July 22, 2008

Dr. Lisa A. Rossbacher, President
Southern Polytechnic State University
1100 South Marietta Parkway
Marietta, GA 30060

Dear President Rossbacher:

At the July 2008 meeting of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), the board reviewed the Visiting Team Report for the Southern Polytechnic State University School of Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology and Construction.

As a result, the professional architecture program:

Bachelor of Architecture

was formally granted a six-year term of accreditation. The accreditation term is effective January 1, 2008. The program is scheduled for its next accreditation visit in 2014.

Accreditation is subject to the submission of Annual Reports. Annual Reports are due by November 30 and must include the following:

- a response to each condition identified as not met in the Visiting Team Report,
- a response to each of the causes of concern in the Visiting Team Report,
- a brief summary of changes that have been made or may be made in the accredited program, and
- the statistical report

Please note, beginning in November 2008, these reports will be submitted online.

If an acceptable Annual Report is not submitted to the NAAB by January 15, 2009, the NAAB may consider advancing the schedule for the program's next accreditation sequence. A complete description of the Annual Report process can be found on pages 14–15 of the NAAB Procedures for Accreditation, 2008 Edition.

NAAB encourages public dissemination of information about each school contained in both the school's 2008 Architecture Program Report and the 2008 Visiting Team Report. If the Visiting Team Report is made public, then it is to be published in its entirety.

The visiting team has asked me to express its appreciation for your gracious hospitality.

Very truly yours,

Bruce E. Blackmer, FAIA
President

Enc. Visiting Team Report

cc: Ameen Farooq, Ph.D., Chair
     C. James Lawler, FAIA, Team Chair
     Visiting Team Members
December 7, 2007

Dr. Wilson C. Barnes, AIA, Dean
Southern Polytechnic State University
Office of the Dean
School of Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology & Construction
1100 S. Marietta Parkway
Marietta, GA 30060-2896

Dear Dean Barnes:

The NAAB Board of Directors selected the following visiting team members for the accreditation visit to your school scheduled for March 22–26, 2008:

C. J. Lawler, FAIA, representing the AIA
Brenda Scheer, representing the ACSA
Tony Vanky, representing the AIAS
Walter L. Wilson, AIA, representing the NCARB

*Previously confirmed

Biographical information on the nominees is enclosed.

The name and biographical information for the AIAS representative will be forwarded at a later date.

Please review the enclosed resumes to determine whether you perceive of any conflicts of interest with the proposed team. We would appreciate a response from you by December 17, 2007, so that the nominees may be formally invited. If no response is received by that date, the NAAB office will assume that you find no conflict and will proceed with inviting the nominees.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Pair
Accreditation Manager

Enc.
June 16, 2008

Ameen Farooq, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Architecture
Professor of Architecture,
Urban Design and Community Planning
School of ACC
Southern Polytechnic State University
1100 South Marietta Parkway
Marietta, GA 30060

Dear Dr. Farooq:

Enclosed you will find the final draft of the Southern Polytechnic State University Visiting Team Report. This version includes minor editorial changes made by NAAB staff and/or any changes that were made by the team in response to issues raised in your response to the draft VTR. This report will be submitted to the NAAB Board of Directors at its July 2008 meeting.

As stated in the 2008 Conditions and Procedures, page 13:

“If differences remain, the program may provide a response for the directors of the NAAB to review in making their accreditation decision. Any such response forms a permanent attachment to the VTR.”

If you plan to submit a response to the final VTR, it should be received in the NAAB office no later than June 20, 2008. If you have any questions, please contact the NAAB office.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Pair
Accreditation Manager

enc. Visiting Team Report

cc: C. James Lawler, FAIA, Team Chair
Southern Polytechnic State University
School of Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology and Construction

Visiting Team Report

Bachelor of Architecture (152 undergraduate credit hours)

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
26 March 2008

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

1. Team Comments

The architecture program at SPSU has its origins in a technically based teaching institution. The technical aspects of the program have become highly detailed through the entire environmental technology series that includes passive systems and sustainable design strategies. Additional technological courses that include construction documents, codes, cost estimating, and professional practice raise the technology side to a new level. The program has recently begun to investigate growth through issues of design and design theory. To this end, additional faculty have been added to further this development.

The program approaches representation in a comprehensive way through hand drawing, model building, and computer graphics. These skills provide students with the ability to choose the best media for representing their work and exploring design options. The team found the exhibition of a series of developmental sketch models to be very helpful in understanding the design process.

Understanding sustainable systems and passive design strategies are evident through upper level studio projects.

Excellent preparation for office practice is evidenced by students working with local architects starting with their third year. However, faculty and students are concerned over poor performance of students working long hours in that it compromises full studio participation.

A fundamental strength of the program can be found in its highly motivated students and devoted faculty. In addition to the work presented by the students, ACC faculty, staff, departmental and college administration provided the team with a well designed team room and easy access to well organized and presented course information.

2. Progress Since the Previous Site Visit (2005)

Condition 5, Human Resources: The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff.

Previous Team Report (2005): The ratio of full-time faculty to students in the program is a serious cause for concern. In a rapidly growing program that is subject to significant annual increases in student enrollment, there is a clear need to institute a planned increase in full-time faculty appointments. While it is understood that there is a search currently underway, and while it is also understood that there are significant budget restrictions imposed on the program, the need to expand the full-time faculty is urgent.

The very recent decision on the part of the department chair to resign his administrative position is symptomatic of the overwhelming burden placed on the holder of this critical appointment. Responding to the demands of administrative initiatives, reacting to increasing administrative responsibilities, responding to the need to provide effective student counseling, active engagement in staff management tasks, and struggling with the vicissitudes of budget constraints all impact negatively on this position. When teaching is added to this volatile mix of responsibilities, it is clear that the terms of this appointment need to be reconsidered to avoid a repetition of the current dilemma.
As the program grows while the complement of full-time faculty remains constant, the burden of teaching and advising is exacerbated. The resultant increased demand upon faculty time is counterproductive to their pursuing research, scholarship, and professional practice.

**2008 Visiting Team Assessment:** Although significant progress has been made through the addition of faculty hires thus reducing the faculty student ratio from a high of 1:25 to 1:16, which is more in keeping with the national norm, and reducing faculty over load from 1 studio and 2 courses to 1 studio and 1 course. The team is still concerned that administrative and technical staff are over burdened. (See additional information under Condition 6 in this report.)

**Condition 6, Human Resource Development:** Programs must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth within and outside the program.

**Previous Team Report (2005):** The program provides only modest financial support for faculty development in the form of support funding to attend conferences to present papers, pursue research projects, and to take some sabbatical leaves. It also sponsors a very limited series of lectures by outside practitioners and academics. It also has to rely on external funding, principally from the local chapter of the American Institute of Architects (AIA), to sustain this lecture series.

Faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure procedures are outlined according to the SPSU institutional system.

Students are supported in their development through a system of personal and academic advising by the faculty and the department chair. The faculty’s hours are posted, and adequate office space is available to guarantee privacy for these discussions. Students are encouraged to participate in field trips and off-campus activities, some of which are sponsored by the two very active student organizations, AIAS and NOMAS. The summer Dessau, Germany, travel option is an elective offered by the program that permits only some students to broaden their experience of seminal 20th century architecture. Such enriching experiences should be the norm for all students rather than the exception for a few. This will require a significant increase in support funding by the university.

