

2.0 PROGRESS SINCE THE PREVIOUS SITE VISIT

2.1 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE TEAM FINDINGS

Below are the team comments (in italics) followed by the School's response to each point.

2.1.1. Conditions Not Met

3: Public Information

At the time of the site visit, this condition was not met because of an oversight in the publication of 1998-2000 General Catalog. This problem has been addressed through two actions: In this interim, the SOA Student Handbook has been provided to every currently enrolled student and includes the appropriate language from Appendix, A-2 of the NAAB Conditions and Procedures. In addition, the team was assured that corrective action has been taken to include the appropriate statement in the 2000-2002 FAMU General Catalog.

The exact language found in Appendix A.2 has appeared in each of the subsequent catalogs: 2000-2000; 2002-2004, and 2004-2006. The University is currently editing the 2006-2008 catalogs, and the new language from the 2004 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation has been included.

2.1.2. Criteria Not Met

12.11: Non-Western Traditions

While the work in the Models of Inquiry course, ARC 6425 is commendable, more emphasis needs to be placed on the value of investigating non-Western architectural traditions earlier in the curriculum. Evidence of awareness of non-Western architectural and urban design traditions, from vernacular and historical to post-industrial in the non-western context, was minimal at best in course syllabi and not sufficiently present in studio work or student papers to meet the standard or awareness.

The discussion of non-Western traditions is of primary concern in the ARC History I and ARC History II classes. For graduate students, it is also addressed in the Advanced Theory class.

12.19: Life Safety Systems

The curriculum clearly introduces the students to life safety issues prior to the completion of their third year. The students' studio work displayed in the Team Room did not successfully represent the students' abilities to utilize the knowledge

and skill in addressing the systems impact in their design process and product. The bachelor's or the master's thesis projects also did not demonstrate this basic fundamental requirement of this design process and action.

While students are introduced to the basic principles of life safety systems in their classes prior to completing third year, they are required to demonstrate an understanding of these principles in studio work in ARC 3325 Architectural Design 3.2 and ARC 4341 Design 4.1.

2.1.3 Causes for Concern

1. A Need for Immediate Action

... the team believes it is imperative that an appropriate action plan be developed immediately in response to the overwhelming growth now underway.

The program has experienced steady growth since the last visit; however, the rate of growth has been considerably less than what was anticipated in 2000. Additionally, it is anticipated that during the 2005-2006 academic year the program and the University will experience a 10-15% enrollment decline.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the administrative staff has worked on a new organizational structure for the SOA that specifically targets the growth issue. The proposal was presented to the faculty during the last faculty meeting (May 5, 2004). Some relevant aspects of the proposed new structure are:

1. Emphasis on shared governance
2. Abandonment of the pyramidal administrative mode. Delegation of responsibilities to intermediate positions (Director of Architecture Programs, Director of Graduate Programs, among others)
3. Definition of Associate Dean position as clearinghouse person for development of future degrees and programs.
4. Streamlining of admissions processes.
5. Formalization of assessment and evaluative instruments.
6. Increase of administrative support staff.

2. Faculty Passion

... there appears to be limited opportunity for the faculty to integrate their creative work and research into their teaching because of the highly structured curriculum and the limited resources to offer elective course.

Faculty can integrate their creative work and research through either (1) elective courses or (2) leading master's thesis project. The following is a sample list of elective course offerings offered in the last four years.

Alfano—The House
 Alfano—Architecture History and Theories of Urban Design
 Bohannon—Landscape Architecture Computer Graphics
 Capoot, Gray—Intermediate CADD
 Caster—Site Engineering
 Caster—Site Implementation
 Chin, Pabón—Cultural Landscapes: Barcelona
 Dombek, Porter—Architectural Graphics IV
 Dozier—History of American Architecture
 Goodwin—Cloth Construction
 Grey, Bohannon—Practice and Community Assistance
 Grondzik—Vital Signs
 Knight—Architectural Design Theory and Methods
 Ots—Design Methods
 Pabón, Robles, Chin—Cultural Landscapes: Panama
 Peterson—Green Architecture and Sustainable Planning
 Peterson—Master’s Seminars on Sustainability
 Powers—Introduction to Landscape Architecture
 Powers—Teaching and Learning in Design Edu.
 Robles—Furniture Design Workshop
 Rome—Landscape Architecture History
 Rome—Modern Landscape Architecture History
 Wells-Bowie—Caribbean Architecture
 White—Path-Portal-Place

