

Visiting Team Report

University of Houston
Gerald D. Hines College of
Architecture and Design

B.Arch.

M.Arch.

Visit Dates: March 7-9, 2022

© 2021 by the National Architectural Accrediting
Board. All Rights Reserved.

NAAB

National
Architectural
Accrediting
Board, Inc.

Visiting Team Report (VTR)

2020 Conditions for Accreditation

2020 Procedures for Accreditation

Institution	<u>University of Houston</u>
Name of Academic Unit	Gerald D. Hines College of Architecture and Design
Degree(s) <i>(check all that apply)</i> Track(s) <i>(Please include all tracks offered by the program under the respective degree, including total number of credits. Examples:</i> <i>150 semester undergraduate credit hours</i> <i>Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours</i> <i>Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 90 graduate semester credit hours)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Bachelor of Architecture</u> 160 semester undergraduate credit hours <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Master of Architecture</u> Track I: Undergraduate degree with architecture major + 60 graduate semester credit hours Track II: Undergraduate degree with non-architecture major + 99 graduate semester credit hours <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Doctor of Architecture</u> Track: Track:
Application for Accreditation	Continuing Accreditation
Year of Previous Visit	2014
Current Term of Accreditation <i>(refer to most recent decision letter)</i>	Continuing Accreditation (Eight-Year Term)
Program Administrator	Dietmar Froehlich
Chief Administrator for the academic unit in which the program is located <i>(e.g., dean or department chair)</i>	Patricia Belton Oliver
Chief Academic Officer of the Institution	Paula Myrick Short
President of the Institution	Renu Khator

I. Summary of Visit

a. Acknowledgments and Observations

- The NAAB team extends its deepest appreciation to the College of Architecture and Design administration, faculty, and staff for the organized manner in putting material together for the visit and their responsiveness to material requests from the team. Their effort going into the visit made it possible for the visiting team to complete their review especially given the new content and processes that are part of the 2020 Conditions and Procedures and the reality of doing an accreditation visit remotely.
- The effort of the program to meet the new Conditions and Procedures, which are very different from the previous set, positioned the College to be well on its way to meeting them.
- The team greatly appreciated the candid commentary and honesty with the information and analysis in the APR and in the response to questions team members asked in all the meetings.
- The team was also impressed with the large number of students representatives involved in student organizations especially with remote teaching making this more difficult.
- The respect and support of the Provost was clear as the college is becoming more integral to the mission of the institution as a whole based on the work of that faculty and students are pursuing.
- Finally, the team wants to acknowledge that the efforts of the faculty, staff, and administration of the architecture programs during the pandemic to “turn on a dime” while dealing with increased enrollments and budget cuts, clearly shone through as dedication to the institution’s mission as a Hispanic serving institution, and their service to their community is admirable.

b. Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

- PC 4 History and Theory (M.Arch)
- PC 7 Learning and Teaching Culture (B.Arch and M.Arch)
- PC 8 Social Equity and Inclusion (B.Arch and M.Arch)
- SC 2 Professional Practice (B.Arch and M.Arch)
- SC 5 Design Synthesis (B.Arch and M.Arch)
- SC 6 Building Integration (B.Arch and M.Arch)
- 5.6 Physical Resources (B.Arch and M.Arch)

II. Progress Since the Previous Visit

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.3 Sustainability (B.Arch only): Ability to design projects that optimize, conserve, or reuse natural and built resources, provide healthful environments for occupants/users, and reduce the environmental impacts of building construction

and operations on future generations through means such as carbon-neutral design, bioclimatic design, and energy efficiency.

Previous Team Report (2014): B.3. Sustainability is Not Met in the **B. Arch** program. The Team could find no evidence in classroom exercises or studio projects that reflect the student's ability to design projects utilizing sustainable principals

Team Assessment: The APR response lists five undergraduate studios and six technology classes some of which introduce sustainable principles and some materials provided reflect that. However, this SPC was at the ability level and there is no evidence requiring that students use this information within a studio project or specific assignments. However, this topic now falls within PC 3 and the program's narrative of their more holistic approach for this is confirmed though material submitted. This is now considered met per the 2014 Conditions.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.4 Site Design (B.Arch only): *Ability to respond to site characteristics such as soil, topography, vegetation, and watershed in the development of a project design.*

Previous Team Report (2014): B.4. Site Design is Not Met in the **B. Arch** program. The Team could find no evidence in classroom exercises or studio projects that reflect the student's ability to respond to projects situated on sites with varying site conditions. As noted in the Team's comments under criterion B.2. Accessibility, students were not exposed to site diversification and were consequently lacking in their skills to resolve the myriad of issues associated with sites of varying topography.

Team Assessment: The program APR states that additional site topic material was put into some courses and studios on working with various topographies. While some of this was seen in any of the course material provided, in discussion with students many of them talked about the various typographies they had to work with in studios, so this is now considered met.

2009 Student Performance Criterion B.7 Financial Considerations (B. Arch & M.Arch): *Understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting.*

Previous Team Report (2014): B.7. Financial Considerations is Not Met in the **B. Arch** program. The Team could find no evidence in course studies, or the student studio projects that reflected an understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting. The course syllabus for ARCH 4360 – Technology 6 includes relevant content and faculty provided lectures associated with content when requested; however, the Team could find no work product or examination content providing evidence of student understanding.

B.7. Financial Considerations is Not Met in the **M. Arch** program. The Team could find no evidence in course studies, or the student studio projects that reflected an understanding of the fundamentals of building costs, such as acquisition costs, project financing and funding, financial feasibility, operational costs, and construction estimating with an emphasis on life-cycle cost accounting. Consultation with faculty confirmed that the required Financial Considerations content and criteria was not explicitly addressed in any other course that ARCH 6360 – Practice of Architecture for all tracks within the M Arch program. There is strong evidence of financial issues within the Track I Design-Build Studio curriculum; however, the Design-Build Studio is only required for Track I students.

Team Assessment: B.Arch: The APR states that Financial Considerations is now incorporated as an exercise in ARCH 4510. The syllabus for ARCH 4510 lists a financial analysis assignment as 5% of the final grade and its presentation is due in week 14 of the course. The handout for the Digital Project Book due at the end of the term also lists the Financial Considerations assignment as a requirement within the required Project Book and student projects show it. This is now considered met.

M.Arch: The APR indicates that two Financial Considerations workshops are incorporated into ARCH 6604 (a one-page handout of types of costs was in the APR). The course syllabus did not indicate the topic, but four samples of student work showed an overall bldg. cost estimate. All three syllabi for ARCH 6393 mentioned a session on Financial Considerations. Four of the five student presentations had a general project budget. This SPC is now met.

2009 Student Performance Criterion C.1 Collaboration (B.Arch only): *Ability to work in collaboration with others and in multi-disciplinary Teams to successfully complete design projects.*

Previous Team Report (2014): C.1. Collaboration is Not Met in the **B. Arch** program. The Team could find no evidence in course studies or the student studio projects that indicated students were required to work together as a team to successfully complete a studio design project. Students indicated that they gave and received assistance from their colleagues on an informal basis; however, there was no evidence that collaboration was a structured component of the B Arch curriculum.

Team Assessment: The common syllabus for ARCH 4510 has divided the students up into groups of two for assignments and student project books provided have both students' names. This SPC is now met.

3. Causes of Concern

a) Site Accessibility: ^[L]_[SEP] While the Team found that the program has made great strides within the physical building in resolving the Accessibility "Not Met" criterion from their 2008 accreditation visit, evidence of the ability to resolve site accessibility remains weak. The majority of studio projects were situated on flat sites, essentially devoid of topographical considerations. The Team had great difficulty determining if students were able to resolve the difficulties of ramping and other accessibility issues associated with site design. During discussions, students acknowledged they had little experience dealing with site accessibility concerns. This applies to both the B. Arch. and M. Arch. programs.

Team Assessment: While the APR stated that site accessibility issues were addressed by adding more varied topographical locations for studio projects, the only evidence of this was the ARCH 3501 syllabus stating a final deliverable was to show accessible pathways to parking and transit on the site plan; no student work was shown nor required for this course under the new C&P. Arch 4510, the only class that had student work and only had flat sites. However, in discussions with students, visiting a class and information found in a Pro Practice, it was confirmed that varied topography in a variety of class was done. This is now met. ^[L]_[SEP]

b) Applied Research: ^[L]_[SEP] Research skills were evident in student work. Nevertheless, the level of understanding reached regarding information culled from research was not always evident. With immediate access to information on the internet, students easily cut and paste information, pictures, and graphs that are appropriate to their research, but do not show evidence they understand how the information correlates to their specific tasks or informs their design decisions.