**2008 Visiting Team Assessment:** This condition has now been met.

**Criterion 12.22, Building Systems Integration:** Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, building envelope systems, and building service systems into building design

**Previous Team Report (2005):** Evidence shows that students are made aware of building systems in various courses, but the integration of this acquired knowledge into design projects is not evident on a consistent basis. With the exception of reference to structural systems, evidence is lacking of the integration of mechanical, electrical, acoustical, and fire-protection systems into holistic architectural design projects.

**2008 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criteria has now been met.

**Criterion 12.28, Technical Documentation:** Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction

**Previous Team Report (2005):** Technical documentation is made reference to as occurring in studio courses 3311, 4014, and 4313. The team found very little evidence of technical
documentation in these courses. A limited amount of time was spent in developing a set of preliminary construction drawings in course 3311, showing only a small amount of detail in a particular portion of the course. This deficiency may have been the result of the recent state-imposed limitation of 150 credit hours for B.A. degrees, because of which three separate courses, including Technical Documentation, were compacted into one course.

2008 Visiting Team Assessment: This criteria has now been met.

Criterion 12.29, Comprehensive Design: Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program’s design criteria

Previous Team Report (2005): In various courses, students are made aware of all the components and systems that are part of a fully comprehensive project. However, the team did not find evidence of a project that demonstrated that the students had the ability to put all these elements into a project. This lack of application was particularly evident because of the absence of detailed wall sections and building assembly drawings, including specific allowances for mechanical and electrical requirements.

2008 Visiting Team Assessment: This criteria has now been met.

[Causes of Concern taken from VTR dated March 23, 2005]

There is low morale among the architecture faculty. This has clearly been partially caused by the university’s financial constraints and the lack of understanding on the part of the architecture faculty as to how the senior administrators of the university are taking measures to address this serious problem while maintaining equitable treatment among the various university schools.

The architecture faculty course load is above the national norm of two courses per semester—one studio and one lecture/seminar course. Studio faculty members at SPSU are expected to teach two lecture courses/seminars and one studio each semester and, in some cases, four courses during a semester. The negative impact of this high course load is, among other things, the reason for reduced faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. It also contributes significantly to “job burnout.”

The architecture department chair administers a program that serves more than 400 students. Consequently, the day-to-day workload for this position is exacting. The school should consider adding another junior administrative position to assist the chair with his or her duties.

There is a high faculty-to-student studio ratio that is above the national norm. First-year studios have up to 25 students for every instructor. The second-year studios have 18 to 22 students for every instructor. Third- and fourth-year studios have 18 and 20 students for every section. Fifth-year studios have 16 students for every instructor. The national norm for undergraduate studios averages around 14 to 15 students. Because of the large sections, students are not able to have timely faculty critiques, and faculty have to spend long hours with their students that far exceed the scheduled time for their studio.

Currently, 29 percent of the student population consists of females, but there are no full-time female faculty members to act as role models.

The team is concerned about the potential long-term effect of the state budget cutbacks. The two most difficult to overcome will be the following:
• The fact that the library has discontinued book acquisitions in order to continue periodical purchases

• The merit salary pool averaged 2 percent per year the past 3 years and 1.5 percent per year the past 2 years—merit salary raises that will create faculty salary compression that will be difficult to correct.

2008 Visiting Team Assessment: The student population has continued to grow however both space and faculty have been added. The student teacher ratio in studio is now at an appropriate level and faculty course loads have been reduced to 1 studio and 1 course.

3. Conditions Well Met

Condition 2. Program Assessment
The team has found continued evidence of very active and successful program assessment, focused change, and reassessment.

Condition 5. Studio Culture
The team has found the students, faculty and administration engaged in significant discussion, engagement and practice of positive studio culture as evidenced through survey, posted notices and consensus at the well-attended all student meeting. Of note, there is a strong nurturing of leadership throughout the program.

Criteria 13.7. Collaborative Skills
The collaboration is evidenced through team studio projects and student presentations.

Criteria 13.19. Environmental Systems
The Environmental Tech series that involves active and passive systems as well traditional MEP systems, requires students to develop the ability to create mechanical, plumbing and lighting plans. Additionally, the series considers statutes and regulations governing the health, safety and welfare of the occupant.

Criteria 13.20. Life Safety
The Environmental Tech series provides students with a deep, fundamental understanding of life safety concepts through application of IBC and NFPA model codes to design projects and evaluated through examination.

Criteria 13.21. Building Envelope
The Environmental Tech series studies the topic through thermodynamic and energy modelling. Additionally, envelope assemblies are explored and evaluated through lectures and exercises. This work extends into the studio through drawing and detailed, large-scale model development. For students wishing to further their knowledge in this area, an elective course entitled Skin and Bones has been made available.

Criteria 13.22. Building Service Systems
The Environmental Tech Series provides students with good understanding of building service systems through lectures and examination as well as incorporation of building technology in the student’s design, development and construction documentation drawings.
4. **Conditions Not Met**

Condition 6. Human Resources
Although there has been a very positive improvement in the ratio of faculty to students (from 1:25 prior to 1:16 now) in studio courses, there has not been a concomitant increase in administrative support staff and information technology support staff. The chair does not have sufficient administrative support for class scheduling and advising and the computer and plotting facilities cannot be utilized properly by students since tech support is part time split with another program.

5. **Causes of Concern**

SPSU's department of architecture has seen enormous student population growth in the past three years yet funding is deficient due to the funding formula which is based upon two year old data as required by the state legislature. This results in funding that is less than the needs of the current expanded program. This, combined with extremely low tuition results in minimal resources.

Administrative professional staff is not sufficient to meet scheduling and advising needs of an expanded school population. In addition, half-time technical support for computers and plotters does not permit full access to services provided by plotters, printers, and computers. There is ample computer and plotting equipment but the hours are limited by lack of adequate administrative support.

SPSU is a small, focused university offering few opportunities for full exposure to liberal and fine arts. Students also noted minimal exposure to international travel and study abroad opportunities. There are few opportunities for intercollegiate exchange through course work or other curricular programs. Although minors and double majors are possible, the demands of the current curriculum do not easily allow for students to pursue minors.

Although significant improvements have been made since the last accreditation visit, there have been communication and governance challenges. Full and open communication relative to faculty and student governance is necessary for the continued success.

While the department acknowledges the desires of the university administration for continued growth, strategies must be employed to monitor retention of students and manage enrollment in order to maintain the standards upon which architectural accreditation is founded.

Student advising and mentoring is essential to the positive advancement and success of architecture students. The team believes the program would benefit from establishing a more formal structure for advising.

Mentoring tenure-track faculty is particularly challenging due to the recent growth and addition of junior faculty. A structure for mentoring these faculty as they advance through the promotion and tenure process is critical to maintaining the positive influences of these talented, energetic, and passionate faculty.
II. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the NAAB Perspectives

Schools must respond to the interests of the collateral organizations that make up the NAAB as set forth by this edition of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. Each school is expected to address these interests consistent with its scholastic identity and mission.

1.1 Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institution. In the APR, the accredited degree program may explain its academic and professional standards for faculty and students; its interaction with other programs in the institution; the contribution of the students, faculty, and administrators to the governance and the intellectual and social lives of the institution; and the contribution of the institution to the accredited degree program in terms of intellectual resources and personnel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students benefit from being able to take classes throughout the Georgia University system, the school’s close proximity to Atlanta, and opportunities for earning minors from other units on campus: Construction Management Program, Engineering Technology, Business, and Computer Science. However, the number and diversity of course offerings is limited due to the specialized focus of Southern Polytechnic State University (SFSU), and its history of being a technical university.

