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1. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met from the 2012 Visiting Team Report

   a. Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3

      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.

      2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Previous teams have reported deficiencies in physical resources, which, for the most part, remain unaddressed. (Descriptions are found in the 2000 and 2006 VTRs.)

      Although all programs are now housed on campus (previously some were off campus), physical resources continue to be lacking due to the programs being delivered in five separate campus locations over a ¾ mile distance. Faculty and staff offices are in multiple locations, making program collaboration and coordination, even with technologies like email and the Internet, difficult.

      The team discussed “hot versus cold” desks at length. The program still uses hot desks at the first and second year levels. For second year professional track students, hot desks are inconsistent with accepted practice for students in a professional curriculum (2006 VTR). Similarly, acoustics remain an issue due to turnover of space, space turnover noise and marginal pin-up areas.

      Full-time faculty office space remains a problem and is unavailable for adjunct faculty.

      Weber Hall (shop) is deficient due to insufficient ventilation, roof leaks, and inoperable windows (ventilation). Students requested appropriate areas to spray (paint, glue, and weld).

      In summary, it is clear facility issues such as location, quality, and adjacency are chronic deficiencies (2006 and 2000 VTRs) affecting the efficacy of investments made in resources to deliver the curriculum.

      Enrollment is slightly down from the last visit, which may be attributable to the national economic downturn or possibly factors like those observed herein. The team feels potential within the program is likely being compromised due to the lack of appropriate facilities.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

We note that the 2012 Visiting Team’s Assessment above does not take into account the comments from the FE Review (2009) and provide their own observations of any changes. We would like to clarify our changes since these original comments. We have expanded into a number of on-campus facilities beginning in 2007. Please see annotated campus maps (Annotated Campus Maps in Supplemental Materials) with dates and sequence of changes.

Changes to the physical spaces that the Architecture Program has focused on includes:

   - Consolidation of studios on the main campus in adjacent buildings.
Changes from a mostly analog environment to digital environment driven by changes in the curriculum

Develop interdisciplinary collaborative environments to support didactic and interactive learning (nexus learning)

In Fall 2014 the First and Second Year studios were moved to the main campus in a building immediately next door to the main College building, the Architecture and Design Center. This move brings all of the architecture students studios to the main campus and allows for students and faculty to co-locate and be able to share resources and teaching spaces. Crit and presentation spaces are now shared among all years in these buildings and this creates for a more cohesive and collaborative environment for the program. During this first year in the new studio spaces we will be self-evaluating the efficacy of the new studios and creating surveys and prototyping storage systems for various equipment. The intent is to provide solutions for implementation in Summer 2015. (See Image 1, page 6)

We continue to use “hot desk” studios in First and Second Year foundation design studios. The curriculum is being adjusted for these foundation studios to have a number of digital assignments, lessening the requirement for drafting on a desktop, and lessening the need for “cold desk” studio space. We are currently reviewing and creating a stronger emphasis for digital technology in our curriculum. The portable nature of digital assignments allows students to be able to work in a variety of spaces around campus. Currently we have over 200 computer workstations around campus that have all the required software for the program. The “PhilaU App” allows students to see the computers being used in real time, so they may choose where to go to use them. Philadelphia University is in the process of re-thinking and experimenting with new approaches to housing and student lounge spaces that allow for individual and group student workspaces. These new workspaces give students more options and greater autonomy to choose where students work and who they work with. We have provided a number of dorm rooms and dorm working spaces with drafting tables, as well as having large group work tables at the new student lounge at the Ravenhill Center, which is opening on 1 December 2014. There are also a number of collaborative spaces on the main campus including spaces in the Field DEC Center, Kanbar Campus Center and Gutman Library. We also are very conscious of the learning outcomes we assign to these foundation courses in the first two years of the program and how these outcomes align with NAAB Student Performance Criteria. We hope the NAAB Board will allow program discretion in how the program accomplishes and provides evidence for these requirements.

The nature of large studio spaces with “hard” durable surfaces, which compromise acoustics, is an issue at many architecture programs. With the renovation of the new Search Hall foundation studios, we have recognized this problem and have provided carpeted floors. We continue to monitor the acoustic qualities of the space.

Please also note the new 2009 conditions have revised the Physical Resources criteria. **2009 Conditions, 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 the preparation for teaching, research, mentoring and student advising.

These conditions no longer call for “design studio space for the exclusive use of each student in a studio class.”

Since the Visiting Team Report (2006) faculty have been moved into two new buildings, SEED Center and Smith House. Every full time faculty member now has individual or shared (two people maximum) offices. We have also provided a shared space with tables, computers and printers for adjunct faculty to use and have meetings. The main office in the Architecture and Design Center has a long worktable (14’),
that allows for many casual meeting opportunities as faculty move between classes or during lunch. This worktable is an intentional “attractor,” near the kitchen area, to increase faculty interaction. The entire College faculty, in all disciplines, is highly interactive and collaborative. As the new program director, having recently arrived from a very large school with faculty spread around the quadrant of a large campus, I observe that there is better communication, coordination and collaboration than existed at my previous institution.

Since 2006, Weber Hall fabrication lab has been significantly enlarged and outfitted with a full time supervisor, better-trained users and metal-working tools. The building has been repaired and a new ventilation system is being installed in the shop. Assigned studios have been removed from this building and the studio is being used as a casual work space for team meetings and assembling projects. We are continuing to work with Facilities to provide options for spray areas. In addition, the SEED Center, a building recently used for storage but renovated by the University in 2010 to accommodate the new graduate programs, also includes a satellite model shop with digital fabrication equipment, laser cutters and three-dimensional printers.

The arrangement of studios in the lower level of the Architecture and Design Center has changed markedly since the Team Report (2006). We have been able to spread studios to the two new facilities on the main campus (SEED and Search Hall, see annotated maps) and reduce the amount of desks in these studios. We have kept clear aisles to allow for easy access and egress with this new arrangement. We have also removed all movable partial walls and enclosures, creating a perimeter pin-up space. Exit signs are now clearly seen down the aisles. (Please see Review Space plans in Supplemental Materials)

With the new facilities online since 2007, we now have pin-up and review spaces available next to all the architecture studios. (Please see Review Space plans in Supplemental Materials) In addition to these review spaces that are part of our College spaces, we are frequent users of a number of other spaces around campus that are in other colleges. These include review spaces in Tuttleman Center, Downs Hall and Field DEC Center. We make arrangements for using these spaces for mid-term or final reviews.

We have had individual student laptop and software requirement for five years. This now is beginning to affect the use of labs and how our students work. As a part of ongoing improvements to our facilities we are evaluating our curriculum requirements, facilities and the individual laptop interaction. Beginning in Summer 2014 we have begun a multi-year upgrade to new desks with 27” monitors for each work station in the Architecture and Design Center. We have currently provided all new desks (96) and 32 new monitors to the Fifth Year design studios on the upper level. (See Image 2, page 7) We are currently evaluating what impact this is going to have on our computer labs. These changes to the workstations include a two phase upgrading to the electrical service on the upper level of the Architecture and Design Center. This will allow for all students to have power available at their desks for their laptops and monitors in the upstairs studios by Spring 2015.

The Fall 2014 renovations to Search Hall also include upgraded electrical infrastructure.

We note that the 2012 Visiting Team's Assessment does not note the detailed changes outlined above that pre-date the 2012 visit. We would hope the notes above have clarified the many steps we have taken to improve the physical resources at Philadelphia University in the last 8 years, and our ongoing desire for the best possible teaching and learning spaces we can provide. In the near future we continue to foresee improvements to the infrastructure and renovations that will provide new studio spaces as the University updates and expands its facilities.
Image 1: Search Hall, Fondation Design Studios, newly renovated and in use Fall 2014
Image 2: Architecture and Design Center, New worksations on upper level in use Fall 2014
Based on ACSA

b.  Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)
   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.

   2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence found was not consistent or sufficient to comply with this criterion.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

Please see the response to this condition in B.6 Comprehensive Design below. We are integrating our response to this condition not met as part of a holistic strategy to address SPC’s for Comprehensive Design.

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

   2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Evidence presented was not consistent or sufficient to comply with the requirement specified for this criterion.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

Please see the response to this condition in B.6 Comprehensive Design below. We are integrating our response to this condition not met as part of a holistic strategy to address SPC’s for Comprehensive Design.

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

   2012 Visiting Team Assessment: Projects reviewed did not consistently indicate an ability to implement principles of life safety or compliance with the requirements of the ADA as specified in the detailed requirements of the Comprehensive Design criterion.
2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

A revised curriculum has been instituted in the Architecture Program beginning in 2010. The new curriculum was introduced in a rolling fashion through Spring 2014. The old curriculum for courses that covered comprehensive design was reviewed by the 2012 Visiting Team. In the last two years since the 2012 Visit, the new curriculum has restructured how comprehensive design has been taught. The new comprehensive design studio is taken in the fourth year of the program. There were two new faculty hires in 2011, Professor Kihong Ku and Professor Daniel Chung, who were tasked with developing this new comprehensive design studio. The new structure has moved the SPC for B.6 Comprehensive Design into two classes, ARCH-412: Design 8 and ARCH-416: Technology 5. These two classes now have a more vigorous application of comprehensive issues in them and the content and delivery strategy of the two classes are aligned to complement each other. A core group of full time and adjunct faculty have been involved in both of these classes for the last two years and have been carefully experimenting with the interactive teaching methods to best integrate this content into a comprehensive project. This report will show the initial changes to these courses in Fall 2012 and how the course has evolved into its current form in Fall 2014.

New syllabi and schedules have been created and initiated in the Fall semester to 2012. The new syllabus for ARCH-412: Design 8 clearly outlines the goals of the course in the description:

“This comprehensive course demands that students work in teams integrating constructional, structural and environmental systems in the design and documentation of a large and complex building. Students research building type and systems precedents and their resulting impact on built form, analyze material properties, specify component building systems and apply codes and standards to fulfill technical, programmatic and aesthetic needs.
The studio explores and examines the integration of systems of varying scales with a building in an urban context. Site and program are explored as temporal forces that influence design concept, natural and artificial lighting, passive and active heating and cooling systems, structure and issues of enclosure, materiality and skin. Notions of what makes a “sustainable” architecture and building technology are foci of the course. Design and technology investigations are collaborative, while research and precedent application may be both group and individual.”

-ARCH-412: Design 8

The syllabus also includes the SPC’s seen in 2009 Conditions for Accreditation B.6 Comprehensive Design, along with other appropriate SPC’s for this design studio. This communicates clearly to the students the need to include these issues and demonstrate their understanding and ability to integrate them into their projects.