The Team is also concerned that information accessed from the internet was not appropriately credited and cited, making it difficult for the Team to differentiate original student research and design from data pulled from online reference sources. [SEP]

Team Assessment: The APR states that the programs addressed this issue primarily through changes in Tech classes and their connections with studios. The specifics are highlighted as part of the new NAAB requirement of PC5 Research and Innovation which was met for both programs. This is no longer a concern.

c) Requirements of IDP: [SEP] There was little evidence that students were broadly aware of the requirements of IDP. Even less evidence was found within the faculty. The requirements of IDP have changed significantly in recent years. When questioned, only the leadership of the various student organizations seemed to be aware of these changes. All students need to be made aware of IDP, its significance to licensing, and how they can begin to earn their credits while in school.

Team Assessment: The APR states that students are informed about NCARB/ARE at the beginning of each semester, during all college meetings, and in studio, and this was verified in meetings with students. This is no longer a concern.

d) Studio Culture Policy: [SEP] When questioned, students responded with vague knowledge of their Studio Culture Policy. Students are made aware of the Studio Culture Policy at the beginning of each year, and this appears to be the extent of their knowledge and/or involvement with the policy. Faculty had even less knowledge of the Studio Culture Policy history, or the content of their specific policy. The Studio Culture Policy is intended as a living document, modified by the student body and faculty as appropriate to the learning environment within the college. [SEP]

Team Assessment: The APR states that in 2020 a new college-wide College Culture document was created and replaces the former Studio Culture Policy. In student and faculty meetings it was verified that they know there is a policy. As required under the 2014 Conditions, this is no longer a concern.

e) Program Recognition: [SEP] Some students expressed frustration that they felt they had not had enough opportunities to participate in design competitions and/or other types of occasions that would give appropriate credit to the high-caliber student work emerging from the College of Architecture. The Team found it refreshing that the students were proud of their architectural education and thought it equal to other programs, especially within the State of Texas. The faculty and program administration are encouraged to embrace the students' enthusiasm and make every effort to elevate the College of Architecture at the University of Houston. When mentioned to the Senior Vice Chancellor during the exit interview, she indicated the university administration was solidly behind the students' desires and would support their viable endeavors. [SEP]

Team Assessment: The APR states that the program is experiencing increased national and international recognition through lectures, reviews, exhibits, and competition participation—all with student involvement. Three UH collaborative teams led by CoAD architecture faculty and students competed in the 2021 ULI Hines student competition with one of the three teams selected as one of four finalists. Additionally, student work has received recognition in the AIA Houston and AIA Fort Worth design awards programs. In meetings with students, they believe that they have opportunities to participate in design competitions although it is not systematic. This is no longer a concern.

III. Program Changes

If the Accreditation Conditions have changed since the previous visit, a brief description of changes made to the program as a result of changes in the Conditions is required.

Team Assessment: The APR stated that the Covid pandemic required a switch to online learning and the program continues to teach almost exclusively Hy/flex and Online Synchronous; it also allowed for joint presentation to both graduate and undergraduate students. Moving forward the programs will use technology to record and make available lectures for studio classes and will offer large lecture classes online. The Program Criteria and Student Criteria in the 2020 Conditions necessitated that the program redistribute and broadly spread technology topics across the undergraduate program's courses. Under this new pedagogical mode: ARCH 2327 Technology 1 is focused on the introduction of technology, covering all architecture technology topics, ARCH 2328 Technology 2 is focused on structural systems and coordinated with studio ARCH 2501 Design Studio IV with combined requirements, ARCH 3327 Technology 3 is focused on materials, assemblies, and constructability and coordinated with ARCH 3500 Design Studio V with combined requirements, and ARCH 3328 Technology 4 is focused on Environmental Systems and Coordinated with ARCH 3501 Design Studio VI with combined requirements. A greater emphasis on sustainability is also being added to studio projects.

IV. Compliance with the 2020 Conditions for Accreditation

1—Context and Mission

To help the NAAB and the visiting team understand the specific circumstances of the school, the program must describe the following:

- The institutional context and geographic setting (public or private, urban or rural, size, etc.), and how the program's mission and culture influence its architecture pedagogy and impact its development. Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the mission of the college or university and how that shapes or influences the program.
- The program's role in and relationship to its academic context and university community, including how the program benefits—and benefits from—its institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or its individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. Also describe how the program, as a unit, develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages unique opportunities in the institution and the community.
- The ways in which the program encourages students and faculty to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective opportunities (e.g., field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities).

[X] Described

Program Response: [NOTE: Staff to copy Summary Statement from APR]

The Gerald D. Hines College of Architecture and Design offers its students a platform of integrated disciplines—Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Industrial Design—from which to negotiate the complexities of contemporary practice in a world that is grappling with diminishing economic and natural resources, the realities of post-disaster reconstruction, and, at the same time, continued rapid urbanization. Our programs foster an environment where ideas find form and where practices, socially equitable and fundamentally ecological, establish a model from which to develop Houston's future and inform and share design strategies globally. "We teach with the idea that Houston is our laboratory, challenging students to push the boundaries of architecture and design in this complex and diverse metropolis, and therefore, make a difference in the world." Design at the University of Houston's College of Architecture and Design reconciles conflicting visions and utilizes all available technologies to shape and sustain a better world. Houston's hot, humid environment, low-lying Gulf Coast geography, and dispersed pattern of un-zoned metropolitan development presents designers with an extraordinary laboratory full of challenges and opportunities. The proposals seeded in the vast urban sprawl of Houston are transmutable to cities around the globe.

Analysis/Review: The University of Houston is a Tier I Research Institution with over 47,000 students. The College of Art and Design has an enrollment of 987 students within its three programs of Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Industrial Design. The B.Arch program has 695 students and the M.Arch has 45 students.

- The institution is a Hispanic serving institution and the B.Arch program focuses on the providing the opportunity for these students and others within the Houston area to obtain a first professional degree in preparation to entering the architectural profession and to obtain employment in the building industry.
- Since the university became a Tier I institution several years ago there is a greater emphasis on a range of research in the graduate program and this smaller student body draws from applicants across the country.
- The city of Houston is a laboratory for both programs and its work on urban design issues both on campus and in the city has made the College more visible.
- The university's new strategic plan has at least three major areas in which the College can play a major role: sustainability, equity, and collaboration across disciplines. This has recently been

recognized by the College receiving two out of 20 of the University's Frontier Faculty initiative in which the College shares two faculty with a 75/25 split with the College of Engineering.

- The College has recently received funding from the Provost for a Research Liaison Office to work with industry and shift the culture to include other areas of research.

2—Shared Values of the Discipline and Profession

The program must report on how it responds to the following values, all of which affect the education and development of architects. The response to each value must also identify how the program will continue to address these values as part of its long-range planning. These values are foundational, not exhaustive.

Design: Architects design better, safer, more equitable, resilient, and sustainable built environments. Design thinking and integrated design solutions are hallmarks of architecture education, the discipline, and the profession.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: Architects are responsible for the impact of their work on the natural world and on public health, safety, and welfare. As professionals and designers of the built environment, we embrace these responsibilities and act ethically to accomplish them.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: Architects commit to equity and inclusion in the environments we design, the policies we adopt, the words we speak, the actions we take, and the respectful learning, teaching, and working environments we create. Architects seek fairness, diversity, and social justice in the profession and in society and support a range of pathways for students seeking access to an architecture education.

Knowledge and Innovation: Architects create and disseminate knowledge focused on design and the built environment in response to ever-changing conditions. New knowledge advances architecture as a cultural force, drives innovation, and prompts the continuous improvement of the discipline.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: Architects practice design as a collaborative, inclusive, creative, and empathetic enterprise with other disciplines, the communities we serve, and the clients for whom we work.

Lifelong Learning: Architects value educational breadth and depth, including a thorough understanding of the discipline's body of knowledge, histories and theories, and architecture's role in cultural, social, environmental, economic, and built contexts. The practice of architecture demands lifelong learning, which is a shared responsibility between academic and practice settings.

[X] Described

Analysis/Review:

Design: Design education is a process-oriented and open-ended inquiry yielding multiple responses and continually provoking questions. Design is central to the way CoAD engages the evolving world and has the power to produce a formal, material, and technological embodiment of that world's sociocultural, ecological, and economic dimensions through a platform of integrated disciplines—Architecture, Interior Architecture, and Industrial Design. Design reconciles conflicting visions and exploits all available technologies to shape and sustain a better world. Houston's hot, humid environment, low-lying Gulf Coast geography, and dispersed pattern of un-zoned metropolitan development presents designers with a laboratory full of challenges and opportunities. The proposals seeded in the vast urban sprawl of Houston are transmutable to cities around the globe grappling with diminishing economic and natural resources, the realities of post-disaster reconstruction, and, at the same time, continued, rapid urbanization.