1.2 Architecture Education and Students

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to assume leadership roles in school and later in the profession and that it provides an environment that embraces cultural differences. Given the program’s mission, the APR may explain how students participate in setting their individual and collective learning agendas; how they are encouraged to cooperate with, assist, share decision making with, and respect students who may be different from themselves; their access to the information needed to shape their future; their exposure to the national and international context of practice and the work of the allied design disciplines; and how students’ diversity, distinctiveness, self-worth, and dignity are nurtured.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SFSU has a very strong and active AIAS chapter with a national presence that includes the 2008-2009 president-elect and a nationally recognized Freedom by Design team. Both AIAS and NOMAS have strong school support and are engaged in both leadership and studio culture issues. However, little feedback is being communicated to students regarding matters of governance as it relates to the program, college, and university at large.
1.3 Architecture Education and Registration

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to internship and licensure. The school may choose to explain in the APR the accredited degree program's relationship with the state registration boards, the exposure of students to internship requirements including knowledge of the national Intern Development Program (IDP) and continuing education beyond graduation, the students' understanding of their responsibility for professional conduct, and the proportion of graduates who have sought and achieved licensure since the previous visit.

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

Since AIAS has a strong and visible program, students assume the leadership role relative to IDP and the process of becoming familiar with how to transition to the profession through licensure. However, the program does not have a formally identified faculty advisor to help fulfill this role. Adding an IDP coordinator and clearly communicating this individual's role to the students would provide a more reliable method for ensuring that IDP and licensure-related issues are part of the program. Under current conditions, students find themselves having to discover the information on their own.

1.4 Architecture Education and the Profession

The accredited degree program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles and responsibilities in a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base. Given the program's particular mission, the APR may include an explanation of how the accredited degree program is engaged with the professional community in the life of the school; how students gain an awareness of the need to advance their knowledge of architecture through a lifetime of practice and research; how they develop an appreciation of the diverse and collaborative roles assumed by architects in practice, how they develop an understanding of and respect for the roles and responsibilities of the associated disciplines; how they learn to reconcile the conflicts between architects' obligations to their clients and the public and the demands of the creative enterprise; and how students acquire the ethics for upholding the integrity of the profession.

Met Not Met
[ ] [ ]

Students are sought out by local offices prior to graduation and are offered signing bonuses and excellent starting salaries.

1.5 Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and develops their capacity to address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions. In the APR, the accredited degree program may cover such issues as how students gain an understanding of architecture as a social art, including the complex processes carried out by the multiple stakeholders who shape built environments; the emphasis given to generating the knowledge that can mitigate social and environmental problems; how students gain an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions involving the built
environment; and how a climate of civic engagement is nurtured, including a commitment to professional and public services.

Met Not Met
[X]  [ ]

There are dedicated history and theory courses as well as urban design curricula that address civic engagement. This is strengthened by the cultural diversity of the students and faculty.

2. Program Self-Assessment Procedures

The accredited degree program must show how it is making progress in achieving the NAAB Perspectives and how it assesses the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The assessment procedures must include solicitation of the faculty's, students', and graduates' views on the program's curriculum and learning. Individual course evaluations are not sufficient to provide insight into the program's focus and pedagogy.

Met Not Met
[X]  [ ]

This criteria is well met. The reassessment and analysis of the program since the last NAAB visit is clearly evident.

3. Public Information

To ensure an understanding of the accredited professional degree by the public, all schools offering an accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include in their catalogs and promotional media the exact language found in the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Appendix A. To ensure an understanding of the body of knowledge and skills that constitute a professional education in architecture, the school must inform faculty and incoming students of how to access the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

Met Not Met
[X]  [ ]

4. Social Equity

The accredited degree program must provide faculty, students, and staff—irrespective of race, ethnicity, creed, national origin, gender, age, physical ability, or sexual orientation—with an educational environment in which each person is equitably able to learn, teach, and work. The school must have a clear policy on diversity that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and that is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources. Faculty, staff, and students must also have equitable opportunities to participate in program governance.

Met Not Met
[X]  [ ]

There is a richness of gender, racial and cultural diversity among the faculty, students and staff.
5. **Studio Culture**

The school is expected to demonstrate a positive and respectful learning environment through the encouragement of the fundamental values of optimism, respect, sharing, engagement, and innovation between and among the members of its faculty, student body, administration, and staff. The school should encourage students and faculty to appreciate these values as guiding principles of professional conduct throughout their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is well met.

6. **Human Resources**

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head with enough time for effective administration, and adequate administrative, technical, and faculty support staff. Student enrollment in and scheduling of design studios must ensure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the teacher and the student. The total teaching load should allow faculty members adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there has been a very positive improvement in the ratio of faculty to students (from 1:25 prior to 1:16 now) in studio courses, there has not been a concomitant increase in administrative support staff and information technology support staff.

7. **Human Resource Development**

Schools must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth inside and outside the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This condition is minimally met. Additional funding for travel and paper presentations in support of research must increase in order to maintain faculty development. There is no sabbatical policy.

8. **Physical Resources**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The program has access to three buildings: a relatively new main building that is well suited to the program, another older building that is presently under renovation and additional classrooms in an
adjacent building. Another building is in the planning stage in anticipation of program expansion. There are minimal facility maintenance and operational issues in the main building that need attention, such as a paint spray booth, materials stored in exit stairways and corridors. A second dust evacuation system is required in the wood shop to meet the addition of new equipment and a laser cutter.

9. Information Resources

Readily accessible library and visual resource collections are essential for architectural study, teaching, and research. Library collections must include at least 5,000 different cataloged titles, with an appropriate mix of Library of Congress NA, Dewey 720–29, and other related call numbers to serve the needs of individual programs. There must be adequate visual resources as well. Access to other architectural collections may supplement, but not substitute for, adequate resources at the home institution. In addition to developing and managing collections, architectural librarians and visual resources professionals should provide information services that promote the research skills and critical thinking necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning. Met Not Met

[X] [ ]

The main campus library provides and houses approximately 6,000 volumes in the architecture collection. The librarians provide necessary support and instruction to students and faculty. The librarians indicate that architecture students are the primary users of the library. The university is in close proximity to two major research libraries where architecture students and faculty can access additional materials. Since SPSU is part of the University of Georgia system, students are able to check out resources from any of the associated libraries.

10. Financial Resources

An accredited degree program must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources to meet its needs and be comparable in scope to those available to meet the needs of other professional programs within the institution. Met Not Met

[X] [ ]

This condition is minimally met. Budget increases have lagged student growth by 2 years due to legislative limitations. If SPSU continues to promote student enrollment increases, the university must be prepared to provide commensurate budgetary allocations.

11. Administrative Structure

The accredited degree program must be, or be part of, an institution accredited by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies for higher education: the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSACS); the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCACS); the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU); and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The accredited degree program must have a measure of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded other professional degree programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the conditions for accreditation. Met Not Met
12. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: 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 electives. Schools offering the degrees B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are strongly encouraged to use these degree titles exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

13. Student Performance Criteria

The accredited degree program must ensure that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria set out below. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

13.1 Speaking and Writing Skills

Ability to read, write, listen, and speak effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is well demonstrated in course work and in meetings with the Team.

13.2 Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well-reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These skills are evident in written texts and design studio work.

13.3 Graphic Skills

Ability to use appropriate representational media, including freehand drawing and computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ X ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computer graphic and manual drawing skills and model building skills are well developed.
13.4 Research Skills

Ability to gather, assess, record, and apply relevant information in architectural coursework

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Clear evidence of research is found in a variety of contexts throughout the various year levels.