Special attention has been given to the SPC B.2 Accessibility and B.5 Life Safety in the ARCH-412: Design 8 course. First, specific rubrics were developed for mid-term and final reviews that included these SPC’s. There was also a specific week devoted to these topics. During this week the instructors lectured and workedshopped the topics and the students were asked to provide analysis drawings of their projects that proved compliance. Detailed assignments on building codes, egress paths and accessibility were then developed. Detailed grading rubrics were also created to compliment the written outline rubrics. These grading rubrics were used to provide direct feedback to the students. (see syllabus, written rubrics and grading rubrics in Syllabus 2012 folder)
Delivery of this content has also changed over the last three years as different instructors have taken different opportunities to give students an active learning experience. The design project in Fall 2012 was for a specific client, to create a design for a local Patch Adams Clinic. The projects were mostly single story linear buildings, which allowed for at grade egress. Professors Chung and Kratzer were able to have access to wheelchairs for student use and had the students experience the mobility issues associated with this disablement. (see pictures in Student Evidence 2012 folder). In-class sketch exercises asked the students to trace, identify and clarify their egress components/ system and overall ADA accessible route. Students then reflected on their experience being in a wheel chair and completed in-class diagram designs of their toilet rooms and clinic counter focused on conformance with the ADA. This information was then incorporated into their design proposals.

In Fall 2014 Professor Gindlesparger continues to develop the methodology and delivery of the content of ARCH-412 by formalizing the topics of accessibility and life safety/egress through a workshop that is clearly defined (see this workshop outline and handout in Syllabus 2014 folder). These workshops are supplemented by a lecture on life safety and egress (see this lecture in the Lecture 2014 folder). As the Design 8 coordinator, Professor Gindlesparger does not provide a specific lecture on ADA accessibility to each studio, there is ongoing discussion and checks in individual studios. It is a topic that gets touched on with each group at least once per week. Part of the egress exercise this year was to determine fixture counts and lay out of restrooms. Throughout desk crits and reviews the students are constantly checking on accessibility (ramps, handrails, bathroom layouts) and egress issues.

The evidence for this work is seen in different types of packaging. Student teams take part in the typical final review with a jury, but are also asked to package their entire process over the semester into a comprehensive process book. An example of the required process book from 2012 shows a comprehensive overview of the student project with pages dedicated to SPC’s, including egress (see Student Evidence 2012 folder).

The second group of evidence is analysis drawings from Professor Gindlesparger’s workshops. These drawings show egress and accessibility analysis of case studies the students have researched. It is to be noted that the evidence from these workshops also includes code analysis.

The changes to the courses in our curriculum that are dedicated to comprehensive design have been substantial and coordinated. We have devoted a design studio, ARCH-412: Design 8, and an associated technology course, ARCH-416: Technology 5, to the attainment of the SPC’s. We continue to evaluate these classes and update content on a yearly basis.

Syllabi, schedules, rubrics and evidence of student work are included in Supplement Material available through the link noted at the end of this report.

2. Plans for/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern from the Most Recent Visiting Team Report

   Impact of Cumulative Change

   A. **Impact of Cumulative Change** – Over the past several years both the university and the College of Architecture have driven positive change from within. The university has reorganized its academic programs, grouping them into three colleges and altering the relationship between faculty, students, and administration. The impact these administrative changes will have on the College of Architecture is unknown.
In addition, fundamental curriculum changes are underway at the College of Architecture. The team noted the pace of change is rapid, and managing all aspects concurrently will be a challenge for the College of Architecture in the near term.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

In the Summer of 2012 an new Executive Dean, Barbara Klinkhammer, was appointed to lead the College of Architecture and the Built Environment. She led the College through a period of reorganization and consolidation of programs and leadership in the College in 2012-13. This reorganization has created fewer directors and grouped disciplines in a more typical leadership hierarchy of director and assistant/associate directors within each discipline in the College. The Executive Dean oversees all programs and ensures there is coordination and opportunities for collaboration by having a vision for resources and facilities across the College. In the previous college structure the Dean was also the discipline leader in either architecture or interior design. This new structure creates a fair and equitable structure with less discipline bias and allows the programs to be peers in the college. This restructure occurred with faculty input, allowing for revisions to the shared governance model in the university and received full endorsement from the University, Architecture and College faculty.

In the Summer of 2013 a new Director of Architecture Programs, James Doerfler, was appointed to lead the Bachelor of Architecture and the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies programs. The structure for the Architecture Programs includes an Assistant Director, who primarily manages student advising and class registration in the undergraduate programs. This has created a clear program oversight structure, with defined complementary roles. These two positions have created balance and stability in the administration of the college and architecture programs.

The curriculum changes that were being implemented during 2012 have now been completed. The faculty and students have been surveyed about these changes through the yearly assessment process that is part of the Middle States accreditation regime. This has suggested a few minor adjustments to content and delivery methods, which are being implemented. This self-assessment is ongoing and will aid in keeping the content current and effective.

We have created a College First Year Task Force to investigate and propose improvements to the first year design student experience. The focus of this investigation is our College interdisciplinary foundation studios. We are interested in the experiences of each of the design disciplines in these studios, which are managed and staffed by the Architecture faculty.

As the University continues to commit itself to “Nexus Learning,” the College and Architecture Programs benefit from the increased collaboration and sharing of resources to support this strategy.

“Nexus Learning optimizes occasions for students to actively participate in their learning, apply knowledge and skills, collaborate with others, and connect their learning experiences to the real world and to their future professions. Nexus Learning is integrative. Nexus Learning prizes imagination and supports reflection on learning experiences to build on past experiences and to create connections to the future. It is marked by integration of knowledge across disciplines, as well as within and outside of the classroom. Learning environments and learning activities support a culture of innovation, exploration, synthesis and discovery. Although Nexus Learning experiences may vary in some respects from discipline to discipline, common qualities include the engaged and active participation of the learner, collaboration among students and across disciplines, and connections to the real world and professional practice, informed by the study of liberal arts and sciences.”

-From the Nexus Learning Grant Application 2014
Nexus Learning has influenced the College of Architecture and the Built Environment’s Strategic Plan which is being currently being developed post-reorganization and will be complete in Spring 2015. The three principles of sustainability, collaboration and innovation are being integrated into the curriculum of all the programs in the College.

The Architecture Program is both challenged and invigorated by these changes to the curriculum. We embrace these positive changes to create a dynamic program that is an innovator in collaborative education and learning. The faculty is engaged in these issues and encouraged by the College and University Administration to provide these opportunities for our students, through grants and various partnership and outreach strategies.

3. Changes or Planned Changes in the Program
   Such as
   - Faculty retirement/succession planning
   - Administration changes (dean, department chair, provost)
   - Changes in enrollment (increases, decreases, new external pressures)
   - New opportunities for collaboration
   - Changes in financial resources (increases, decreases, external pressures)
   - Significant changes in educational approach or philosophy (e.g., new provost = new approach)
   - Changes in physical resources (e.g., deferred maintenance, new building, cancelled new building)

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:

The Architecture Program has launched a new Master of Science in Architecture Program in the Fall 2014. This post-professional program is a research degree with a concentration in high performance buildings. This degree program compliments the existing Master of Science programs in the College. These include MS Sustainable Design, MS Construction Management, MS Interior Architecture and MS Geodesign.

We are in the internal approving stages of a new Master of Architecture, first professional degree, program. We expect to apply for candidacy for the program to NAAB in Spring 2015.

We are very pleased to report a dramatically increased enrollment for our incoming freshman class of Fall 2014 by 30%. We understand through anecdotal information that many programs throughout the country stabilized or slightly increased their enrollment, but these report suggest modest (5%) increases. This incoming class has also raised our SAT and GPA averages for the program.

The extensive changes to physical resources are noted in Section 1 in this report.
4. Identity & Self Assessment

a. History Mission

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]
The report must include the following:

- Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted

History and Mission of Philadelphia University

Philadelphia University was founded in 1884 as the Philadelphia Textile School in the wake of the 1876 Centennial Exposition. Led by Theodore Search, a group of textile manufacturers noticed a sizable gap between the quality and variety of American textile products and those displayed by European mills. To address this, the group established the School to educate America's textile workers and managers. The Philadelphia Textile School entered a period of growth at the outset of World War II, when it was granted the right to award baccalaureate degrees and changed its name to the Philadelphia Textile Institute. Following the war, it moved to its present site in the East Falls section of Philadelphia. Continued growth led the institute to become the Philadelphia College of Textiles & Science (PCT&S) in 1961. Over the decades, the campus grew through the acquisition of adjacent properties, and academic offerings expanded to include programs in the arts and sciences, business administration, and architecture and design. Reflecting the institution's breadth and depth, in 1999 the College was granted university status by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and became Philadelphia University. The most recent academic reorganization of the University, in July 2011, resulted in the creation of three colleges: the College of Design, Engineering and Commerce (formerly the Schools of Design + Media, Engineering and Textiles, and Business Administration); the College of Architecture and the Built Environment (formerly the School of Architecture); and the College of Science, Health and the Liberal Arts (formerly the Schools of Science and Health and of Liberal Arts). Since this APR documents the progress of the Architecture Program during the last six years, through the report the old structure of the School of Architecture is used whenever possible. The University's niche in today's world of higher education continues to provide quality professional education based on a strong liberal arts foundation.

Throughout its existence, the institution has had as the core of its mission the service to industry and society. Outstanding teaching as well as research and professional practice are the avenues for faculty development, from which students benefit. Today, the 3,700 students gain professional skills combined with a broad education in the liberal arts and sciences that enables them to thrive in diverse and changing contexts and to maintain a global perspective. This attitude underpins the University's signature “Nexus Learning” approach, which is characterized by active and collaborative learning that is connected to the real world and infused by the liberal arts. The current University mission is presented in the Faculty Handbook (Fall 2009 edition):

Philadelphia University is a student-centered institution that prepares graduates for successful careers in an evolving global marketplace. By blending the liberal arts and sciences, professional studies, interdisciplinary learning, and collaborations in and out of the classroom, students learn to thrive in diverse and challenging environments. Our students are encouraged to form supportive relationships with each other as well as faculty, staff, and alumni in an academically rigorous setting that is focused on intellectual and personal growth. Philadelphia University is an experiential learning community where integrity, creativity, curiosity, ethics, responsibility, and the free exchange of ideas are valued. (pp. 4-5)

All faculty are evaluated annually on their contributions to the University's seven strategic initiatives, ensuring that the initiatives are integrated into the daily life of the University community. The strategic initiatives:

- Formalize the Philadelphia University “Signature Learning” (now called “Nexus Learning”) to distinguish the university’s educational experience.
- Promulgate an academic learning community that will embrace the key elements of the design, engineering, and commerce curricula where constant collaboration and teamwork are the keys to creating successful leaders.
- Advance applied research to serve signature learning, industry, and societal needs.
- Invest in academic strengths to create leaders in the professions.
- Provide, increase, and enhance distinctive opportunities for graduate and professional students.
- Develop innovative facilities to enhance 21st century learning.
- Integrate student coursework with purposeful and intentional learning outside the classroom.

The University is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS) and other discipline-specific organizations such as the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), and is a member of the American Council on Education, the College Entrance Examination Board, and the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities.

History and Mission of the Architecture Program
Traditionally strong in textile engineering and science, PCT&S began expanding its design programs based on the technical foundations within those fields. The Architecture Program evolved from a single interior design course started in 1980 as a service to the textile-related programs. Eventually this led to the Interior Design Program as a full-time day program leading to a B.S. (1985). The College introduced the Bachelor of Architecture Program in 1991 under the leadership of Program Director Gary Crowell, AIA; Over the next 14 years, Prof. Crowell served as the chair of the Department of Architecture and Interior Design, then Dean of the School of Architecture + Design, and until 2007 Dean of the School of Architecture. With Prof. Crowell as Architecture Program Director, the program received its initial NAAB accreditation (1997) and subsequent renewals (2000, 2006).

