PART 2 — NAAB Visiting Team Report - "II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation"

CONDITION "NOT MET"

Student Performance Criteria

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

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: This criterion is not met. There is inconsistent evidence that the ability to apply basic principles of life-safety is incorporated into the design process. There is substantial evidence that it is incorporated into lectures, but not shown in the student work as required by the ability level.

Response:
2012 Response: We see the comments on the three Student Performance Criteria, B.2, B.5 and B.6 described in the 2011 Team Assessment as being linked. We are working within our third year curriculum to make these adjustments. Changes have been approved for the third year curriculum that will improve the building systems integration into the design studio projects for this entire year. Focused homework assignments will be developed for each of the building systems lectures with the idea that students will apply the focused knowledge to design studio projects in the fall, winter and spring quarters. This year we are starting with these changes. First, we have changed the Fall 2012 Arch 341 lecture, which has implemented homework assignments for students to develop egress, accessibility and structural systems solutions. Students will be required to show egress, accessibility and structural systems for their corresponding design studio course (ARCH 352) project. The department will assess the student work at the end of Fall Quarter. For the Winter and Spring Quarters (which have not been taught yet), a similar plan for developing focused homework assignments for building systems lectures with the idea of having students apply these lessons to corresponding design studio projects. These changes will improve each student's ability to develop a comprehensive design project for our spring quarter ARCH 353 Design Studio.

2011 Response: Year level coordinators will develop strategies for integrating this requirement across all design studios sections in both ARCH 353 (Third Year Building Design Course) and ARCH 481 (Fifth Year Thesis Building Design Course).

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

A.4. Technical Documentation

A.5. Investigative Skills

A.8. Ordering Systems

A.9. Historical Traditions and Global Culture

B.2. Accessibility

B.3. Sustainability

B.4.Site Design

B.5. Life Safety

B.8. Environmental Systems

B.9. Structural Systems

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: Evidence of comprehensive design is inconsistent across coursework. Realm A skills are prevalent, as well as structural systems and site design. Accessibility, sustainability, life safety, and environmental systems are more inconsistently applied.

Because of the variable scope and scale of individual studio projects, evidence is lacking that every student meets this criterion. The ARCH 481 / ARCH 492, cited as playing a major role in meeting this criterion, allows a student to select a highly theoretical or philosophical problem with no assurance that they will complete a comprehensive architecture design problem.

Response:
See B.5 response.

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.**

[X] Not Met

2011 Team Assessment: Students seem to show some limited understanding of barrier free design, as it relates to accessible restroom facilities, however, no evidence was found in the student work that addresses accessible site design. Accessibility, which needs to be demonstrated at the ability level, requires that evidence be present in projects for which it is not the primary focus of the course. The capacity to embed accessibility into fundamental, conceptual design is missing, or not consistently demonstrated in the work.

Response:
See B.5 response.