13.5 Formal Ordering Skills

Understanding of the fundamentals of visual perception and the principles and systems of order that inform two- and three-dimensional design, architectural composition, and urban design

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

13.6 Fundamental Skills

Ability to use basic architectural principles in the design of buildings, interior spaces, and sites

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

13.7 Collaborative Skills

Ability to recognize the varied talent found in interdisciplinary design project teams in professional practice and work in collaboration with other students as members of a design team

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

This criterion is well met.

13.8 Western Traditions

Understanding of the Western architectural canons and traditions in architecture, landscape and urban design, as well as the climatic, technological, socioeconomic, and other cultural factors that have shaped and sustained them

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

The integration of theory and history has brought a level of richness and depth to the program.
13.9 Non-Western Traditions

Understanding of parallel and divergent canons and traditions of architecture and urban design in the non-Western world

Met [x] Not Met [ ]

There is ample evidence in the Cultures course sequence (history and theory).

13.10 National and Regional Traditions

Understanding of national traditions and the local regional heritage in architecture, landscape design and urban design, including the vernacular tradition

Met [x] Not Met [ ]

13.11 Use of Precedents

Ability to incorporate relevant precedents into architecture and urban design projects

Met [x] Not Met [ ]

There is ample evidence of the ability to use precedents.

13.12 Human Behavior

Understanding of the theories and methods of inquiry that seek to clarify the relationship between human behavior and the physical environment

Met [x] Not Met [ ]

13.13 Human Diversity

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

Met [x] Not Met [ ]

13.14 Accessibility

Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical abilities

Met [x] Not Met [ ]
Studio work includes evidence of an ability to include universal design concepts in sites and facilities.

13.15 Sustainable Design

Understanding of the principles of sustainability in making architecture and urban design decisions that conserve natural and built resources, including culturally important buildings and sites, and in the creation of healthful buildings and communities

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

Evidence seen in all four environmental tech courses and studio work.

13.16 Program Preparation

Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, including assessment of client and user needs, a critical review of appropriate precedents, an inventory of space and equipment requirements, an analysis of site conditions, a review of the relevant laws and standards and assessment of their implication for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

13.17 Site Conditions

Ability to respond to natural and built site characteristics in the development of a program and the design of a project

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

[S]trong evidence is demonstrated by both course and studio work as reflected by the ARE site planning component pass rate of 100% for the most recent NCARB report.

13.18 Structural Systems

Understanding of principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces and the evolution, range, and appropriate application of contemporary structural systems

Met Not Met
[ X ] [ ]

There is ample evidence in both course and studio work that students have this understanding.

13.19 Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of environmental systems, including acoustical, lighting, and climate modification systems, and energy use, integrated with the building envelope

Met Not Met
This criterion is well met.

13.20 Life-Safety

Understanding of the basic principles of life-safety systems with an emphasis on egress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met.

13.21 Building Envelope Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building envelope materials and assemblies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met.

13.22 Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This criterion is well met.

13.23 Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and conceptually integrate structural systems, building envelope systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, and building service systems into building design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coursework demonstrates strength in structural systems and building envelope design.

13.24 Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, including their environmental impact and reuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding and ability demonstrated in both drawings and large-scale models.

13.25 Construction Cost Control
Understanding of the fundamentals of building cost, life-cycle cost, and construction estimating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material presented in a semester-long course that provides fluency in a cost estimating computer program.

13.26 Technical Documentation
Ability to make technically precise drawings and write outline specifications for a proposed design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples showing construction documentation were excellent; however, team was unable to find examples of outline specifications.

13.27 Client Role in Architecture
Understanding of the responsibility of the architect to elicit, understand, and resolve the needs of the client, owner, and user

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional practice course is well written and very complete.

13.28 Comprehensive Design
Ability to produce a comprehensive architectural project based on a building program and site that includes development of programmed spaces demonstrating an understanding of structural and environmental systems, building envelope systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections and building assemblies, and the principles of sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of development was inconsistent across thesis projects. The team would have liked to see comprehensive design initiated in earlier studios.
13.29 Architect’s Administrative Roles

Understanding of obtaining commissions and negotiating contracts, managing personnel and selecting consultants, recommending project delivery methods, and forms of service contracts

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

13.30 Architectural Practice

Understanding of the basic principles and legal aspects of practice organization, financial management, business planning, time and project management, risk mitigation, and mediation and arbitration as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice, such as globalization, outsourcing, project delivery, expanding practice settings, diversity, and others

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Well explained and detailed in Professional Practice course.

13.31 Professional Development

Understanding of the role of internship in obtaining licensure and registration and the mutual rights and responsibilities of interns and employers

Met [ ] Not Met [X]

Although several students are working and enrolled in IDP, there is no designated coordinator and information is disseminated by AIAS. Topic does not appear to have been covered in any course work.

13.32 Leadership

Understanding of the need for architects to provide leadership in the building design and construction process and on issues of growth, development, and aesthetics in their communities

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

13.33 Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility as determined by registration law, building codes and regulations, professional service contracts, zoning and subdivision ordinances, environmental regulation, historic preservation laws, and accessibility laws

Met [X] Not Met [ ]

Well explained and detailed in Professional Practice course.
13.34 Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment in architectural design and practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Well explained and detailed in Professional Practice course.
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Appendix A: Program Information

1. History and Description of the Institution

The following text is taken from the 2008 Southern Polytechnic State University Architecture Program Report.

Southern Polytechnic State University being a progressive academic element of historic setting of City of Marietta and larger metropolitan Atlanta is a special purpose university in the state-supported University System of Georgia. It has a statewide mission to meet the needs of Georgia's citizens and industry for technological and related instruction at the collegiate level.

Founded in 1948 as a two-year division of Georgia Institute of Technology, SPSU was established at the request of Georgia business and industry. It first opened its doors as the Technical Institute in Chamblee, Georgia, with 116 students, all but 10 being World War II veterans, and a staff of 12.

In 1949, SPSU became the Southern Technical Institute and was recognized as a college-level school by the U.S. Department of Education. Less than a decade later, the college migrated to its present campus in Marietta, Georgia.

In 1961, Hoyt McClure was named acting director and led the movement to build eight new buildings on 120 acres of land. Since then we have continued to expand—our campus now encompasses more than 230 acres and contains 35 buildings.

SPSU became accredited as a four-year college in 1970, and was one of the first colleges in the nation to offer the Bachelor of Engineering Technology degree. The University also earned independence in the University System, separating ties with Georgia Tech. In the summer of 1980, SPSU officially became the 14th senior college and the 33rd independent unit of the University System.

The college’s first president, Dr. Stephen R. Cheshier of Purdue University, was named in 1980 and served with distinction until his retirement as president in June 1997. He saw SPSU through two name changes -- Southern College of Technology in 1987 and Southern Polytechnic State University in the summer of 1996, when the school also became a university. Dr. Daniel S. Papp served as interim president from July of 1997 to August of 1998, when the university welcomed Dr. Lisa A. Rossocher, formerly of Dickinson College, as its president.

Most of the programs began offering baccalaureate degrees in 1970, and in 1980, the school was granted its independent, senior college status within the University System.

The University offers undergraduate programs leading to degrees in Engineering Technology (Apparel and Textile, Civil, Electrical and Computer, Industrial, and Mechanical) Architecture, Computer Science, Construction, Management, Mathematics, Physics, Surveying and Technical Communication and six master’s degrees in Construction, Management, Engineering Technology and Technical Communications. Most recent additions in 2006 are Construction Engineering, Systems Engineering, Mechatronics and Chemistry under the academic leadership of Dr. Zvi Szafran [Vice President of Academic Affairs].
2. Institutional Mission

The following text is taken from the 2008 Southern Polytechnic State University Architecture Program Report.