In 2007 the positions of Dean and Architecture PD were divided between two people; over the next four years additional administrative positions were created – Associate Dean, Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs, and Manager of Academic Operations. Those changes were partly in response to the NAAB self-study process and site visit team observations and reflect the growth in program size, the number of related programs, and the continued evolution of the institution and campus-wide strategic planning. The Interior Design and Architecture programs’ immediate progeny are the undergraduate programs in Architectural Studies (recently renamed Historic Preservation and Visual Studies), Graphic Design Communication, Industrial Design, Digital Design, Landscape Architecture, and Construction Management, and graduate programs in Sustainable Design, Construction Management, and Interior Architecture. The School of Architecture was elevated to a College of Architecture and the Built Environment as part of an institutional restructuring in 2011, and is now headed by an interim Executive Dean. A national search aided by Auerbach Associates is underway to identify an Executive Dean to be installed in 2012.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
Executive Dean Barbara Klinkhammer was installed in the Summer 2012 and led a faculty inclusive restructuring process that consolidated leadership in the college into disciplines. A national search for a new Director of Architecture Programs in 2013 led to the appointment of James Doerfler to lead the Bachelor of Architecture and Bachelor of Science in Architectural Studies Programs. This restructuring has also led to the appointment of Assistant Directors, to support the primary Program Director in specific areas. Professor Carol Hermann is currently the Assistant Program Director in Architecture. Her portfolio includes managing Advising and Student Affairs, among other duties.

Currently, the Architecture Program, with approximately 350 students, is the largest degree program on campus and is housed in multiple buildings. Aligned with the University’s traditions, the Program focuses on providing a solid professional education for the next generation of architects aided by its associations with the Engineering and Design Institute, the Center for Teaching Innovation and Nexus Learning, study abroad programs, the internship program, service learning studios, and other opportunities, most notably the interdisciplinary opportunities provided by its context within the new College.
On 7 December 2010, the full-time faculty of the Program approved an updated mission statement, which is included in the 2011-12 academic catalogue:

The Architecture Program at Philadelphia University prepares students to engage critically in the complex discourse of architectural practice and theory. In keeping with the University’s legacy of craft, materials, and technology, the curriculum balances the creative and technical aspects of making architecture. Through research, analysis, and exploration, students discover that design is found at the dynamic intersection of our social and physical environments. Faculty with diverse perspectives guide students in their investigations of contemporary issues that supersede trends. Encouraged by interdisciplinary study, they craft varied ideas for the environment, finding passion and delight in the consideration of architecture.

The University and the Program
As the degree program with the largest number of students enrolled on campus, the Architecture Program has a significant impact on the community. The studio-centered curriculum and attendant work habits of the passionate students has permanently affected the academic culture on campus. Today, due in part to the several design programs which grew out of Architecture and Interior Design, nearly one-half of the student population is studying design. The Architecture faculty has collaborated with colleagues across the University to foster interdisciplinary activities. Architecture faculty and students are among the leaders of the campus community.

The Program benefits from the University’s legacy of craft and technology. Our emphasis on exploring process and the making of architecture, and the potential to intersect with the Textile, Fashion, Industrial, Graphic, and other Design Programs, some of which are recognized internationally, as well as programs in Disaster Management, Sustainable Design, and Construction Management, place us in a unique situation. The Program also benefits from the University’s strategic goal of nurturing thoughtful and creative citizens. The office of Student Development houses the First Year Experience, Community Service Learning, and Spiritual Development Programs. Those programs address issues of transitioning to college life, creating curricular and co-curricular links, honing leadership skills, and promoting community service, self awareness, and intercultural exchanges. This is an excellent environment in which to educate young architects who we are preparing to be creative and independent thinkers as members of a sustainable society.

Introduction to the Architecture Program
The Program’s goal of preparing students to draw upon the University’s legacy of craft, materials, and technology so they may aspire to be 21st-century leaders in shaping a sustainable built environment is achieved through a thoughtful curriculum that unites specialized courses in the major with elective offerings and the College Studies core courses. Students start out in interdisciplinary foundation design studies and drawing courses their first semester. Subsequent design courses focus on architecture; however, the required support courses such as design history, visualization, and technology maintain the interdisciplinary mix of students through years two and three. From years three to five, opportunities to return to interdisciplinary courses resume in studio and electives allow students to broaden their horizons and, if they choose, develop a concentration in one of a variety of areas. Hands-on learning begins in the abstract assignments of the first semester, continues through intensive model building and occasional design-build opportunities, and climaxes in the collaborative comprehensive studio. In their final semester, students choose from studios that vary in focus and encourage more independent explorations, based in part on the professional support courses and elective courses they have completed. Overlaying the professional sequence is the University-wide College Studies Program, a carefully orchestrated sequence of courses geared to the University’s professional majors and building communication skills and global awareness. Architecture students typically take one or two College Studies courses each semester for their entire education.

Following a year-long assessment of the curriculum, in 2010-11 the Program began phasing in a new curriculum, starting with first- and second-year students, and ultimately impacting years two through five. The primary goals were to better integrate studio and support courses, and to expand independent work
at year five (see sections I.1.4 and I.1.5). Each year another level of the old curriculum will be replaced by the new, until the old curriculum is retired in 2013. When the NAAB team visits the Program in spring 2012, only the first two years of the new curriculum will have been completed; therefore, this report and the student work displayed in the evidence room focus on the old curriculum since the last visit, in 2006. For the first few new courses that have been introduced, explanations will be provided throughout. This report includes a Student Performance Criteria matrix, curriculum chart, and chronological diagram for both old and new curricula, for the sake of clarity and to solicit the visiting team’s responses (see sections II.1.1 and II.2.2).

b. Responses to the Five Perspectives

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]

The report must include the following:

- Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted

A. Architectural Education and the Academic Community

Perspective A is the expectation that the community of the accredited degree program makes unique contributions to the University. This is accomplished through the professional and liberalarts- based realms so all members help develop new knowledge. Philadelphia University offers all its students a blend of professional and liberal education, crafted in such a way as to have the two strands reinforce one another. Within that framework, students use their College Studies and elective courses to direct their professional curriculum in a variety of ways. The intimate setting and diverse faculty backgrounds enables not just students to benefit from the offerings, but faculty themselves find few barriers when they pursue interdisciplinary work.

In short, architecture faculty contribute significantly to the academic progress of Philadelphia University. Administrators across campus seek their involvement in diverse ways from pedagogical initiatives to scholarship and practice to faculty governance.

Architecture faculty are wholly committed to the University’s focus on quality teaching. In the last decade, several faculty have been awarded one of two competitive prizes – the President’s Award for Teaching Excellence and the Lindback Distinguished Teaching Award. All FT faculty consult with colleagues from across the University to ensure our course goals are appropriately connected to our students’ learning experiences in other classes, as well as connected to work done by our students with writing tutors and others in the Learning Center. These practices will now become more structured due to the inauguration of assessment and nexus learning advocates for each College.

Architectural education, revolving around the studio experience, traditionally has been a dynamic, collaborative, hands-on, and (often) interdisciplinary activity. As University priorities have moved in that direction lately, the design-based faculty and students have seen peers in other University programs move closer in their teaching and learning methods. The University’s new colleges have been created to foster this type of education, called Nexus Learning, and School of Architecture faculty and students have mentored peers across the University and have been recruited as counterparts in multidisciplinary collaborations. Prof. Carol Hermann served on the Signature Learning Action Team, which involved overseeing the ePortfolio Implementation as well as chairing the DEC (Design, Engineering and Commerce) Research Innovation Grant Committee (later called the Nexus Grants). Simultaneously, she participated in the DEC Foundation and First Year Curriculum Working Group and the SERVE-101 Learning Community. Prof. Susan Frostén supervised a two-semester-long project on a fueling station of the future (Sustainable Station +), which involved faculty and students from graphic design, business, and economics of sustainability. Prof. Frostén was the thesis advisor for a graduate Textile Engineering thesis student for “An Exploration of Warped Knitted Structures (ePTFE membranes) for the Application of Architectural Fabrics,” (Spring 2010). Using grant funding, Prof. David Kratzer and his students
collaborated with industrial designers and occupational therapists to design an adaptable hygiene station for universal use. These and other instances help faculty become better instructors and help students learn about their field of study outside the conventional classroom format.

Faculty continue to deliver papers at academic conferences (at ACSA Annual Meetings and other venues), enter design competitions, and pursue professional practice, thereby remaining engaged in their respective realms of scholarship and practice. One additional indication that our students are receiving a quality holistic education: alumnus Skylar Tibbets (B.Arch 2008) recently earned an M.S. in Design and Computation from MIT, and was awarded a TED 2011 Fellowship.

As suggested above, Architecture Program faculty often assume leadership roles on school-wide and University-wide committees, and are routinely elected by their peers across the institution to at-large positions on standing committees. Two of the last three chairs of the University Tenure Committee have been Architecture faculty.

The Architecture Program students are no less prominent on campus, and not just because they are in the largest major at the institution. Our students have been elected to top positions in student government, show up in force for many extra-curricular events, have a reputation for being thoroughly engaged in classes across the University, and are respected for their visible dedication to the profession they are preparing to enter. In spring 2011, a group of fifth-year students from the Haiti Ideas Challenge Design X studio were invited to attend the President’s annual Innovation Gala in Center City and show the video they recorded of them building their prototype post-earthquake shelter on campus.

See also  
I.1.4 Long Range Planning  
I.1.5 Program Self Assessment  
I.2.1 Human Resources – evidence of faculty work, evidence of student work  
I.2.2 Administrative Structure  
I.3.3 Faculty Credentials  
IV.2 Faculty Resumes

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:  
Architecture faculty and students continue to be leaders on campus and off-campus through academic awards, committees and publications and conferences.

B. Architectural Education and Students  
Perspective B expects that accredited degree alumni are ready to function in a global world and they respect diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity; to become academic and professional leaders; to make responsible choices; and to continue to learn. This student body hails from cities and primarily suburbs and small towns. For those unaccustomed to urban life, the campus’s proximity to Center City Philadelphia is often a life-changing experience. Learning to thrive in a multicultural environment is a lesson reinforced by curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences. Working at a small teaching university, staff and faculty take seriously the opportunity to expose all students to the inspiring challenges abundant in and around the city. Philadelphia is a crucible of early 21st-century life in America, and a good springboard for students exploring the global context.

