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

1. Team Comments & Visit Summary

The School of Architecture at UK occupies a singular leadership role as the only accredited school of architecture in the Commonwealth. The work it does, the issues it explores, the problems it solves, and the initiatives it takes reflect a proud history, frame the issues of the day, and foreshadow the quality and influence of future architects and architecture throughout the Commonwealth and beyond. During the team visit, we found the stream of communication to be insightful and motivating, positive and unified. Clearly everyone cares about the traditions of the school and is excited about its future.

As the team observed the many-faceted outcomes of a transformed program successfully transitioning from a five-year Bachelor of Architecture program during the previous NAAB visit to the four-plus-two Master of Architecture program today, we found an energy within the program that suggests this transition has launched the program into a new era of relevance and importance to the university, the city of Lexington, and, indeed, the entire Commonwealth. An entrepreneurial spirit is gathering momentum as it makes real-world change in the lives of people, businesses, and communities through such initiatives as the River City project, the Houseboat to Energy Efficient Residences (HBEER) project, and the Town Branch Commons. There is recognition that the revised program offers new opportunities to attract and retain quality students and faculty. The school and its work are making a difference. It is seizing important opportunities to show the value of design and what it can add—economically, ethically, sustainably, and culturally.

The team room was organized to reflect the work of every course that contributes to the overall architecture program at UK. This was an important part of finding evidence of compliance with the Conditions and Procedures required for accreditation. But as important as the team room is, the interaction with key stakeholders in the program—administrators at all levels of the university, faculty, alumni, and of course the students—is also important and provided the team with the following insights:

University Administration
The School of Architecture has support at the highest level of the university administration. President Capilouto and Provost Tracy are proud to highlight the school's service to students and to the Commonwealth. Though not the largest school on campus, it is producing results far beyond its size. The university administration understands the importance and value of a vibrant architecture program. This recognition has been validating within the School of Architecture.

College and School Administration
The administration at the college and school, led by Dean Speaks and Director Biagi, is committed to the success of the students and has worked hard during tough economic years to minimize the negative impact to students.

Faculty and Staff
The faculty and staff are a diverse group that is supportive of each other and of the students they serve. With a balance of teaching and research responsibilities, faculty are motivated to discover and share, supported and encouraged by the university.

Alumni
There is pride and support for the program by the alumni. That is manifested by their presence as mentors for students, as employers of graduates, and as
4. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2007)

2004 Condition 8, Physical Resources: The accredited degree program must provide the physical resources appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class; lecture and seminar space to accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space. The facilities must also be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and applicable building codes.

Previous Team Report (2007): It is apparent that this has been the most visible and most discussed component of the NAAB Conditions that continues to impact students and faculty.

Since the last NAAB visit, the building facilities have continued to be renovated and improved on a small-scale, as-needed basis, relying on in-school design competitions to enhance the building while making Pence Hall a more acceptable facility. In a nutshell, having the architecture program scattered across three or more buildings is creating a series of challenges to the pedagogy, collegiality, and sense of community and culture in the School of Architecture.

While some of the existing facilities are spatially adequate to meet the academic needs at this time, by no means are they the best solution one could expect to find in a university setting. For example, the woodshop occupies a large section of the basement and presents some challenges. As students and course work increase, demand of the woodshop and more sophisticated woodworking tools are added to the inventory, it is observed that the residual/open space is becoming increasingly cramped and probably unsafe. There is need for additional air ventilation to ensure that students using paints and/or wood stains, while working on their required course projects, are not impacting the air quality in the shop as a whole. In addition, there is a need for additional staff in order to better manage the woodshop during peak times.

The lack of connectivity between the three buildings that the school occupies (four buildings if you include the whole College of Design) ultimately creates an environment in which the design culture is being affected. Faculty and students in the outlying facilities (away from Pence Hall) need access to critical media equipment and other resources that are centrally located in Pence Hall—this impacts the continuity within the teaching of a studio. Students are in need of access to additional computer hardware in order to work as teams within studio time. They are also in need of the required software that is essential for completing their work.

