism, and the restructuring of the post-professional architecture program. The list of current Visiting Committee members is in the Appendix.

Ten Year SACS Self Study and Annual SACS Assessments

In 2008 the University of Miami received reaffirmation of accreditation for the next ten years from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The university is committed to an ongoing assessment program and has developed the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to look at implementing strategies for improvement and measuring the impact new strategies for learning in the university. Prof. Richard John of the School of Architecture has been a member of the University's QEP Committee. Prof. Rocco Ceo was part of the original steering committee that determined the focus for the QEP. Andy Gomez, the University of Miami's Associate Provost for the Office of Accreditation and Assessment (OAA) was recently appointed a commissioner on the 72-member SACS board for his leadership in the accreditation process.

As part of the University wide SACS outcomes assessment program initiated for the last SACS accreditation cycle, School of Architecture students are tested for language, math and technology proficiencies, as freshmen and in their final semester, to measure knowledge growth. Associate Dean Denis Hector has been administering this program as well as the School's own Student Learning Outcomes Assessment program, in which several courses in both the bachelor and masters program assess student progress. For instance, in the B.Arch. program students are assessed in the first year spring studio and again in the third year spring comprehensive studio. Using the School's mission statement as Program   Objectives, the Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment Measures focus on three outcomes: Practice: Architectural   Design Skills Theory: Scholarship and Research Skills; Communication: Verbal, Writing and Graphic Skills. Samples of the Assessment Forms are in the Appendix.

Student and Professional Focus Groups

Over the years, the school has engaged a variety of methods to determine student perceptions of strengths and weaknesses in academic and extra-curricular programs. The school administration relies on meetings with undergraduate and graduate student representatives to maintain awareness of current issues. Recurring issues include inadequate printing facilities at semester's end (research into a rendering farm hopes to mitigate this problem), more interaction between students of different years (both from the 2008 focus group and meetings with faculty), and studio space needs (plans for a new open plan studio building have been prioritized in the master plan efforts currently underway.) Additionally students have expressed an interest in more hands-on experience to build, (a Design-Build studio was offered in the fall 2009 and will be offered each fall along with a regular set-design and construction course in cooperation with the School of Music. Notes from a variety of focus group meetings are included in the Appendix.

Self-Assessment Report

The philosophy of the school as outlined in the Mission Statement presents the study of architecture in the broader context of environment, society and economy, in which architecture is understood to be a public and civic act with incumbent responsibilities. The commitment to teaching architecture always within the larger context of community, allows a faculty of diverse agendas to co-exist in a complementary rather than competitive ambience.

Initial studios and courses focus on the role of architecture in culture and more particularly the inaugural moment of architecture as an act that builds civilization. Subsequent semesters sequentially focus on themes of social context (including ADA requirements), environmental context (sites and buildings), technological concerns (structures and systems), regulatory context, culminating in the comprehensive studio, in the B. Arch. second semester of third year, and in the M.Arch. second semester second year. Several years ago, the comprehensive studio was moved to the core curriculum of the B.Arch. program and three year M.Arch. program, to provide a more uniform experience (than it was assessed to have been in its former upper level elective studio format). This year, the two year M.Arch. program curriculum was brought into line with that change when the M.Arch. core was re-defined as four semesters, thus scheduling both classes of M. Arch. students for the comprehensive studio in the fall semester.

This core program structure in both the B.Arch. and the M.Arch. supports curricular attention to NAAB's five perspectives and criteria for accreditation and a minimum standard of uniformity for the basic student experience. The faculty met in several special

meetings during the fall of 2009 and spring of 2010 to review the NAAB perspectives and the new criteria relative to the overall curriculum as well as individual courses and teaching assignments. These were reviewed with regard to both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, and are a useful benchmark for balancing curricular offerings. While the five perspectives do not align exactly with the various assessment processes described above, there are a number of examples of decisions taken and changes resulting from assessment processes.