1.2.1 SPSU Vision
Southern Polytechnic State University is a comprehensive university with a unique purpose. Through a fusion of technology with the liberal arts and sciences, we create a learning community that encourages thoughtful inquiry, diverse perspectives, and strong preparation of our graduates to be leaders in an increasingly technological world.

1.2.2 SPSU Vision + Values
Southern Polytechnic State University educates students at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels in the application of technology to solve real-world problems and improve the students' and society's quality of life. Southern Polytechnic State University shares the University System of Georgia's vision of creating a more educated Georgia, well prepared for a global, technological society, by providing first-rate undergraduate and graduate education, outstanding scholarship, and committed public service.

In rising to the technological, scientific, and humanitarian challenges of the future, we aspire to broaden our offerings by including programs in engineering, in new and emerging sciences and technologies, and in additional technically related fields. We will enhance our reputations as a University where imagination, innovation, and application are integrated to provide leadership into the future.

People are Southern Polytechnic State University's greatest asset. Acting as individuals and as members of a community, we determine our future and our success, and we support one another in our efforts to provide the best possible education for all our students. The education we provide is our reputation.

Values
The student comes first. The recruitment, education, and placement of our students are our highest priorities.

Learning is the focus of everything we do. We provide an environment for the success of our students, including high academic standards, outstanding teaching quality, and excellent student services.

Achieving an education is a responsibility shared by students, faculty, and staff. We all accept responsibility for excellence in fulfilling our respective roles.

Continual improvement is essential to our future. We strive to improve the education that we provide to our students.

We encourage academic freedom. We cherish an atmosphere of independent thought and open discussion.

We work cooperatively and collaboratively. We value the contributions of all members of the Southern Polytechnic team and treat each other with courtesy and respect.

Honesty, integrity and mutual respect form our foundation. Our actions are characterized by social and personal responsibility, and we act in ways which command the respect of all who deal with us.
Our partners are essential to our excellence. We maintain open and honest lines of communication and collaboration with our many academic, industrial, and community partners.

We are citizens of the world. We strive to instill environmental, cultural and international awareness throughout our college community.

1.2.3 SPSU Mission Statement
Southern Polytechnic State University is proud to be Georgia’s technology university. Our academic, professional, outreach and service programs embrace all aspects of technology, including the practical applied skills (techné) needed to solve today’s real-world problems and the theoretical knowledge (logos) necessary to meet tomorrow’s challenges. SPSU graduates are well prepared to lead the scientific and economic development of an increasingly complex state, nation, and world.

Our mission is to serve both traditional and non-traditional students at the undergraduate, graduate and continuing education levels; in engineering and engineering technology, the sciences, applied liberal arts, business and professional programs. We work to develop the broader community’s intellectual, cultural, economic, and human resources. Facilitated by our innovative faculty, dedicated staff and supportive campus environment, our learning community empowers SPSU students with the ability and vision to transform the future.

1.2.4 SPSU Mission in Practice
Our Mission has a committed focus to produce academically and technically proficient graduates for the economic development of the state, region, and nation, and seek international opportunities to participate in the teaching and transfer of technology. To achieve objectives of our Mission:

We offer a flexible schedule of day and evening classes for programs at the associate, baccalaureate, and master’s levels to the highly motivated students we seek to recruit and retain.

We offer both degree and non-degree programs, provide opportunities for cooperative education, and engage in collaborative efforts with other institutions.

We enroll a significant number of working professionals as part-time students, as well as a large number of traditional college-age students. We welcome academically prepared transfer students from community/junior colleges, technical institutes, senior colleges and universities, who are seeking a high quality technical education.

All of our programs include a strong general education course of study that integrates science, technology, and liberal arts. Our growing graduate programs introduce students to research that is industrially, technically, or applications focused.

The faculty strives for excellence in teaching and service, providing a laboratory-centered and/or professionally oriented education that fosters problem solving, ethical awareness, and a desire for lifelong learning.

At Southern Polytechnic State University, we encourage continual improvement throughout the campus and assume statewide leadership in the study and teaching of the process of continual improvement. We offer opportunities for professional development, and we work to achieve an international outlook.
We serve our community through partnerships with industry, professional organizations, government, schools, and through continuing education and public service programs. We promote activities which increase public awareness of science, technology and related fields.

1.2.5: SPSU Mission In Action
In rising to the technological, scientific, and humanitarian challenges of the 21st Century and future, we aspire to broaden our offerings by including programs in engineering, in new and emerging sciences and technologies, and in additional technically related fields.

We are determined to enhance our reputation as a university where imagination, innovation, and application are integrated to provide leadership into the future.

Southern Polytechnic State University shares with the other colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia the following core characteristics or purposes:
- A supportive campus climate, necessary services, and leadership and development opportunities, all to educate the whole person and meet and needs of students, faculty and staff.
- Cultural ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in the faculty, staff, and student body, supported by practices and programs that embody the ideals of an open, democratic, and global society.
- Technology to advance educational purposes, including instructional technology, student support services, and distance education.
- Collaborative relationships with other System institutions, State agencies, local schools and technical institutes, and business and industry, sharing physical, human, information, and other resources to expand and enhance programs and services available to the citizens of Georgia.

Southern Polytechnic State University shares with the other State Universities and Senior Colleges of the University System of Georgia the following core characteristics or purposes:
- A commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of an area of the state, and by particularly outstanding programs or distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect throughout the region or state.
- A commitment to teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, serves a diverse and university-prepared student body, promotes high levels of student achievement, offers academic assistance, and provides developmental studies programs for a limited student cohort.
- A high quality general education program supporting a variety of disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and professional academic programming at the baccalaureate level, with selected master's and educational specialist degrees, and selected associate degree programs based on area need and/or inter-institutional collaborations.
- A commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the education level within the university's scope of influence.
- A commitment to scholarly and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits, and a commitment to applied research in selected areas of institutional strength and area need.
3. Program History

The following text is taken from the 2008 Southern Polytechnic State University Architecture Program Report.

Bachelor of Architecture

In 1964, the Architectural Engineering Technology associate degree program was established. This was expanded to a four-year baccalaureate program in 1970. Professors Chester Orvold and Robert Myatt headed the department until 1982, when Professor William S. Newman assumed responsibility for the program. He and Professor Fauget, other faculty, students, and representatives from the profession, and the state soon began the long process of developing the professional degree program, which was finally approved by the Board of Regents in 1989. The School of Architecture was established within Southern Tech’s organizational structure.

The program began operating in September 1990, under the leadership of Acting Dean Harry Kaufman, who had led its rounding out during 1989 when he was department head. In January 1991, after the program was established and operating, Dr. David Pearson was brought in as dean and served until September of 1992. The Environmental Development program was made official in 1991; the faculty was enlarged. NAAB candidacy was granted effective January 1, 1992.

In the fall of 1992, Professor William S. Newman was appointed Acting Head, who developed a comprehensive committee structure, established a time-line to coordinate the efforts leading toward accreditation. Professor Harry Kaufman accepted the task of coordinating the curriculum.

During the summer of 1993, Harry F. Kaufman was appointed Dean, which gave the school stability in its pursuit of excellence in design, theory, and technological application. During April of the following Spring, in 1994, the school hosted an Interim Candidacy visit. In January 1995 the program received its initial accreditation.

In November 1995, the University System Board of Regents approved semester conversion effective in the fall quarter 1998. In March 1996, the Regents published a report on the maximum number of semester credit hours required for completion of degrees. For the Bachelor’s degree, 120 hours was the stated maximum. The Board also increased the Regents’ Core Curriculum, the general studies requirements for the system, by 2 semester credit hours.