In addition, the lack of private office spaces for faculty makes it difficult for confidential sessions with students as well as privacy to work. A designated communal gallery/gathering space is needed within the School of Architecture for faculty and students to gather to form a cohesive and integrated culture of collaboration.

The proposed renovation and/or addition as presented in the APR is a significant step forward at this time and will be of great assistance to the program. As the program embarks on its current academic evolution and with the potential growth of the college, a new facility may be in order within the next decade.

2010 Focused Evaluation Team Assessment:

The 2007 VTR cited the following deficiencies in meeting Condition 8: The college remains inadequate in terms of faculty office space, instructional and pin-up areas, and technology implementation. Up-to-date technology is critical, from a competitive standpoint, as many benchmark institutions are 100 percent computerized. The program spaces, split between three buildings, compromise the program and inhibit a culture of collaboration. Although important strides have been made in correcting some of the deficiencies noted in the last VTR, the gravity of the facility deficiencies remains a problem.
"After reviewing the Focused Evaluation Program Report submitted by the University of Kentucky College of Architecture as part of the focused evaluation of its Master of Architecture program, in conjunction with the Focused Evaluation Team Report, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) has found that the changes made or planned by the program to remove the identified deficiencies are satisfactory."

During the 2013 visit, the team found existing buildings to contain sufficient space and that key areas had recently been renovated, namely the shop area (which was expanded and received new equipment) and computer facilities. Combined with identified future plans for expansion and further improvement, the team found that this condition continues to be in line with the 2010 approval statement and is met.

**2004 Criterion 13.9, Non-Western Traditions: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world**

**Previous Team Report (2007):** This criterion is not met at the level of understanding.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team found this SPC now to be met at the level of understanding in ARC 111-Introduction to History and Theory and ARC 315-History and Theory IV: World Architecture & Urbanism, including Eastern and Western cultures and traditions.

**2004 Criterion 13.13, Human Diversity: Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical ability, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the implication of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects**

**Previous Team Report (2007):** The team found no evidence that a level of understanding for this criterion has been reached.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** The redirection of course work to address human (cultural) diversity following the last Visiting Team Report has now been met at the level of understanding in ARC 315-History and Theory IV: World Architecture & Urbanism.

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

**Previous Team Report (2007):** While the team was able to substantiate throughout the program that students were able to understand some aspects of designing for the physically challenged in portions of their projects, we were unable to find consistent evidence of the students' ability to integrate current accessibility guidelines and performance criteria into the design of buildings and site.

**2013 Visiting Team Assessment:** Students demonstrated the level of ability in satisfaction of this criterion in the specific exercises and exams as part of ARC 631-Building Systems Integration. Evidence was also found in ARC 354-Studio IV and ARC 750-Comprehensive Studio that students have the ability to design facilities to provide accessibility within the structure for physical disabilities, such as wheelchair accessibility in bathrooms and accessible paths through buildings.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Part One (1): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

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

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

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

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: As a public, land grant university, the University of Kentucky has stated its vision to be one of the nation’s 20 best public research universities. In 1960 the university established the Department of Architecture in the College of Engineering. The School of Architecture was established in 1965, becoming the College of Architecture in 1967. As a result of restructuring within the university, the College of Design was established in 2003; it includes the School of Architecture, School of Interior Design, and the Department of Historic Preservation.

In 2007 the School of Architecture completed a nomenclature change from a 5-year Bachelor of Architecture program to a four-plus-two Master of Architecture program. With an increased balance of design research and emphasis on the economic and societal value of architecture and design, the School of Architecture has achieved rising visibility within the university and within the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

A very detailed history and mission of the program and its relationship to the university was provided in the APR to satisfy this condition.

1.1.2 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.
undergraduate programs in the arts, sciences, humanities, professional disciplines, and philosophy. Since its founding in 1960, the architecture program has served as the location for Kentucky’s only professional degree program in architecture.