The following is a list of faculty with their thesis students in the last year:

M. Alfano	P. Grocher
A. Chin	L. Rios
K. Grey	J. Francis
W. Grondzik	S. Moniz
V. Goodwin	S. Chambers, V. Greenaway
R. Knight	J. Peat
T. Martineau	C. Cao
A. Pabón	J. Yates, A. Arrington-Bey, L. Alcime, N. Richardson
L. Peterson	A. Pelkey
L. Robles	K. Williams
R. Rome	A. Beavers, R. Simmons, S. Murray
T. White	B. Pham, K. Dutt, D. Williams

As a result of both elective courses and theses directing, more than 75% of the faculty engages in activities that allow them to integrate areas of particular interest into their teaching.

Various faculty have developed international educational opportunities. Professors Wells-Bowie and White coordinated study trips to the Bahamas, Cuba, the Caribbean, and Greece. Professors Chin, Pabón, Powers, and Robles worked in collaboration and created a study trip elective course to Panamá. Each professor highlighted to students his/her particular area of interest. The areas of architectural research, historic preservation, landscape architecture, and urban planning were explored.

The graduate program revision introduced electives in the following areas: historic preservation and ethnic studies, design technology, design methods, and practice and community assistance. It is a first step in making it possible for graduate students to concentrate and design a master's thesis around these particular areas.

3. *Architectural Library*

. . . the resources of the library are losing ground rapidly. The collection of printed materials and visual materials is dated and worn. This situation needs immediate attention.

Since the last the visit, the University has provided the program with an infusion of financial enhancements to update the collection through the library budget and the use of Title III funds. In the 2001-2002 academic year, it provided over \$77,000 of Title III funds to books and related materials for the landscape architecture and architecture programs. (See Section 3.9 Information Resources.) During the 2002-2003 academic year, the library's budget was \$87,300 for books and related materials. Over 1,441 books and 2,940 slides were acquired. It should be noted that the SOA has invested in laptop computers and a wireless network and is moving toward Power Point presentations that will make slides almost obsolete. Additional staff support has been provided by three OPS student assistants (half time), four teaching assistants (SOA graduate students), and student assistants.

4. *Mechanism for internal communication*

A. . . . the team found that information was not communicated in such a way that those affected were informed and understood what was taking place in the SOA.

Communication lines between administration and faculty are as open and fluid as possible within the University's traditional structure. The Dean meets with the faculty every month while some committees meet up to two times every month. Other information instruments are: "all faculty" emails, a School-wide calendar (available on the Web to all), and the Web-posted daily agenda of the Dean, among others.

No relevant change is carried out without notifying the faculty and receiving their input. Course assignments comply as much as possible with faculty requests, which are submitted prior to the assignment. It should be noted that many members of the faculty do not feel comfortable using modern systems of communications, email, and phone answering machines. As a result, hard copies of important information are also distributed individually.

B. . . . it is also important to clarify the level of responsibility and authority in the current administrative structure of the SOA

The Dean of the School of Architecture reports directly to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. This results in a short, effective, and responsive decision-making relationship with the University administration. Within the School, the goal is to keep lines of communication short and simple.

Although each of the School's five full-time administrators is involved in teaching, his/her primary responsibilities are administrative. The *Dean* (Rodner B. Wright) is the chief executive officer and oversees the administration of all degree programs, research, and service programs of the School. The *Associate Dean* (currently vacant) consults with the Dean and faculty to develop academic policies and programs and, in turn, directly supervises all aspects of academic policy, implementation, and delivery. The *Assistant Dean* (Andrew Chin) is responsible for the oversight of faculty academic activity and student progress. The *Director of the Institute for Building Sciences* (Thomas Pugh) is responsible for the operations of the Institute, the research and community service arm of the School. The fifth administrator is the *Director of the Landscape Architecture Program* (Richard Rome). These five administrators meet bi-weekly to coordinate the activities of the School.