Environmental Stewardship and Professional Responsibility: Students are continually made aware of their responsibility towards people, the environment, and our world as a whole as students and as future practicing architects. This happens through the projects undertaken in studios, in the tech and environmental science classes, and in the history and theory courses. The technical aspects of the work of an environmentally conscious architect are discussed in the respective courses, while the ethical and societal aspects are part of all courses. Projects presented in different undergraduate and graduate studios address current environmental and ecological issues challenging facing cities and communities of the future and uses Houston as a laboratory for studio projects to educate students on about the

complexities of ecology in contemporary cities. Environmental stewardship is also practiced through recycling of model material, reduced printing output, and economical use of resources as part of our practical approach to stewardship.

Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion: The APR states that diversity, equity, and inclusion are core to CoAD's mission. The curriculum addresses these issues in various ways, and projects given in studio or class reflect the importance of mutual understanding and respect, while also speaking to the different barriers arising out of the reality of exclusion and inequity. The large representation of minorities in the student body is proof that diversity and inclusion is more than just a slogan and the programs help students from disadvantaged backgrounds be successful on the road to becoming an architect. Work-life balance is encouraged by measures such as limited access to the building over weekends and after regular hours to discourage a 24-7 schedule. A Wellness Center is located on campus. Yoga classes and other healthful activities are also widely available to students. Faculty is mindful when assigning work not to overload the students, especially as many of them are also working outside the university. Various DEI task forces and committees, consisting of both the faculty and students, have played a significant role in initiating the conversation on this vital topic and helping the administrators identify gaps and weaknesses across units and has outlined plans to continue addressing equity issues and diversify the faculty and curriculum.

Knowledge and Innovation: Design education is a process-oriented and open-ended inquiry yielding multiple responses and continually provoking questions. Design is central to the way we engage our evolving world and has the power to produce a formal, material, and technological embodiment of that world's sociocultural, ecological, and economic dimensions. Studios, seminars, lectures, and all other educational environments serve as laboratories for design experimentation. All members of our community are encouraged to contribute to the vibrancy and intensity of the work and discussion. Success is measured by the quality of discourse and the design process as well as by the quality of work produced. New advances in the field are communicated to the students through constant updates of the syllabi, through our lecture series, and through the work of guest professors and visiting scholars. Innovation and knowledge acquisition are encouraged throughout all the programs. Linking research done in academia with the profession occurs primarily through participation in conferences and participating in competitions and exhibits. Research is directly generated from and applied to the profession through the work of the Center for Sustainability and Resilience (CeSAR), the Community Design Resource Center (CDRC), and the designLAB. Students in the collage enjoy studio crits and lectures from a varied and diverse population of professors and academics as well as practitioners from across the globe thanks to electronic media delivery systems. Video conference lectures and studios bring a host of varying opinions on the role of architects in the built environment and the extent of their stewardship of the Health, Safety and Welfare of the public. Engagement with local community supports the growing influence of both programs on the built environment and the need for talent to support design and planning needs of the region.

Leadership, Collaboration, and Community Engagement: Leadership, collaboration, and community engagement is practiced through the work of the CRDC, CeSAR, the Graduate Design/Build Studio, and engagement in studio projects that address underserved communities locally and nationally via studio projects. The Graduate Design/Build Studio develops permanent improvements through its projects for schools and other institutions. These opportunities help students learn how to enact change, utilizing responsibility and critical/design thinking to make change meaningful. While every student is not required to participate in these projects, there is an ethos of community engagement that permeates the programs due to these activities. Collaboration and collaborative design occur at several points throughout the programs in required courses and elsewhere in the College. The College also provides support for several student organizations in order to provide an opportunity for students to get engaged in conversations and get involved in the decision-making process.

Lifelong Learning: The APR lists the following as its efforts to inculcate lifelong learning: The curricula of the architecture programs contain a wide variety of learning approaches that are inclusive and reflect the latest developments within the discipline. Within the College, Interior Architecture and Industrial Design Programs allow for cross-disciplinary experiences and learning from allied professions. The faculty and

students are encouraged to participate in ACSA events and other architecture related conferences. Every member of the college community is encouraged to attend lectures and events at UH, Rice University, Rice Design Alliance, Houston Mod, and other local design organizations. Students and faculty participate in competitions in and outside of class. Students are reminded through our listserv to take advantage of attending events by NOMAS, AIAS, etc. Engagement with Houston's Third Ward brings reality into the classroom and allows for acquiring new skills such as communicating effectively with clients. Offering credit to students for attending lectures, events, etc., outside college is another way we encourage learning outside the studio. All these initiatives are geared towards instilling a desire for lifelong learning. They also help to further the integration of theory and practice.

3—Program and Student Criteria

These criteria seek to evaluate the outcomes of architecture programs and student work within their unique institutional, regional, national, international, and professional contexts, while encouraging innovative approaches to architecture education and professional preparation.

3.1 Program Criteria (PC)

A program must demonstrate how its curriculum, structure, and other experiences address the following criteria.

PC.1 Career Paths—How the program ensures that students understand the paths to becoming licensed as an architect in the United States and the range of available career opportunities that utilize the discipline's skills and knowledge.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The APR notes two classes in the BARCH and one in the MARCH program with descriptions like Professional Practice and intro to design culture. Material from these courses appears to have some relevance to the professional practice and licensure. A spring and a fall workshop are held to introduce students to the resources of NCARB, the importance of licensure where to find the state licensing board resources. Class syllabi indicate broad coverage of the role and responsibility of an architect the role the profession plays in society. Class materials include detailed information about the ARE, AIA Code of Ethics, Legal Structure and AIA contract documents. This area was lacking in the 2014 Visit and is generally covered although AXP seems only to be mentioned in the NCARB deck of slides. Benchmarking included an awareness of numbers of students completing the program and an understanding of the yearly percentage of students passing the exam and numbers of students being hired in firms around Houston. Local firms provide an annual career fair at the school along with other industry providing alternatives for design students to consider future employment.

Evidence was requested of the school to show the results of the career fairs or hiring numbers and the response was that the faculty member responsible for this work has left the college and they were unable to provide any further documentation.

PC.2 Design—How the program instills in students the role of the design process in shaping the built environment and conveys the methods by which design processes integrate multiple factors, in different settings and scales of development, from buildings to cities.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Design is described throughout both programs as the primary driver in all curricula and administrative decisions.

Supporting evidence was found in B.Arch course information for ARCH 1501, 2500, 2501, 3500, 3501, and 4510 as well as M.Arch courses ARCH 6603, 6604, 6393, 6361 indicating design process development and integration in various settings and scales of development including buildings and cities. It is important to note that evidence found within the aforementioned courses come in contact with almost

every year of study in the BARCH and every year of study in the MARCH which reinforces the programs' claim of design as the primary driver and foundation of their efforts.

BARCH Individual course assessments have been done through a variety of means including common evaluation rubrics, data acquisition, and the use of faculty meetings where presentations and discussions of student work compare section to section within each course helping create a common grading measure. This also exposes issues and concerns to improve upon and the team was able to identify elements which the program incorporated within the later of the two course years shared helping address items discussed during the first year.

MARCH curricular review occurs annually by the Graduate Committee as well as an external panel of educators and practitioners who blind peer reviews terminal projects. Metrics generated by these processes create feedback and influence for curricular improvement.

In addition to the metrics initiated and managed internally within the UHCoAD, BARCH and MARCH benchmarking also occurs annually by Academic Program Assessment Reports [APAR], a shared statewide assessment tool used by Texas state institutions.

PC.3 Ecological Knowledge and Responsibility—How the program instills in students a holistic understanding of the dynamic between built and natural environments, enabling future architects to mitigate climate change responsibly by leveraging ecological, advanced building performance, adaptation, and resilience principles in their work and advocacy activities.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: It is stated that the imparting of ecological knowledge is a primary tenet and goal of both programs and that due to its holistic nature, they approach this topic through various means using seminars, workshops, and studios. Through recent re-evaluation of this area of the curriculum within both programs, this content is now offered in a reinforced manner throughout the entire curriculum in multiple forms of learning delivery and at differing speeds. They situate parts of their curriculum around the ecological tensions between the city of Houston and the natural ecosystem of the Gulf Coast and in addition to curricular activities, the UHCoAD also provides students with research opportunities in this area by way of the Community Design Resource Center (CDRC) and the Center for Sustainability and Resilience (CeSAR). Through student interviews, some older students expressed that ecological responsibility had been taught as an “add-on” to other, more primary considerations of design while other students stated significant improvement in the better integration of this concept as foundational and integrative to good design. The team recognized that this is a positive change in this area.

Supporting evidence was found in BARCH course information for ARCH 2327, 2328, 3327, 3328, 2500, 2501, 3500, 3501, 4327, 4373, and 4510 as well as MARCH course information for ARCH 6A48, 6603, 6A49, 6A51, 6357, and 6604.