In their design, history, technology, and other courses, students are exposed simultaneously to the wealth of architectural accomplishment and to dire architectural shortcomings around the globe. For over a decade, the Program has made sustainable architecture an important topic, particularly in ARCH-301 Design V, a third year studio on “Well-Building” and increasingly in a pair of co-requisite fifth-year courses, ARCH-511 Technology V, the technology capstone course and ARCH-501 Design IX, the comprehensive design studio. In a move to strengthen the program, the new curriculum presents sustainable practices as the underpinning of all studios from years two through five. In addition, all the technology courses have been revised to reinforce a sustainable approach to building. Our long-term goals are to make sustainable principles second nature to the students, helping them to be better
architects and better citizens, and to intersect more consistently the undergraduate courses with the graduate students, faculty, and courses in the Sustainable Design Program. As we are located in Philadelphia, with its diversity of urban and suburban settings, the Program offers multiple studio projects that present students with ethical issues, especially in ARCH-302 Design VI, another third-year studio that concentrates on urban issues and architectural programming. For example, one semester, ARCH-302 participated in an exercise to design a new facility for Habitat for Humanity’s Re-Store. Fifth-year studio sections in ARCH-502 Design X have accepted the challenge in a variety of forms. One entered the Haiti Ideas Challenge, which included designing and, over a week-long charrette, building (with donated materials) a prototypical shelter for survivors of the Haiti earthquake. Another worked with the Archdiocese of Philadelphia’s homeless services coordinator to address the city’s acute housing shortage in low-income neighborhoods.

Co- and extra-curricular activities have a role as well in this regard. The Student Development Office has several programs that address diversity and social justice, including: LEAD (Leadership, Engagement, Assessment, Development), a co-curricular certificate program designed for upper-class students looking for leadership development opportunities that will contribute to their personal development and help achieve their leadership potential; a Safe Zone program for gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgendered (GLBT) students and their allies; Emerging Learners for First-year Students; and others mentioned elsewhere in this report, such as NOMA (see I.1.2). Architecture students are active participants in many of these efforts. Beyond campus, they often are found in Old City galleries and the other cultural venues of the city.

Our new Studio Culture Policy reiterates the word “respect” (a student’s suggestion) to reinforce a healthy attitude in all learning experiences. The University’s pervasive College Studies Program reinforces students’ understanding and sympathy of the global community through a minimum of 43 credits of courses, culminating in COLLST-499 Contemporary Perspectives, a writing intensive capstone course for which each student identifies and researches a global issue in his/her chosen field. Other opportunities – design/build, service learning in landscape architecture studios, study abroad in post-apartheid South Africa – are options students have recently chosen which expose them to the breadth of professional opportunities. The University’s Strategic Plan spotlights lifelong learning; by presenting architecture as an enjoyable path of discovery, we hope to reinforce that attitude. Our alumni are increasingly choosing to enter graduate programs in architecture, planning, social work, and other fields. While this points to an obvious indication of lifelong learning, faculty are equally proud of the more informal educational experiences our alumni partake in whether they remain in the architectural profession or choose other careers.

See also: I.1.4 Long Range Planning
I.1.5 Program Self Assessment
I.2.1 Human Resources – visiting lectures and other student opportunities
II.2.2 Professional Degrees – off-campus programs

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
We continue to choose projects and support our students learning experiences through many projects that involve real-world projects and clients. Our faculty continues to engage projects from around the world, from Africa (Professor Harnish’s Fifth Year Design Studio, eNtokozweni Community Centre, Johannesburg, South Africa projects) to Northern Philadelphia (Professor Kratzer’s Fourth Year Design Build Studio, Project Home: Women’s Shelter Design). We put our students in the position to have a variety of first-hand learning experiences with communities in need and corporate clients that demand innovation. We have strengthened collaboration in the curriculum with three specific places for interdisciplinary experiences in the design studio in first year, third year and fifth year. These opportunities allow the students to increase their communication skills and prepare them for working on professional interdisciplinary teams.
C. Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment
Perspective C deals with students receiving information and opportunities to pursue internship and registration. Upon matriculation, the majority of our students indicates that achieving professional registration is a primary career goal, and when the economy permits many work part-time for architectural firms in the region. Many courses are taught by faculty holding full-time positions in firms; they bring current experience to the classroom/studio, serve as role models to students in ways full-time faculty cannot, and often facilitate students in their search for internships or other employment. Students begin learning about architectural issues of health and safety (codes, standards, regulations, and accessibility) in second and third year technology and studio courses; thereafter, their subsequent work must demonstrate adherence to the legal and ethical requirements regarding public health, safety, and welfare. Program practice is to assign only registered architects to teach studios at levels three to five, and a very high percentage of our FT and PT faculty are registered architects. Annual presentations by NCARB representatives have been well attended and provide students with a good overview of the professional concerns of students and young alumni, and faculty encourage students to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP) at an appropriate time. A FT faculty member (and registered architect) serves as our IDP coordinator; she organizes the NCARB presentations and has attended the summer IDP coordinator workshops in Chicago and Portland. Fifth-year professional management courses, taught by instructors with full-time positions at respected local firms (Vitetta Architects/Engineers and Kieran Timberlake) provide in-depth information about the complexities of architectural practice.

See also: I.1.5 Program Self Assessment
I.2.1 Human Resources – matrix of teaching loads; professional societies

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
The upcoming changes to the NCARB IDP process and exam will affect this perspective in the near future.

D. Architectural Education and the Profession
Perspective D aims to ensure young architects understand the complex roles and responsibilities architects face in the profession and in the larger community. Our Program attempts to provide opportunities for students to experience architecture as a real-world activity. Most design projects are assigned on sites readily accessible to students so site visits are mandatory and integral to the design process. When feasible, “clients” are involved in the process so students do not work in a social vacuum. Recent examples include a fourth-year studio charged with renovating the respected Hedgerow Theatre in the historic Rose Valley arts community, and a fifth-year studio working with a not-for-profit organization seeking ideas for a respite facility for families with autistic children. During the last six years, the frequency of community-based studios has continued to increase. The diversity of contemporary practice was presented in the spring 2011 fifth-year studios: one group concentrated on cutting-edge digital methodologies and another on urban design in Latin America, while a thesis student addressed the economic and public relations realities of how to design, build, and sell environmentally conscious mass-produced houses. Sharing studio facilities and support courses with students in the Interior Design, Landscape Architecture, Construction Management, Historic Preservation, and other majors, our students are exposed on a regular basis to the collaborative roles and responsibilities of related disciplines.

Architecture students routinely interact with professionals besides their instructors, whether through the fall and spring lecture series – which strive to present a spectrum of viewpoints about contemporary practice – or through the many jurors who generously participate in mid-term and final critiques semester after semester. These are among the advantages of studying architecture in a thriving city which is also within easy reach of New York and Washington, DC. Students have also come to know local architects through events such as internships, the Vitetta “Best and Brightest” student design competition, and a recent multi-university exhibition of student work at the local AIA headquarters. AIAS regularly arranges for student groups to visit architects’ offices.
The University’s Office of Development and Alumni Relations has begun to play a role in the formation of our graduates. In May 2011, it helped to organize and fund a day-long celebration of the Architecture Program’s 20th anniversary (and Interior Design Program’s 30th), at which time alumni gathered to attend the now-annual Senior Design Show and, for the first time, presentations by five alumni of the Architecture and Interior Design Programs whose diverse career paths inspired their peers as well as the upper-level students who attended. A cohort of young alumni now practicing in the region regularly attends critiques where they meet and begin forming mentorships with students. One indication of the program’s success in this regard is the reception by alumna Karen Blanchard (B.Arch 1998, now an architect with Wallace, Roberts & Todd) of the 2010 AIA Philadelphia Young Architect Award.

During the last six years, Architecture students have been involved in AIAS activities at the regional and national level, including hosting the Northeast Quad Conference in 2009. Our student chapter has found multiple ways to introduce themselves and their classmates to the profession through firm visits, conferences, architectural tours, and other activities (see section I.2.1).

See also: I.1.4 Long Range Planning I.1.5 Program Self Assessment I.2.1 Human Resources – development policy, faculty work, lectures, career guidance, student work II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
Students from the program continue to enter and win academic and industry sponsored competitions and projects. An interdisciplinary team of students from Architecture and Interior Design won the AISC/ACSA Steel Competition in 2013. In the Stewardson Memorial Fellowship, a state-wide competition among the seven architecture programs in Pennsylvania, we had students place first and third, with the winner claiming a $10,000 traveling scholarship. A regional practice, BLT Architects, has sponsored a competition that our students have won two years running. Placement in these competitions allow our students to make strong connections to the profession.

In addition to these individual success stories the Architecture Program has been working with D.R. Widder the Vice President of Innovation on University-wide sponsored projects in the last year. These sponsors have included Comcast, working on the “House of the Future,” and Johnson&Johnson on the topic of “Aging in Place.” These short projects (between 3 and 7 days in duration) expose students to working in a transdisciplinary way, creating innovative solutions and presenting them to the stakeholders. Our recognition in the regional professional community is enhanced through these initiatives.

E. Architectural Education and the Public Good
Finally, Perspective E expects that students are developing an understanding of social issues and of their own individual responsibilities as community members. The complex intersection of liberal arts courses, design studios, support courses in history/theory, technology, and professional management, elective courses, and extra-curricular activities means that each student will emerge from the Program with different experiences, though all will have been exposed to the important issue of engaged citizenship.

College Studies courses set out the context for the students: presenting the socio-political contexts of the professions, building critical thinking and communication skills, and debating the implications of the multicultural workplace in the 21st century. Architecture courses – on campus, on field trips, in Rome and other international locations – focus the discussion on the profession our students expect to pursue as it connects to the rest of society. With increasing frequency, lessons and skills learned in academe are then carried into the field.
Our architectural community has engaged with the larger community on a regular basis, including: designs, and volunteered hours as laborers, for Habitat for Humanity; schematic designs for homeless shelters planned by the Archdiocese of Philadelphia’s Project H.O.M.E.; the University Day of Service annual event, providing students the chance to scrape and repaint nearby structures at Historic Rittenhouse Town, a National Historic Landmark; cleaning and repairing local parks; and other projects for financially-strapped neighbors. Two faculty worked with staff from the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia leading to two separate opportunities (studio and seminar) for students in the Outside In exhibit, an under-funded and over-looked children’s exhibit at the Academy of Natural Sciences. The students provided innovative renovation designs and, to satisfy a short-term goal, one group of students helped renovate the exhibit. Addressing the client’s long-term goal, another group developed design strategies for activities and exhibits that engage principles of sustainability and inquiry-based learning. In May 2010, one section of Tech 2 students built a shed under direction of adjunct faculty Will Stanforth to learn methods of construction; they then donated the structure to the East Park Revitalization Alliance (EPRA) of Philadelphia, a program that teaches children at two locations in Strawberry Mansion, a nearby disadvantaged neighborhood, to grow food, which the children either then take home or contribute to a food cupboard also run by EPRA. A section of fifth-year studio undertook an International Homeless Assistance Center Competition, proposing solutions throughout Philadelphia. They were advised by representatives from the City of Philadelphia Support Services, Project H.O.M.E., and the Archdiocese of Philadelphia’s Homeless Services and Office of Community Development (HSOCD). Three students branched off and worked directly with HSOCD and Inner City Missions, a disadvantaged women’s housing organization, focusing on actual development schemes for a blighted block. They proposed homeless services, housing for Inner City and two other social welfare organizations. These schemes are now being used by HSOCD and Inner City for fundraising, project marketing, and negotiations with City of Philadelphia to acquire and develop the blighted block.