The School of Architecture is within the College of Design, which is one of 16 academic colleges at the university. It has its own administrative structure and budget and is entirely responsible for faculty appointments, program and curricular development, academic standards, and admissions criteria. The college’s Rules and Procedures clearly define the relationship between the college and the school.

The current architecture program of study is a four-plus-two Master of Architecture. In addition to the architecture pre-professional and professional requirements for this program, requirements include elective courses that are not limited to offerings in the School, but extend to a wide range of courses in the College and the University. Each student takes an average of 50 plus credits of general education (non-architecture) coursework. The new curriculum has broadened the opportunities for faculty and students to participate in interdisciplinary graduate studies and research and for students to pursue minors. It has also established an arena in which both faculty and students can be engaged in scholarship and community engagement studies.

The faculty within the school represents a wide diversity in terms of their background, gender, educational experience, professional expertise, interests, and age. Through the University Governing Regulations and Administrative Regulations, as well as the Rules and Procedures of the college, policies that ensure academic freedom, along with continuity and stability of academic policies, are in place. Faculty and students serve in governance roles in the university and the school.

The school has targeted research activities on the theme of Design + Energy. This has facilitated engagement with numerous centers, departments, and colleges across the campus in a variety of specific programs. For example: Solar Decathlon 2009 and 2013, Center for Applied Energy Resources, colleges of Business, Engineering, and Education.

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

[X] The program is responsive to this perspective.

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence for this criterion can be recognized throughout the culture of the school and through its policies. Students have emphasized in various ways how they value their education; through relationships with faculty, specific courses, and the entirety of their education. Besides recognizing the criteria in personal responses from students, the evidence can be found more specifically in the following courses: ARC 111-Intro to Arch History & Theory, ARC 315-History & Theory; World Architecture and Urbanism, ARC 658-Studio IX, ARC 641-Professional Practice, ARC 642-Professional Internship, and throughout the sequence of studio courses.

C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment. That students enrolled in the accredited degree program are provided with: a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure within the context of international, national, and state regulatory environments; an understanding of the role of the registration board for the jurisdiction in which it is located, and; prior to the earliest point of eligibility, the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP).
are introduced in early design studios to "real life" project scenarios in local communities where interaction with clients takes place. In later studios, specifically the HBEER project, the River Cities project, and the Paducah project, all students are engaged with the local business community, politicians, and other stakeholders where studio solutions are reviewed. In the case of HBEER, student projects were developed by local architects and built, aiding an economically depressed industry.

Recent efforts by the university in its quest to become a top-20 research institution have provided the School of Architecture the opportunity to increase time available for faculty research. This focus and the increased number of faculty positions added in the last four years has given the school impetus to address the important issues of energy and economic development for the citizens of the Commonwealth. The school has targeted research activities on the theme of Design + Energy. This has facilitated engagement with numerous centers, departments, and colleges across the campus in a variety of specific programs, including, for example, Solar Decathlon 2009 and 2013, Center for Applied Energy Resources, and the colleges of Business, Engineering, and Education.

Through the efforts of Dr. Michael Speaks, dean of the College of Design, the School of Architecture has elevated the value of design in the reanimation of downtown Lexington, Kentucky. In concert with the mayor and the Downtown Development Corporation, the School of Architecture has attracted renowned global firms to the campus as speakers and to participate in the downtown design efforts. Students are exposed to this effort, and some studio projects are built around these actual projects.

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: Both hard copy and online information addressing long-range planning was provided. The School of Architecture's long-range planning goals and objectives align with those of the university. Continuous and directed review of data is taking place in the School of Architecture's planning efforts.