Architectural Education and Academic Community: Faculty associations with University colleagues grew out of faculty discussions about bringing the expertise of specific disciplines, such as environmental sciences, into the classroom and studio. Alliances now exist with the University's College of Arts and Sciences, School of Business Administration, College of Engineering, the School of Marine and Atmospheric Studies, School of Medicine, and School of Music, fostering inter-disciplinary endeavors both in teaching and in research.

Joint appointments of architecture faculty members in the Miller School of Medicine established for research endeavors that already have produced publications, have extended to produce a curriculum area of focus in health care design, with curriculum offerings in both the design of health care facilities and the integration of health care facilities in communities. The decision to make health care design an area of focus with additional courses, resulted from the faculty retreat in January 2009, in which discussion of the economy and its impact on the practice, promoted the idea that our students should be graduating with portfolios that show experience in those areas of development and building that were likely to survive the downturn, such as the design of health care facilities.

Architecture Education and Students: The ethnic and cultural diversity of the faculty and students supports the potential for the school to act as a model professional community through which students engage understanding and awareness of issues that can be projected to the professional and civic realm. The familial model emphasizes connections and shared accomplishments, and begins with a collegial model for teaching. The familial model finds form in team-teaching, teamprojects, and an emphasis on the rewards of joint student/faculty investigation of primary materials.

A response to the University-wide goal to increase students' research experience, reiterated by the SACS accreditation assessment process, is the School faculty's engagement of students in research projects. *Miami Modern Metropolis*, edited by Alan Shulman involved faculty and students within and beyond the school in fieldwork, archival research and original insight, a process at the foundation of primary research and scholarship. Carmen Guerrero's research on the work of Italian architect Moretti has engaged her seminar students in research and model-building for publications and exhibits in Italy; a number of students have traveled to be present at the exhibit openings.

The school thus seeks to bridge the often perceived gulf between research and design by drawing the two kinds of learning together through both the active engagement of the studio in research and the extension of the studio model of application to seminars and lectures. Students have long collaborated with faculty in studies brought to publication. Another recent example is *Marion Manley: Miami's First Woman Architect* by Profs. Lynn and Penabad. And the publication of students' studio work for communities in Mexico and Colombia, *Monterrey* and *Baranquilla*, provide a short term and first-hand experience of professional engagement in public and in publication. A complete list of faculty publications can be found in Section 2 – Resources.

Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment: In recent years, more attention has been focused on the regulatory context, from core studio programs engaging a variety of codes and design guidelines, and pre-professional engagement with the IDP program, to elective studio opportunities to encounter client-driven projects and attendant building codes, and a course focused on USGBC LEED certification.

Student focus group meetings produced suggestions for more 'hands-on' experience. The Design-Build Studio was instituted as a direct response to this, inviting Visiting Critic Jim Adamson, to lead the studio in fall 2009. (The second studio is underway this fall 2010.) Students in last fall's Design-Build Studio experienced one particularly cogent regulatory situation. At mid-semester, with a park pavilion design and construction documents completed and ready for permitting, the original donor of the park was invited into the studio to view the project. He pointed out that his gift of the park had design guidelines requiring a traditional South Florida vernacular that the students' design would be not permitted. As a result, and because the remaining half semester would not allow enough time to redesign and permit for that location, the students had to seek a new location for a new pavilion design; they succeeded in completing the design and construction of their project by semester's end, with many unexpected lessons learned!

As a whole, the regulatory environment should receive more attention in coming years, as the economic context for the profession sets a higher standard for entry of graduating students, and as the IDP program is given increased prominence in the School. IDP Coordinator Alan Shulman returned from the IDP summer conference with new information that will require a faculty discussion of how best, and most thoroughly, to present the professional transition to students in the classroom and in the studio.