BARCH assessments are carried out in a variety of methods but include weekly discussion groups conducted between section faculty used to assess students' progress and understanding and informal review sessions at the end of each semester where students discuss their work and progress with invited outside guests. In 2019, program wide assessment (BARCH and MARCH) began through evaluation and comparison to other undergraduate architectural programs. Evidence of these assessment processes have been found in video recordings of faculty discussion groups. Alteration and improvement to the program has been done in reference to the metrics listed above and through the use of a task force appointed in 2021, better alignment the efforts of the BARCH and the college's non-accredited Bachelor of Science Environmental Design [BENVD] have been incorporated as well.

For years and prior to 2020, assessment in the MARCH coursework has been based on program wide evaluation of student's work product in several criteria falling under one of three categories: Craft, Intellectual Clarity, and Completion. The program wide assessment used these evaluations through meetings with the Graduate Committee, the program recognized a blind spot and has adopted recent changes adding the category of "Construction" to the list allowing the program a better opportunity of tracking progress on building assembly, systems, and regulation. This is currently helping the MARCH better evaluate their progress in curricular development and student achievement in the area of PC.3.

PC.4 History and Theory—How the program ensures that students understand the histories and theories of architecture and urbanism, framed by diverse social, cultural, economic, and political forces, nationally and globally.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Not Met

History and Theory in the BARCH program are mainly covered in three classes: ARCH 1210 (Introduction to Design Media), ARCH 1358, and two survey classes (ARCH 2350 and ARCH 2351). ARCH 1358 (Introduction to Design Culture) provides an appropriate overview of a wide range of theoretical topics. The readings and assignments are diverse and seem to be engaging for students. This course, as well as ARCH 1210 (Introduction to Design Media), are successful in making a connection with the design studios. Both survey classes (ARCH 2350 and ARCH 2351) provide an overview of architectural history from 1400 to the 2000s. The lectures, assignments, and handouts presented in survey classes do not provide evidence for sufficient coverage of global history, as these classes seem to be mostly focused on European and American traditions. While ARCH 2350 offers lectures on non-Western cultures (e.g., China, Turkey, and India), ARCH 2351 is mostly focused on Western traditions.

The MARCH program offers three required history and theory classes: ARCH 6357, ARCH 6359, and ARCH 6376. ARCH 6357 (Contemporary theory and Critical Practice) provides a comprehensive overview of theoretical issues surrounding architecture and urbanism. ARCH 6359 (Modern Architecture and Urbanism) provides a good coverage of modern architecture in Europe and the USA. ARCH 6376 (Urban Determinants) provides an understanding on the impact of past and current processes and practices on the space and shape of the city. Similar to the undergraduate HTC classes, the HTC classes offered in the MARCH program do not sufficiently cover architectural history and cultures outside the boundaries of Europe and USA. However, the HTC program seems to be aware of these shortcomings and has initiated plans to resolve address this issue in future. The HTC faculty should be acknowledged for their efforts (e.g., organizing GAHTC workshops) in order to globalize and diversify the HTC curriculum.

PC.5 Research and Innovation—How the program prepares students to engage and participate in architectural research to test and evaluate innovations in the field.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment

Research and innovation are integrated within the studio sequence. ARCH 2501 (Studio IV) addresses a comprehensive list of topics having to do with design methods. In ARCH 3500 (Studio V), which is

focused on design strategies, projects are diverse, thought provoking, research oriented, and address a wide range of issues related to various contexts. ARCH 5500 (Studio VIII) provides considerable diversity in design, as projects are research based. Moreover, the readings provide a proper foundation for research and design; lectures are thought provoking. The program promotes innovation and research by offering extracurricular activities for students such as lecture series.

The programs for studio projects are quite innovative. The studios, HTC, and Technology sequences and thesis studios are heavily research oriented. The Precedents and Research Methods workshops also play an important role in educating students on applied research in architecture. Master project, including ARCH 6393 and ARCH 7601, in the final year of the program provides a unique opportunity for students to learn essential skills in the pre-design as well as analysis and synthesis of architecture.

The college has taken significant steps to implement research in their both undergraduate and graduate curricula. The recent six hires in both programs include researchers in three areas of curriculum: Technology, HTC, and Design media. Moreover, the college is currently in the process of constructing an innovation lab which would potentially help the school push research in robotics, material research, design research, wood, textiles, and additive manufacturing.

PC.6 Leadership and Collaboration—How the program ensures that students understand approaches to leadership in multidisciplinary teams, diverse stakeholder constituents, and dynamic physical and social contexts, and learn how to apply effective collaboration skills to solve complex problems.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Previously unmet in the 2014 visit as collaboration of students working on projects together to produce a combined effort project was not evident. The ARCH6603 class mentions one week exercise in small group format. ARCH 6604 has presentations by small groups of students (two to three) where a particular building material is studied and discussed in a power point presentation. Finally in ARCH 4328 larger groups up to five were involved in creating an imaginary firm where they developed a marketing slide deck, income loss statements etc. In the BARCH portfolio of offerings ARCH 4510 features a project with heavy emphasis on collaboration with a dice rolling exercise to form the teams. Benchmarking through participation and studio engagement.

Much discussion was provided in the APR about various design collaboration efforts which involved the students working with each other and the community around the school as well as other ecological sensitive areas. Some of this evidence was found in samples of student work but not all was found, (design build projects for example).

PC.7 Learning and Teaching Culture—How the program fosters and ensures a positive and respectful environment that encourages optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation among its faculty, students, administration, and staff.

B.Arch.
[X] Not Met

M.Arch.
[X] Not Met

Team Assessment:

The new College Culture policy (provided as a document 45 days before the visit) addressed the following topics:

- Diversity, equity, and inclusion are core to our College's mission.
- The College prioritizes freedom of inquiry, teaching, and research.
- The College promotes design as a creative process.
- The College is an incubator for ideas.
- The College holds that constructive critique is a necessary means of engaging the world.
- The College community encourages wellness.

Material provided to the team indicated the varied representation on the committee of students, faculty, staff, and administrators to develop the policy, series of meetings that were held to develop the policy and the PowerPoint to present it to a townhall.

The document stated that each spring the Dean would convene a task force to obtain feedback and update the statement. In April 2021 there was a survey on the policy wording that had 13 total responses, although the team was not clear on what if any changes were made or what that process was. The APR also stated that at the beginning of each academic year the studio classes the Studio Culture Policy would be discussed and the students would sign the document. In meetings with students, they indicated that this was not always done.

The APR Addendum stated that the program is developing rubrics for the effectiveness of the Teaching and Learning Culture to be included in every course assessment and academic interaction and plan an annual survey to all faculty, students, administration, and staff about the program fostering/encouraging a positive and respectful environment. This would then be followed up by changes in modified teaching methods and our course content. These steps need to be completed.

PC.8 Social Equity and Inclusion—How the program furthers and deepens students' understanding of diverse cultural and social contexts and helps them translate that understanding into built environments that equitably support and include people of different backgrounds, resources, and abilities.

B.Arch.

[X] Not Met

M.Arch.

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: The UHCoAD, particularly the BARCH program, currently exhibits strong diversity within their student body although their faculty and curriculum, does not share the same level of diversity. While the team has found much evidence in the program's assessment, benchmarking, and current initiatives proposals to better diversify their faculty, and curriculum, these improvements have yet to be instituted within the programs due to the recent nature of the assessments and benchmarks themselves.

In June of 2020, the Office of the Dean created the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force (DEITF), a tremendous and commendable effort manifesting a study which looked comprehensively into the college at large. The DEITF taskforce examined the programs through three subsections: "Context for Change," "Where We Stand," and "Goals and Recommendations." The "Context for Change" sections provide a broad overview and the "Where We Stand" sections provide context and data points that will allow the reader to better understand the DEITF's recommendations which include goals, some timelines, and success metrics.

While the study further subdivides the program into 5 areas: 1] COLLEGE Organization and Budget 2] STUDENT Experience and Support 3] CURRICULUM Transformation 4] FACULTY Diversity and 5] COMMUNITY Third Ward Engagement, the goals in the DEITF report relating to deepening students

understanding of social equity and inclusion are primarily within the curriculum transformation section and include:

- 1] Establishing a curriculum committee who will be charged with completing a comprehensive study of existing courses, identifying priority areas for new courses, and developing recommendations.
- 2] Develop a curriculum strategic plan for the integration of diversity, equity, and inclusion through the curriculum committee and the comprehensive analysis of the existing course offerings, create a strategic plan to integrate issues of race, equity, inclusion, and social justice in courses across the College.

Tentative timelines were proposed for both goals within the body of the DEITF and it's important to note that their implementation dates had past prior to the team's assessment of the programs.

In May of 2021, a diversity, equity & inclusion action task force was appointed and charged with facilitating the implementation of as many of the recommendations included in the December 2020 DEI Task Force Report as possible, and as soon as possible. Top recommendations within the action task force primarily revolve around the "STUDENT Experience and Support" [heavily based on student recruitment and retainage] and "FACULTY Diversity." The above goals identified in the CURRICULUM Transformation section of the 2020 DEITF report didn't rise within the top 12 priorities of the action task force's most recent work.