Philadelphia University, believing “that community service initiatives are a central part of the under graduate experience,” supports an office of Community Service Learning, which works to increase student access to service opportunities, serve as an informational resource about community agencies, support student’s civic engagement, and promote service as a tool for learning. The goal is to develop students into community-conscious leaders who have an active and engaged relationship with the city, neighborhood, and the broader society (see SH sec 2). Annual events include the New Student Orientation (NSO) Plunge, campus-wide Day of Service, Alternative Spring Break with Habitat for Humanity's Collegiate Challenge, and other activities. The University also supports this goal through SERVE 101 – Civic Engagement: Serving and Learning in Philadelphia, a hybrid, one-credit course which may be taken up to four times in a student’s curriculum and is designed to create an opportunity to understand the reciprocal nature and responsibility of citizenship through both practical applications and critical reflection. The First Year Experience includes an option for student participation in Learning Communities, in which self-selected students form a cohort in their design studies course (for School of Architecture students) and SERVE 101. Students have the option to work with a community partner, explore the impact of service on the community, and understand the vehicle that contributes meaningful social action to address societal and policy issues that perpetrate social inequities. Students who participate are more likely to return after first year than the control group. Outside the curriculum, one year the chapter of Freedom By Design built ramps for the home of a disabled young man. Architect magazine (December 2009 issue) included a feature on this intervention. Students involved in such efforts, for example in the Haiti prototype shelter studio, gave freely of their time to build the structure (and to document the process) and a subgroup was active in getting the University’s Public Relations team to publicize the humanitarian crisis.

Individual faculty have worked with disadvantaged communities as close as the adjacent neighborhood of Germantown and as far as South Africa, providing professional services as well as physical labor. The combination of curricular and co-curricular priorities as well as faculty experience has inspired many students. An increasing number of students devote their spring break to humanitarian programs like Habitat for Humanity. A small but increasing number of recent graduates are beginning their careers in unconventional ways: several have gone from graduation to Americorps, Habitat for Humanity, the Peace Corps, and other organizations working to improve communities across the globe. One alumnus,
Schendy Kernizan (B.Arch 2008), returned to post-earthquake Haiti as an Architecture for Humanity Design Fellow to devote his skills to rebuild that society. His presentation at the 2011 alumni reunion was inspiring. Among the most memorable public lectures in the last few years were those involving this topic, Scott Shall (International Design Clinic) and Harris Steinberg (PennPraxis) among them.

Many of the opportunities listed in sections A-D above provide additional examples of student engagement (see I.1.3 A-D).

See also: I.1.4 Long Range Planning
I.1.5 Program Self Assessment
I.2.1 Human Resources – lectures, student activities

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
The very active chapters of AIAS, Freedom by Design and NOMAS continue to engage the local community by providing design services and construction for various projects from access ramps to construction staff for Habitat for Humanity various projects around the city. The College supports student travel to conferences and meetings for these organizations.

c. Long Range Planning
[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]
The report must include the following:
• Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted

Planning Process
The planning process has undergone significant changes during the last two years, so parts of this description have been ongoing, parts have been recently introduced, and some parts will be implemented in the near future, which should be evident in the narrative that follows. The most recent expression of our planning process, “Architecture Program Strategic Plan 2009-14,” is found on the chart found on the next page. It shows the program’s current priorities and what achievements have been made to address those priorities.

The current strategic plan of the Architecture Program concentrates on eight objectives:
1. Updating the B.Arch. curriculum
2. Improving and consolidating facilities
3. Developing, maintaining, and assessing a revised Studio Culture Document
4. Improving students’ opportunities for interdisciplinary experiences
5. Increasing students’ opportunities for community involvement
6. Improving and integrating technology in teaching
7. Increasing involvement of alumni and diversity of students
8. Increasing interaction with other architecture programs

The process has three components, which are linked to facilitate continuous improvement for the program; these are self-assessment, approval for changes, and implementation.
Self-assessment
During the 2010-11 academic year, the program updated its strategic plan and articulated six program objectives with associated learning outcomes to guide the planning process (see section I.1.5). In addition, the program is guided by the NAAB’s Conditions for Accreditation, including the Student Performance Criteria (see section II.1.1). Starting in fall 2011, as part of the University-wide reorganization, the PD will consult with three full-time faculty Academic Support Advocates charged with coordinating nexus learning, assessment, and academic advising at the College level.

The self-assessment process is explained in detail below, in section I.1.5. It involves many stakeholders and bridges the gap between the Program’s strategic plan, student learning outcomes, and student performance criteria.

Approval for changes
Once the PD and program faculty have established a plan to improve the curriculum through overall revisions or revisions to individual courses, they work with the School Curriculum Committee (SCC) to prepare a formal proposal to the School. The Committee solicits input from across the School, and votes to recommend or deny the proposal. If it is supported, the SCC obtains approvals from stakeholders across campus (Library Director, Writing Center Director, Information Literacy Coordinator, VP for Information Resources, et al.) and presents the proposal to the University’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UEC). Approval by the UEC must be obtained approximately 12 months before a change can be implemented, in order for the University to prepare, such as to update the course catalog, arrange for suitable teaching spaces or new faculty, and similar logistical concerns.

For program changes other than the curriculum, the process differs. The PD and program faculty establish priorities, which are articulated in the strategic plan. With the assistance of faculty, the PD consults with the School Dean in monthly meetings, with the Program Board of Trustees in semi-annual meetings, and with appropriate consultants to determine the feasibility for initiatives and to garner their support. Ultimately, the dean forwards program proposals to the Provost during regularly scheduled meetings; the Provost decides a course of action. When funding is required for an approved proposal, the Dean submits a request in the next budget, which is reviewed by the administration (as well as ranked by the Budget Advisory Committee) and then either included or not included in the next budget.

Fig. 3 Architecture Program Strategic Plan 2009-14 follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture Program Strategic Plan 2009-14 (updated 2011)</th>
<th>*Indicates actions that were delayed until subsequent year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Action09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Update B.Arch curriculum</td>
<td>Planned/approved new curriculum; Advised students of changes/had 1st year students sign on; Planned new curriculum at UARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Improve and consolidate facilities</td>
<td>Planned consolidation of faculty offices; Expanded Fab Lab at Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Create Studio Culture Policy</td>
<td>Began talks between faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Improve interdisciplinary opportunities</td>
<td>Introduced new 5th year project: sustainable station; Introduced new 4th year project: hygiene station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation
The PD works with suitable stakeholders to move the program forward. For example, during the recent curriculum changes, he met with program faculty, the Learning & Advising Center Director, the Registrar, and others to allow for as seamless a transition as possible. To implement the new curriculum, he had to establish a dissemination plan, produce charts to aid advisors on the changes, work with first-year students who had to agree in writing to change their catalog year, and keep track of students who would have to take courses in both the old and new curriculum. Finally, an assessment of the changes begins and we return to the beginning of the loop.

Other changes are implemented differently. For example, during the recent national searches for three full-time faculty, the PD and Dean agreed on a search committee; and the PD, as chair, refined the types of expertise sought by discussing the issues with the committee, with other faculty, and by consulting the faculty characteristics of other, aspirational programs. To attract suitable candidates, the PD and Dean requested the Provost to re-evaluate contract types and the result was three successful searches.

Data and Information Sources
Staff and faculty have relied on a variety of sources in the planning process: Master Development Plans for the University (Hillier Group 1995; Sasaki Associates 2004), the University Learning Outcomes Document entitled “What Characterizes a Philadelphia University Graduate?” (2004); Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS) academic plans and planning retreats; and other means. Significant institutional advances have been made in this regard since the last NAAB visit, with the onset of a new administration’s University Strategic Plan: a Director of Institutional Research was hired in 2007, consultants Academic Growth Plan brought on board 2010-11; and an innovative technology, Analytics Dashboard, was introduced 2011. The new Director of Institutional Research has been particularly helpful in collecting and assessing data to inform Architecture Program initiatives. The 23 data sources identified in the 2011 Periodic Review Report for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education include several Universitywide sources that are directly involved in planning for the Architecture Program: Admissions databases (continually updated), Development database of alumni, supporters, et al (ditto), Program 5-year strategic plan (periodically updated), Faculty Activity Reports (annual), Course evaluations by students (each semester), Career Services Alumni surveys (annual), Architecture
Alumni Survey (most recent, summer 2011), Student portfolios (collected each semester), and Student surveys (including NSSE, AICUP First Year Survey, etc). In 2012, the University will begin the annual Direct Assessment of Student Learning.

Specific examples should help to illustrate our experiences. Faculty Activity Reports (provided in the team room) offer insights as to what challenges faculty have faced to make their courses more current, more interdisciplinary, and more active; this activity provides suggestions for addressing strategic plan objectives 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Student comments on course evaluations have provided incentive for addressing objectives 1 through 6. The recent AP Alumni Survey of summer 2011 (available in the team room, plus see narrative in section I.1.5) will allow faculty to consult colleagues in the Writing Center and those teaching quantitative reasoning courses to evaluate objectives 4 and 6.

Role of Planning in Other Programmatic and Institutional Initiatives
Information from the sources listed above has assisted in the planning for curriculum and facilities, improvements to courses, and hiring decisions. The University’s strategic plan and emphasis on nexus learning have reinforced the Architecture Program’s search for interdisciplinary opportunities and community partners. Two examples are new studio opportunities beginning in fall 2011: developing a student design competition for TD Bank’s “Bank of the Future” and community planning projects with the Eastern Shore Land Conservancy’s Center for Towns program. There are other, less visible initiatives worthy of mention. By observing second-year student critiques, faculty determined that each group worked too much in isolation and would benefit from the energy and example of a greater number of students; this led to the practice of scheduling sections of second-year studio as cohorts in order to facilitate greater interaction among students. Discussions at our monthly faculty meetings revealed that incremental changes to reading assignments and project briefs were not being disseminated to other faculty; this situation led us to standardize communications practices between FT coordinators and their adjunct faculty and among all FT faculty across the curriculum. The reading of student evaluations of their faculty alerted the PD that there were inconsistencies in how faculty evaluated their students and how they communicated with their students; this encouraged the PD and faculty to put greater emphasis on presenting grading rubrics to adjuncts and to ensure their use, as well as other practices included in the new Studio Culture Document such as encouraging focused face-to-face assessment of students’ progress in design courses. Finally, following discussions with faculty and administrators from other Architecture programs, our program has begun a renewed effort to network among local professionals to identify a larger pool of qualified adjunct faculty; this includes the PD meeting with more potential adjunct faculty, inviting them to critiques, and interacting with them in that setting.