Architectural Education and the Profession: Community-based projects in the studio offer an important resource in developing the student's capacity to expand the traditional role of the architect, beyond making beautiful objects, to that of professional leading a team that carefully assesses the impact of building, its role in the organization of settlements as well as in its use of materials, and plays a significant role in the stewardship of the earth. While no particular assessment has pointed to the need for increased professional engagement outside of the classroom, student and faculty have been seeking support for participation in professional venues, and the School has been able to support this in a variety of ways.

Faculty and students participate in a variety of organizations that enable interaction with practicing professionals and encourage students to envision their future in the professions. These include the American Institute of Architects (AIA and AIAS), the Society of Registered Architects (SRA), the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH), the Congress for the New Urbanism, the Institute for Classical Architecture/Classical America (ICA/CA), the Council for European Urbanism (CEU), the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). Students have attended the national the national conferences of these organizations with School support. Faculty participation in these organizations encourages a lively intellectual discourse that links the school not only with North and South America but with Europe as well. Asian alumni have helped the faculty extend these links to various parts of Asia, with travel study tours and studio projects.

The new Masters in Real Estate Development and Urbanism (MRED+U) program is an outgrowth of the School's Knight Program for Community building and its final evaluations, and the School's Visiting Committee advice. The program has expanded the School's offerings with new courses focusing on the implementation of building and urban designs that are already having an influence on the professional architecture programs. At its outset as a new program, MRED+U students received national attention in the 2009

Urban Land Institute (ULI) Gerald D. Hines Student Urban Design Competition, in which a team of students were among the four finalist teams, outpacing some 500 students in 99 teams from throughout the U.S. and Canada.

Architectural Education and the Public Good: Community outreach projects engage students, faculty, and off–campus professionals in a variety of para-professional civic experiences. The Center for Urban and Community Design (CUCD) has led countless students through encounters with individuals and communities in the practice of urban design and building design and construction. In 2008 public charrettes included the Coconut Grove Playhouse revitalization plan, a master plan for "Alturas de Manoguayabo in Santo Domingo for the Pedro Martinez Foundation, sponsored studio studies for affordable housing in Dania Florida, and a master plan for the historic center in El Pueblito, Mexico with the Instituto Tecnologico de Monterrey in Queretaro.

Recently, the School engaged an important community issue at an unusual scale. This followed several faculty discussions about how to renew a spirit of purpose that seemed to lag after an earlier highpoint. Recalling the post-Hurricane Andrew engagement of the whole school in rebuilding plans and projects, it was suggested that a new schoolwide project of civic impact could be stimulating. In fall of 2007 all design studios, from first year to the final semester of both professional programs, focused on the design of the Miami waterfront as a way to draw public attention to the need for increased public access to the water's edge. The collaborative effort produced a series of studies for 7 miles of the bayfront walkway. An exhibition and symposium followed the fall studios, bringing the work to the public for review and comment, in an event that allowed participating students to see public reaction to an improved civic realm as well as to their work. That work was recently revisited when architects participating in the AIA National Convention organized a charrette to address the riverwalk in June of 2010. This summer, the MPO funded two faculty members to publish the work.

Future Directions

Developing a future perspective demands that the School look to its past to inform its future. Some twenty years ago, a young faculty sought to establish a unique identity for the new School. That identity evolved to what the School is known for today: establishing a foundation of knowledge for architectural practice in the profession's history, and engagement with the larger context of environment, society and economy. Early evidence of that identity emerged with the 1989 initiation of the Master of Suburb and Town Program (now the Master in Urban Design), and subsequently could be seen in the book *Between Two Towers* (1996).

Since then the School has charted a trajectory of growing academic offerings, increased research activity, and broader engagement with community in the region, across the country and abroad. Several years ago, faculty conversations about the School's identity turned to re-invention, focusing on the questions of how to continue building on the achievements of the first decades without the destructive pendulum swing that often accompanies renewal.