In addition, internal conditions required that the administrative structure be updated. As the School has grown and matured, there is a need to move away from the pyramidal structure to one that is more formal and less intuitive. More responsive and efficient mechanisms to address issues were needed as well as more collaboration and help for all faculty so they can focus, refine, and develop their expertise.

To meet these needs, the proposed structure included the creation of two new faculty bodies: the Undergraduate Programs Council and the Graduate Programs Council. These are deliberative bodies charged with the *direction* of the two basic programs of study: undergraduate (currently including the B.S.Arch. and B.Arch. programs) and graduate (currently including the M.S.Arch., the M.Arch., and the M.L.A.). The Undergraduate Council is chaired by the Director of Architecture Programs while the Graduate Council is co-chaired by the Director of Architecture Programs and the Director of the Landscape Architecture Program, both appointed by the Dean. The Councils are

composed of five members each, including the chairs. The faculty elects two members to serve on each Council, and the remaining members are appointed by the Dean.

The new structure was implemented in fall 2004. The representatives were elected at the first faculty meeting (thereafter to be elected at the end of each spring term). Councils were charged with meeting at least once a month and to submit written reports to the Dean after each meeting.

5. Unit to Degree

. . . there is a need to undertake a careful review of the total units to the degree. The purpose of this review is to consider increased opportunities for students to expand their exploration of electives within the SOA and as importantly, within other disciplines . . .

Because many of our students are either minority students or first-generation university students, many show deficiencies in the area of general studies. The existing curriculum tries to address this reality. As a result of these two facts, the number of elective credits is limited. In spite of this, there was an increase of 100% from the number of electives offered during the first semester (4) to those offered during the second semester (8).

The Curriculum Committee proposed a revision to the curriculum that highlights the SOA's concern with this issue. The proposal requires that two required courses be moved to the professional level so that at least two more electives can be offered.

As part of the graduate program revision, electives in historic preservation and ethnic studies, design technology, design methods, and practice and community assistance will be offered to students every semester. It is a first step in making it possible for graduate students to concentrate and design a master's thesis around these particular areas.

To further increase academic opportunities, the SOA has proposed that FAMU authorize the following new degrees and programs:

- Ph.D. in Architectural Studies (This would be an "academic umbrella" for advanced graduate studies in special areas of historic interest to FAMU: ethnicity, cultural diversity, gender, and minorities.)
- D.Arch. (Doctor of Architecture)
- Ph.D. in Environmental Design (Interdisciplinary degree that would include architecture, landscape architecture, urban design, and community planning and sustainability)

- B.L.A. (Bachelor of Landscape Architecture. This program will support the current Master of Landscape Architecture.)

6. Construction Documents

. . . The team found no direct or indirect validation as to whether the students were exposed to the totality of the process that architects utilize in developing a set of construction documents.

Students are exposed to the process in two courses: ARC 3463 Materials and Methods of Construction II and ARC 5475 Professional Practice.

7. Global Practice

. . . there is minimal evidence that students were exposed to the issue of global practice and cultural differences in practice and the value of an architect operating in this context.

As part of the legal aspects investigation in Practice II, architectural practice rules and regulations in other countries are surveyed. Some of the students prepare reports on their own countries of origin (e.g., India, Perú, and Jamaica) while others adopt countries to report on (e.g., Germany, Nigeria, South Africa, Australia, Sweden).

8. Creative Work and Research

A. . . . it is apparent to this team that the need to hire several faculty members to complement the current faculty and to replace the skills of the retiring is critical.

During the 2002-2003 academic year, two new faculty members joined the SOA. Professor Dobson and Professor Powers were appointed to tenure-track positions in the architecture and landscape architecture programs. Professor Powers will also teach courses that will serve the architecture programs. Professor Henderson was appointed to a full-time visiting position. He teaches in the history of architecture sequence as well as electives in the areas of Architecture and African-Americans.

The SOA attempted additional searches in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005, but the University froze all searches both years due to limitations and reductions in state funding. Special dispensation was sought, and during the next year searches will be reinitiated for several key academic areas.

At the present time, we have one phased retiree: Professor Stone. Professors Shaeffer and Dombek completed their phased retirements in 2004. Additionally, Professor Grey retired at the end of the 2004-2005 academic year.