Role of the Five Perspectives
The “Architecture Program Strategic Plan 2009-14” matrix articulates what has been accomplished in the past two years and what is to be done in the next three years. The goals are connected to the five perspectives in the following ways. Architectural Education and the Academic Community seeks to foster wide-ranging academic engagement and is addressed by our objectives 4 (Interdisciplinary) and 6 (Technology). Architectural Education and Students hones in on preparedness to make a positive mark on the future, which corresponds to our objective 3 (Studio Culture). Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment, or preparing students for professional practice, connects to objective 1 (Curriculum), since the new curriculum involves changes to how professional practice is taught. Architectural Education and the Profession aims at the professional potential of architecture, reflected in our objectives 1 (Curriculum), 6 (Technology), 7 (Alumni and Diversity), and 8 (Other arch programs). Architectural Education and the Public Good is connected to self-aware, ethical, and proactive architects, which correspond to our objectives 3 (Studio Culture) and 5 (Community involvement).

The Architecture Program’s goals dovetail with the University’s Strategic Initiatives – being “the model for professional university education in the 21st century” – at the larger scale. The University’s priorities include formalizing the Nexus Learning approach (active, real world, engaged, and multidisciplinary), achieving innovation and advancing applied research, and integrating curricular and co-curricular learning. These issues are pursued at multiple levels by various University activities connected to the Architecture Program, including: the Engineering and Design Institute, an interdisciplinary research center
focusing on green materials, sustainable design and community outreach, directed by Dr. Christopher Pastore and Prof. Rob Fleming; the Center for Innovative Teaching and Nexus Learning, under the direction of Dr. Marion Roydhouse, which concentrates on integrating active, collaborative and real-world learning that is infused with the liberal arts across the curriculum, thereby enhancing students’ overall academic experience and preparing them for the 21st-century work world; the Study Abroad Office, directed by Ms. Amy Roshannon, which prepares students for successful participation and competition in an increasingly interdependent world, through exposing students to the international and multicultural contexts that are increasingly shaping professional life; and the Career Services Office, led by Ms. Trish Shafer, which organizes and monitors student internships and aids in students’ full-time employment opportunities.

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
The structures and processes outlines in this section have not changed significantly. The College is completing the draft of a new 5-year strategic plan in Spring 2015. The Architecture Program will update the program strategic plan in the near future.

d. Program Self Assessment

[The NAAB will provide this section, quoted directly, from the most recent APR]
The report must include the following:

- Programs must describe how this section changed since the most recent APR was written and submitted

Self-assessment Process

The self-assessment process is a multi-pronged effort involving many stakeholders, though the primary group is the FT faculty and their primary function is the assessment of student learning. In addition, in any one semester there are approximately 65 adjunct (part-time) faculty teaching the student body of approximately 350 students. Full-time faculty coordinators of subject areas/studio levels have familiarized adjuncts with the importance of assessment, as the program has been professionally accredited by NAAB since 1997 (with renewals in 2000 and 2006). In addition, the University is regionally accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS), which has its own assessment priorities and reporting structure. During the last few semesters, a MSACS-driven assessment effort has been formalized. The University’s 2006 self-study for the Middle States Decennial Review has been followed up by the June 2011 Periodic Review Report which notes that subsequent to the 30 recommendations the University steering committee had made in the 2006 report, the Middle States visiting team made no recommendations and only 16 suggestions. A third avenue of assessment is the Architecture Program Advisory Board, reconstituted in 2011 after a hiatus. The PD has begun meeting the board semi-annually to inform its members of the program’s current situation and to solicit its recommendations. Finally, discussions with students, student evaluations, and alumni surveys round out the information gathering.

Each semester, self-assessment involves the PD and faculty reviewing student work on an ongoing basis, by attending mid-term and final critiques in studio courses, seminars, etc. Faculty collect studio work as well as assignments and exams in other classes for assessment and for archival preservation in preparation for NAAB accreditation visits. Next, during annual meetings the PD and FT faculty evaluate student progress toward the established learning outcomes. Every third year, a more substantive evaluation includes meetings between the PD and senior faculty alone, and subcommittees of faculty focused on a particular sequence in the curriculum. The PD presents the strategic plan, student learning outcomes, and student performance criteria to the Dean and the Program Advisory Board, who in turn make recommendations to the PD. These meetings help the PD to identify and prioritize problems and opportunities and to track initiatives underway. Preservation of student work for assessment is augmented by recently compiled data – from student evaluations of faculty (each semester), alumni surveys (every 5-6 years), and other means – which helps steer the discussions. In addition, the Director attends ASCA Administrators’ Conferences and consults with administrators of other architecture programs to understand the context of changing practices in the field.
**Student learning outcomes**

The Architecture Program, in conjunction with the Director of the Learning & Advising Center, established a separate student learning outcomes matrix, included below, which emphasizes several themes determined appropriate to Middle States assessment. These outcomes are to foster:

1. Professional skills informed by the liberal arts and sciences
2. Multidisciplinary and collaborative approaches
3. A creative synthesis between theory and practice, to inform research and guide decisions
4. An appreciation for global and local contexts, in order to interpret and value diversity
5. Ethically responsible citizens
6. Sustainable professional practice, by bringing innovation to the field of architecture and adapting to inevitable changes
**Philadelphia University**

Interim Progress Report

Fall 2014

---

Fig. 4 Program Assessment Plan 2010 for the Architecture Program follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Program Goal (Objective)</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>In what course(s) the outcome is addressed.</th>
<th>Measure (how or the specific instruments used to measure the outcome)</th>
<th>Time-frame (for doing assessment)</th>
<th>Actual Learning Outcome (a result of the measure)</th>
<th>Feedback into Unit (changes implemented or planned)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Professional skills informed by liberal arts + sciences</strong></td>
<td>Students will integrate knowledge of liberal arts and sciences with design of the built environment</td>
<td>Address social and cultural issues through informed design solutions, Research, analyze, and compare design options in a global environment.</td>
<td>ARCH-202 Des 4 ARCH-502 Des 10</td>
<td>ARCH-202, 502: Research projects, including case studies, presented in oral and written/graphic forms to invited jurors and graded (by some faculty) with a rubric</td>
<td>Course coordinator meets with other instructors intermittently during semester to assess course progress More comprehensive review every 3 years</td>
<td>ARCH-202 30% more than competent 60% competent 10% less than competent ARCH-502 60% more than competent 40%</td>
<td>ARCH-202 Research project modified to help students better use information on next assignment ARCH-502 Rubric will be extended to all sections next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Multi-disciplinary + collaborative approaches</strong></td>
<td>Students will appreciate the value of collaboration, including multidisciplinary collaboration, in solving design problems</td>
<td>Function collaboratively to connect beyond the expertise of architects. Organize and direct heterogeneous teams.</td>
<td>ADFND-101 Des 1 ADFND-102 Des 2 ARCH-501 Des 9 ARCH-511 Tech 5</td>
<td>ADFND-101: Design projects ADFND-102, ARCH 501, 511: Design projects and case study assignments</td>
<td>Course coordinator attends critiques, meets with other instructors intermittently to introduce changes More comprehensive review every 3 years</td>
<td>ADFND-101 30% more than competent 40% competent 30% less than competent ARCH-501/511 70% more than competent 25% competent 5% less than competent</td>
<td>ARCH-501/511 Faculty to meet regularly to facilitate better integration between assignments and to improve deadlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Theory + practice to inform research + design</strong></td>
<td>Students will synthesize theory, function,</td>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to apply design history and theory,</td>
<td>AHIST-305 Hist 3 AHIST-305, 306: Case study assignments,</td>
<td>Course coordinator collects cross-section of case studies,</td>
<td></td>
<td>AHIST-305, 306 25% more than</td>
<td>AHIST-305, 306 Student assistants chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide decisions</td>
<td>and aesthetics in an integrated and creative way</td>
<td>practices, and technology in design projects</td>
<td>AHIST-306 Hist 4 ARCH-502 Des 10</td>
<td>graded with a rubric ARCH-502: Case studies and other preparatory work for design projects</td>
<td>with other instructors each semester to discuss effectiveness More comprehensive review every 3 years</td>
<td>65% competent 10% less than competent ARCH-502 30% more than competent 60% competent 10% less than competent</td>
<td>faculty discuss assignment in greater length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Interpret + value diversity</td>
<td>Students will understand and respect the people, places, and contexts that bear upon the built environment around the world</td>
<td>Demonstrate familiarity of diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns of different cultures and individuals Exhibit the implication of this familiarity on the role and responsibilities of the architect</td>
<td>AHIST-205 Hist 1 ARCH-202 Des 4</td>
<td>AHIST-205: Exams and case study assignments ARCH-202 Culture/climate research project</td>
<td>AHIST-205 Course coordinator collects cross-section of case studies for exhibit; meets with instructors each fall to introduce changes ARCH-202 Course coordinator participates in juries, collects some student work for archives; meets with instructors each spring to introduce changes All: more comprehensive review every 3 years</td>
<td>20% more than competent 55% competent 25% less than competent</td>
<td>AHIST-205 Student assistants chosen to mentor; library staff present in-class workshop ARCH-202 Research project altered to use contemporary case studies so students can understand relevance to subsequent design project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Ethically responsible citizens</td>
<td>Students will understand the characteristics of professionalism in architectural practice</td>
<td>Demonstrate an understanding of the sustainable practice of building Integrate professional</td>
<td>ARCH-201 Des 3 ARCH-301 Des 5 ARCH-302 Des 6</td>
<td>ARCH-201, 301, 302: Discussions, programming exercises, and design projects including oral presentations</td>
<td>ARCH-201, 301, 302 Course coordinator attends critiques to gage outcomes; meets with instructors each</td>
<td>ARCH-201 ARCH-301, 302 25% more than competent 65% competent</td>
<td>ARCH-301 Introduced representation charrettes to hone graphic communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students will practice design as an integrated process that respects existing contexts and/or inevitable transformations in the field. Demonstrate familiarity with current research and best practices.

Exhibit an awareness of structural, environmental, and other building systems that support a healthy environment. Demonstrate an understanding of dealing with clients and consultants, and integrating community service.

Practice with issues of public health, safety, and welfare regulations.

Demonstrate an understanding of dealing with clients and consultants, and integrating community service.

Semester to introduce changes

ARCH-505, 506: Exams and other written assignments

Faculty meet annually to discuss changes; every 6 years alumni survey collects student feedback.

ARCH-505, 506: Design projects

ARCH-402, 403, 405, 406: Assignments, case studies, and exams

ARCH-501, 502: Coordinators visit critiques where faculty and visiting jurors review student work; collect cross-section of work for exhibit; meet with instructors each semester to review changes.

ARCH-402, 502: 35% more than competent

ARCH-403, 405, 406: 60% competent

ARCH-405, 406: 5% less than competent

ARCH-401: Des 5

ARCH-402 Des 8

ARCH-403 Tech 3

ARCH-405 Struc 3

ARCH-406 Struc 4 ARCH-501 Des 9

ARCH-402, 502: 60% competent

ARCH-403, 405, 406: 70% competent

ARCH-301, 402, 501: 10% less than competent

ARCH-305, 506: 30% more than competent

ARCH-505, 506: skills and incorporated historiographica l assignment; Students required to submit process books to document more rigorous site analyses and evaluation of sustainable practices.