In addition to the required curriculum and to supplement the college's goals for diversification in their curriculum and deepening students understanding of social equity and inclusion, the team has made note that the CoAD's lecture series is positive, diverse, and forward thinking.

3.2 Student Criteria (SC): Student Learning Objectives and Outcomes

A program must demonstrate how it addresses the following criteria through program curricula and other experiences, with an emphasis on the articulation of learning objectives and assessment.

SC.1 Health, Safety, and Welfare in the Built Environment—How the program ensures that students understand the impact of the built environment on human health, safety, and welfare at multiple scales, from buildings to cities.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: Evidence of learning objectives for health safety and welfare was found in BARCH course information provided for ARCH 3230 – Programing & Building Regulations, ARCH 3328 – Technology 4, ARCH 4327 – Technology 5, ARCH 4328 – Technology 6, ARCH 4510 – Architecture Design Studio VII and MARCH course information provided for ARCH 6A48 – Environmental Tech III, ARCH 6603 – Design Studio III, ARCH 6A49 – Environmental Tech III, ARCH 6604 – Design Studio IV, and ARCH 6360 – Professional Practice

The team's review of student work showed an understanding of human health and safety in BARCH 4510 and MARCH 6604. Assessments of this work in both programs are conducted through the use of smaller projects, case study assignments, exams in lecture coursework and jury evaluations and full class reviews for larger projects in studios. Through the review of provided in-progress work within both programs, the team evidenced common standards of development from section to section and year to year as well as improvement throughout the respective terms being reviewed.

SC.2 Professional Practice—How the program ensures that students understand professional ethics, the regulatory requirements, the fundamental business processes relevant to architecture practice in the United States, and the forces influencing change in these subjects.

B.Arch.

[X] Not Met

Same comments apply to both programs. Apparent schism between newer students and graduate students as to the awareness of the licensure process or professional practice.

M.Arch.

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: Professional practice is generally addressed in the ARCH3328, ARCH4327 ARCH4328 classes for the BARCH and in much better detail in MARCH ARCH6630/ARCH6631

The programs approach is characterized as immersive with case studies, expert panels, subject matter experts, with visits to the field for jobsite inspection, “feedback from experts in the field to project a path for their own professional practice.” Information provided included slide presentations from lectures. No evidence of field visits with SME’s. Disconnect that might be attributed to COVID but no information in the Syllabus indicating that site visits were intended.

Request for evidence of the meetings with practitioners and students came back empty only noting that the instructor for this area left the school.

SC.3 Regulatory Context—How the program ensures that students understand the fundamental principles of life safety, land use, and current laws and regulations that apply to buildings and sites in the United States, and the evaluative process architects use to comply with those laws and regulations as part of a project.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: ARCH 3230 (Programming and Building Regulations) and ARCH 4328 (Technology 6) and the graduate course ARCH 6360 (Professional Practice) provide detailed instruction on life safety, technical, and regulatory concepts and is evident in student projects. Upper-level studios ARCH 7602 and ARCH 7601 address land use in depth, and address urban planning, land use, and safety.

The APR indicates that invited critics and faculty assess the student work in pinups, design juries, desk crits and the information is recorded in notes which are provided back to the students. No evidence of this type of documentation was provided in the evidence of work in the initial materials.

Discussion during the faculty Q/A meetings revealed that the pandemic has created challenges which they are turning into opportunities. The desk crits had to be done online which creates an opportunity for the school to invite critics from all over the globe, potentially. Evidence of notes of critiques provided through Arch 6603 showed written notes provided back to students about their project work. Additionally, Concept boards were provided as evidence of actual desk crit work, marked up drawings, and show SC.3 as MET in both programs.

Discussions with the students indicated disconnects between course content and practical application of the practice of architecture.

SC.4 Technical Knowledge—How the program ensures that students understand the established and emerging systems, technologies, and assemblies of building construction, and the methods and criteria

architects use to assess those technologies against the design, economics, and performance objectives of projects.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment: The broad elements of technical knowledge are addressed in course information for the BARCH program in ARCH 2327 – Technology 1, ARCH 2328 – Technology 2, ARCH 2500 – Architecture Design Studio III, ARCH 2501 – Architecture Design Studio IV, ARCH 3327 – Technology 3, ARCH 3328 – Technology 4, ARCH 3500 – Architecture Design Studio V, ARCH 3501 – Architecture Design Studio VI, ARCH 4327 – Technology 5, and ARCH 4510 – Architecture Design Studio VII.

Course information was found in for the MARCH in ARCH 6A48 – Environmental Tech III, ARCH 6A50 – Construction Technology III, ARCH 6603 – Design Studio III, ARCH 6A49 – Environmental Tech III, ARCH 6A51 – Construction Technology IV, ARCH 6604 – Design Studio IV and ARCH 6361 – Integrated Practice also supporting elements of technical knowledge.

The learning objectives required in lectures and studios above create an environment which builds on student's knowledge year by year. Student projects provide evidence in the understanding of building systems, technologies, and assemblies as well as economics and performance factors influencing their selection.

SC.5 Design Synthesis—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating synthesis of user requirements, regulatory requirements, site conditions, and accessible design, and consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of their design decisions.

B.Arch.
[X] Not Met

M.Arch.
[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: Design synthesis is addressed in ARCH 2501 (Architecture Design Studio IV), ARCH 3500 (Architecture Design Studio V), ARCH 3501 (Architecture Design Studio VI), and ARCH 4510 (Architecture Design Studio VII). The projects offered in these studios provide different design challenges to students at various levels. Student projects provide sufficient evidence for the coverage of site conditions, accessible design, and environmental issues in student projects. While ARCH 3500 and ARCH 4510 provide a comprehensive overview of environmental and ecological issues, student projects do not provide any evidence regarding the consideration of the measurable environmental impacts of design decisions.

Design synthesis is addressed in three graduate design studios: ARCH 6603 (Design Studio III), ARCH 6604 (Design Studio IV), and ARCH 6361 (Integrated Practice). These studios provide a proper coverage of all necessary items, including materials, environmental impacts of design, user requirements, and site conditions. However, only some of the projects provide evidence regarding measurable environmental impacts of design decisions.

SC.6 Building Integration—How the program ensures that students develop the ability to make design decisions within architectural projects while demonstrating integration of building envelope systems and

assemblies, structural systems, environmental control systems, life safety systems, and the measurable outcomes of building performance.

B.Arch.

[X] Not Met

Courses developed for a student's ability in items relating to Building Integration are ARCH 3500 – Architecture Design Studio V, ARCH 3501 – Architecture Design Studio VI, ARCH 4510 – Architecture Design Studio. The projects offered in ARCH 4510 provide strong and noteworthy evidence of students' abilities in envelope, structural, environmental, and life safety systems integration however not all projects presented to the team showed "measurable outcomes" of building performance. Course information reviewed stated an outcome of thermal envelope performance, in alignment with the measurability of this criteria, however students' work reviewed by the team did not find that all students completed this "measurable outcome." It is also important to note that while strong effort was found illustrating commendable section to section coordination within the BARCH program, the team noticed a correlation between particular sections of this course and the irregularity of students' work relating to the "measurable outcome" above.

M.Arch.

[X] Not Met

Team Assessment: Courses developed for a student's ability in items relating to Building Integration are ARCH 6603 – Design Studio III, ARCH 6604 – Design Studio IV, and ARCH 6361 – Integrated Practice

The projects offered in ARCH 6604 and ARCH 6361 provide strong evidence of student's abilities in envelope and structural systems. In addition to the student work provided by the program, commendable evidence of student ability regarding integration of envelope, structural, and environmental systems was witnessed during the visiting team's observation of ARCH 6604.

ARCH 6604 also provides additional evidence in environmental, and life safety systems integration and general knowledge, however not all projects presented to the team showed "measurable outcomes" of building performance. Course information reviewed stated an outcome of energy use performance, in alignment with the measurability of this criteria, however students' work reviewed by the team did not find that all students completed this "measurable outcome."

4—Curricular Framework

This condition addresses the institution's regional accreditation and the program's degree nomenclature, credit-hour and curricular requirements, and the process used to evaluate student preparatory work.

4.1 Institutional Accreditation

For the NAAB to accredit a professional degree program in architecture, the program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education:

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE)
- Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC)

[X] Met

Team Assessment:

- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)
 - Found here: <https://uh.edu/ir/reports/new-statistical-handbook/>
- Letter also provided in the APR as requested.

4.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits professional degree programs with the following titles: the Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M.Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D.Arch.). The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include professional studies, general studies, and optional studies.