In March 1997 the Senior Vice Chancellor of Academics approved a waiver of 150 semester credit hours for the Bachelor of Architecture program (the only B. Arch. in the system). The Bachelor of Architecture curriculum in place during the initial accreditation visit contained 250-quarter credit hours, or 167 semester credit hours.

During the 1996-97 academic year the architecture faculty worked diligently to maintain the rigor of the current pedagogy while reducing the curriculum by 19 semester hours and complying with the 1995 NAAB Conditions and Procedures. Within a week of the publication of the 1998-99 University catalog, the 1998 NAAB Conditions and Procedures was received.

These new procedures permitted the faculty to revise the newly created semester curriculum. The number of hours of Architecture Electives was reduced from 30 semester credit hours (20% of the total hours) to 18 semester credit hours. This surplus of hours
was used to revise the history-theory course sequence that was unsuccessfully
incorporated into the studio courses on the first attempt at semester conversion.

This revised program for Bachelors of Architecture was implemented during the 1999-
2000 academic year. In 2001, President of the University, Dr. Lisa Rossbacher combined
three departments Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology and Construction to
establish a better collaborative connection between three departments following the
strong-dean model.

All three departments in School of ACC [Architecture Construction Management], Civil
Engineering Technology] are managed by their Independent Program Heads under the
leadership of Dr. Wilson Barnes appointed as Dean in 2001. During spring of 2002,
Architecture Department moved to the state-of-the art new facility with two hundred and
forty students, ten faculty members, four staff members and two administrators.

Dr. Curtis Sartor was appointed as Chair in 2001, and successfully managed the
Architecture Program before accepting the position of Chair of Architecture Department
at Judson College in 2005.

In fall 2005, Dr. Barnes appointed Mr. Jay Waronker as Interim Chair for six months to
help the Search and Screen Committee to complete its National/International Search for
a permanent Department Chair.

Dr. Ameen Faroog accepted the position as Chair of the Architecture Department at
SPSU in January, 2006 with a mandate from faculty and students. He is committed to
raise the bar of architectural education at SPSU with a strong conviction of collective and
shared governance to move the Architecture Program forward.

The Architecture Program has experienced dramatic growth over the past six years.
Chart I a illustrates the growth pattern of architecture versus its sister programs of civil
engineering technology and construction management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>SPSU(-)</th>
<th>CNST</th>
<th>CET</th>
<th>ARCH</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>3512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>3662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>3794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>4203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>4573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 1b shows the combined school growth versus the university. It is clear that architecture has been a significant force for stability and growth of the university in bad economic times as well as good.

It is anticipated that the B. Arch will not continue to expand indefinitely but will plateau and divert some students to a four year architectural science program in addition to the current feed it provides to other programs on campus, especially to the construction management and civil engineering related programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS</th>
<th>SPSU(%)</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2768</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2771</td>
<td>1022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2639</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2849</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2942</td>
<td>1499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Program Mission

The following text is taken from the 2008 Southern Polytechnic State University Architecture Program Report.

The Architecture Program in School of ACC is driven to expand growth with quality while integrating and extending the University’s mission through collaboration into the realm of architecture, development, and environmental education through the 5-year Bachelor of Architecture degree program. This program prepares students for professional practice in the design, planning, development, and stewardship of the built environment.

1.4.1. Architecture Program Mission

The Architecture Program Mission is committed to foster invention, creativity, and craft through "hands-on" exploration that is the foundation of technology. Moreover, the knowledge of cultural diversity, communication, history, and criticism is inseparable from the application of technology. This process is “the making of architecture.” The Architecture Program assures collaborations with allied fields of Civil Engineering Technology and Construction Management Programs within School of ACC and other Programs in campus to diversify the learning portfolio of our students.

1.4.2. The Vision being the Mission
The paradigm to guide the Architecture Program into the 21st Century is Technologically Expressive architecture. This is not to be confused with “High Tech”, that is a style. Technologically Expressive architecture is not a style; it is a tool and a philosophy — the essence of what we call "making architecture." With this paradigm we will produce future architects [for local and global markets] who will:

- Learn the basic skills and knowledge necessary to acquire a professional architectural education, the methods and paradigms of professional practice, and the critical theoretical framework and critical skills necessary to challenge current paradigms of architecture and urbanism.

- Rely on science, engineering within the socio-economic-structure and cultural dynamics of a society as ordering systems while retaining an awareness of their own aesthetic subjectivity—creating an architecture that is of technology rather than superimposed on technology or driven by technology.

- Appreciate curriculum within the context of liberal arts and sciences, by stressing the integration of knowledge from other disciplines in design analysis and synthesis, and in historical analysis.

- Constantly search for new potential for existing building materials and push forward the frontiers of technology as well as being involved in the very physical nature of prototyping and construction.

- Learn architecture in a manner that places a premium on design excellence understood as the preservation of the environment, the maintenance of sustainable growth and change, and the embodiment of appropriate cultural patterns, values and symbolic forms.

- Create an architecture that is shaped not just by function and technology but also by the people and their behavior, by the place and its traditions, and by an urge to settle into, and integrate with, the surroundings and the natural environment with an emphasis on architectural design excellence informed by ethics and an appreciation of the cultural, social and physical (natural and urban) contexts.

- Create architecture through methodical studies into the potential of each 'piece' to realize the potential of the whole. Those who see the 'piece' as a mere component that can be taken up easily and used in other designs profoundly misunderstand how intrinsic its role is in a specific building, its scale and place.

- Learn to emphasize the understanding, appreciation, and criticism of specific buildings and their urban context, rather than purely historical matters that are more pertinent to a career in architectural history. Through attentive listening, create an architecture that clearly demonstrates the user and community participation in determining design goals rather than an architecture that imposes a distinctive personal idiom.

- Make significant contributions to architecture through academic and professional research to explore and understand dynamics and dialectical relationships between emerging technologies and new global urban ecologies shaping 21st Century living environments.

- Realize and acknowledge that architectural projects; from the simplest to the most complex, are best realized through a team effort. Further, they will realize that it is impossible to separate the initial moment of conception, the
process of technological verification, documentation, and the construction process—and still realize a unified whole.

- Realize that architecture is the making of things; it requires a balance of science and craft, head and hand, experiment and memory; and that it is not necessary for technology to be incompatible with history or nature.

- Expand knowledge to seek advanced and continuing education opportunities beyond architectural licensure through post professional degree studies, continuing education courses, public lectures, symposia and exhibitions.

- Contribute to architectural practice and education in the world, nation and community through design and research publication, participation and leadership in professional organizations and professional service.

If we are able to produce graduates with these capabilities, we will have a lasting effect on both the built environment and the architecture profession. We will produce future architects who will not lapse with the pressures of production and market image, into a safe formula of recognizable style, but instead, will produce extraordinarily diverse projects that are products of unflagging creativity, inventiveness, and a precision of response to the particulars of each project.

Periodic assessments of the Architecture Program remain instrumental to methodically structure the dynamic nature of architectural education at SPSU to effectively address paradigm shifts between academic and profession to understand and meet current and future needs of architectural design and practice in local and global markets.

The program mission and vision statements were adopted on February 12, 1994 and were endorsed by the faculty during the summer, 1993. The Mission and Vision of the Program were revisited in a Strategic Planning Assessment Initiative during 2004 and have been in place since 2005.

5. Program Self Assessment

The following text is taken from the 2008 Southern Polytechnic State University Architecture Program Report.