ARCH-302: Programmi ng exercise strengthened

ARCH-402, 502: Closer coordination with Vis II course to aid with documentation issues

ARCH-501: Faculty taking on more responsibility for special lectures

ARCH-403: Revision of student assignments to better coordinate with skills

ARCH-404: 6 Bring innovation to their fields. Adapt to change.
Program assessment cycles
Faculty develop and modify syllabi and judge student work according to the learning outcomes. This occurs on a frequent schedule individually, and on a more structured schedule as a program. Having NAAB visit our program every six years has encouraged us to develop an assessment plan that has short-term and long-term cycles, which is reflected in the Middle States assessment. Each semester or each year, faculty coordinating a course visit multiple sections (for example, during a project critique or a typical lecture), evaluate the effectiveness of the course against stated student performance criteria, collect suitable examples of student work (exams, assignments, design projects, etc), and meet with all faculty assigned to teach the course in order to collect their observations as well as to disseminate improvements for the coming semester. Since the FT faculty meet once or twice per month, there are multiple opportunities to discuss curricular issues as a group each academic year. Every three years, all senior FT faculty meet formally to discuss the curriculum as a whole and how each course fits into the overall matrix. That way, we are able to stay ahead of any problems that could develop as well as respond to changing ideas and technologies. When larger issues confront us, such as the transformation of a previously interdisciplinary course (Design 2) into a course taken only by majors in the discipline, the three-year assessment may focus on that particular challenge and put off major assessment of other sections of the curriculum for the following year.

Recent program assessments and the new curriculum
In the 2009-10 academic year, the full-time faculty were organized into subcommittees that evaluated the B. Arch curriculum and proposed significant changes, which are discussed according to categories. Following the work of the subcommittees, faculty met in a series of retreats in fall 2010 to clarify and articulate the main challenges.

- Overall curriculum changes: Through participating in design project critiques, faculty identified an opportunity for students to better integrate sustainable principles in upper-level studio work. Therefore, ARCH-301 Design V – the well-building studio that emphasized sustainable issues – was phased out of the curriculum as a discrete course and its content was integrated into all studios from level two to level five. Critiques also demonstrated to faculty that additional mentoring would help students include information and skills from technology and structures courses into their studio projects. Therefore, these courses were reorganized so they are offered earlier in the curriculum (starting in spring 2011) and they will culminate in a technology/structures capstone at ARCH-314 Technology 4, to better prepare students to incorporate the content into subsequent studios. To allow the program to implement the latter change, during the summer of 2011 the program hired a FT faculty who specializes in environmental technology systems.

- Changes to assignments: In the Theory Seminar, now required in the new curriculum, each student will submit a position paper connected to the course topic that points ahead to the area of specialization that a student hopes to focus on during fifth-year studios (see below). Also, responding to the previous VTR, the PD met with professional management faculty to reevaluate how professional ethics would be evident in student outcomes and assignments were altered accordingly.

- Pedagogical changes: To provide fifth-year students with enrichment opportunities commensurate with their level of maturity and ambition, the fifth-year studios have been restructured as special topics options allowing greater student independence. In the new fifth year sequence, which will begin in fall 2013, each student will use the fourth-year position paper (see above) to guide a two-semester sequence of studios that combines research and design. To allow the program to implement this change, the program has recently hired a full-time faculty specializing in digital technologies to replace the faculty member who left in 2010.

The changes noted above are moving through the University approval process. The overall curriculum changes were approved by the Undergraduate Education Committee first, and each semester changes to individual courses (or new courses replacing retiring courses) have been approved a year before they are scheduled to be implemented.
- Additional changes: To further pursue the program’s mission of rooting education in practice, in the summer of 2011 the program hired a FT faculty with an expertise in design/build, and continues to seek suitable community partners to nurture this student opportunity.

During the fall 2010 retreats, faculty identified and discussed “what we do well” and “what we don’t do so well,” and these topics are being addressed by subsequent improvements to the program. Some examples follow. Faculty work well together, but need to improve communication regarding the details of each others’ courses; therefore, we have begun devoting a portion of one monthly meeting per semester to update the group on how project assignments have recently changed. Students at years one and two are often detached from each other; therefore, we have begun to insist that all sections of first- and second-year studios be scheduled for one of several common time slots, and have strongly encouraged faculty to have sections collaborate as often as possible in discussions, pin-ups, lectures, and other group activities. We are open-minded, not doctrinaire in studio, but maintain level-appropriate standards for all studio work. This has resulted in an expectation that second- and third-year students demonstrate their drawing and model-making skills and concern with materiality, in conjunction with their conceptual goals. We handle large numbers of students reasonably well, but a few progress through the curriculum who aren’t completely ready to move on; therefore, we have decided to have a faculty committee (an informal gateway starting spring 2012) review second-year student work and help studio faculty determine whether each student is prepared to move up to third year.

A note on future assessments: In addition to the other sources already discussed, the published results of the AREs will be considered by the PD and faculty from this point on. The results for the 2010 tests indicate that the pass rates of our alumni who participated can be favorably compared to alumni of the four existing B. Arch programs in Pennsylvania as well as to alumni of our typical competitor schools in the Northeast in every exam except Programming, Planning & Practice. This will give us a point of reference for discussions in AY 2011-12 and beyond.

Architecture Alumni Survey (2011)
Periodically, the program requests alumni to complete a survey asking their opinions on how well their education prepared them for professional practice, life-long learning, and related issues. Due to unplanned administrative changes in the last few years, the survey was delayed; however, an updated version was developed in spring 2011 and circulated in summer 2011 to all alumni who graduated from 1996 (our first class) to 2010. Questions involved occupation and tasks performed, progress through IPD and professional registration, preparedness for professional employment (through major, elective, and liberal arts courses), and changes to the occupation since they began working. (The survey and its results will be available in the team room.)

Of 622 current (pre-2011) B. Arch alumni, the university provided 359 email addresses. Of those, a total of 116 alumni responded, for a healthy response rate of 32%. Most importantly, when asked if they would choose Philadelphia University again, 34% said definitely yes, 53% probably yes, and only 13% probably no; when asked if they would choose to study architecture again, 41% said definitely yes, 41% probably yes, and 18% probably no.

Results are of course the product of which students responded. There were far fewer email addresses for the older alumni and far more for recent graduates, which suggests that the younger alumni are disproportionally represented in the following evaluation. Also, respondents self-identified as following: 94% white, 3% Asian, 2% African American, and 2% Hispanic/Latino; so minority students were underrepresented compared to the alumni population as a whole. Respondents self-identified as 63% male and 36% female, a split which corresponds closely to the typical graduating classes of the recent past.

Alumni evaluations of their experience in the program will provide topics for many faculty meetings in the next academic year, in an effort to sustain and improve what has worked well. Overall, 58% of alumni
were very satisfied, 39% somewhat satisfied, and only 3% somewhat dissatisfied. They were most satisfied with faculty availability and helpfulness (74% very satisfied, 22% somewhat satisfied), their own abilities to formulate creative/original ideas and solutions and to function effectively as a team member (70% very satisfied for both, 24% somewhat satisfied with both), and to acquire new skills and to apply design skills (roughly 62% very satisfied, 34% somewhat satisfied). They were fairly content with their abilities to relate well to people of diverse cultural backgrounds and to make ethical decisions (more than half very satisfied, about 40% somewhat satisfied). Despite the relative youth of our program, alumni were satisfied with their level of preparedness compared to peers from other institutions (55% very satisfied, 37% somewhat satisfied). We cannot rest on our laurels, but apparently alumni have found that in many ways they have been prepared to face professional challenges.

The areas of biggest concern for future program discussions will be alumni ambivalence regarding the ability to utilize technology (41% very satisfied, 46% somewhat satisfied, and 11% somewhat dissatisfied); writing skills (38% very satisfied, 49% somewhat satisfied), and quantitative abilities (29% very satisfied, 57% somewhat satisfied). Alumni were least satisfied with facilities; approximately half of them were either somewhat satisfied or somewhat dissatisfied with classrooms, studios, fabrication labs, and computer labs. Recent full-time faculty hires, changes to the curriculum, and significant improvements to the fabrication lab in Weber Hall and its new satellite lab in the SEED Center are already addressing some of these alumni concerns. Discussions with our colleagues at the Writing Center and in quantitative reasoning courses must focus on the other issues, as well as a program-led evaluation of writing assignments in architecture courses.

Those alumni who responded are demonstrating success as professionals and as life-long learners. Many have pursued further education; 74% have completed and 26% are currently enrolled in the following: 29% in vocational tech certification or degrees (including LEED), and 19% in a Master’s of Architecture program. (The statistic indicating that 48% have been/are involved in another kind of Master’s degree is possibly a mistake, and requires further investigation.) They differ in their opinions about the rate of change in their profession, though that could be explained by how long each respondent has been working: 21% see very little change, 40% some change, 26% quite a lot of change, and 11% a great deal of change.

Not surprisingly, they find themselves in a wide variety of situations. In July 2011, 82% were employed by others, 8% self-employed, and 10% not employed. Given the recent economic downturn, those are very respectable numbers. For those employed, 82% were in a position highly related to their field of study and 13% moderately related to their field of study. Architectural pursuits occupied 71%, a few were employed in construction or teaching, and 10% in more diverse fields (in other words, not construction management, interior design, real estate, and similar areas). For those in architecture, 14% identified themselves as architects, 19% as designers, 16% as project architects, and 14% as project managers. Since 26% are licensed architects and 86% have completed or are completing IDP, we conclude that the majority are still in IDP on the path toward registration. Architecture alumni are primarily responsible for digital drafting, construction administration, construction documentation, design, design development, and project management and their firms’ client bases are commercial, educational, health care, and retail.

They demonstrate both stability and mobility in terms of job tenure: 23% in their jobs for less than a year, 20% for 1-2 years. 11% for 2-3 years, 10% for 3-4 years, and 36% for 5 or more years. During their careers, 26% have had only one position, 29% two positions, and 45% three or more. Though 46% have free-lanced, only 3% derive their main source of income that way. The majority of these mostly new alumni supervise no or just a few subordinates – 38% have none, 49% have 1-5, and 8% have 6-10, though at the other end of the spectrum two alumni supervise over 50 subordinates each. They are employed in offices that vary widely in size: 18% have 1-5 employees, 13% have 6-10, 18% have 11-20, 16% have 21-50, 6% have 51-100, 8% have 101-200, and 21% have over 200 employees. 14% of employers maintain offices outside the United States. Current income is shown in the chart below. (Total amounts to 101% due to rounding fractions.) Fig. 5 Alumni salaries reported in 2011 survey:
This, the first comprehensive survey of our alumni in six years, will be instrumental in our program assessments of the near future.

Student input
The University conducts a variety of student surveys and participates in both the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Noel-Levitz Satisfaction-Priorities Survey (see http://www.philau.edu/ir/). The most recent NSSE data point to an Architecture Program retention rate of 93% for spring of 1st year and 82% for fall of 2nd year. Given that incoming students do not submit a portfolio for admission, those numbers are understandable. Similarly, NSSE School of Architecture respondents completed more presentations, integrated ideas from varied sources more frequently, worked harder than they had expected, and were involved in more community based projects compared to their peers across the University. On the other hand, they read fewer books and participated in fewer co-curricular activities than their peers.