The School's mission statement relates to the distinctive character of the School and its faculty that includes: leadership in the New Urbanism and DOCOMOMO; the association with faculty across the University; the potential of dynamic metropolitan Miami to offer an urban laboratory for the investigation of theory and practice; the opportunity for scholarship in the documentation of the history and evolution of Floridian and Caribbean building types, towns, and landscapes (HABS and HALS) as well as the presence of local archives that encourages and supports valuable primary scholarship; a regional climate and ecology that supports the study of sustainability at every scale from region to

building; and a body of faculty and students that in its diversity encourages the modeling of an ideal professional community and society.

The faculty discussion resulted in an understanding that these strengths could remain in place as the foundation for developing depth in several *areas of focus* that would augment and enrich the curriculum as well as provide students with beneficial experience for seeking employment during the recession. Seven topics were identified as areas of in-depth elective curriculum offerings: historic preservation (a Certificate program since last year), real estate development (the MRED+U program instituted last year), tropical and sub-tropical coastal design (a Visiting Committee suggestion, with one new course thus far), new urbanism (already represented in the courses of the MUD program), health care design, mid-century modern design, and classical and vernacular design (the last three currently having sufficient course offerings in place to become Certificate programs).

In all these topics, the faculty maintains the school's broader philosophy, which affirms the necessity for a solid understanding of the intellectual legacy of the profession and the application of that body of knowledge to practice today. The examination of traditional form and methods of building has a strong influence on the design products of the school. The School, however, does not carry the banner for any particular architectural style, as the faculty strives to provide a forum for the investigation of the history of building and the transformation of understanding into an ability to draw upon that history in contemporary application.

The assumption on the part of the faculty is that once a student is girded with the knowledge of architecture in its fullest sense, each student will find a place in the lexicon of architecture's vast stylistic vocabulary. The final form of the language is beyond the span of an individual's professional degree program and is in fact the life project of every architect. The faculty seeks to make a fundamental contribution to that life quest by guiding students to simultaneously develop a tactile understanding of the past as well as an ability to initiate and participate in the discovery of new knowledge. The intention is to teach through a process of engaging the physical world, emerging with new knowledge, and applying that knowledge to practice.

As the faculty and the administration believes that the important steps to better respond the new accreditation criteria have been implemented and for the most part tested, the School can now embark on a new phase of its development. In response to the increased commitment of the University as a whole to research and increased national and international visibility, the School intends to widen its research capacity and agenda. In order to do so, various ideas and projects have been contemplated and will likely be the focus of the next year's faculty discussions and meetings. First, the faculty will discuss the future of the post-professional Master in Research and its potential reorganization as a full-fledged Post-Professional Master of Architecture (likely to be around a 3-semester, 45-credit structure) with specific tracks of concentration to be developed through research seminars and thesis concentration (tropical modernism, sustainable design, film and set design, etc.). This idea was promoted by the School's Visiting Committee in spring 2010 in order to promote the school's graduate program reputation and make it more marketable for potential American and foreign students (particularly Latin American ones who are currently little represented in the graduate students body as a whole) already in possession of a Professional degree in architecture.

At the same time, the newly restructured Master of Urban Design will not only continue to study and promote the principles and actions of Charter for the New Urbanism, but also develop a research agenda in sustainable and ecological urbanism as well as a focus on the urgent needs of improving infrastructure and informal urbanism in the Caribbean, Latin America and even further within the tropical zone. The arrival of new faculty

member and Kenya-born John Onyango should help expend the horizons of interest and research. The first fall design studio of the Master will focus on historic preservation and redevelopment in central China.

Likewise, the faculty and the administration intend to search funding for academic work (studios, conferences) in relation to sustainable design and coastal climate change issues. In order to so, the School is considering to develop joint programs with various groups and institutions such as the Climate Change Lab at the University of Karlsruhe (with professor Alex Wall). Other plans include the on-going research agenda from the Rome Center in collaboration with La Sapienza University and the Fondazione CE.S.A.R. (an exhibition on the typology of the modern palazzina in 2011 and an ambitious exhibition and catalogue on Terragni in Roma). Moreover, the faculty is looking for grants in order to publish selected results of the yearly Open City Studio, with an emphasis on informal urbanism in Asia, South Africa, etc. Last but not least, the faculty has been considering the possibility of studying the feasibility of the School's first Ph.D. program, likely to be concentrated on Urban Design and History. It is expected that the first study will take place in 2011 in order to plan the necessary peer visits in the following years and the subsequent process of University approval.