1.1.5 Self-Assessment Procedures: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How the program is progressing towards its mission.
- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives (see above) since the objectives were identified and since the last visit.
- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while developing learning opportunities in support of its mission and culture, the mission and culture of the institution, and the five perspectives.
- Self-assessment procedures shall include, but are not limited to:
  - Solicitation of faculty, students', and graduates' views on the teaching, learning and achievement opportunities provided by the curriculum.
  - Individual course evaluations.
  - Review and assessment of the focus and pedagogy of the program.
  - Institutional self-assessment, as determined by the institution.
PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

1.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

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

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

2013 Team Assessment: The School of Architecture has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. This includes administrative leadership, full- and part-time instructional faculty, and technical and administrative support. The School of Architecture is the largest unit within the College of Design, which is one of the smallest colleges at the university. The relationship between the school and the college is deeply intertwined. The successful working relationship allows for effective administration and fair allocation of faculty and student support. Administrative functions and support staff are shared to efficiently operate a school within a small college.

The School of Architecture adheres to established university policies for Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action initiatives. Under the new master’s program, faculty workloads have been revised to an average of approximately 50% teaching, 45% research and scholarship, and 5% service. The majority of the faculty has expressed support for this change. The university and the college have allocated funding to support professional development, and offered generous start-up packages to incoming faculty.

Procedures for tenure and promotion are according to the university policies. The new master’s program and redistribution of the faculty responsibilities (teaching, research, and service) have produced a climate in which faculty members have the potential to be tenured and promoted. Priority has been given, even in tough financial times, to providing resources to support human resource development.

Mark O’Bryan, the associate dean for administration, is the IDP coordinator. He has participated in the NCARB training conferences for the past three years.

\[2\] A list of the policies and other documents to be made available in the team room during an accreditation visit is in Appendix 3.
2013 Team Assessment: This is met based on evidence of administrative structure, position descriptions, and description of committees that were found in the Architectural Program Report and online resources.

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

[X] Governance opportunities are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: The program has a long history of bottom-up governance. It is evident that there are multiple opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to participate in governance at all levels. This condition is met.

1.2.3 Physical Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides physical resources that promote student learning and achievement in a professional degree program in architecture. This includes, but is not limited to the following:
- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning
- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning.
- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

[X] Physical Resources are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: Based on a review of the information provided in the APR relative to the facilities, the results of the 2010 Focused NAAB visit related to facilities (supported by NAAB's letter stating adequacy of the facilities to meet this condition), as well as a tour by the team in Pence Hall and Miller Hall, the physical resources are considered adequate for the program.

The team found evidence of the modest renovations that have been made to the buildings recently—notably the renovation of the lowest level of Pence Hall to make room for new equipment to support model-making and fabrication of components for student design work. The team also saw evidence of master planning and conceptual programming identifying the location for a future addition to Pence Hall. During the team's meeting with the president and provost, the team received an explanation of the difficult process for obtaining legislative approval and implementing capital improvement projects. Both the president and the provost strongly support the college and recognize the need for improved facilities.

The team found overall adequate space for individual and collaborative work within Pence and Miller Halls; however, we noted that the separation of these buildings, and therefore the separation of functions of the School of Architecture, presents challenges to the overall connectivity of the program and its stakeholders. The ability for all levels of the program to interact on a formal or informal basis is reduced, as is access to common resources, such as shop facilities, media equipment, library facilities, and support services.

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

[X] Financial Resources are adequate for the program

2013 Team Assessment: Financial resources are centralized at the college level. Fee income provides support for unit operating budgets as well as services that are shared at the college level, such as studio technology, the digital fabrication lab, and college lectures and events. Roughly 70%
2013 Team Assessment: This criterion was met through the university library services. The Design Library, located in Pence Hall, offers convenient access to all of the information resources as listed: literature, information, and visual and digital resources. Expertise and staffing specialists are on hand to help faculty and students navigate through resources and educate students on various research skills. Additions to the collection are made in one of two ways: either upon request of students and faculty, or through librarian research on trends in architecture topics or popularity in distributors.