The Architecture Program at SPSU has been accredited since 1995 and is the only 5-Year Professional B. Arch degree in the State of Georgia. It is a young Program and recognized as the flagship program in campus. Our Program shares university-wide goals in its Curriculum for expanding the University's role as a technical, social and cultural force by integrating "practical applied skills (techné) needed to solve today's real-world problems and the theoretical knowledge (logos) necessary to meet tomorrow's challenges (The Strategic Plan: Southern Polytechnic State University, September 25, 2006)"

Faculty periodically assesses its academic quality to maintain and improve its professional integrity and high academic standards. Our purpose is to serve our students, our professional communities, the state, and our nation. The critical question is how we do this, its quality, and the reputation we currently reap.

Students are prepared to provide design solutions to problems by connecting all possible dots of explorations ranging from contextual parameters to ecological impacts,
technological changes and shifts in population growth and their combinatory impact on the overall quality of life.

Our goal remains to provide architectural education that must facilitate breadth and in-depth understanding of diverse socio-economic and cultural milieus. We feel it is important to address all critical issues through a re-integration of knowledge and "hands-on" practice with an integrated multi-disciplinary collaborative approach in areas of design, technology, emerging ecologies, urban design and morphology, sustainability, history and theory and implications of globalization into design thinking and action.

The University's Strategic Plan envisions that current growth in the Architecture Program should become the norm across the University. Our Program strives to be an active design agent in Metropolitan Atlanta and is uniquely poised to do so.

Following is a brief account of efforts and measures that shaped the Architecture Program following its Strategic Plan initiatives. They are dynamically linked to the shifting academic equilibriums of the University.

1.5.1 Strategic Self Assessment 1998-2004

In 1998, the Strategic Planning Initiative was revisited to reinforce the higher standards of architectural education in the face of the University and State's financial and administrative uncertainty and flux [APR, 2000]. Given its unrelenting commitment to excellence, the Program was accredited for full five-year term under the leadership of Dean Harry Kaufman. Professor Kaufman successfully spearheaded the effort to provide a new home to the Architecture Program that was previously housed in Building "I". The new Architecture Building was completed in 2001 and was first occupied in March of 2002. The new building was designed to house 268 students.

In 2002, SPSU underwent a major academic restructuring effort which combined allied academic programs to support a collaborative environment and for meeting challenging budgetary constraints. The Architecture Program, previously as an Independent School, became one of the three departments in the School of ACC [Architecture, Civil Engineering Technology and Construction]. Dr. Wilson Barnes became the new Dean of School of ACC and Dr. Curtis Sartor was appointed Chair of the Department of Architecture.

Despite limited financial support, our highly motivated faculty and students took this state of the art facility to heart and turned it into a living, learning, design tool. Since 2002, the Architecture Program has experienced unprecedented growth. It surpassed the projected growth of 268 to approximately 339 students in fall 2003, thus adding an enormous load on faculty. The Strategic Plan developed in 1998 required a serious overhaul to address the current academic stresses by needing to adjust and meet the new needs of the Program without comprising its excellence in design education.

In 2004-05, the faculty designed a broad-based Strategic Plan with key objectives to make it a competitive and comprehensive Program for the 21st Century while concurrently addressing issues that needed improvement. This planned initiative has a built-in flexibility to be in sync with the goals and objectives of the Strategic Plans of School of ACC [2004] and the University [2004, 2006].

During the 2004 Accrediting Visit, the Team commended the vision and proactive policies of the 2004 Strategic Plan. Nevertheless, the expansion of the Program with limited financial and administrative support caused serious duress among the existing faculty. The Visiting Team fully acknowledged the strengths of the Program and suggested
guidelines to improve the conditions that precipitated the faculty duress before the next Accrediting Visit in the spring of 2008.

1.5.2 The Architecture Program in Transition: 2005

In 2005, the Program went through a period of uncertainty when Dr. Sartor [Chair] decided to take up the Chair position at Judson College. Dr. Barnes hired Interim Chair, Mr. Jay Waronker to support the Program with the approval of Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. David Hornbeck.

Leadership belongs to those who can address critical issues through a re-integration of knowledge and practice and through multi-disciplinary research with a "hands-on" approach to design education, integrating process with craft and technology, and imbued with an in-depth understanding of the social, cultural and economic agents of our society. Our Architecture Program is uniquely poised to do this.

In fall of 2005, Dr. Zvi Szafran joined SPSU as the permanent VPAA [Vice President of Academic Affairs]. The Architecture Program is gradually gaining stability and is on a path of continuous improvement.

In December 2005, the Search and Screen Committee, chaired by Professor William Carpenter, completed its international search for a permanent Chair. In January 2006, with a mandate from students and faculty, Dr. Ameen Farooq agreed to lead the Program as Chair.

1.5.3 The Self-Assessment Process

The Self Assessment Process portion of the Architecture Program's 2004 Strategic Plan employed procedures described by Alexander L. Lerner, Research Associate, College of Business Administration and Economics at California State University in his article "A Strategic Planning Primer for Higher Education". The environmental scan was accomplished through a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) Analysis of the SPSU Architecture Program.

The Process relied upon collaboration and continuous involvement of all stakeholders related to the Architecture Program [Faculty, Adjunct Faculty, Students, Alumni, Advisory Board and outside Professionals]. This inclusive process lends certain credibility and a vested interest by stakeholders in its fruition.

Overall, for more than 40 meeting hours, in excess of 45 individuals participated in the planning process. An additional 16 alumni and 53 students provided input through surveys. The drafts of results at various stages were also shared with the Vice President for Academic Affairs in an effort to keep him informed and to invite his feedback on the process and the plan.

A series of separate and collective planning meetings were held with faculty, adjunct faculty, DFN students, Professional Core students, Thesis students, Program alumni, business and advisory board members. In addition to scheduled meetings, input into the process was also provided through surveys of alumni and current students. In mid-August, a day-long final planning meeting was held. It included representatives of all of the above-mentioned groups

Planning sessions included opportunities for individual, small group and large group inputs. The results of each of these sessions were compiled. While each group identified unique concerns, the great amount of consensus among the groups reinforced the
validity of the process and outcomes. The Steering Committee compiled the input of all
groups and developed a final list of goals and objectives.

The value of such an inclusive process was that it achieved buy-in from all the constituency
groups and a commitment from all of them to work together to implement an action plan
for each of the identified objectives.

1.5.4 The Self-Assessment Process in Action: 2006— to Date

In 2006, with a renewed spirit of collective and shared governance, the faculty with Dr.
Ameen Farooq (Dept. Chair), with the committed support of Dr. Wilson Barnes (Dean of
School ACC) and Dr. Zvi Szafran (Vice President of Academic Affairs), set the strategic
initiatives into action to meet the unmet conditions and concerns pointed out by the
Accrediting Team of 2004—and to move beyond.

Our strategic initiatives at present are focused to build upon the existing strengths of the
Architecture Program to create an integrated curriculum with mutually supportive inter
and multidisciplinary collaborations with other degree programs in the School of ACC and
the SPSU campus. The collaborative synergy of the three Programs in the School of ACC
along with other Programs on campus remains crucial to addressing pressing social,
technical and environmental issues, for advancing the Program’s reputation, and to help
build bridges to professionals and academic scholars.

The flexibility in the 2004 Strategic Assessment Plan is designed to give the Architecture
Program a clear identity by recognizing its unique position in fast-growing urban Atlanta to
combine research with application, craft with technology, creativity with innovation, critical
thinking with methodology, and process with feasibility, to evolve, contribute and adjust to
the creative challenges of the 21st Century.