Appendix 2.   Conditions Met with Distinction

A.5.   **Investigative Skills,** the programs ability and commitment from the onset of the student education to a path of engagement at all level of investigation and assessments is commendable. The students are truly exposed to a high level of inquiry which leads then into a higher degree of exploration in their search for answers.

A.7   **Use of Precedents,** the programs commitment to precedents and their impact into design is a welcome path for the students. Their ability to synthesize what has happen in the past and still create a fresh future is also commendable. The quality of the students work and design was fresh and by no means stale and-or predictable.

A.9.   **Historical Tradition and Global Culture,** the programs use of history and the appreciation for a global arena was well threaded into their curriculum. The students were able to view project in the local region through the eyes and challenges other culture, countries and regions face. This provided the students a opportunity to begin embracing a global architecture rich in tradition and yet free from preconceptions.

A.10.   **Cultural Diversity,** the programs ability to embrace cultural diversity as part of their foundation for design is exceptional. This curriculum id laced with a preoccupation with the linkages one find in culture, region and historical memories in order to build a better solution.

C.1.   **Collaboration,** this curriculum and studio culture id rich in collaboration and the collaborative nature of our profession. Students are able to learn how to work with each other, seek and support as a fundamental skill required to build a better project.

C.6.   **Leadership,** as stated earlier that this program, the faculty and the students have an understanding of leadership and the skills require for being a leader among the community they serve is paramount. This is easily observed throughout many of the School's program offerings that this is a cornerstone of the School's identity.

C.9.   **Community and Social Responsibility,** as stated earlier that this program, the faculty and the students have an understanding of the community and the social needs we face as architects and designers. They also exhibit and understanding of the skills required for being a leader and to take a responsible role in the community as a whole. This is easily observed throughout many of the School's program offerings and again that this is a cornerstone of the School's identity.

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
Nestor I. Infanzon, FAIA, RIBA, LEED® AP, EDAC
Education & Health Studio Leader
KAI Texas
Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street, Suite 5240
Dallas, TX 75270
(214) 742-0400
(214) 742-0401 fax
(469) 230-3122 mobile
ninfanzon@kaitexas.com

Representing the ACSA
Jonathan Friedman
New York Institute of Technology
School of Architecture and Design
6 Sunset Avenue
Glen Cove, NY 11542
(516) 759-5301
friedman2k@aol.com

Non-Voting Member
R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA, Dean
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
College of Architecture
210 Architecture Hall
Lincoln, NE 68588-0106
(402) 472-9212
(402) 472-3806 fax
wdrummond@unl.edu

Representing the AIAS
Matthew Barstow
716 72nd Street, NW
Albuquerque, NM 87121
(505) 615-6113
matb514@msn.com

Representing the NCARB
Brenda Sanchez, AIA, LEED® AP
Architect/Design Manager
Smithsonian Institution, OFEO
Office of Engineering Design
 & Construction
600 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Ste. 5001
Washington, DC 20013-7012
(202) 633-6277
(202) 633-6233 fax
SanchezB@si.edu

Non-Voting Member
Marleen K. Davis, FAIA
Distinguished Professor
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
College of Architecture and Design
1715 Volunteer Road, Room 224
Knoxville, TN 37996-2400
(865) 974-1779
(865) 851-3911 mobile
(865) 974-0656 fax
mkdavis@utk.edu

Representing the ACSA
Lisa Tilder
The Ohio State University
Knowlton School of Architecture
275 West Woodruff Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 292-1012
(614) 292-7106 fax
tilder.1@osu.edu