The Design Library is one of the few specialty libraries housed within its unit at the university. However, the college anticipates that the Design Library will leave Pence Hall and merge with the Fine Arts Library, located two buildings away. The current library space would be converted to studios, classrooms, and offices.

The library is staffed by a full-time librarian, one full-time library technician, and student assistants. The library is open 58 hours per week, but there are no weekend hours. The compensation for lack of weekend hours is in terms of more materials available online, as well as the increased use of course packs and e-reserves for lectures.
The program is required to provide all annual reports, including statistics and narratives that were submitted prior to 2008. The program is also required to provide all NAAB Responses to annual reports transmitted prior to 2008. In the event a program underwent a Focused Evaluation, the Focused Evaluation Program Report and Focused Evaluation Team Report, including appendices and addenda should also be included.

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

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of the Annual Reports from 2008 to 2011 is located on the University of Kentucky College of Design web site, http://www.uky.edu/design/index.php/info/category/naab_and_career_development/. Reports prior to 2008 are on file at the school and available upon request. This condition is met.

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.

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

2013 Team Assessment: Curriculum Vitae were provided for all faculty members—full-time and part-time. Exhibits of the work of full-time faculty were also on display. The program has been very successful in recent years in recruiting a number of very talented faculty members to augment the established program faculty. The dean has also been able to work well with the university administration and other departments on campus to create a cohort that is largely comprised of full-time faculty. Within this group are tenured members, tenure-track members (in varying stages of that process), and non-tenure-track full-time and part-time instructors. The overall result is an architecture faculty that has a broad range of knowledge and experience, comes from different backgrounds, has a diverse set of research interests, and has an extensive network of connections both in the professional and academic arenas.

\(^4\) 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.
PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

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

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.

[✓] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Writing skills at the level of ability were demonstrated in ARC 314-History and Theory III: Twentieth Century. Reading, discussion and speaking skills at the level of ability were demonstrated in ARC 511-515-History and Theory Seminars. The team also observed discussion and speaking skills through various meetings and presentations during the visit.

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.

[✓] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Students demonstrated compliance at the level of ability in design thinking skills in ARC 101- Introduction to Design Studio, ARC 151-Studio I, and ARC 750-Comprehensive Studio.

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.

[✓] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of this performance criterion at the level of ability was observed throughout the design studio sequence in both the undergraduate and graduate portions of the program.
A. 9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture: Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture, landscape and urban design including examples of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, national settings from the Eastern, Western, Northern, and Southern hemispheres in terms of their climatic, ecological, technological, socioeconomic, public health, and cultural factors.

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The redirection of course work to address this criterion, following the last Visiting Team Report, has now been met at the level of understanding in ARC 111-Introduction to History and Theory and ARC 315-History and Theory IV: World Architecture & Urbanism. The graduate studios also address climatic, ecological, socioeconomic, and public health issues in the River Cities Project as part of ARC 750 - Comprehensive Studio.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: The redirection of course work to address cultural diversity, following the last Visiting Team Report, has now been met at the level of understanding in ARC 315-History and Theory IV: World Architecture & Urbanism.


[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion was satisfied at the level of understanding in ARC 456-Studio VI and ARC 659-Studio IX. The River Cities and HBEERs projects, part of ARC 750-Comprehensive Studio, are also evidence of this criterion.

Realm A. General Team Commentary: In general, the team observed that the research emphasis by the university and the reassignment of faculty load to include research has provided the opportunity for these criteria to be emphasized. Students develop the tools and skill sets necessary to perform and assess research, communicate effectively through a variety of methods, and design for diverse cultures, economies, and environmental conditions.
[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Students demonstrated the level of ability of this criterion in the specific exercises and exams completed as part ARC 631-Building Systems Integration.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: Students demonstrated the level of ability of this criterion in the specific exercises and exams completed as part ARC 631-Building Systems Integration, and to a lesser degree in ARC 333-Environmental Controls II and ARC 641-Introduction to Professional Practice.