- 4.2.1 **Professional Studies.** Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program are the core of a professional degree program that leads to licensure. Knowledge from these courses is used to satisfy Condition 3—Program and Student Criteria. The degree program has the flexibility to add additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. In its documentation, the program must clearly indicate which professional courses are required for all students.
- 4.2.2 **General Studies.** An important component of architecture education, general studies provide basic knowledge and methodologies of the humanities, fine arts, mathematics, natural sciences, and social sciences. Programs must document how students earning an accredited degree achieve a broad, interdisciplinary understanding of human knowledge.
- In most cases, the general studies requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree. Graduate programs must describe and document the criteria and process used to evaluate applicants' prior academic experience relative to this requirement. Programs accepting transfers from other institutions must document the criteria and process used to ensure that the general education requirement was covered at another institution.
- 4.2.3 **Optional Studies.** All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to develop additional expertise, either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the required professional studies curriculum. These courses may be configured in a variety of curricular structures, including elective offerings, concentrations, certificate programs, and minors.

NAAB-accredited professional degree programs have the exclusive right to use the B.Arch., M.Arch., and/or D.Arch. titles, which are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore may not be used by non-accredited programs.

The number of credit hours for each degree is outlined below. All accredited programs must conform to minimum credit-hour requirements established by the institution's regional accreditor.

- 4.2.4 **Bachelor of Architecture.** The B.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. Programs must document the required professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies courses (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.
- 4.2.5 **Master of Architecture.** The M.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate coursework and a minimum of 30 semester credits of graduate coursework. Programs must document the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for both the undergraduate and graduate degrees.
- 4.2.6 **Doctor of Architecture.** The D.Arch. degree consists of a minimum of 210 credits, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of combined undergraduate and graduate coursework. The D.Arch. requires a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level 135 quarter-hour equivalent, in academic coursework in professional studies and optional studies. Programs must document, for both undergraduate and graduate degrees, the required professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the elective professional studies classes (course numbers, titles, and credits), the required number of credits for general studies and for optional studies, and the total number of credits for the degree.

B.Arch.
[X] Met

BARCH program: 160 semester credit hours required over a five-year curriculum.
<https://www.uh.edu/architecture/programs/undergraduate-programs/architecture/>

M.Arch.
[X] Met

Team Assessment:

Evidence found in the APR Template_Final_2021_CoAD_UH as outlined below:

MARCH+3 program: 3 year 99 units required. <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/programs/graduate-programs/architecture-level1/>

MARCH+2 program: 2 year 60 units required. <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/programs/graduate-programs/architecture-level2/>

4.2.1 <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/programs/graduate-programs/architecture-level1/>

4.2.2 <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/programs/graduate-programs/architecture-level2/>

4.3 Evaluation of Preparatory Education

The NAAB recognizes that students transferring to an undergraduate accredited program or entering a graduate accredited program come from different types of programs and have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this condition, a program must demonstrate that it utilizes a thorough and equitable process to evaluate incoming students and that it documents the accreditation criteria it expects students to have met in their education experiences in non-accredited programs.

- 4.3.1 A program must document its process for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB accreditation criteria when it admits a student to the professional degree program.
- 4.3.2 In the event a program relies on the preparatory education experience to ensure that admitted students have met certain accreditation criteria, the program must demonstrate it has established standards for ensuring these accreditation criteria are met and for determining whether any gaps exist.
- 4.3.3 A program must demonstrate that it has clearly articulated the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content in the admissions process, and that a candidate understands the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program before accepting an offer of admission.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: In discussions with the Assistant Dean clarification was provided on how undergraduate applicants with high GPAs are automatically admitted by the university and then others are reviewed by an architecture faculty committee; portfolios are optional. The CoAD allows content transfer but not credit transfer. Files provided during the visit demonstrated this and information was verified by students during student meetings. The following websites provided in the APR provides transfer information.

<https://www.highered.texas.gov/institutional-resources-programs/public-universities-health-related-institutions/transfer-resources/texas-transfer-framework/>

<https://reportcenter.highered.texas.gov/agency-publication/miscellaneous/architecture-field-of-study-curriculum/>

5—Resources

5.1 Structure and Governance

The program must describe the administrative and governance processes that provide for organizational continuity, clarity, and fairness and allow for improvement and change.

- 5.1.1 **Administrative Structure:** Describe the administrative structure and identify key personnel in the program and school, college, and institution.
- 5.1.2 **Governance:** Describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures and how these structures relate to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

B.Arch.

[X] Described

M.Arch.

[X] Described

Team Assessment:

The APR provided a chart that outline the governance structure for the College of Architecture and Design (CoAD) and provided a list of individuals who have those roles. In addition, the APR provided a link to the CoAD Faculty Handbook that outlined the Bylaws and Policies of the College, and a link to the University's Faculty Handbook outlining a variety of institution policies including Shared Governance outlining how faculty participate at the institutional level.

The faculty, together with the elected student representatives, through the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees, provide recommendations to the dean for policies on curriculum, courses, admissions, graduation, scholastic probation, dismissal, and new student recruitment. Similarly, the faculty, together with the elected student representatives, through the Steering Committee and its ad-hoc and subcommittees, provide recommendations to the dean on matters concerning the administrative and general academic policies of the college. Staff is represented in various task forces such as the DEI task force or the College Culture Task Force.

The dean as the chief executive officer of the College has general administrative authority over college affairs in the areas of educational policy, budgets, personnel, hiring, and teaching assignments. Regular input from the faculty is provided in the form of written recommendations from the standing committees or ad hoc or sub- committees. The dean is also responsible for the preparation of the annual budget with the counsel of the Steering Committee. The dean appoints and annually reviews the academic area coordinators, the director of graduate studies, the assistant and/or associate dean(s), the college business administrator, and the directors of college centers or institutes. The dean will periodically review all college programs.

The APR also provided a link of all the members of the various College Committees, Representatives and Task Forces for the current year.

5.2 Planning and Assessment

The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies:

- 5.2.1 The program's multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, as part of the larger institutional strategic planning and assessment efforts.
- 5.2.2 Key performance indicators used by the unit and the institution.

- 5.2.3 How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated multiyear objectives.
- 5.2.4 Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program as it strives to continuously improve learning outcomes and opportunities.
- 5.2.5 Ongoing outside input from others, including practitioners.

The program must also demonstrate that it regularly uses the results of self-assessments to advise and encourage changes and adjustments that promote student and faculty success.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The programs' multiyear strategic objectives, including the requirement to meet the NAAB Conditions, are laid out in the Five-year Strategic Plan of the College (link within the APR) as well as in the mandatory APRs that are submitted to the University on a yearly basis. Planning for improvements also takes place in the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. These incremental changes take place each semester and academic year. They are assessed and discussed in the standing committees as well as in the faculty meetings. The Undergraduate Committee meets once a month and the Graduate Committee at least twice a semester. Task Forces such as the 3-D Program Committee comprised of representatives of the Architecture, Industrial Design, and Interior Architecture programs, look for possible synergies that can be utilized between the programs. The current Strategic Plan covers years 2016 until 2021. The next Five-year Strategic Plan has started with information gathering this academic year (videos of some of the studio faculty assessing student work were provided in material delivered 45 days before the visit) in preparation for a faculty retreat this summer to discuss the next five-year strategic plan.

The 2019-2020 report by external reviewers to the university with specific benchmarks as well as data on the programs' own strategic goals and assessment of progress was supplied to the team 45 days before the visit. Included were:

Key performance indicators at the University level:

- o Graduation rates^{[L][S][E][P]}
- o ARE passing rates^{[L][S][E][P]}
- o Evaluation matrices (e.g., master's project rubric)
- o Grades^{[L][S][E][P]} Juries/reviews (e.g., rubrics filled in by the external jurors)

Documents provided by the program outlined

- Seven Programs Goals in the 2016 strategic plan and results
- Description of its strengths, challenges, and opportunities, and
- Assessment for the programs starting with individual class assessments through meetings with faculty

While the team found some student work assessment forms in the materials provided for some classes, aggregated data about the overall assessment of the course was not found. The programs also provided Zoom videos of coordinator's meetings with faculty to assess and evaluate learning outcomes in some classes but there was no overall assessment of the courses nor any changes to be initiated the next time the class was taught. From the information provided in the APR and from discussions with faculty, the program administrators and the dean, the team finds that the programs have a clear strategic plan that they are working to accomplish and that there are overall assessment processes in place at a variety of different levels to make and implement changes, and to do ongoing assessment.

5.3 Curricular Development

The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for assessing its curriculum and making adjustments based on the outcome of the assessment. The program must identify:

- 5.3.1 The relationship between course assessment and curricular development, including NAAB program and student criteria.
- 5.3.2 The roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The school has developed a robust policy to assess the outcome of each class within the whole curriculum and revise the material on an annual basis, if needed. Individual instructors in each program are in charge of evaluating the courses and proposing potential changes to their coordinators. The programs require all instructors to address the NAAB program and student criteria in their related courses. At the end of each semester, the program examines courses to examine if the content corresponds to the NAAB criteria and makes necessary adjustments in case of any deficiencies.