B. . . . the school must demonstrate a clear requirement for faculty to participate in creative work and research.

There are several clear requirements for faculty to participate in creative work and research. The *SOA Tenure and Promotion Criteria* for tenure-track faculty require that they demonstrate and maintain an active research and creative work agenda. Creative work and research are also required in the application for graduate faculty status, a requirement to direct or form part of a thesis committee.

All faculty also submit end-of-the-year reports to the Dean (Report on Non-credit Generating Activities and Annual Review Report). The annual Review Report is discussed at length with the Dean. Finally, incentives are offered to all faculty members who wish to present papers in conferences and participate in professional organizations. Travel, hotel stays, per diem, registration, and other related costs are covered by the SOA if funds are available.

2.2 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO CHANGES IN THE NAAB CONDITIONS

The School was last evaluated by NAAB under the *1998 Conditions and Procedures*. The present APR is written and organized under the new *2004 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. It is relevant for our School to comment on the new (2004) requirements as they apply to our preparation of this report.

We have conducted a detailed comparative study of the *1998* and *2004 Conditions* and have found the intent and content of the two sets of conditions to be essentially the same.

The School has found no difficulty in adjusting to the *2004 Conditions* and meeting the requirements stated there. The *2004 Conditions* have resulted in no hardship in preparing the evaluation or in the production of this report.

A brief presentation of our comparative analysis is found below. The changes are noted in large type. The unchanged conditions are in smaller type.

1998 Condition. Expressed in 2004 Conditions as 2004 Conditions

5	Program Strategic Plan	1.5 Program Self-Assessment
	Not in <i>1998 Conditions</i>	3.5 Studio Culture

Performance Criteria

Performance Criteria

12.1	Verbal and Writing Skills	1. Speaking and Writing Skills
------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------

12.2	Graphic Skills	3.	Graphic Skills
12.3	Research Skills	4.	Research Skills
12.4	Critical Thinking Skills	2.	Critical Thinking Skills
12.5	Fundamental Design Skills	6.	Fundamental Design Skills
12.6	Collaborative Skills	7.	Collaborative Skills
12.7	Human Behavior	12.	Human Behavior
12.8	Human Diversity	13.	Human Diversity
12.9	Use of Precedents	11.	Use of Precedents
12.10	Western Traditions	8.	Western Traditions
12.11	Non-Western Traditions	9.	Non-Western Traditions
12.12	National and Regional Traditions	10.	National and Regional Traditions
12.13	Environmental Conservation	15.	Sustainable Design
12.14	Accessibility	14.	Accessibility
12.15	Site Conditions	17.	Site Conditions
12.16	Formal Ordering Systems	5.	Formal Ordering Systems
12.17	Structural Systems	18.	Structural Systems
12.18	Environmental Systems	19.	Environmental Systems
12.19	Life-Safety Systems	20.	Life-Safety Systems
12.20	Building Envelope Systems	21.	Building Envelope Systems
12.21	Building Service Systems	22.	Building Service Systems
12.22	Building Systems Integration	23.	Building Systems Integration
12.23	Legal Responsibilities	32.	Legal Responsibilities
12..24	Building Code Compliance	32.	Legal Responsibilities
12.25	Building Materials and Assemblies	24.	Building Materials and Assemblies
12.26	Building Economics and Cost Control	25.	Construction Cost Control
12.27	Detailed Design Development	28.	Comprehensive Design
12.28	Technical Documentation	26.	Technical Documentation
12.29	Comprehensive Design	28.	Comprehensive Design

12.30	Program Preparation	16.	Program Preparation
12.31	Legal Context of Architectural Practice	33.	Legal Responsibilities
12.32	Practice Organization and Management	29.	Architects' Administrative Roles
		30.	Architectural Practice
12.23	Contracts and Documentation	29.	Architects' Administrative Roles
		30.	Architectural Practice
12.24	Professional Internship	31.	Professional Development
12.25	Architects' Leadership Roles	32.	Leadership
12.36	Context of Architecture		Not in <i>2004 Conditions</i>
12.37	Ethics and Professional Judgment	34.	Ethics and Professional Judgment
	Not in <i>1998 Conditions</i>	27.	Client Role in Architecture