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.5. Investigative Skills  B.4. Site Design

B.5. Life Safety

[X] Not Met

2013 Team Assessment: The team noted that while the individual abilities of performance criteria were met in individual courses throughout the curriculum, the work presented in the comprehensive studios did not rise to the expected level of ability to synthesize and integrate all of the requisite components into the overall project design.

While evidence exists that the student are given a real site and in the case of the HBEER project, difficult site topography, solutions do not indicate an ability to manipulate the site contours to respond either to the topography or watershed. In the most recent studio project for the U of L Satellite Student Center, even though the site is flat, projects do not show any engagement with the site features (streets, curbs, sidewalks, drainage) addressing building access.

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

[X] Met
2013 Team Assessment: This criterion was satisfied at the level of understanding in ARC 231-Structural & Material Concepts, ARC 435-Materials & Methods of Construction, ARC 533-Structures Design II; ARC 332-Environmental Controls I, and ARC 333-Environmental Controls II

Realm B. General Team Commentary: In general, the team found that students were able to demonstrate the requisite ability or understanding for each of the separate performance criteria, with the exception of Comprehensive Design. The team noted that many of the SPCs in this realm were satisfied by only a few courses, which effectively focused on individual elements of design and construction. However, the evidence that students had an ability to put the elements together in a well-integrated, comprehensive technical design was inconsistent.

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

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of ability in ARC 458-Studio VI. These projects were completed under the larger umbrella of the River Cities project and the UK Center of Applied Energy Research.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding of human behavior in ARC 355-Studio V, ARC 658-Studio VII, and ARC 631-Building Systems Integration.

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: This criterion is met at the level of understanding through multiple design studios at both the preprofessional and graduate levels, as well as opportunities for engagement with project stakeholders, especially the River Cities and HBEER work.
2013 Team Assessment: Evidence of this criterion was found at the level of understanding in student work for ARC 759-Masters Project, ARC 659-Studio IX, and ARC 750-HBEERs studio.

Realm C. General Team Commentary: In general the team observed that the students in the School of Architecture are engaged in a series of projects that have provided them with an opportunity to understand various aspects of professional responsibility and practice. Graduate studios have provided the students opportunities to demonstrate their abilities to collaborate with stakeholders and professionals in communities throughout the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This form of service, coupled with the professional practice course, provides the students with a well-rounded understanding of professional and societal responsibilities.
PART TWO (II) : SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY/PRE-PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION

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

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

[X] Met

2013 Team Assessment: As identified in the APR, the team found that the Master of Architecture program has two paths for admission to the accredited degree program: completion of the UK Bachelor of Arts in Architecture program; and entrance from a preprofessional degree program within a NAAB-accredited program or a program under the Canberra Accord. Historically, most students have followed the first path. Those following the second path first apply to the UK Graduate School and then to the architecture program. Students entering from outside UK must demonstrate satisfaction of SPC matrix items to enter the program. These matrices are evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the director of graduate studies and the Office of Student Affairs.

Going forward, with the potential of increasing numbers of transfer students and international students, the evaluation of preprofessional education will necessarily require focused attention and scrutiny to maintain consistency and rigor.
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

2013 Team Assessment: Public access to NAAB required documents including all Annual Reports (2008-2011), NAAB responses to the Annual Report, final decision letter from the NAAB, the most recent APR, and the most recent VTR are available electronically and located under a singular heading titled NAAB and Career Development Information. From the University of Kentucky web site, the information is available in four clicks. http://www.uky.edu/design/index.php/info/category/naab_and_career_development/

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

2013 Team Assessment: The web site for the College of Design features a link for "Resources," under which is another link for "NAAB and Career Development." This leads to a page with several links. A subheading for public access to the APRs and VTRs includes a link to a chart with the ARE pass rates for 2007 through 2011. http://design.uky.edu/webfiles/AREPassRates.pdf
2. **Conditions Met with Distinction**
   A.5 Investigative Skills
   A.7 Use of Precadents
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