The coordinators in charge of various areas are in charge of presenting potential changes to improve contents: Media Design, Level I Design, Level II Design, Level III Design, History / Theory, Industrial Design, Technology, Foundation Design, Intermediate Design, Integrated, Architectural Solutions, Professional Level Design, and Interior Architecture. The changes proposed by the coordinators and directors should be approved by the program director, the Associate Dean, and the Dean before being implemented. While the process explained by the administration emphasizes student involvement, the students have expressed concerns about being disengaged in the process of curriculum development.

5.4 Human Resources and Human Resource Development

The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate and adequately funded human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff. The program must:

- 5.4.1 Demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty in a way that promotes student and faculty achievement.
- 5.4.2 Demonstrate that it has an Architect Licensing Advisor who is actively performing the duties defined in the NCARB position description. These duties include attending the biannual NCARB Licensing Advisor Summit and/or other training opportunities to stay up to date on the requirements for licensure and ensure that students have resources to make informed decisions on their path to licensure.
- 5.4.3 Demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.
- 5.4.4 Describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, mental well-being, career guidance, internship, and job placement.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The APR lists Patrick Peters, Architect, licensed in State of Texas since 2005 and the TBAE site lists his registration as active. The ALA demonstrates registration at the proper seminars and conferences commensurate with the duties of the ALA.

Overall course loads average 15 hrs. per and some relief is offered for faculty in directors' roles, as well as architects in research positions.

Seminars were held to provide pathway to licensure discussions with the students and the slide decks for these seminars were provided in the review material.

Staff are registered for many different seminars and conferences including AIA, ACSA and research type venues to study architecture, materials, and methods as well as opportunities outside of traditional design and or construction venues to grow and explore new avenues for their teaching environment.

Discussions with Students in leadership and students in general revealed that Councilor Guidance is currently not available to students and has had a hit or miss support over the last several years. The assistant dean is noted as a great supporter of the students and has gone above and beyond to fill the gap of student advisor, but her time is limited, and the over population of the school has stretched her thin as the only resource.

Subsequent meetings with staff we met the new advisor who was hired in November of 2021 and has not quite gotten up to speed with all of the needs of the program and the students.

5.5 Social Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The program must demonstrate its commitment to diversity and inclusion among current and prospective faculty, staff, and students. The program must:

- 5.5.1 Describe how this commitment is reflected in the distribution of its human, physical, and financial resources.
- 5.5.2 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty and staff since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's faculty and staff demographics with that of the program's students and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.
- 5.5.3 Describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its students since the last accreditation cycle, how it has implemented the plan, and what it intends to do during the next accreditation cycle. Also, compare the program's student demographics with that of the institution and other benchmarks the program deems relevant.
- 5.5.4 Document what institutional, college, or program policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other social equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.
- 5.5.5 Describe the resources and procedures in place to provide adaptive environments and effective strategies to support faculty, staff, and students with different physical and/or mental abilities.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The program has made exemplary strides in evaluating their program from many angles and perspectives in a very short period of time. In June of 2020, the Office of the Dean created the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force (DEITF) to study this and assist in better aligning the faculty and coursework to the student body through the lens of diversity. In 2021 the establishment of the DEI Action Task Force was a creditable step toward the commitment of these topics by holding themselves accountable to “Action”. Please see PC.8 for further description of these two efforts.

These initiatives are very young. Benchmarking and goals have been comprehensively identified, some actions in various areas have been made however measurements of success in the CoAD’s outlined areas of social equity, diversity, and inclusion are not yet capable of being measured to determine if their actions are moving them closer to their goals.

5.6 Physical Resources

The program must describe its physical resources and demonstrate how they safely and equitably support the program’s pedagogical approach and student and faculty achievement. Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- 5.6.1 Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.
- 5.6.2 Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including lecture halls, seminar spaces, small group study rooms, labs, shops, and equipment.
- 5.6.3 Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.
- 5.6.4 Resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program’s pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, off-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

B.Arch.

[X] Not Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Not Demonstrated

Team Assessment: The tour of the campus showed many synergistic design-oriented buildings and neighboring programs in proximity to the architecture program building. Studios are arranged in a vertical open studio format encouraging open collaboration and cross disciplinary interaction. While many of the buildings appear to be historic in nature, the interior spaces are contemporary in design and function. The open studio spaces are an appealing asset to the programs however students have expressed acoustic difficulties in face-to-face learning when studios are in session as well as concerns to the limited studio space by both students and staff in relation to the college’s expanded enrollment during the remote learning period of COVID 19. This is exacerbated by the college’s further plans to expand enrollment. The school equips students with an array of excellent additional modern resources including computer labs, 3D modeling, CNC, laser cutters large scale 3D printing, recording studios, paint booth, steel fabrication shop, and a large woodworking area.

The CoAD pivoted in a noteworthy manner to online/hybrid studio/class instruction during the COVID pandemic with upgrades to computers, cameras, projectors, and leveraging their existing recording studio to accommodate a HYflex instructional environment.

The team was able to verify these accounts from student representatives interviewed during the visit however there were many comments made by a cross section of students illustrating some additional areas of concern in current physical resources.

The team observed students' concerns relating to recent changes in studio area locker opportunities which have presented heightened security issues for those working in the physical studio spaces and an apparent communication disconnect between the CoAD's positive values stated in the APR and members of the student body. Furthermore, the lack of security cameras, daytime controlled access, or monitoring personnel have added to students' concerns who claim they've experienced personal property theft and expressed overall personal safety concerns given the open access environment in the age of active shooter possibilities. During interviews, numerous staff and faculty validated the team's observations of communication disconnects between the administration to that of the faculty/staff bodies.

Students further noted that physical studios and tech courses require printing and the high costs associated with these requirements are passed on to the student body and not covered by course or studio fees. Students were also vocal about their experience in reduced access to common architectural software in the college's computer labs now that face-to-face learning is resuming. This comment is in relation to the access they had previous to the pandemic.

The information provided to the team included the proposal of a new "Craft Lab" building which illustrated future growth of the physical resources available to the students. Follow up interviews gave the team a better understanding of the scope and forthcoming timeline of this expansion, primarily associated with research, tier one college initiatives in the graduate program and neighboring non-accredited programs. While this expansion will be a valuable asset for the research agenda within the programs, it does not appear to address the primary physical resource concerns raised to the team during the visit.

5.7 Financial Resources

The program must demonstrate that it has the appropriate institutional support and financial resources to support student learning and achievement during the next term of accreditation.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment:

Over the last 12 years, the College (which includes Interior Architecture and Industrial Design) has held steady at 23-25 tenured/tenure-track faculty for all programs while student enrollment has grown from 767 to 987. The College did add an Alumni Affairs Director, a Director of Marketing and Communications, and a Web Designer/Videographer. The overall revenue/expenses summary for FY21 (2020-21). Endowments and Scholarships for the College was found in the APR.

An impact of the pandemic created a 5.7% budget cut in the 2019-2020 budget and an end-of-year 25% sweep of funds. During the team's meeting with the dean, she confirmed that no full-time faculty were cut but enrollments in undergraduate studios increased. The sweep of funds at the end of the year, which has not been done before, was a loss of the reserves that the dean would have otherwise used. While no additional cuts are in the 2020-2021 budget, the Dean anticipates that this sweep of funds at the end of the year is a practice that will continue.

The APR stated that there are no planned increases or reductions in enrollment other than the long-range goal of increasing graduate students, with a corresponding reduction in undergraduates. The goal is to increase graduate enrollment to approximately 100 students.

The APR stated that the college had put in several proposals for two new university-wide programs: the "Frontier Faculty" Initiative and the "Key Initiatives" program. At the meeting with the dean, and confirmed by the provost, the college received two of the 20 faculty positions to increase a range of research and to create collaboration between disciplines with a 75/25 with the College of Engineering. CoAD also received funding from the Provost for a Research Liaison Office to work with industry and expand areas of research. This funding included a staff position, two graduate assistants and funds for equipment for the research lab.

5.8 Information Resources

The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient and equitable access to architecture literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals who provide discipline-relevant information services that support teaching and research.

B.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

M.Arch.

[X] Demonstrated

Team Assessment: Located in APR Section 5.8 Information Resources

- on-site library dedicated to research in architecture, design, and the visual arts.
- Nearly 100,000 monographs, current and historical journals, circulating design supplies, visual and digital resources.
- In addition, the university has a Kenneth Franzheim II Rare Books Room, which provides access to rare and primary materials, such as 18th century texts by Piranesi and first editions by modern masters like Gropius, Corbusier, and Mendelsohn.
- Material deemed unused are circulated to the M.D. Anderson Library

6—Public Information

The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public about accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information about accredited and non-accredited architecture programs. The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the public. As a result, all NAAB-accredited programs are required to ensure that the following information is posted online and is easily available to the public.