An assessment plan for assessing student learning in all academic programs and administrative units has been instituted, using a Dashboard Analytics data reporting system which provides a scorecard for comprehensive assessment of effectiveness, identifies areas of targeted intervention, and allows units to align more easily with institutional goals and processes. The data is carefully considered and integrated into the planning process at all levels of the institution.

Specifically in regard to the Architecture Program, several years ago students had been invited to participate in discussions of the Program Curriculum Committee; this practice has waned lately, but is scheduled to be restored beginning in fall 2011. Furthermore, every semester, students are required to evaluate each of their courses. The process has been completely digitized, easing its use for assessment.

Meanwhile, there are at least three other avenues for student input. All FT faculty serve as academic advisors to Architecture students in years two through five, providing an opportunity for students to share with faculty their concerns or ideas regarding the courses they have taken or are taking. All courses have faculty coordinators and students are informed that they should bring any concerns to the coordinator if they do not feel that speaking to their own instructor would be appropriate or effective. Finally, at the beginning of the semester, the PD arranges meetings with students by studio year (two to five) to disseminate general information and upcoming events as well as to encourage the students to make recommendations about their education at that moment or at a later time. Each semester, students take advantage of this opportunity to make recommendations for improving the curriculum, the facilities, and/or policies that impact them on a regular basis.

Results of Assessments as Outlined in the Five Perspectives
Using the assessment tools discussed above – Middle States procedures, NAAB Student Performance Criteria, alumni and student feedback, faculty meetings and particularly faculty retreats, we have been able to evaluate the Architecture Program’s progress. The AP Strategic Plan 2009-14 (see I.1.4) provides a structure by which to review our goals in an organized way.

In response to Perspectives A and B (Architectural Education, the Academic Community, and Students), some advances have been made. In fall 2010, the faculty agreed on a new mission for the program which seeks to unite architectural practice with the larger community. With an eye toward strengthening a holistic and practical education, after a delay of several years, the B. Arch curriculum was...
thoroughly evaluated, restructured, and approved. Implementation began in fall 2010. Successes include having the entire first-year class sign on to the new curriculum retroactively, getting the first group of new courses approved individually, and preparing FT and PT faculty to begin teaching them. End-of-semester reviews and subsequent faculty discussions of student work over the last several semesters encouraged faculty to expand our approaches to teaching the value of well-made architecture. This concern not only drove many curricular changes, but helped the faculty search committee (2010-11) to identify the following areas of specialty as prerequisites for new hires: environmental tech systems, design/build, and digital methodologies. Three faculty have been hired with expertise in those areas; they will begin in fall 2011, and their resumes and the beginning of their students’ work will be provided when the team visits campus. On another front, the primary destination for study abroad students was relocated to the University of Arkansas’s Rome Center (UARC) and so far two cohorts of students have completed that program successfully. How to better prepare students for their semester abroad is a topic that will be entrusted to a committee in the near future, as well as how our students can collaborate with their American and Italian counterparts at UARC. Other issues that require further attention include monitoring the second-year studio curriculum, particularly how students are introduced to sustainable design and how to mentor them in architectural drawing skills. Additional FT faculty will be shifted to teach at that level, as well as PT faculty with proven experience in those topics.

Facilities are another significant challenge for the program. Since the last visit, the small model shop has been significantly enlarged and outfitted with a FT supervisor, better-trained users, metal-working tools, and a laser cutter. In addition, the SEED Center, a building recently used for storage but renovated by the University in 2010 to accommodate the new graduate programs, also includes a satellite model shop with a laser cutter. These indicate a notable improvement. Undergraduate studios have been consolidated on campus instead of having some students travel to the off-site Manayunk location. Architecture faculty offices, after being split between two locations are now consolidated at Smith House, situated in between the lower-level studios on one side of campus and the upper-level studios on the other side. Though vastly improving FT faculty’s ability to communicate and collaborate on projects, this situation has encouraged us to continue to work with the Dean on identifying a better long-term solution. Meanwhile, we will make improvements to the existing offices to encourage the best possible experience for faculty, staff, and students.

Perspectives B and D (Architectural Education, Students and the Profession) have also been addressed by a sustained effort on the part of students and faculty to issue a new Studio Culture Document and adopt it as policy, rethink interdisciplinary collaboration, expand the use of technology in the classroom, bring students together with alumni, and increase student diversity. In this realm, successes and challenges are as follows. The protracted but very positive process of hammering out the new Studio Culture Document is reaching a milestone. The extent of involvement caused a delay in getting the document ready for distribution to all School of Architecture studios so faculty and students could discuss it and vote on it in spring 2011; this will occur at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester. Also, recent curricular changes have included Interior Design and Landscape Architecture programs withdrawing from all but the first semester of interdisciplinary design studies. The PDs are working on the potentially improved solution of having more fruitful interdisciplinary opportunities at the upper-level studios. One pilot semester between fourth-year Architecture and Landscape Architecture students ran in spring 2011, another is already planned for Architecture and Landscape Architecture with the Eastern Shore Land Conservancy for fall 2011, and one for Architecture and Interior Design, an industry sponsored competition to design the bank of the future, for spring 2012. However, these will not be available to all students and therefore a more comprehensive solution must be found to ensure that all students are guaranteed to be involved at least once in interdisciplinary curricular activities above first year. Appropriately, School programs continue to share many support courses such as history, technology, visualization, and many elective courses. Regarding the issue of technology, students are now required to have a laptop beginning in second year, a move which will open up new possibilities in many courses. Student presentations clearly reveal the impact of sophisticated modeling and rendering software and of the inventive use of laser cutters. The new curriculum makes another visualization course required, and a higher percentage of students are able to take our own Visualization elective option – the ADFND-112 Technics of Communication course – which instills an appreciation for integrating analog and
digital drawing. Starting in fall 2011, students will use hand-held performance assessment tools for some of their technology course assignments. The revival of NOMA activities, and efforts to work with the Admissions Office to meet prospective minority students from Philadelphia will begin to address our concerns over diversity. Faculty must continue to assess the impact of these changes and plan for appropriate adaptations in future semesters.

Our current responses to Perspectives D and E (Architectural Education, the Profession, and the Public Good) have been impacted by many recent changes within the program and the University. The University’s First Year Experience and especially SERVE-101 are beginning to prepare some students for the kind of professional life discussed in these perspectives. Our newly-constituted AP Advisory Board should be able to play a role in transitioning our program into a more community-oriented experience. Faculty are increasingly finding suitable projects for their students that point to the impact of socially aware architects and their clients in diverse settings. The new curriculum encourages this further by transforming the thesis program at it now stands (a limited number of students apply and are accepted to pursue projects that are typically independent of each other) to a required two-semester research studio at fifth year (in which all students are similarly challenged and are clustered by the broad topic of their inquiry). Assessing the transitional efforts we have experimented with shows that these require a lot of planning on the part of faculty and students to ensure success. Therefore, FT faculty in particular will have to begin concentrating on this in the near future: the new fifth-year format will begin AY 2012-13 with the students’ mandatory fourth-year position paper. Also, the new fifth-year sequence is envisioned to dovetail with faculty members’ own professional or scholarly agenda, so there will be the opportunity to utilize external funding sources. We are increasing the frequency with which students interact with alumni; however, another challenge will be to figure out how these interactions may lead to suitable employment opportunities for graduates. Working with PT faculty who teach the current courses in Professional Management has revealed the importance of providing multiple iterations of assignments that require students to integrate quantitative reasoning with writing and other skills. Therefore, in fall 2011, faculty will begin working with writing tutors, the information literacy coordinator, and others to plan some immediate interventions in years two through four to provide students with suitable exercises. One helpful step has already been taken in limiting the number of students in each section of Professional Management to 25, so faculty can more easily work with individual students and student groups.

Finally, we are faced with Perspective C (Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment). NCARB’s regular workshops have helped to address this concern, though of course the weak economy has meant fewer opportunities for internships and, for recent graduates, full-time employment. The new curriculum proposes strengthening the professional management sequence in ARCH-503, which will be introduced formally in 2013, but a transitional plan was developed for immediate implementation in 2010-11. Faculty will work towards introducing some relevant IDP information in the lower years of the curriculum, so that students are prepared in this regard. Having just celebrated the 20th anniversary of the program’s licensed architects and 86% have completed or are completing IDP.

In summary, the Program will continue to pursue the following goals:
- To make the Program nationally recognized, in order to recruit and maintain excellent students, staff, and faculty;
- To continue to refine the curriculum, in order to provide the best possible educational experience to our students;
- To continue to promote a supportive learning environment, particularly through interdisciplinary and collaborative work, in order to prepare graduates for the contemporary work environment;
- To provide the supportive physical environment and digital infrastructure necessary to produce the best work possible by all stakeholders in the Architecture Program; and
- To use community outreach, fundraising, and other development methods, in order to make the other goals possible.
Institutional Requirements for Self-assessment
Each PD is required to submit a Program Assessment Plan which includes Program Goals (connected to Institutional Learning Outcomes), Program Learning Outcomes with the courses involved and methods of measurements, a time frame, the actual learning outcomes, and how feedback improves the course and/or curriculum. Annual updates are due to the Director of the Advising Center. Beginning in fall 2011, the Architecture PD will be able to collaborate with a colleague in her role as Self-Assessment advocate for the College to make this an even more fruitful process in terms of updating the program’s matrix and supporting its implementation.

How Results Inform Planning and Other Activities
During the last few years, the Program Director, assisted by colleagues, would review assessment results and present them at faculty meetings to begin discussions on planning for improvements. When consensus was reached, the PD worked with the Dean to evaluate how plans would impact future use of facilities, faculty teaching assignments, and budgets. The Dean integrated proposals into budgetary requests and these were presented to the Provost. With the administrative changes underway, there may be changes in how the Executive Dean relays program plans to the Provost and other administrators.

1. Summary of Activities in Response to Changes in the NAAB Conditions (NOTE: This section is not required for programs submitting reports in 2013.)

2014 Philadelphia University Architecture Program Response:
We are responding the conditions not met and causes of concern relating to the last accreditation visit under the 2009 Conditions for Accreditation. We are currently evaluating the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation that take effect April 1, 2015.
Supplemental Material

Please follow this link to Supplemental Material:

https://philau.box.com/s/q88r7nx2ao6v3i3oz8m9

1. Evidence for/Progress in Addressing Conditions Not Met
   a. Conditions I.1-I.5 or II.2-II.3
      Annotated Campus maps folder:
      2006 Visit: Locations of Architecture Studios and faculty offices
      2012 Visit: Locations of Architecture Studios and faculty offices
      2014 Focused Evaluation: Locations of Architecture Studios and faculty offices

      College of Architecture and the Built Environment Crit Spaces folder:

   b. Conditions II.1 (Student Performance Criteria)
      Evidence Folders:
      Syllabus 2012
      Student Evidence 2012
      Syllabus 2014
      Lecture 2014
      Student Evidence 2014

2. Plans/Progress in Addressing Causes of Concern
   Leadership Biographies:
   Barbara Klinkhammer, Executive Dean
   James Doerfler, Director of Architecture Programs