Our goal remains to develop the critical mass of faculty, students, and meaningful
academic culture necessary to advance the Program from one with an excellent
architectural education. The B.Arch. Program is achieving increasing recognition at the
local, state and international scenes. Currently, the Program is well-recognized
internationally through its established Exchange Programs with the Bauhaus at Dessau and
Anhalt University, Milan Polytechnic in Italy, and North China University of Technology in
Beijing.

A post-professional Masters in Architecture degree laid out in the Strategic Plan of 2004 is
designed to provide a research and application forum to offer a diverse range of inter and
multidisciplinary scholastic venues that draw from the Program faculty’s rich academic and
scholarly strengths. Research-based, it would support the needs of the ever-expanding
growth of Metro Atlanta on scales related to Planning, Urban and Community Design,
Adaptive-Reuse, Smart Growth, Globalization, and Sustainability.

Our B. Arch Program’s emphasis is on design excellence with its signature strength in a
“hands-on approach” within a broad critical framework of cultural, natural environmental,
and man made contexts, generally described as “urban", but varying in their location and
density from the open landscape to the most dense of cities.

Section 1.5.5 highlights salient initiatives within the broad framework of the Self
Assessment Process that are currently part of our proactive process for improving the
existing quality of our Program. These are discussed in detail in Section 3.2.
1.5.5 Strategic Initiatives relative to the Program Self Assessment

The following executive summary highlights our salient objectives/initiatives within the broader framework of our Self Assessment Plans and Procedures that are currently part of our proactive process for improving the existing quality of our Program:

A. To maintain and further enhance the existing professional degree program in architecture

Continuously strengthen the curriculum to foster critical thinking and exceed academic standards, while exploring emerging professional, architectural and construction trends and societal issues.

Establish stronger interconnections and collaboration between the Programs in School of ACC and other Programs on campus.

B. To enhance the reputation of the Architecture Program

Continuously improve the quality, rigor and academic standards of the program to ensure the increased productivity and preparedness of our students and to enhance the performance of the program.

C. To Attract, retain, and support qualified faculty

Enable faculty to support the missions of the professionally accredited Program in architecture and the university in order to achieve excellence in teaching, creative activity, research, and service.

D. To secure the financial and physical resources necessary to support and enhance the architecture program

Provide the facilities and technologies necessary for and appropriate to the mission of the Program.

E. To increase program visibility and recognition; improve its' professional and academic reputation

Maximize the advantages of our location set within Historic Marietta and as a part of the greater Metropolitan Atlanta area.

F. To advocate the appreciation, exploration and application of good design and responsible architecture within the architectural profession and society

Develop and nurture a culture of professionalism and a strong sense of ethics within the program and the profession.

Provide continuing education courses to the profession such as LEED, Sustainable Design, Digital Informatics, Initiatives, Design/Build, Adaptive-Reuse & Historic Preservation, Urban Redevelopment and Urban Morphology, Design & Policy.

G. To seek opportunities to launch additional professional and non-professional programs designed to complement the existing Architecture Program.

Establish a Post-professional MS degree in Architecture to expand and strengthen research and application in specific subject areas: History and Theory, Historic
Preservation and Adaptive-reuse, Urban Redevelopment, Urban Design & Morphology, 

Enhance the multi-disciplinary approach to the design process, research and application
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Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Representing the AIA
C. James Lawler, FAIA
C. J. Lawler Associates
7 South Main Street
West Hartford, CT 06107-2401
(860) 233-8526
(860) 231-9033
jlawler@cjlawler.com

Representing the ACSA
Jane Britt Greenwood AIA
Associate Dean and Associate Professor
College of Architecture, Art, and Design
Mississippi State University
PO Box AQ
Mississippi State, MS 39762
(662) 325-2202
(662) 325-8872 fax
jgreenwood@caad.msstate.edu

Representing the AIAS
Tony Vanky, Vice President
The American Institute of Architecture Students
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 626-7472
(202) 626-7414 fax
(734) 846-7057 mobile
Tonyvanky.com; vicepresident@aias.org

Representing the NCARB
Kevin Jensen, AIA, CSI
City and County of San Francisco
Department of Public Works
30 Van Ness Avenue, 5th Fl
San Francisco, CA 94104-6099
(415) 557-4685
kevin.w.jensen@gmail.com; kevin.w.jensen@sfdpw.org

Observer
Michel A. Mounayar, R.A.
Professor of Architecture & Associate Dean
College of Architecture and Planning
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
(765) 285-5859
(765) 285-3726 fax
mmounaya@bsu.edu
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Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

NAAB Visit Agenda and Schedule
March 22-26, 2008

Saturday, March 22, 2008
1:00 PM Accreditation Team members Arrival: Crown Plaza Hotel, Marietta.
2:00 PM Dean’s Symposium
7:00 PM Faculty Exhibition Reception
8:30 PM Accreditation team dinner: Persian Restaurant
Academic Coordinators + Symposium Speakers + Dean + Chair + Accrediting Team + Liz + Rich B + Rich C + Bill C

Sunday, March 23, 2008
09:00 AM Overview of Team Room: Department Chair + Academic Coordinators
10:00 AM Review of Team room exhibits and records
12:00 Noon Team lunch with Faculty
2:00 PM Tour of the Facilities by students
3:00 PM Continued review of Team room exhibits and records
7:00 PM Team only Dinner and Debriefing session

Monday, March 24, 2008
07:00 AM Team Breakfast with Department Chair, Dr. Ameen Farooq
09:00 AM Entrance Meeting: Dean: Dr. Barnes, School of ACC [Dean’s Conference Room]
09:30 AM Entrance Meeting: VPPA: Dr. Zvi Szafran [Administrative Building: Conference Room]
10:00 AM Entrance Meeting: President: Dr. Lisa Rossbacher [Administrative Building: Conference Room]
11:30 AM Continued Review of Team room exhibits and records
12:00 PM Box Lunch for the Team
01:00 PM Library Visit and Meeting: Dr. Joyce Mills [Director] and Yongli Ma [Assistant Director]
02:00 PM Meeting with full time and adjunct faculty
02:45 PM Meeting with Architecture Staff
03:15 PM Observation of Studios
04:00 PM School-wide entrance meeting with students: Theater: Student Center
05:00 PM Reception: 1180 Peachtree Street: Faculty, administrators, advisory board, alumni, students and practitioners
07:30 PM Team only Dinner and Debriefing session

Tuesday, March 25, 2008
07:00 AM Team Breakfast with Department Chair, Dr. Ameen Farooq
09:00 AM Review of general studies, electives, and related programs
10:00 AM Observations of lectures and pin-up presentations
11:00 AM Continued review of exhibits and records
12:00 Noon Meeting with Student Representatives: Class Room
01:30 PM Review of exhibits and records
07:30 PM Team Only Dinner: Accreditation deliberations and drafting the VTR

Wednesday, March 26, 2008
07:00 AM Team Breakfast with Architecture Department Chair [Dr. Ameen Farooq]
08:15 AM Exit meeting with Dean [Dr. Wilson Barnes]: School of ACC
09:00 AM Exit meeting: Vice President Academic Affairs [Dr. Zvi Szafran] and President [Dr. Lisa Rossbacher]
10:30 AM School-wide Exit Meeting: Faculty, staff and students
12:30 PM Team lunch with faculty and team member departures
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IV. Report Signatures

Respectfully submitted,

C. James Lawler, FAIA
Team Chair
Representing the AIA

Jane Brit Greenwood, AIA
Team member
Representing the ACSA

Tony Yanik
Team member
Representing the AIAS

Kevin Jensen, AIA, CSI
Team member
Representing the NCARB

Michel A. Mounayar, R.A.
Observer
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