6.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*, Appendix 2, in catalogs and promotional media, including the program's website.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section - 6.1 (pages 132-133)

- Link Provided - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/>
- The College of Architecture and Design is a member of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) <http://www.acsa-arch.org/> and is accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). <https://www.naab.org/>

6.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

The program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

- a) *Conditions for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- b) *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2014, depending on the date of the last visit)
- c) *Procedures for Accreditation, 2020 Edition*
- d) *Procedures for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2012 or 2015, depending on the date of the last visit)

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section - 6.2 (page 133)

- Initial Link Provided - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/>
- Links provided w/i initial link
 - o A.) <https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Conditions-for-Accreditation.pdf>
 - o B.) <https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2009-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf>
 - o C.) <https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2020-NAAB-Procedures-for-Accreditation.pdf>

- o D.) https://www.naab.org/wp-content/uploads/2012-NAAB-Procedures_Amended_Final-for-Publication-072413.pdf

6.3 Access to Career Development Information

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section - 6.3 (page 133)

- Initial Links Provided -
 - o <https://uh.edu/ucs/students/career-resources/>
 - o <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/alumni/resources/>
 - o <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/current-students/career-resources/> (Most helpful career and internship link)
 - <https://uh.edu/ucs/students/career-resources/>
 - Helpful Topics (links included in APR at top of page 144 within link above)
 - Get Resume Support, Meet with a Counselor, Career Resources, Workshops, Attend an Event, Student Employment, Cougar Pathway, Alumni Career Services

6.4 Public Access to Accreditation Reports and Related Documents

To promote transparency in the process of accreditation in architecture education, the program must make the following documents available to all students, faculty, and the public, via the program's website:

- a) All Interim Progress Reports and narratives of Program Annual Reports submitted since the last team visit
- b) All NAAB responses to any Plan to Correct and any NAAB responses to the Program Annual Reports since the last team visit
- c) The most recent decision letter from the NAAB
- d) The Architecture Program Report submitted for the last visit
- e) The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda
- f) The program's optional response to the Visiting Team Report
- g) Plan to Correct (if applicable)
- h) NCARB ARE pass rates
- i) Statements and/or policies on learning and teaching culture
- j) Statements and/or policies on diversity, equity, and inclusion

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section - 6.4 (pages 134-135)

- Initial Link Provided - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/>

A.) Included Reports (Found in Initial Link above)

- IPR July 2020, IPR April 2020, PAR 2020, PAR 2019, PAR 2018, PAR 2017, PAR 2016, PAR 2015, PAR 2014

B.) Included Reports (Found in Initial Link above)

- IPR July 2020, IPR April 2020\

C.) Included Link to Report

- <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/accreditation-final-report-recd-aug182014.pdf>

D.) Included Link to Report

- <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/apr-2013-final-report-sent-to-accreditation-team.pdf>

E.) Included Link to Report

- <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/accreditation-final-report-recd-aug182014.pdf>

F.) Included NCARB Link to Report

- <https://www.ncarb.org/pass-the-are/pass-rates/are5-pass-rates-school>

I.) Included College Culture - Link

- <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/culture/>

J.) Initial DEI Link Provided

- <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/about/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/>
- Additional Link to DEI Report found in DEI link above
 - <https://uh.edu/architecture/about/diversity-equity-and-inclusion/final-dei-report-2020.pdf>

6.5 Admissions and Advising

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern the evaluation of applicants for admission to the accredited program. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers from within and outside the institution. This documentation must include the following:

- a) Application forms and instructions
- b) Admissions requirements; admissions-decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (when required); and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing
- c) Forms and a description of the process for evaluating the content of a non-accredited degrees
- d) Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

- e) Explanation of how student diversity goals affect admission procedures

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section - 6.4 (pages 135-136)

A. Provided Links MET

- “Virtual Information Session & Building Tour” - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/information-sessions/>
- “Orientation” - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/orientation/>
- Undergraduate Admissions - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/admissions/> (Links for application for admission found within for “First-Time Freshmen, International Students, Transfer Students, Change of Majors”).
 - o First-Time Freshman - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/admissions/first-time-freshman/>
 - Requirements link found under Link above. <https://uh.edu/undergraduate-admissions/apply/freshman/> - Requirements found under - “With and Without a Test Score”
- Domestic Graduate Admissions – States Portfolio Requirements - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/graduate/domestic/>
- International Graduate Admission - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/graduate/international/>

B. Information Provided in DPR

- Explained requirements on DPR- “The directors of the programs together with faculty members evaluate the submitted material.

The applicants provide the required material as described on the CoAD website.

The directors evaluate the submitted material including SAT scores (when applicable; minimum of 1170) letter of intent, essay and portfolio if submitted (not required). The evaluation meetings have taken place via MS TEAMS during the pandemic and will very likely stay online as it allows for a faster and more convenient evaluation process.”

- Link in 6.5 A.) Undergraduate Admissions Link explains some admissions requirements.

C. Information Provided – (No link listed) - The CoAD does not allow credit transfer. The content of courses taken outside the college is evaluated for content by the directors and faculty.

Graduate Students coming from a non-accredited program will have to go through the 3+ path.

D. Initial Link Provided –

- Scholarships and Financial Aid - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/current-students/financial-resources/scholarships/>

- o Additional Links Provided – Helpful Links - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/links/>
- o Scholarships - <https://uh.edu/financial/undergraduate/types-aid/scholarships/index>

E. (No Link Provided) The pool of applicants to the undergraduate program is very diversified, no adjustment to the goals is needed at this time. It can be expected to stay at this level or even increase.

The pool of graduate program applicants is less diversified. Recruitment efforts are used to increase the diversity of this applicant pool.

6.6 Student Financial Information

6.6.1 The program must demonstrate that students have access to current resources and advice for making decisions about financial aid.

6.6.2 The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

B.Arch.

[X] Met

M.Arch.

[X] Met

Team Assessment: Found in APR – Section – 6.6.1 (page 136)

A. Links provided –

- a. Financial Resources - <https://uh.edu/financial/undergraduate/>
- b. Scholarships - <https://uh.edu/financial/undergraduate/types-aid/scholarships/index>
- c. Scholarship & Financial Aid Forms - <https://uh.edu/financial/undergraduate/forms/>
- d. Financial Resources - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/current-students/financial-resources/>
- e. Graduate Financial Information - <https://uh.edu/financial/graduate/>

Found in APR – Section – 6.6.2 (page 137)

- f. Financial Estimate Document - https://uh.edu/architecture/about/accreditation/naab-spring-2022/arch1500_arch6600_toolsmedialist_f21.pdf
- g. <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/current-students/financial-resources/>
- h. Price Calculator - <https://uh.edu/financial/net-price-calculator/>
- i. Helpful Links - <https://www.uh.edu/architecture/future-students/undergraduate/links/>
- j. Tuition and Fees - <https://uh.edu/financial/graduate/tuition-fees/>
 - i. Additional Links found w/i link above
 - 1. <https://uh.edu/financial/undergraduate/financial-literacy/>
 - 2. <https://uh.edu/about/offices/enrollment-services/financial-aid/>

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

Appendix 2. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator Representative

Barbara A. Sestak, FAIA
Professor, School of Architecture
Portland State University
Portland, OR 97207-0751
503-725-3340
sestakb@pdx.edu

Educator Representative

Mohammad Gharipour, PhD
Professor and Director, The Graduate Program in Architecture
Chair, Department of Graduate Built Environment Studies
School of Architecture and Planning, Morgan State University, Baltimore, MD
443-885-3910
Mohammad.gharipour@morgan.edu

Practitioner Representative

Nathaniel Hudson, AIA, NCARB
Principal | FormGrey Studio
650 S. Rock Blvd. #14
Reno, NV 89502
775.848.9933
nhudson@formgrey.com

Regulator Representative

Jim Oschwald, NCARB, AIA, LEED AP^{BD+C}
Sandia National Labs
Kirtland AFB
Albuquerque, NM 87185
505-221-4357
jim.oschwald@gmail.com

Student Representative

Britney Martinez
M.Arch Candidate
University of Kansas
620.655.5333
britneymartinez@gmail.com

Observer

Francisco Javier Rodríguez-Suárez, FAIA
Director, School of Architecture, University of Illinois
Principal, r s v p architects
787.604.7118
Paco70@illinois.edu

V. Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,



Barbara Sestak, FAIA
Team Chair



Mohammad Gharipour, PhD
Team Member



Nathaniel Hudson, AIA
Team Member



Jim Oswald, AIA
Team Member



Britney Martinez
Team Member



Francisco Javier Rodríguez-Suárez, FAIA
Observer